

Technology with a Human Face: Reimagining Progress Through Universal Ethical Principles

Tarakanta Sahoo^{1,*}, Priyanka Priyadarshini²

Abstract

Technological progression is mostly considered a tool of human evolution. In this digital era, however, quick novelty has revealed complex ethical gaps in the modelling and implementation of technology. Technologies, namely artificial intelligence, algorithmic systems, and digital surveillance, progressively affect social life, economic activity, and political decision-making. While these technologies provide proficiency and progress, they also raise moral concerns connected to discretion, disparity, liability, and human dignity. The technique seriously observes the leading technology-driven knowledge of development and queries its moral suitability. The work proposes to be a logical and normative method to reveal the impression of expertise with a human face. This perception underscores the requirement to normalize scientific advancement in global moral values. Combining human rights dissertation along with universal moral outlines, this work claims that knowledge itself is not worthy, but is guided by communal conventions, power constructions, and human selections. When moral reflection is unnoticed, technology can strengthen inequality and fade distinct independence. To converge on ethics, namely human pride, righteousness, transparency, independence, and sustainability, the work considers advancement as a morally directed course. It settles that decent values should be united with technological novelty. This combination is needed to ensure that technology assists civilization and fosters comprehensive and justifiable growth.

Keywords: Ethics, technology, progress, humanity, justice, sustainability

INTRODUCTION

Down the timeline, technological advancement has been linked with human growth along with communal advancement. Commencing from past toolmaking and the agricultural revolution to the Industrial Revolution, technology has altered financial decorum and communal relations [1–10]. The revolution pointed out a pivotal shift via automating manufacturing and hurrying financial progress, but it also produced ethical difficulties like labor mistreatment, urban poverty, and ambient deprivation [11]. These past practices highlight that technological advancement has constantly supported moral values together with material advantages [12, 13]. The twentieth century further

*Author for Correspondence

Tarakanta Sahoo
E-mail: tarakant.sahoo@gmail.com

¹Professor and Head, Department of Basic Science and Humanities, Gandhi Institute of Excellent Technocrats, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Science and Humanities, Gandhi Institute of Excellent Technocrats, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Received Date: January 25, 2026

Accepted Date: January 29, 2026

Published Date: February 05, 2026

Citation: Tarakanta Sahoo, Priyanka Priyadarshini. Technology with a Human Face: Reimagining Progress Through Universal Ethical Principles. International Journal of Behavioral Sciences. 2026; 3(1): 30–36p.

extended technological power via electrification, mass production, and technical novelty. While these growths enhanced existing values, they also familiarized unique ethical ventures. The development of nuclear weapons at the outset of World War II exposed the damaging capability of scientific strength and encouraged universal reflection on a human-sustainable approach in the face of novelty [14]. This time span emphasized the requirement for ethical constraint and liability in the pursuit of growth.

In this current advanced time, expertise, namely artificial intelligence (AI), algorithmic schemes, and data-driven work domains, exerts profound

impact over communal, financial, and dogmatic life [15–25]. Unlike previous knowledge, these arrangements progressively facilitate human experience and decision-making. Researchers argue that knowledge is not value-neutral but attached to dogmatic and moral conventions that guide communal results [9, 26]. Algorithmic arrangements implemented in job-given work, controlling, and economic concern services often repeat communal differences because of unfair data and impervious methods [18]. This archaic path exhibits a determined break between scientific fitness and decent replication. The idea arises as a reply to this disparity. The work observes how global ethical rules, namely human pride, fairness, transparency, and accountability, can channel technological advancements. It claims that reimagining growth via moral contexts is needed to confirm that technological novelty contributes to comprehensive, kind, and maintainable communal progress [22].

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The idea of “technology with a human face” arises from serious grants that request knowledge-driven systems for growth. Leading novelty arrangements repeatedly highlight competence, scalability, and financial progress while demoting moral likeness and communal results. These methods venture to give human beings as inactive operators rather than dynamic ethical mediators. A human-centered outline encounters this inequality by stating that scientific arrangements must serve human standards rather than redefine them. The core of this arrangement is knowledge that is socially optimistic. Learners in science and technology lessons opine that technological advancement is guided by academic involvement, cultural guidelines, and dogmatic arrangements [8]. Model selection is never unbiased; it encrypts conventions around users, primacies, and tolerable risks. When ethical considerations are omitted from these initial phases, injurious results are mostly attached and difficult to rectify.

Starting from an ethical point of concern, human-faced knowledge orders human pride along with moral intervention. Kantian ethical standpoints underscore that humans must never be dealt with only as means to an end, a rule progressively defied by data-driven arrangements that trade off private information [3]. In algorithmic situations, results influencing individuals are often computerized, diminishing chances against description, contestation, and permission. This weakens belief and liability in technological control. The arrangement also draws on the capabilities method, which assesses growth depending on persons’ actual liberties to live a worthy life rather than on scientific result alone [21]. Knowledge associated with this method enlarges human abilities, eliminates disparity, and advances communal contribution. On the other hand, knowledge that limits access, strengthens unfairness, or focuses control opposes the exact concept of ethical growth. International plan dissertation further resolves this perception. The European Commission’s ethics rules underscore human error, impartiality, and liability as vital workings of reliable knowledge [7]. These ideologies strengthen the argument that ethical reflections must be attached all over the technological lifespan. Thus, technology includes a human face that expresses a normative alteration. It re-arranges growth as an honestly directed course which combines ethical intellect into creation, control, and communal influence.

UNIVERSAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES GUIDING TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

Global ethical rules play a pivotal role in controlling technological novelty in a universal and linked world. As technologies progressively exceed nationwide margins and artistic settings, ethical assessment cannot exclusively rely on restricted models or market-driven measures. Worldwide values offer a common moral terminology that allows civilizations to evaluate whether technological growth sincerely contributes to human prosperity or only progresses technical competence. Human pride is considered the initial ethical rule in this setting. Based on international human rights, self-respect upholds the inherent value of each individual, regardless of communal, financial, or technological class [23]. In the recent digital situation, this rule is regularly challenged by technologies that shape, forecast, and classify people without their expertise or agreement. Computerized decision-making units in regions such as welfare distribution and project monitoring,

along with credit scoring, eliminate persons from intellectual data illustrations, thereby declining personal control and moral units [6]. Ethical scientific growth needs protection and self-respect via safeguarding significant human participation, well-versed permission, and the true challenge of automated choices.

The idea of justice further develops the ethical assessment of knowledge by resolving matters of equality. Rawls' (1971) [20] concept of justice underscores that communal establishments must be settled to assist the least privileged individuals of the community. Practically, this viewpoint seeks to study how aids and loads are dispersed. Digital knowledge mostly worsens operational disparities by benefiting those who align with data, skills, and setups while demoting the rest. Algorithmic bias, digital gaps, and incapable admission to scientific possessions expose that novelty can extend unfairness if ethical reflections are overlooked [17]. Clarity and accountability are ethical requirements in composite technological setups. As algorithms and AI systems become progressively impervious, people are mostly deprived of knowledge of the way choices are made.

Opacity does not arise solely from technical complexity; it is also shaped by institutional secrecy and proprietary interests. Therefore, ethical supremacy requires clearly defined responsibilities, transparent accountability mechanisms, and effective frameworks for dispute resolution. Deprived of clarity, belief in technological organizations wears down, and autonomous mistakes become unproductive. Accountability and sustainability spread ethical apprehension past instant results to long-term communal values. The concept of a risk-oriented society emphasizes that contemporary technologies generate organized forms of risk that are not always immediately visible or perceptible. Ethical obligation includes anticipating probable difficulties, accepting protective methods, and upholding influences on forthcoming groups. This is mainly appropriate in the growth of AI, ambient technologies, and large-scale digital setups. Jointly, these global ethical conventions redefine technological advancement as a normative course. Development is not assessed exclusively through novelty or proficiency but by the degree to which knowledge progresses pride, law, liability, and elongated human well-being.

CASE STUDIES: ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN CONTEMPORARY TECHNOLOGICAL PRACTICES

Real-time examples support a solid understanding of how ethical rules are either defended or sullied in practical technological submissions. The two cases below—algorithmic signing and large-scale digital monitoring—validate how technological innovation, when guided primarily by efficiency and control, can undermine universal ethical standards. These actions express the imperative requirement to combine ethical likeness into technological models, positioning, and governance. Collectively, these case lessons validate that scientific advances cannot be measured exclusively via novelty or execution standards. The issue together exhibits the way knowledge, when separated from ethical values, can institutionalize judgment and wear away human supremacy. They emphasize the need to implant worldwide ethical ideologies into scientific arrangements from strategy to disposition. Therefore, ethical growth requires unceasing reflection, comprising supremacy, and a promise to defend human principles in a progressively computerized environment.

Algorithmic Bias in Automated Hiring Systems

The execution of AI in employment processes has been broadly accepted based on competence, cost reduction, and objectivity. Automatic acquisition measures are modelled to estimate resumes, investigate video conferences, and forecast job routines using machine learning models. Regardless of these advantages, experimental studies have shown that these arrangements often repeat operational disparities attached to ancient data. An extensively referred concern is Amazon's AI-based employment arrangement, which was trained on previous hiring accounts from a male-dominated expert labor force. The arrangement methodically disciplined reviews holding pointers linked with women, including academic institutions and qualified associations [5]. This is a disaster for defending the ethical conventions of fairness. Instead of encouraging chance, the arrangement strengthened the

present gender discrepancies in engagement. Algorithmic judgments can sometimes emerge indirectly through seemingly neutral variables that function as proxies for protected or sensitive attributes of the user.

In the absence of clear ethical defenses, automatic arrangements can regularize unfair performances while confusing liability. Clarity and liability are further negotiated through algorithmic acquisition. Applicants characteristically obtain no clarification against refusal, nor do they have access to mechanisms for demand. Pasquale (2015) [19] defines these arrangements as black boxes that collect control while restraining inquiry. The absence of clarity weakens routine justice and wears down the belief in formal decision-making. Hence, ethical signing requires reasonable algorithms, consistent bias reviews, and expressive human mistakes throughout the employment course.

Digital Surveillance and the Erosion of Human Autonomy

Digital surveillance represents another critical ethical challenge in contemporary technological landscapes that must be addressed. Advances in data analytics, facial recognition, and networked sensors have enabled governments and corporations to monitor behavior on an unprecedented scale. China's Social Credit System exemplifies this trend by aggregating data from financial transactions, online activities, and social interactions to evaluate citizens' trustworthiness. These scores influence access to transportation, employment, and public services [4]. From an ethical perspective, this system raises serious concerns about human dignity and autonomy. Continuous monitoring transforms individuals into objects of behavioral predictions and control. Zuboff (2019) [27] argues that such practices exemplify a new form of power that seeks to shape behavior, rather than merely observing it. When surveillance becomes normalized, individuals may alter their behavior out of fear of punishment, undermining their freedom of expression and moral agency. Ethical risks are compounded by a lack of transparency and consent. Citizens have limited knowledge of how data are collected, interpreted, or used, and few avenues for contestation. Ethical governance frameworks emphasize that technologies affecting fundamental rights must be subject to proportionality, accountability, and legal oversight [7]. Without these safeguards, surveillance technologies risk legitimizing coercion under the rhetoric of security and efficiency.

REIMAGINING PROGRESS THROUGH ETHICAL GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORKS

The ethical difficulties emphasized through algorithmic partiality and digital monitoring validate that technological growth alone does not promise communal well-being. Reimagining growth needs a combination of ethical supremacy contexts that upsurge novelty while protecting human standards. These bases go beyond sensitive directives and seek to attach moral cognition, clarity, and responsibility throughout the technological lifespan. An essential element of ethical supremacy is the proposal of ethics. This plan underscores that ethical considerations should be integrated throughout the model and fabrication phases, rather than being treated as a postscript [10]. For instance, machine learning organizations can be reviewed against bias, and decision-making processes can be made understandable to impacted people. Conscience through strategy confirms that technologies encourage equality, non-discrimination, and communal inclusion from the beginning.

Formal errors and control tactics are also serious issues. Administrations and global figures play a vital role in establishing strategies, values, and compliance units for ethical expertise. The European Commission's "Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI" [7] (2019) offers a basis underscoring human error, strength, liability, and secrecy. Likewise, UNESCO's Approval of the Beliefs of Artificial Intelligence (2021) [12] proposes supervision to align scientific growth with human rights, fairness, and sustainable progress. These contexts demonstrate how strategy interference can operationalize global ethical rules in training. Business obligations and executive ethics are the counterparts' controlling dealings. Technology firms must balance novelty with communal obligation, approving comprehensive enterprises, non-stop inspections, and clear reports. Interdisciplinary partnerships between experts, ethicists, and officials reinforce ethical mindfulness and nurture units that exhibit general standards [15].

Ultimately, public meetings and teaching are vital for setting ethical flexibility. Citizens, users, and investors must be well-versed and authorized to participate in scientific supremacy. Digital learning packages, ethical drills against engineers, and shared design courses confirm that human viewpoints guide technological directions. Ethical domination does not obstruct novelty. Instead, they reorient scientific growth against outcomes that promote self-respect, justice, and sustainability. Attaching ethics to all phases, from modelling to disposition, confirms that knowledge assists humanity instead of declining it.

ROLE OF EDUCATION, POLICY, AND GLOBAL COOPERATION

Confirming that skills assist people seeking more than ethical models and power contexts, it requires a general style relating to teaching, strategy, and global teamwork. Deprived of these introductory components, ethical values may continue to aspire rather than become unlawful. Edification nurtures an ethically mindful labor force and learns citizenry; policy interprets ethical values into enforceable values; and global partnership confirms that ethical performance is clear across limits. Together, they generate a complete environment in which knowledge can grow sensibly with regard to human pride, fairness, and sustainability.

Education for Ethical Technology

Ethical instruction plays a key role in guiding accountable expertise and learned citizens. Combining ethics into engineering, computer science, and data science programs prepares forthcoming innovators with the skills to antedate communal results, recognize biases, and attach human standards to technological arrangements [16]. The exercise of algorithmic equality, secrecy, and human-centered models inspires ethical likeness, together with technical expertise. Additionally, public digital learning packages authorize operators to comprehend how skills affect their lives and promote well-informed decision-making and civic involvement (van Wynsberghe & Robbins, 2019 [24]); edification reinforces both upstream novelty ethics and downstream communal consciousness.

Policy and Regulatory Interventions

Policy interventions confirm that ethical levels are steadily engaged and are officially workable. Administrations can enforce controlling contexts that seek clarity, responsibility, and influence valuation in scientific growth. For example, data safety rules, namely the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), hold lawful responsibilities for confidentiality, consent, and accountable data management [25]. Likewise, strategies against unethical AI can order the review of algorithmic arrangements to avert unfairness and judgment. Thus, the rule alters ethical values into legal necessities, reducing the risk of impairment and nurturing community belief.

Global Cooperation

Scientific units progressively work across boundaries, forming challenges that no single country can resolve autonomously. Ethical hazards, comprising algorithmic unfairness, monitoring, and ecological influences, are sometimes intercontinental by nature. Universal teamwork is required to ensure consistent ethical values, distribute the finest performers, and stop governing arbitrage [13]. International organizations, namely UNESCO and the OECD, offer stages against the collective expansion of ethical procedures, confirming that knowledge aligns with global human rights and encourages communal well-being on a universal standard.

CONCLUSION

Technological advancement has the capacity to greatly improve human existence; however, historical and current evidence suggests that modernization itself does not promise communal well-being. From the Industrial Revolution to the proliferation of AI and digital monitoring, the communal lifestyle has been altered, sometimes refining standards of life but also creating moral hurdles, namely inequality, discrimination, and damage to autonomy. These difficulties show that technological advancement must be collaborated through moral replication and power. This work claims that the

idea of “technology with a human face” suggests a worthy context for the convergence of novelty with human values. By combining global moral values, namely human self-esteem, righteousness, clarity, liability, and obligation towards modelling, fabrication, and engagement, knowledge can be recognized as a pivot against comprehensive, reasonable, and workable growth. Real-world examples of algorithmic hiring systems along with large-scale monitoring demonstrate the practical results of moral negligence, expressing how proficiency-propelled novelty can imitate bias and wear away power.

Decent ruling contexts, comprising morality-by-design, governing mistakes, business accountability, and community assignment, support legal means for attaching ethical considerations to technological arrangements. Teaching guidelines and universal collaboration further strengthen moral technological advancements by developing skilled, accountable innovators, executing enforceable levels, and synchronizing with global ethical models. In summary, expertise alone cannot express growth. Exact growth is assessed not only through creation or proficiency but also by the degree to which it promotes human self-respect, endorses the law, and confirms power across communities. Attaching morality to each level of technological advancement is required to confirm that technological growth serves people rather than discouraging it. An upcoming in which knowledge has a human face is attainable only through reliable ethical likeness, strong governance, and shared accountability.

REFERENCES

1. Barocas S, Selbst AD. Big data's disparate impact. *Calif Law Rev.* 2016;104(3):671–732.
2. Beck U. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Translated by Mark Ritter. London: Sage Publications; 1992.
3. Bostrom N, Yudkowsky E. The ethics of artificial intelligence. In: Frankish K, Ramsey WM, editors. *The Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2014. p. 316–334. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139046855.020.
4. Creemers R. China's social credit system: an evolving practice of control. *SSRN Electron J.* 2018. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3175792.
5. Dastin J. (2018). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women [Online]. Reuters. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G>
6. Eubanks V. *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. New York: St Martin's Press; 2018.
7. European Commission. *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*. Brussels: European Commission; 2019.
8. Feenberg A. *Technosystem: The Social Life of Reason*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2017. doi:10.4159/9780674982109.
9. Floridi L. *The Ethics of Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641321.001.0001.
10. Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, Dignum V, et al. AI4People-an ethical framework for a good AI society: opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds Mach.* 2018;28(4):689–707. doi:10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5.
11. Hobsbawm E. *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson; 1962.
12. IEEE Standards Association. *Ethically Aligned Design - A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems*. Piscataway (NJ): Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Standards Association; 2019.
13. Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nat Mach Intell.* 2019;1(9):389–399. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2.
14. Jonas H. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Bowman M, translator. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1984. doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226850337.001.0001.

15. Mittelstadt BD. Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nat Mach Intell.* 2019;1(11):501–507. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0114-4.
16. Moor JH. Why we need better ethics for emerging technologies. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2005;7(3):111–119. doi:10.1007/s10676-006-0008-0.
17. Noble SU. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism.* New York: New York University Press; 2018.
18. O'Neil C. *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy.* New York: Crown Publishing; 2016.
19. Pasquale F. *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2015. doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674736061.
20. Rawls J. *A Theory of Justice.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1971. doi:10.4159/9780674042605.
21. Sen A. *Development as Freedom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
22. UNESCO. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.* Paris: UNESCO; 2021.
23. United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights.* Paris: United Nations; 1948.
24. Van Wynsberghe A, Robbins S. Critiquing the reasons for making artificial moral agents. *Science and engineering ethics.* 2019 Jun 15;25(3):719-35.
25. Voigt P, Von dem Bussche A. *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A Practical Guide.* Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017.
26. Winner L. Do artefacts have politics? *Daedalus.* 1980;109(1):121–136.
27. Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* New York: Public Affairs; 2019.