ICT Use in Third World Countries -A Curse Rather than a Blessing in the Dawn of the 21st Century.

Tafara Marazi

Community and Social Development, University of Zimbabwe

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110200155

Received: 04 March 2026; Accepted: 09 March 2026; Published: 23 March 2026

ABSTRACT

The article presents a critical analysis of the prevailing paradigm of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) integration within the educational systems of third world countries. It argues that in the 3rd decade of the 21st century implementation models, the use of ICT functions more as a multifaceted curse than a blessing. Moving beyond techno-optimistic narratives, the analysis deconstructs the profound dissonance between the global discourse of ICT as an indispensable catalyst for development and the on-ground realities of systemic failure in the Global South. It examines the concatenation of barriers—including the crippling infrastructure chasm, unsustainable donor-driven projects, and a profound human resource crisis characterised by inadequate teacher training and policy voids—that render most initiatives ineffective. Pedagogically, the article details how ICT can foster cognitive dependency, erode foundational skills like handwriting and critical thinking, and introduce significant distractions and psycho-social risks. Furthermore, it interrogates ICT's role as a vector for a new form of digital neo-colonialism, entrenching economic dependency and facilitating cultural homogenisation that threatens indigenous knowledge systems. While acknowledging the contested terrain of potential benefits, the article contends these are contingent upon optimal conditions conspicuously absent in most third-world contexts. The conclusion is a clarion call for a radical paradigm shift towards context-sensitive, sustainable, and empowering reformation. The shift prioritises foundational human and systemic capacity over hardware procurement, champions locally relevant content and open-source solutions, and re-centres the goal on solving specific educational challenges rather than mimicking Western technological models, thereby transmuting ICT from a latent curse into a genuine tool for endogenous development.

Keywords:

1. Information communication technology (ICT): The conglomeration of "hardware, software, networks and media for the collection, storage, processing, transmission and presentation of information (voice, data, text, images), as well as related services" (Evoh, 2007: 1).

2. Third world countries: States predominantly located within the African continent and other regions of the Global South—regions marked by the legacies of colonialism, structural adjustment programmes, nascent or shattered economies, and deeply entrenched inequalities (Isaacs, 2007: 1).

3. Digital Divide: The socio-economic gap in access to and meaningful use of ICT, exacerbated by inequitable implementation (Mathevula & Uwizeyimana, 2014).

4. Technological Dependency: The perpetual reliance on imported hardware, software, and expertise, stifling local innovation (Ayemoba, 2013).

5. Pedagogical Disruption: The negative interference with teaching and learning, including distraction and skill erosion (Mikre, 2011).

6. Neo-Colonialism: The continued economic and cultural domination through control of digital platforms and content (Harding, 2009)

7. Sustainable Implementation: Long-term, context-appropriate integration focusing on local capacity over hardware (Mndzebele, 2013).

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February2026

INTRODUCTION

The dawn of the 21st century is largely characterised by a potent and pervasive global discourse that positions Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) as indispensable, messianic, catalysts for socio-economic development and educational transformation. ICTs, broadly defined as the conglomeration of "hardware, software, networks and media for the collection, storage, processing, transmission and presentation of information (voice, data, text, images), as well as related services" (Evoh, 2007: 1), are championed as the engines of an educational revolution (Kozma, 2008). Yet, in third world settings, this revolutionary promise often dissolves into a complex and disheartening web of unintended consequences, infrastructural failure, pedagogical disruption, cultural erosion, and deepened socio-economic fissures (Warschauer, 2003; Unwin, 2009). This discourse, propagated by international financial institutions, donor agencies, and multinational technology corporations, constructs a narrative of inevitable progress where connectivity equates to modernity and digital literacy to competitive advantage. In developed nations, this narrative has materialised into a tangible reality; ICTs have become thoroughly pervasive, seamlessly integrated into pedagogical frameworks, administrative operations, and the very fabric of daily institutional life (Allan et al, 2003: 158). This integration, however, presents a starkly different and profoundly more complicated narrative in the context of third world countries, denoting states predominantly located within the African continent and other regions of the Global South—regions marked by the legacies of colonialism, structural adjustment programmes, nascent or shattered economies, and deeply entrenched inequalities (McEwan 2009). The challenges collectively suggest that the current paradigm of ICT adoption functions less as a blessing. Instead, it presents itself more as a subtle, yet debilitating, curse—a digital mirage that promises an oasis of development but delivers the sands of dependency and disillusionment (Wade, 2002; Toyama, 2015). While there is demonstrably growing political commitment and rhetorical enthusiasm among third world governments for implementing ICT in schools, the process is persistently hindered and often fundamentally undermined by a concatenation of profound systemic, economic, pedagogical, and cultural challenges (Heeks, 2002; Avgerou, 2008).

METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a critical qualitative research design to interrogate the prevailing paradigm of ICT integration in third world education. The methodology is structured around three principal interconnected phases. Firstly, a critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995) is applied to deconstruct the techno-optimistic rhetoric embedded in key policy documents from entities like the World Bank (2003) and donor-driven project frameworks, revealing their underlying assumptions and power dynamics. Secondly, a systematic literature review synthesises empirical and theoretical scholarship from the past two decades, focusing on peer-reviewed studies from Sub-Saharan Africa and similar Global South contexts (e.g., Unwin, 2009; Farrell 2009, Harding 2009). This review is thematically analysed to juxtapose claimed benefits against documented evidence of systemic failures. Thirdly, the analysis employs a comparative case study approach (Yin, 2018), drawing on specific empirical evidence from national contexts such as South Africa (Mathevula & Uwizeyimana, 2014), Zimbabwe (Matsika, 2021), and others cited in the literature. This multi-method approach facilitates a robust examination of the infrastructural chasm, pedagogical pitfalls, and neo-colonial dynamics, moving beyond superficial narratives to construct a comprehensive argument on ICT's paradoxical role as a socio-technical curse in resource-constrained environments.

Conceptual Foundations – De-Constructing Ict and the Third World Condition

To fully apprehend the profound paradox and potential peril of ICT integration in third world education, it is essential to engage in a rigorous deconstruction of the key terminologies and the material conditions they describe. This technological determinist view is critically challenged by scholars who argue that ICTs are not neutral conduits but are embedded with social, political, and economic agendas (Winner, 1980; Beyers, 2000; Harding 1998). Perron et al, (2010: 67) provide a functional definition of ICTs as “Information and communication technologies used to convey, manipulate and store data by electronic means.” This encompasses a vast and evolving spectrum of tools, from foundational applications like email and SMS to the sprawling ecosystems of social media platforms, and from tangible hardware like laptops and smartphones to the invisible architectures of cloud networks and broadband connectivity (Castells, 2000; Fuchs, 2008). Within a formal educational milieu, this definition extends to a specific suite of pedagogical gadgets including desktop and

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February2026

laptop computers, data projectors, interactive whiteboards, digital cameras, and, most pivotally, reliable internet access (Bingimlas, 2009; Mikre, 2011).

The global discourse, however, often conflates this broad toolkit with a singular, monolithic driver of progress, obscuring the fact that its utility is entirely contingent upon the ecosystem into which it is introduced (Selwyn, 2011; Oliver, 2011). The term "third world,"" is employed with critical intent TO denote states, primarily but not exclusively in Africa, that continue to grapple with the enduring legacies of colonial exploitation, economic underdevelopment orchestrated by global financial architectures, and the debilitating effects of structural adjustment programmes (Rodney, 1972; Amin, 1990; Mkandawire, 2005; Evoh, 2007). These historical forces have resulted in fragile public sectors, limited fiscal space for ambitious social projects, and education systems that are often chronically underfunded, over-burdened, and struggling to meet basic literacy and numeracy goals, let alone technologically advanced ones (Lewin, 2009; Farrell 2009).

Pedagogical Pitfalls - Distraction, and Cognitive Dependency

Proponents of ICT in education fervently herald its potential to create rich, exciting, and motivating new environments for learning, to foster collaboration, and to personalise instruction (Wheeler, 2000; Balanskat et al, 2006; Peter, 2010: 10). However, empirical evidence emerging from third world classrooms reveals a litany of significant and often under-reported pedagogical drawbacks that directly counteract these utopian claims (Trucano, 2005; Light, 2009). The primary site of tension is the inherent nature of the digital environment itself. The internet's defining characteristic—its boundless openness and democratisation of information—while theoretically a powerful educational resource, simultaneously places learners, particularly in contexts lacking sophisticated digital literacy or supervision, into a perpetual and distracting "exploratory mode" that can be profoundly detrimental within the rigid, time-constrained structures of formal school curricula (Livingstone, 2009; Devadason, 2010: 14; Summak & Samancioglu, 2011). Without stringent, constant supervision—a practical impossibility in the overcrowded classrooms that typify much of third world education (Mdletshe, 2013; UNESCO, 2014), as seen in cases like Nigeria's public schools with pupil-teacher ratios exceeding 60 (UIS, 2019).

In a similar scenario of congested urban schools in Kenya (Oketch et al, 2012), learners are frequently tempted to misuse technology for leisure and entertainment. Research by Yousef and Dahmani (as cited in Mikre, (2011: 12) explicitly identifies online gaming, immersive social media engagement, and anonymous chat rooms as major vectors of distraction, systematically diverting precious study time and cognitive focus away from curricular objectives (Junco, 2012; Rosen, Carrier, & Cheever, 2013). This is not a mere theoretical concern. Rather, it manifests in stark social realities. In Zimbabwe, for instance, the post-2020 COVID-19 lockdown period triggered a national outcry from parents, community leaders, and educators over a perceived surge in learner misconduct, premature sexual activity, and disciplinary breaches, widely attributed to prolonged, unsupervised exposure to digital devices and internet content during school closures (Matsika, 2021; Nyaruwata & Mhlanga, 2021).

Beyond the acute problem of distraction lies a more insidious, long-term pedagogical threat: the fostering of cognitive dependency and the erosion of foundational intellectual skills. Mikre (2011: 13) provides a comprehensive warning, arguing that an over-reliance on ICT actively limits the development of critical thinking and analytical skills (Carr, 2010). The ease of information retrieval encourages a "copy-paste" culture where learners exhibit only a superficial, fragmented understanding of downloaded information, lacking the cognitive struggle necessary for deep comprehension, synthesis, and original thought (Howard, 2007; Kargiban & Siraj, 2009; Kruger, 2010). The very act of mechanically copying and pasting text replaces the intellectually demanding processes of summarisation, paraphrasing, and original composition, thereby fundamentally undermining creativity, authorial voice, and academic integrity (Lea & Street, 1998; Cox, Preston, & Cox, 1999; Newman, 2002).

On another note, the neglect of traditional learning resources—books, physical libraries, peer discussion—and the concomitant reduction in the practice of essential skills like handwriting and structured oral argumentation have profound, long-term developmental impacts on neural pathways and cognitive agility (Forsyth, 1996; James & Engelhardt, 2012). Computer-based learning also introduces a suite of negative physical side-effects often overlooked in resource-poor settings: chronic vision problems from staring at flickering screens in poor

lighting, musculoskeletal issues from ergonomically disastrous furniture, and the mental fatigue associated with information overload (Korte & Hüsing, 2007; Straker, Pollock, & Maslen, 2009). Most critically, for weaker learners or those with special educational needs, the pedagogical shift towards independent, self-directed, technology-mediated learning can be profoundly alienating and ineffective (Ertmer et al., 2012). These students may lack the intrinsic motivation, meta-cognitive skills, and self-regulation required for such autonomy, and in a technology-centric classroom, they risk losing the crucial, nuanced, and responsive direct support from teachers that is their primary lifeline to understanding (Bingimlas, 2009; Mikre, 2011; Kerckaert, Vanderlinde, & van Braak, 2015).

Diminution and Paralysis of Foundational and Academic Creativity Skills

A critical and often culturally significant casualty of the unexamined rush towards digital education is the systematic devaluation and functional destruction of personal handwriting. This is not a nostalgic lament for a bygone art, but a recognition of handwriting's deep cognitive and pedagogical significance (Mangen & Velay, 2010). Neuroscientific and educational research underscores that the physical act of handwriting engages the brain in a complex, multisensory process that strengthens memory retention, fine motor skills, and cognitive sequencing in ways that typing does not replicate (Kruger, 2010; James & Engelhardt, 2012). The deliberate, slower process of forming letters by hand forces a deeper engagement with the content being recorded, aiding in comprehension and internalisation (Longcamp et al, 2006; Challis, 2008). . When learners transition exclusively to keyboards, they risk losing this foundational neural scaffolding, which can negatively impact literacy development, particularly in early grades where letter formation is intrinsically linked to letter recognition and phonemic awareness (Forsyth, 1996; Berninger et al., 2006).

In addition, handwriting carries profound cultural and personal significance. It is an expression of individuality and a tangible connection to personal and historical records (Foster, 2005). Its erosion in favour of uniform digital text represents a subtle loss of a humanistic skill and a form of personal expression, furthering the homogenising effects of globalised digital culture (Chan, 2003; Turkle, 2015). This loss is analogous to the neglect of ancient indigenous knowledge recording systems like the Bushmen rock writings (san rock art) of the Drakensberg, a sophisticated graphic communication system whose cultural and historical importance was long overlooked by colonial education (Deacon, 1999; Lewis-Williams, 2002). Just as this rock art constitutes a vital archive of indigenous epistemology, handwriting serves as a personal cognitive archive. Its subsequent neglect due to the pervasive integration of ICT mirrors a broader pattern where digital immediacy displaces deeper, embodied forms of knowing (Challis, 2008; Hayles, 2012). In many third world contexts, where digital access remains intermittent, the overemphasis on digital submission of work actively disenfranchises students without reliable home access to computers, making their educational participation contingent on a resource they cannot consistently command (Farrell & Isaacs, 2009; Mndzebele, 2013).

The marginalisation of personal handwriting in digitally-centric classrooms represents a profound pedagogical loss with significant cognitive and developmental consequences. Neuroscientific research firmly establishes that the physical act of handwriting engages the brain in a unique, multisensory process that enhances learning and memory in ways that keyboard typing cannot replicate (Kruger, 2010; Mangen & Velay, 2010; James & Engelhardt, 2012). The deliberate, sequential movements required to form letters activate neural pathways in the sensorimotor system, creating a richer memory trace and forging stronger connections between the visual recognition of letters and the act of producing them, which is foundational for literacy acquisition (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1990; Berninger et al., 2006; Bialobrzeska & Cohen, 2005). When children learn primarily through typing, they bypass this critical sensorimotor integration, potentially weakening the orthographic representations necessary for fluent reading and spelling (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1990; Forsyth, 1996).

The slower pace of handwriting imposes a beneficial cognitive bottleneck, forcing students to synthesize, summarize, and engage more deeply with information as they record it, thereby fostering comprehension and critical engagement (Chan, 2003; Mikre, 2011; Mueller & Oppenheimer, 2014). The replacement of this deliberate process with the rapid, mechanistic action of typing facilitates a superficial "transcription" mode of note-taking, where information is captured verbatim without the mental processing required for long-term retention and understanding (Kiewra, 1985; Devadason, 2010; Bui, Myerson, & Hale, 2013). This shift, therefore, is not merely a change in tools but a fundamental alteration in the cognitive architecture of learning, with potentially detrimental effects on foundational literacy and knowledge internalization in third world

contexts where educational foundations are already precarious (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006; Lewin, 2009). Beyond its cognitive utility, handwriting carries deep cultural, personal, and practical significance that is eroded by its digital displacement. Handwriting is an expression of individual identity and personality, a tangible artifact of human presence that typed text, in its uniformity, cannot convey (Sellen & Harper, 2002; Chan, 2003; Foster, 2005).

As such, the systematic devaluation of this skill in curricula represents a loss of a humanistic art form and a disconnection from historical and personal archives, as generations lose the ability to read the handwritten documents of their ancestors (Baron, 2009; MacEwan 2009). In many third world cultures, where oral and written traditions are central to cultural continuity, the move away from physically crafting script alienates youth from indigenous knowledge systems largely preserved in hand-written forms (Kruger, 2010; Owiny, Mehta, & Maretzki, 2014), a phenomenon paralleled by the historical disregard for the epistemological value of Bushmen rock writings (Challis, 2008; Deacon, 1999).

The ability to write by hand remains a crucial, fail-safe skill in environments plagued by technological instability—during power outages, hardware failures, or in remote areas without digital infrastructure—ensuring that learning and communication can continue (Unwin, 2009; Mathevula & Uwizeyimana, 2014). Moreover, the development of fine motor skills and hand-eye coordination through handwriting has documented benefits that extend beyond literacy to other academic and life skills, a developmental advantage sacrificed in the rush to digitize (Bialobrzeska & Cohen, 2005; Berninger et al., 2006; Dinehart, 2015). Its destruction, therefore, is not a neutral trade-off but a multidimensional loss affecting personal identity, cultural connection, equitable access, and practical resilience (Hayles, 2012; Turkle, 2015). The pressure to use technology for measurable, quantifiable, outcomes leads to “digital busywork”—creating PowerPoint presentations or basic websites that prioritize technical compliance over original thought, critical analysis, or creative synthesis (Cuban, 2001; Newman, 2002; Mikre, 2011).

True creativity in terms of the ability to generate novel ideas, make unique connections, and produce original work is born from constraint, deep immersion in a subject, and freedom from immediate external templates (Robinson, 2001; Sawyer, 2012). The constant, fragmented attention demanded by digital devices and the overwhelming flood of pre-packaged digital content stifles the boredom and reflection that frequently fuel creative breakthroughs (Devadason, 2010; Goleman, 2013). Moreover, in a context where digital resources are often imported, the creative paradigms embedded within software and online platforms are overwhelmingly Western, subtly steering learners towards particular aesthetic styles, narrative structures, and problem-solving approaches that marginalise indigenous forms of creativity and storytelling (Appadurai, 1996; Harding 1998). Thus, instead of becoming studios for innovation, technology-rich classrooms can inadvertently become factories for the reproduction of globally homogenised digital formats, leaving little room for the cultivation of the uniquely contextual, culturally rooted creativity needed to solve local problems and affirm local identities (wa Thiong'o, 1986; Nandy, 1987).

The Infrastructure Chasm - Building Castles on a Foundation of Sand

The most immediate, visible, and frequently cited barrier to effective ICT integration in the third world is the profound and pervasive lack of basic physical and digital infrastructure. This deficit creates an environment where technological aspirations are, quite literally, ungrounded (Heeks, 2002). Research by Mathevula and Uwizeyimana (2014) in South Africa’s rural Limpopo province is emblematic of a continental-wide reality, echoed in studies of rural schools in Malawi (Chimonyo & Moyo, 2017) and Tanzania (Mwalongo, 2011). Their study of various secondary schools revealed a dire scarcity of ICT resources beyond the most basic and nowtraditional technologies like televisions and photocopiers. The sophisticated tools of digital pedagogy—computers with educational software, data projectors, reliable local area networks—were virtually absent (Norris, 2001; Sife et al., 2007). Mndzebele (2013) usefully categorises such barriers as “first-order” or external, encompassing the tangible, resource-based obstacles: a crippling lack of equipment, wildly unreliable or nonexistent electricity grids, a complete absence of on-site technical support, and prohibitively expensive or simply unavailable internet connectivity (Trucano, 2005; Bingimlas, 2009).

In many rural schools across Zimbabwe (Ndlovu & Lawrence, 2012), Mozambique (Neves & dos Reis, 2012), Zambia (Mweene, 2010), access to a stable electrical grid remains a precarious luxury in some rural schools ,

rendering donated computers and projectors mere inert furniture, symbolic of a promise unfulfilled (Farrell, 2007; Unwin, 2009). Even in the minority of schools where a power connection exists, internet connectivity is often a fantasy—either prohibitively expensive due to exorbitant data charges from monopolistic service providers, or geographically unavailable due to a lack of telecommunications infrastructure in remote areas (Farrell 2009; Aker & Mbiti, 2010). This infrastructure deficit is critically exacerbated and perpetuated by a dominant, yet deeply flawed, donor-driven model of technological provision. Computers, laptops, and even full computer laboratories often arrive as well-publicised donations from foreign development partners, non-governmental organisations, or corporate social responsibility (CSR) projects of multinational corporations (Klees, 2008; Krauss, 2013). Ayemoba et al, (2013) argue that this model is intrinsically unsustainable. They critically note, these projects operate on fixed-term funding cycles.

When the project funding expires, typically after 2-5 years, the schools are abruptly left alone with rapidly obsolescing, often malfunctioning equipment (Cisler, 2000; Trucano, 2005). There are no budgetary provisions—from the donor or the cash-strapped government—for ongoing maintenance, software updates, virus protection, repairs, or eventual replacement (Samoff, 1999; Mundy & Menashy, 2014). The financial burden then falls, by default, onto parents through ad-hoc levies, whose profound poverty makes such contributions sporadic and woefully insufficient (Lewin, 2009). This dysfunctional cycle creates a pervasive "project graveyard" phenomenon across the educational landscape of the third world, documented in cases from Uganda (Farrell, 2007; Hennessy et al., 2010). Well-intentioned but poorly conceived initiatives collapse, leaving behind rusting computer carcasses, disillusioned teachers, and a deep-seated cynicism towards future technological interventions (Cuban, 2001; Toyama, 2015). The hardware, devoid of the sustainable ecosystem of support, training, and recurrent costs it requires, becomes a poignant symbol not of potential, but of broken promises and wasted resources—a physical manifestation of the curse of inappropriate aid (Ely, 1999; Heeks, 2002).

The Human Resource Crisis - The Untrained Teacher and the Policy Vacuum

Sophisticated infrastructure, even if it were magically to appear, remains an inert and useless collection of metal and plastic without the human capacity to pedagogically harness its potential (Ertmer, 1999). The lack of teacher knowledge, skills, and confidence in using ICT is a paramount "second-order" or internal barrier, one rooted in attitudes, training, and institutional culture (Hew & Brush, 2007; Newman, 2002). Empirical studies, such as those conducted in Swaziland, reveal a shocking disconnect: a significant majority of teachers formally tasked with delivering ICT curricula have never themselves received substantive training in the subject or its pedagogy (Pelgrum, 2001; Bingimlas, 2009). They are often mathematics, science, or language specialists who have been administratively co-opted into a role for which they are profoundly ill-equipped and unsupported (Pelgrum, 2001; Bingimlas, 2009). This results in a fragile, anxiety-ridden instructional environment where teachers, fearing a loss of authority in front of students who may be more digitally savvy, avoid using technology altogether or engage with it only at the most superficial, ritualistic level (Zhao et al., 2002; Ertmer et al., 2012).

Cultural Imperialism and Economic Dependency - The Neo-Colonial Curse of Digital Diffusion

The most insidious and structurally significant aspect of ICT adoption in the third world, often glossed over in techno-optimistic discourse, is its potent function as a vector for a subtle, digitally-enabled form of cultural imperialism and economic subordination (Simeone, 2000; Wade, 2002). The hardware and software that constitute the global ICT ecosystem are overwhelmingly designed, manufactured, patented, and controlled by corporations and cultural milieus in the first world—primarily North America, Europe, and East Asia (Castells, 2000; Schiller, 2000). These technologies are not culturally neutral; they are embedded with the values, epistemologies, linguistic frameworks, and commercial interests of their creators (Winner, 1980; Ihde, 1990).

This process systematically stifles indigenous creativity, problem-solving, and innovation, effectively reducing African universities and technical colleges from their potential role as dynamic think-tanks and R&D hubs for local solutions into mere consumers and appendages of Western technological production lines.

Such a scenario creates a dumb site or consumer terminal dynamic, where third world graduates are trained primarily to use tools and software designed for other contexts, rather than being empowered to invent, adapt, and maintain technologies that address their own societies' specific challenges, from offline educational content to agricultural management software (Heeks, 2002; Avgerou, 2008). The contrast with the developmental

trajectories of nations like China or the South-East Asian "tiger economies" is instructive and sobering. These nations engaged in a deliberate, strategic process of technology adaptation and indigenisation—often through reverse-engineering, compulsory licensing, and massive state investment in local R&D—to drive endogenous development and create globally competitive industries (Wade, 1990; Amsden, 2001). The digital content transmitted through these technological pipelines further accelerates this process of cultural erosion and homogenisation (Tomlinson, 1991; zamani 2001).

Globalised platforms like Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube, and Netflix are not mere communication tools; they are powerful engines for transmitting Western-centric values, lifestyles, aesthetic standards, and consumerist ideologies, many of which are profoundly alien or disruptive to African social fabrics (Ritzer, 2011; Fuchs, 2014). The platforms' algorithms glorify hyper-individualism, particular fashion trends, beauty standards, and social norms—including, contentiously, certain expressions of sexuality like homosexuality—presenting them as global and desirable, while marginalising local narratives (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Zuboff, 2019). This creates painful generational schisms, contribute to a crisis of identity among youth, and systematically uproot emerging generations from their indigenous linguistic, spiritual, and communal value systems (Nandy, 1987; Appadurai, 1996). Simultaneously, traditional African games, oral storytelling traditions, visual arts, music, and locally produced dramas are marginalised, their reach suffocated by the sheer volume, production value, and algorithmic promotion of Western and now increasingly, non-African Southern (Bollywood, K-drama) digital content (Thussu, 2007; bloodwell 2011).

Economically, third world countries, with their already ailing economies and volatile currencies, are forced to expend scarce foreign exchange reserves to perpetually import expensive, rapidly-obsolescing technology, pay ongoing software licensing and subscription fees to foreign corporations, and funnel resources towards infrastructure built by foreign contractors (Schiller, 2000; Ayemoba, 2013). This perpetuates a vicious cycle of technological dependency and economic impoverishment, where the lucrative African market for mobile network operators, device manufacturers, and platform companies generates immense profits for foreign shareholders, but does little to build local manufacturing capacity, retain intellectual property, or create highvalue tech jobs within African economies (Heeks, 2002; Avgerou, 2008).

The manuals, user interfaces, and dominant online content are almost exclusively in English, French, or Portuguese, languages not spoken fluently by the vast rural majority, thereby making technological mastery an elite, urban, and often Western-educated privilege rather than a democratising force for the masses (Phillipson, 1992; Warschauer, 2003). In this sense, ICT becomes a powerful tool for a new, digitally-facilitated form of intellectual and economic colonialism, where the global digital divide functions not as an accident of development but as a structural feature that mirrors and actively reinforces existing global power imbalances and centres of capital (Norris, 2001; van Dijk, 2005).

Towards a Context-Sensitive, Empowering Reformation

Transcending the current paradigm of ICT as a curse necessitates a fundamental, radical re-orientation anchored in context-sensitivity, sustainability, and pedagogical empowerment (Unwin, 2009; Toyama, 2015). The first pillar of this reformation encompasses a decisive shift from top-down, hardware-centric procurement to bottomup, needs-driven appropriation (Heeks, 2002; Avgerou, 2008). This requires a participatory diagnostic process involving teachers, students, parents, and local communities to identify specific educational challenges—such as teacher shortages in specific subjects, a lack of mother-tongue literacy materials, or inefficient administrative systems—that technology could potentially help solve (Chambers, 1997; Farrell 2009). Investment must then follow this diagnostic, prioritizing appropriate, sustainable solutions. This could mean investing in offline digital libraries (RACHEL, KA-Lite) on low-power, ruggedized servers for schools without internet, rather than expensive broadband contracts (van Rij & Warrington, 2010; Butcher, 2011). It could mean deploying simple SMS-based platforms for parent-teacher communication or student quizzes in areas with high mobile phone penetration but low smartphone ownership (Evoh, 2007; Aker & Mbiti, 2010). It necessitates a strong policy preference for open-source software and locally developed educational applications to reduce long-term costs, avoid vendor lock-in, and foster local ICT innovation ecosystems (Beyers, 2000; Weber, 2004; Ayemoba, 2013).

The second, non-negotiable pillar is the massive, sustained, and pedagogically sophisticated investment in teacher agency and professional development (Hew & Brush, 2007; Ertmer et al., 2012). Teacher training on computer literacy must be continuous, collaborative, and integrated into the daily professional life of educators (Bialobrzeska & Cohen, 2005; Fullan, 2007; Bingimlas, 2009). Effective professional development should empower teachers as critical curriculum designers and curators, equipping them to evaluate digital resources, integrate technology meaningfully into their subject-specific pedagogy, and manage the new classroom dynamics technology introduces (Wheeler, 2000; Kozma, 2003; Mishra & Koehler, 2006). More so, teacher support networks—both physical and digital—must be established to foster peer learning, share locally relevant best practices, and provide ongoing mentoring (Law et al., 2008). This human investment must be protected by policy: teachers need dedicated time for planning and professional development, and their efforts must be recognized within career advancement and appraisal systems (Chan, 2003; OECD, 2009; Newman, 2013). Only when teachers feel confident, skilled, and empowered as the ultimate arbiters of technology in their classrooms can ICT become a tool for enhancing, rather than undermining, their professional practice.

The third pillar involves strategic focus on cultural and economic sovereignty in the digital realm (Hanna, 2010). National ICT in education policies must explicitly aim to counteract digital neo-colonialism by mandating and incentivizing the development of locally produced, culturally relevant digital content in indigenous languages (wa Thiong'o, 1986; Kruger, 2010). This requires funding for local educational publishers, software developers, and digital artists to create resources that reflect local histories, values, and knowledge systems (Butcher, 2011; Owiny et al., 2014). Educational curricula should include critical media literacy components that teach students to deconstruct the biases and commercial interests embedded in global platforms and imported software (Beyers, 2000; Kellner & Share, 2007). Economically, partnerships with technology corporations must be governed by strict frameworks that prioritize technology transfer, local capacity building, and data sovereignty, rather than merely creating new consumer markets for foreign products (SAITIS, 2002; Avgerou, 2008; Ayemoba, 2013). Public investment should also support research and development in appropriate, low-cost educational technologies suited to local conditions, such as solar-powered learning devices or robust offline networking solutions (Unwin, 2009; Toyama, 2015). The ultimate goal is to cultivate a generation that is not only a consumer of global digital culture but also a proactive creator and critic, capable of using technology to affirm local identity, solve local problems, and contribute to endogenous development (Freire, 1970; Sen, 1999).

On the fourth pillar, educational policy must explicitly recognize and protect the role of handwriting, particularly in early childhood and primary education, as a non-negotiable component of literacy development and cognitive training (Forsyth, 1996; Kruger, 2010; James & Engelhardt, 2012). Intentional curriculum design that allocates time for personal handwriting instruction and practice, ensuring students first is called for; in a bid to develop a strong orthographic foundation through manual writing before transitioning to digital composition for certain tasks (Forsyth, 1996; James & Engelhardt, 2012). Assessment strategies should continue to value hand-written expression, particularly for essays, exams, and creative writing, to reinforce the skill and ensure students remain proficient. Fostering handwriting mastery ensures learning is not held hostage to the chronic unpredictability of electricity, connectivity, and device availability common in some parts of the third world like Africa.

Contested Terrain - Acknowledging the Mirage of Potential Benefits

Despite the above comprehensive critical analysis, it is crucial to engage honestly with the contested terrain of ICT's alleged impact and to acknowledge the body of research that posits potential benefits. The academic literature is not monolithic. Scholars like Kozma (2003), in large-scale international studies, have found ambiguous or even negative correlations between simple frequency of computer use and standardised measures of academic achievement, suggesting that mere exposure is insufficient (Wenglinsky, 1998; Angrist & Lavy, 2002). On the other side of the debate, scholars like Isaacs (2007) argue that given the scale of the educational crisis—characterised by crumbling infrastructure, massive teacher shortages, and outdated textbooks—ICTs may paradoxically present the only logistically and economically feasible means to rapidly expand access to quality learning resources and teacher support in the short to medium term (Leach, 2008; Dodds, 2008). Peter (2010) provides a structured rationale for ICT uptake, delineating economic (efficiency, labour-saving), social (inclusion, connectivity), vocational (workforce preparation), and pedagogic grounds. The pedagogic rationale, in particular, is compelling in theory in that it "emphasizes the contribution that ICT can make to the improvement of the quality of education by providing rich, exciting and motivating and new environments for learning" (Peter, 2010: 10).

Empirical studies, mostly from better-resourced contexts, are marshalled to support this view. Balanskat (2007) and Van Ark (2011) point to benefits such as increased learner motivation, the ability to visualise abstract concepts, and support for collaborative and autonomous learning models (Wheeler, 2000; Roschelle et al., 2000). Kulik's (1994) influential meta-analysis, frequently cited by advocates (e.g., Mikre, 2011), synthesised numerous studies to suggest positive, though modest, effects on student test scores in specific subjects like mathematics and science when using well-designed tutorial and simulation software (Tamim et al., 2011). The purported logistical and administrative benefits are significant in theory: the sharing of digital learning resources across schools minimises costs and improve quality in under-resourced settings (Newman, 2002; Butcher, 2011). Networked computing creates collaborative spaces and reduce isolation (Wheeler, 2000; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 2006); and management information systems could streamline chaotic administrative processes (Hanna, 2010). However if this is the critical caveat that underpins the entire curse thesis, then the potential benefits are almost entirely contingent upon the existence of optimal or near-optimal enabling conditions (Trucano, 2005).

In light of the above, the mirage of potential benefits are assumably realised under conditions of reliable, highspeed internet connectivity; consistent electrical power; a stable of well-trained, confident, and pedagogically innovative teachers; a curriculum that integrates rather than tolerates technology; locally relevant and linguistically appropriate digital content; and robust, affordable technical support systems (Kozma, 2008; Law et al., 2008). These are precisely the conditions that are conspicuously, catastrophically absent in the overwhelming majority of third world educational contexts (Farrell & 2009; Unwin, 2009). Therefore, the relentless citation of these potential benefits in policy documents and donor proposals to justify continued investment in the same flawed, hardware-centric models is intellectually dishonest and operationally disastrous (Klees, 2008; Toyama, 2015). It creates a seductive "mirage" of progress—a vision of transformed classrooms that flickers in policy documents and pilot project reports—but which obscures the vast, arid landscape of ongoing systemic failure, wasted resources, and demoralised educators (Cuban, 2001; Selwyn, 2011). The danger is that this mirage is used to deflect criticism, justify further spending on inappropriate solutions, and avoid the politically harder, less glamorous work of fixing the foundational pillars of the education system itself (Samoff, 1999; Lewin, 2009).

CONCLUSION

In summing up, the accumulated evidence strongly suggests that under the prevailing material, human, and political-economic conditions of most third world countries, the dominant model of unexamined, donordriven, hardware-centric adoption of ICT in education functions less as a blessing and more as a multifaceted curse. It exacerbates existing inequalities by deepening the digital divide along urban-rural and rich-poor lines; it wastes desperately scarce financial and human resources on spectacular but unsustainable technological showcase projects; it distracts from the core mission of foundational literacy and numeracy; it disempowers and de-professionalises teachers; and it facilitates a new, digitally-accelerated wave of cultural homogenisation and economic dependency that threatens indigenous knowledge systems and innovation capacities. This critique, however, is not a polemic for technological abstention or a nostalgic retreat to a pre-digital age. Such a position is neither feasible nor desirable in an interconnected world. Rather, it is a clarion call for a radical, courageous re-imagination of the entire approach to ICT in third world education— a shift from technology-led development to education-led, contextually-embedded technological appropriation. The pedagogical imperative is not to reject digital tools but to advocate for a balanced, deliberate approach that preserves personal handwriting as a core, cognitively vital skill. By consciously preserving the in-built original and ancient technology of the mind, embrace of digital futures is guarded against eroding foundational human capacities. In this way, education systems are equipped to cultivate the deep cognitive processing, personal discipline, and resilient communication skills that form the bedrock of true intellectual empowerment for the third world.

REFERENCES

1. Aker, J. C., & Mbiti, I. M. (2010). Mobile phones and economic development in Africa. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24(3), 207-232.
2. Akyeampong, K. (2003). Teacher training in Ghana - does it count? Multi-site teacher education research project (MUSTER) country report 1. London: DFID.

3. Allan, J., Lewis, D., & Peacock, R. (2003). ICT in Scottish schools: A study of the integration of ICT into learning and teaching. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.
4. Amin, S. (1990). Maldevelopment: Anatomy of a global failure. London: Zed Books.
5. Amsden, A. H. (2001). The rise of "the rest": Challenges to the West from late-industrializing economies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Angrist, J., & Lavy, V. (2002). New evidence on classroom computers and pupil learning. The Economic Journal, 112(482), 735-765.
7. Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
8. Avgerou, C. (2008). Information systems in developing countries: A critical research review. Journal of Information Technology, 23(3), 133-146.
9. Ayemoba, O. A. (2013). Technological dependency and the challenges of ICT integration in Nigeria's educational system. Journal of Education and Practice, 4(12), 1-8.
10. Balanskat, A., Blamire, R., & Kefala, S. (2006). The ICT impact report: A review of studies of ICT impact on schools in Europe. European Schoolnet.
11. Baron, N. S. (2009). Always on: Language in an online and mobile world. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Jones, J., Wolf, B. J., Gould, L., Anderson-Youngstrom, M., ... & Apel, K. (2006). Early development of language by hand: Composing, reading, listening, and speaking connections; three letter-writing modes; and fast mapping in spelling. Developmental Neuropsychology, 29(1), 61-92.
13. Beyers, R. N. (2000). The emperor's new computer: ICT, teachers and teaching. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
14. Bhalalusesa, E. (2001). ICT in education in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education and Culture.
15. Bialobrzeska, M., & Cohen, S. (2005). Managing ICTs in South African schools: A guide for school principals. South African Institute for Distance Education (SAIDE).
16. Biao, I. (2005). Globalization and the reinvention of African education. In Globalization and lifelong education: Critical perspectives (pp. 75-90). Routledge.
17. Bingimlas, K. A. (2009). Barriers to the successful integration of ICT in teaching and learning environments: A review of the literature. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 5(3), 235-245.
18. Bui, D. C., Myerson, J., & Hale, S. (2013). Note-taking with computers: Exploring alternative strategies for improved recall. Journal of Educational Psychology, 105(2), 299.
19. Butcher, N. (2011). A basic guide to open educational resources (OER). Commonwealth of Learning and UNESCO.
20. Carr, N. (2010). The shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
21. Castells, M. (2000). The rise of the network society (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
22. Challis, S. (2008). The impact of the horse on the Amatola 'Bushmen': New identity in the Thukela-Natal region of southern Africa. Southern African Humanities, 20(1), 127-146.
23. Chambers, R. (1997). Whose reality counts? Putting the first last. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
24. Chan, F. M. (2003). ICT in Malaysian schools: Policy and strategies. Ministry of Education, Malaysia.
25. Chimonyo, I., & Moyo, M. (2017). Challenges faced by rural secondary schools in integrating information and communication technology (ICT) in the teaching and learning process: The case of Tsholotsho District, Zimbabwe. International Journal of Science and Research, 6(7), 323-327.
26. Cisler, S. (2000). The digital divide: What is it and what can we do about it? Paper presented at the Digital Divide Network Conference, Seattle.
27. Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
28. Cox, M., Preston, C., & Cox, K. (1999). What motivates teachers to use ICT? Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Conference, Brighton.
29. Craft, A. (2005). Creativity in schools: Tensions and dilemmas. London: Routledge.
30. Cuban, L. (2001). Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

31. Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1990). Early spelling acquisition: Writing beats the computer. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 159.
32. Deacon, J. (1999). The Bushmen rock art of Southern Africa. Cape Town: David Philip.
33. Devadason, R. (2010). The perils of ICT in education. New Delhi: APH Publishing.
34. DiMaggio, P., & Hargittai, E. (2001). From the 'digital divide' to 'digital inequality': Studying Internet use as penetration increases. Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Working Paper Series, 15.
35. Dinehart, L. H. (2015). Handwriting in early childhood education: Current research and future implications. Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 15(1), 97-118.
36. Dodds, T. (2008). Open and distance learning in the developing world. London: Routledge.
37. Ely, D. P. (1999). Conditions that facilitate the implementation of educational technology innovations. Educational Technology, 39(6), 23-27.
38. Ertmer, P. A. (1999). Addressing first- and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration. Educational Technology Research and Development, 47(4), 47-61.
39. Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. Computers & Education, 59(2), 423-435.
40. Evoh, C. J. (2007). Policy networks and the transformation of secondary education through ICTs in Africa: The prospects and challenges of the NEPAD e-schools initiative. International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 3(1), 1-18.
41. Farrell, G. (2007). ICT in education in Guyana: Survey of ICT and education in the Caribbean. Washington, DC: infoDev/World Bank.
42. Farrell, G., & Isaacs, S. (2009). Survey of ICT and education in Africa: A summary report, based on 53 country surveys. Washington, DC: infoDev/World Bank.
43. Forsyth, I. (1996). Teaching and learning materials and the Internet. London: Kogan Page.
44. Foster, A. (2005). A nonlinear model of information-seeking behavior. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 56(3), 228-237.
45. Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.
Fuchs, C. (2008). Internet and society: Social theory in the information age. New York: Routledge.
46. Fuchs, C. (2014). Social media: A critical introduction. London: Sage.
47. Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
48. Glewwe, P., & Kremer, M. (2006). Schools, teachers, and education outcomes in developing countries. In E. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), Handbook of the Economics of Education (Vol. 2, pp. 945-1017). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
49. Goleman, D. (2013). Focus: The hidden driver of excellence. New York: Harper.
50. Hanna, N. K. (2010). Transforming government and building the information society: Challenges and opportunities for the developing world. New York: Springer.
51. Harding, S. (1998). Is science multicultural? Postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
52. Hawkins, R. J. (2002). Ten lessons for ICT and education in the developing world. In *The global information technology report 2001-2002: Readiness for the networked world* (pp. 38-43). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
53. Hayles, N. K. (2012). How we think: Digital media and contemporary technogenesis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
54. Heeks, R. (2002). Failure, success and improvisation of information systems projects in developing countries. Development Informatics Working Paper Series, Paper No. 11.
55. Hennessy, S., Harrison, D., & Wamakote, L. (2010). Teacher factors influencing classroom use of ICT in sub-Saharan Africa. Itupale Online Journal of African Studies, 2, 39-54.
56. Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. Educational Technology Research and Development, 55(3), 223-252.
57. Hollow, D. (2010). Evaluating ICT for education in Africa. Bristol: EdTech Hub.
58. Howard, R. M. (2007). Understanding "Internet plagiarism". Computers and Composition, 24(1), 3-15.
59. Ihde, D. (1990). Technology and the lifeworld: From garden to earth. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
60. Isaacs, S. (2007). ICT in education in South Africa. Washington, DC: infoDev/World Bank.

61. James, K. H., & Engelhardt, L. (2012). The effects of handwriting experience on functional brain development in pre-literate children. Trends in Neuroscience and Education, 1(1), 32-42.
62. Junco, R. (2012). Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(1), 187-198.
63. Kargiban, Z. A., & Siraj, S. (2009). The influence of ICT on students' academic performance. International Journal of Instruction, 2(2), 41-56.
64. Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2007). Critical media literacy, democracy, and the reconstruction of education. In D. Macedo & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), Media literacy: A reader (pp. 3-23). New York: Peter Lang.
65. Kerckaert, S., Vanderlinde, R., & van Braak, J. (2015). The role of ICT in early childhood education: Scale development and research on ICT use and influencing factors. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 23(2), 183-199.
66. Kiewra, K. A. (1985). Investigating notetaking and review: A depth of processing alternative. Educational Psychologist, 20(1), 23-32.
67. Klees, S. J. (2008). Reflections on theory, method, and practice in comparative and international education. Comparative Education Review, 52(3), 301-328.
68. Korte, W. B., & Hüsing, T. (2007). Benchmarking access and use of ICT in European schools 2006: Results from Head Teacher and A Classroom Teacher Surveys in 27 European countries. Empirica.
69. Kozma, R. B. (2003). Technology and classroom practices: An international study. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 36(1), 1-14.
70. Kozma, R. B. (2008). Comparative analysis of policies for ICT in education. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education (pp. 10831096). New York: Springer.
71. Krauss, K. (2013). ICT project implementation in developing countries: A study of the factors for success. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
72. Kruger, J. (2010). The impact of ICT on literacy education. London: Routledge.
73. Kulik, J. A. (1994). Meta-analytic studies of findings on computer-based instruction. In E. L. Baker & H. F. O'Neil (Eds.), Technology assessment in education and training (pp. 9-33). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
74. Kunje, D. (2002). The Malawi integrated in-service teacher education programme: An experiment with mixed-mode training. International Journal of Educational Development, 22(3-4), 305-320.
75. Law, N., Pelgrum, W. J., & Plomp, T. (Eds.). (2008). Pedagogy and ICT use in schools around the world: Findings from the IEA SITES 2006 study. Hong Kong: Springer.
76. Lawless, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2007). Professional development in integrating technology into teaching and learning: Knowns, unknowns, and ways to pursue better questions and answers. Review of Educational Research, 77(4), 575-614.
77. Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. Studies in Higher Education, 23(2), 157-172.
78. Leach, J. (2008). Do new information and communication technologies have a role to play in the achievement of education for all? British Educational Research Journal, 34(6), 783-805.
79. Lewin, K. M. (2009). Access to education in sub-Saharan Africa: Patterns, problems and possibilities. Comparative Education, 45(2), 151-174.
80. Lewis-Williams, D. (2002). The mind in the cave: Consciousness and the origins of art. London: Thames & Hudson.
81. Light, D. (2009). The role of ICT in enhancing education in developing countries: Findings from an evaluation of the Intel Teach Essentials Course in India, Turkey, and Chile. Journal of Education for International Development, 4(2), 1-15.
82. Livingstone, S. (2009). Children and the Internet. Cambridge: Polity Press.
83. Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009). EU Kids Online: Final report. LSE, London: EU Kids Online.
84. Longcamp, M., Boucard, C., Gilhodes, J. C., & Velay, J. L. (2006). Remembering the orientation of newly learned characters depends on the associated writing knowledge: A comparison between handwriting and typing. Human Movement Science, 25(4-5), 646-656.
85. Longcamp, M., Zerbato-Poudou, M. T., & Velay, J. L. (2005). The influence of writing practice on letter recognition in preschool children: A comparison between handwriting and typing. Acta Psychologica, 119(1), 67-79.
86. Mangen, A., & Velay, J. L. (2010). Digitizing literacy: Reflections on the haptics of writing. In M. H. Zadeh (Ed.), Advances in haptics (pp. 385-401). InTech.

87. Mathevula, M. D., & Uwizeyimana, D. E. (2014). The challenges facing the integration of ICT in teaching and learning activities in South African rural secondary schools. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(20), 1087-1097.
88. Matsika, C. (2021). *Socio-educational impacts of COVID-19 in Zimbabwe: A case of selected schools in Harare*. Harare: Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education.
89. McEwan, C. (2009). Postcolonialism and development. London: Routledge.
90. Mdletshe, B. (2013). Challenges of teaching and learning in overcrowded classrooms. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
91. Mikre, F. (2011). The roles of information communication technologies in education: Review article with emphasis to the computer and internet. Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences, 6(2), 109-126.
92. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017-1054.
93. Mkandawire, T. (2005). Maladjusted African economies and globalization. Africa Development, 30(1&2), 1-33.
94. Mndzebele, N. (2013). Challenges faced by schools when introducing ICT in developing countries. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 2(9), 1-4.
95. Moyo, S., & Yeros, P. (2005). Reclaiming the land: The resurgence of rural movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America. London: Zed Books.
96. Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. Psychological Science, 25(6), 1159-1168.
97. Mumtaz, S. (2000). Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: A review of the literature. Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education, 9(3), 319-342.
98. Mundy, K., & Menashy, F. (2014). The World Bank and private provision of schooling: A look through the lens of sociological theories of organizational hypocrisy. Comparative Education Review, 58(3), 401427.
99. Mwalongo, A. (2011). Teachers' perceptions about ICT for teaching, professional development, administration and personal use. International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 7(3), 3649.
100. Mweene, P. (2010). The challenges of integrating ICTs in the Zambian education system. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press.
101. Nandy, A. (1987). Traditions, tyranny, and utopias: Essays in the politics of awareness. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
102. Ndlovu, N., & Lawrence, D. (2012). The quality of ICT use in South African classrooms. Perspectives in Education, 30(1), 74-82.
103. Neves, J., & dos Reis, M. (2012). ICT in education in Mozambique: Current situation and future prospects. Maputo: Ministry of Education.
104. Newman, D. R. (2002). The impact of technology on teaching and learning in the classroom. Paper presented at the Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, Nashville.
105. Norris, P. (2001). Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
106. Nyaruwata, S., & Mhlanga, E. (2021). *Digital learning and learner misconduct in post-COVID-19 Zimbabwe: A qualitative inquiry*. Harare: Zimbabwe Open University.
107. Oketch, M., Mutisya, M., & Sagwe, J. (2012). Pupil classroom ratios and learning achievement in Uganda: Implications for education quality. London: Institute of Education.
108. Oliver, M. (2011). Technological determinism in educational technology research: Some alternative ways of thinking about the relationship between learning and technology. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27(5), 373-384.
109. Owiny, S. A., Mehta, K., & Maretzki, A. N. (2014). The use of social media technologies to create, preserve, and disseminate indigenous knowledge and skills to communities in East Africa. International Journal of Communication, 8, 234-247.
110. Pelgrum, W. J. (2001). Obstacles to the integration of ICT in education: Results from a worldwide educational assessment. Computers & Education, 37(2), 163-178.
111. Perron, B. E., Taylor, H. O., Glass, J. E., & Margerum-Leys, J. (2010). Information and communication technologies in social work. Advances in Social Work, 11(2), 67-81.

112. Peter, J. (2010). ICT in education: A critical literature review and its implications. International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 6(3), 1-16.
113. Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
114. Plomp, T., Anderson, R. E., Law, N., & Quale, A. (Eds.). (2009). Cross-national information and communication technology: Policies and practices in education (2nd ed.). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
115. Resnick, M. (2007). Sowing the seeds for a more creative society. Learning and Leading with Technology, 35(4), 18-22.
116. Ribble, M. (2015). Digital citizenship in schools: Nine elements all students should know (3rd ed.). Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education.
117. Ritzer, G. (2011). The McDonaldization of society 6. Los Angeles: Sage.
118. Robinson, K. (2001). Out of our minds: Learning to be creative. Chichester: Capstone.
119. Rodney, W. (1972). How Europe underdeveloped Africa. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
120. Roschelle, J. M., Pea, R. D., Hoadley, C. M., Gordin, D. N., & Means, B. M. (2000). Changing how and what children learn in school with computer-based technologies. The Future of Children, 10(2), 76-101.
121. Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Facebook and texting made me do it: Mediainduced task-switching while studying. Computers in Human Behavior, 29(3), 948-958.
122. SAITIS. (2002). South African Information Technology Industry Strategy (SAITIS) Project: Final report. Pretoria: Department of Trade and Industry.
123. Samoff, J. (1999). Education sector analysis in Africa: Limited national control and even less national ownership. International Journal of Educational Development, 19(4-5), 249-272.
124. Sawyer, R. K. (2012). Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
125. Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (2006). Knowledge building: Theory, pedagogy, and technology. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 97-118). New York: Cambridge University Press.
126. Schiller, D. (2000). Digital capitalism: Networking the global market system. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
127. Selwyn, N. (2011). Education and technology: Key issues and debates. London: Continuum.
128. Sellen, A. J., & Harper, R. H. R. (2002). The myth of the paperless office. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
129. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
130. Sife, A., Lwoga, E., & Sanga, C. (2007). New technologies for teaching and learning: Challenges for higher learning institutions in developing countries. International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 3(2), 57-67.
131. Straker, L., Pollock, C., & Maslen, B. (2009). Principles for the wise use of computers by children. Ergonomics, 52(11), 1386