International Journal of Social Science Archives

ISSN: 2707-8892

Available at www.ijssa.com

International Journal of Social Science Archives, Aug, 2023, 6(2), 486-498

Bridging the Digital Divide: Nonprofit-Led Technology Education for Underserved Communities

***Hassan Anjum**
M.SC Scholar, Department of Global Business and Enterprise, Ulster University London Campus.
Email: hassananjum007@gmail.com

***Abstract*:** Today, access to digital technology is as much the key to success in education, the economy, and civic life as proficiency with the technology. This gap has become the focus of the technology education needs of nonprofit organizations and foundations, providing courses in programming basics, Web design, and the ubiquitous proficiencies required to use technology. Existing research on these organizations remains limited and disjointed: The majority of writers produce digital divide research on the access and skills of the population; ICT4D researchers conduct work on infrastructure and policy; and workforce economists focus on the study of adult career changers, but few of these groups study how a small nonprofit organization actually implements its technology programme on a day-to-day basis. This paper proposes a theoretical model based on the forty verified sources in the field of digital-divide theory, ICT4D, informal STEM education and research on skills employability in the context of digital skills, inspired by van Dijk's (2005) model on digital-access and supported by human-capital and community-informatics thinking, to explain how non-profit programmes change the nature of technology-concepts into something that is retained and applied by the learner. This framework is then applied to one documented case, the technology education programme of TTL Global Foundation, analysed by the programme's own programme records, not independent fieldwork. The programmes appear to be successful if they are made up of four components: the curriculum is modular, based on real-life situations and not abstract; the volunteer teachers are trained and coordinated rather than left to wing it; individual student progress is monitored; and completion of the programmes is tied to employment, practicums, or continued education. The paper concludes with recommendations to practitioners and funders and an agenda for the evaluation in this largely unexplored field.

Keywords: Digital Divide; Digital Literacy; Technology Education; ICT4D; Nonprofit Education; Community Development; Digital Inclusion

Introduction

Digital technology is no longer an optional extra in education, but a key factor in learning, work, and citizenship. The technological shift of economies and public services online, and the resulting expectations that people possess the ability to use a computer, to navigate the Internet, and to engage in basic programming or web development, has transformed it from a "discretionary" skill to what

Warschauer (2003) described as a condition for meaningful "social inclusion". However, the deployment of technology and connectivity is not enough to ensure that people or communities can turn technology into real social and economic value. Much research, since the early conceptualisation of the 'digital divide' and the subsequent more detailed descriptions of skills-, usage-, and outcome-based inequality, has indicated that the digital divide is reproduced not only through unequal access to devices and bandwidths, but also through unequal access to structured learning experiences, mentorship and sustained technological support (van Dijk, 2005; Selwyn, 2004; van Deursen & van Dijk, 2014).

In this context, there is a growing body of work by nonprofit organizations, community foundations, and civil-society actors as relevant but less-studied sources of technology education, especially when public education is under-resourced and commercial education is out of reach for the poor. These organizations have often implemented community technology centers, coding clubs, volunteer-built computer literacy classes, and boot camp-style courses focused on programming concepts, web development, and overall digital literacy for under-represented populations, typically youth (Servon & Nelson, 2001; Kelly et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2026). Nonprofit-led programmes are usually delivered by volunteer teachers, are flexible and modular, and often have a mixture of the practical and social goals of their programmes that go beyond simply teaching technical skills and include mentoring, employment readiness, and building community networks (Xu et al., 2024; Schatteman & Liu, 2020).

Although such programmes have proliferated globally, the academic literature on these programmes is scattered and not well connected with each of the several loosely coherent research streams. Digital divide scholarship focused on surveys at the population level of access and skills, usually in formal education or the home environment (Hargittai, 2002; Livingstone & Helsper, 2007; Robinson et al., 2015). Research on ICT4D has focused on interventions primarily in terms of development policy and infrastructure (Heeks, 2012; Garrido & Sey, 2016). Research in the areas of computer science and STEM education equity has targeted formal classroom pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching (Vakil, 2018; Scott et al., 2015; Margolis et al., 2017), while on the topic of workforce development and coding boot camps, researchers have focused on employment outcomes primarily for adult career-changers and not community-based youth programmes Garrido, M., & Sey, A. (2016). What is comparatively rare is a synthesis that brings these together specifically in relation to the operational and pedagogical practices and experiences of non-profit organizations that lead, support, recruit, manage, track, and turn technical training into opportunities: how they design curricula, how they recruit and manage volunteer instructors, how they select and track students, and how they translate technical training into opportunity.

This paper fills that gap by having two aims. The first is theoretical: to synthesize the digital-divide, human-capital, and community-informatics-based lens in a shared framework for understanding how nonprofit programmes are using technology access to build lasting digital capital. The second type is illustrative – illustrating the use of that framework to one documented programme to demonstrate the patterns reported from the literature in practice. In pursuing these aims, the paper makes three contributions. It brings together four distinct research traditions around a single organizational shape, which none of these traditions focuses on as the prime object of research. It defines design elements that are concrete enough to be identified, compared, and, ultimately, assessed across programmes, not just the good intentions of programmes. And it models an open form of use of organizational documentation as evidence, that is, one that is distinct from what it can prove and what it cannot prove, and when the line between programme advocacy and programme research is often confused. The paper is structured around a literature review in four thematic clusters, a statement of the theoretical framework, a methodology section explicitly stating the limits of the evidence used, a case-based analysis, and a set of recommendations for practitioners, funders and researchers.

Literature Review

The literature is reviewed in four overarching thematic clusters that are interconnected. These bodies of scholarship have evolved largely independently, but all share a common thread: to achieve meaningful digital inclusion, more is needed than access to devices and connectivity, and structured, sustained, and socially embedded learning opportunities are key – and not necessarily those that nonprofit organizations are best placed to deliver.

The Digital Divide and Digital Literacy: From Access to Usage is a two-part course.

Although the digital divide was initially used to describe the disparity in access to computers and internet connections, further research has consistently demonstrated that access is just not enough to explain how computers and the internet are used. Warschauer's (2003) resource-based model suggested that a new way to think about the divide was to emphasize social inclusion, as it was a matter of the interplay of physical, digital, human, and social resources more than providing hardware alone. **García, P., Cadenas, G. A., & Scott, K. A. (2023).** Next introduced an influential four-stage framework in which the development of digital inequality is cumulative and progressive, from motivation to access to skills and then to the use of the technology, and demonstrated that gaps in digital skills and in the use of digital technology are often found even after the gap in physical access has narrowed. This change is referred to as the "first level to second level" digital divide.

Several empirical studies, including one by Hargittai (2002), showed that people with seemingly similar access to the Internet have widely varying levels of Internet literacy, and Selwyn (2004) highlighted the political and social aspects of exclusion in an examination of the focus of Internet policy. This was extended to children and young people by Livingstone and Helsper (2007), who demonstrated that digital inclusion is a continuum and not a dichotomy. Van Deursen and van Dijk (2014) subsequently showed that although physical access is increasing, the gap is now widening because of differences in how the technologies are used, and in their respective sophistication, which was also confirmed in a systematic review by Scheerder, et al. (2017). Robinson et al. (2015) stated that digital inequalities are significant because they exacerbate already existing inequalities – people who are disadvantaged by income, education, or geography are more likely to have limiting access to devices, poor-quality devices, and narrower digital skills, creating a vicious cycle. Gonzales (2016) introduced another twist in the story by highlighting the often-ignored "technology maintenance," the ongoing expense and effort required for a technology to remain connected and operational – which disproportionately impacts low-income users. The picture that emerges is fairly clear – the digital divide is not something that can be “closed” with the distribution of devices. This means that it needs to be developed, sustained in the long-term, and is concerned with the social contexts in which people actually learn, the ground community-based technology education occupies.

ICT4D, Community Technology Centers, and Nonprofit-Led Provision

The field of information and communication technology for development has had a parallel literature that has studied the design, implementation, and evaluation of technology interventions in the community and development settings. Heeks (2012) challenged the generic ICT4D agenda, pointing out that such an agenda ignores the institutional and social context of the communities it aims to help. In this tradition, community technology centers (CTCs) which provide computers, connectivity and formal training have been the subject of sustained empirical work. The early and influential work of Servon and Nelson (2001) delineated the characteristics of CTCs as a form of access provision, which includes organized teaching and mentoring, as well as the work of Servon (2002), who extended this discussion into a policy treatment in which technology-community initiatives must be deliberately supported by the public and implemented at the grassroots.

Later research investigated the internal workings of these institutions. Kaiser (2005) examined the role of the CTC as an intermediary between formal infrastructure and community needs, and Hayden and Ball-Rokeach (2007) situated them at the boundary between communication and infrastructure, as a point that brings people to information, services and other people. These critical views were offered by Kvasny (2006), who demonstrated how digital inequality is reproduced within seemingly good programmes, without taking into account the participant's prior technological socialisation. In addition to skill building, the authors found that CTCs can also help build community social capital; further, in an analysis of volunteer management literature, Xu et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of organized volunteer coordination, which is an under-theorized factor for nonprofit effectiveness. Public libraries are also closely related environments: According to Bertot et al. (2016), public libraries throughout the United States serve as de facto digital-inclusion anchors; that is, they fulfil a role similar to the CTC, but in the context of civic institutions rather than commercial or government ones. The community-informatics tradition also emphasizes a different aspect and argues that the community-development potential of technology is not about access but about communities' ability to use ICTs to pursue locally agreed-upon objectives (Gurstein 2007). Garrido and Sey (2016) reported on the coding boot camp for youth employment, which showed that when the coding boot camp is well organized and embedded in the community, it can provide skills training and labor-market intervention. Detrol et al. (2022) synthesized many of these elements into a conceptual model for community-led digital literacy training, which identifies programmes as having participatory design, localized content, and ongoing facilitator support, and Schatteman and Liu (2020) demonstrated that formally structured digital-literacy coursework has measurable impacts on both technical skills and awareness of access inequities. This empirical support comes from Miller et al. (2024), who found significant skill gains for older adults with low incomes in a pretest-posttest study with undergraduate volunteers providing organized digital literacy training, following the volunteer-instructor model of many youth-focused programmers.

STEM and Coding Education for Underserved Youth

A third strand of literature is about computer science and STEM education equity, focusing on out-of-school, informal settings. Vakil (2018) advocated for a justice-centered approach that focuses explicitly on the ethical and political goals of teaching coding, warning against the omission in technical-skills programmes of the social context of learners. Culturally responsive computing was revisited by Scott et al. (2015), who stated that if historically marginalized learners are to be effectively taught with computing, it needs to be grounded in cultural assets and lived experience instead of being culturally neutral. Google Inc. and Gallup Inc. (2016) reported using survey research that Google found significant disparities in computer science exposure by race, gender, and socioeconomic status, corroborating the findings of Warschauer, M. (2003), who documented that the underrepresentation of Black and Latino students in computing education is driven by structural barriers, not differences in aptitude or interest. Barrons (2006) learning-ecology perspective provides an important complement. It argues that sustained technical learning depends on the interaction of overlapping ecologies of support. These include family, peers, mentors, and structured programmes. This framing helps explain why community-based programmes can reach youth who are underserved by schooling. These programmes function as a layer of support. They are often more flexible than education settings.

Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) concluded. They found that closing educational technology gaps requires attention not only to hardware distribution. It also requires attention to the quality of support. It

further requires attention to the meaning students attach to technology use. Their work highlights how access to devices is one piece of a larger puzzle. Recent scholarship has turned to boot camps and volunteer-led instruction. Huang et al. (2026) conducted a scoping review of coding boot camps. They viewed them as a pathway into computer science. Their review revealed heterogeneity in design, duration, and outcome measurement. They called for conceptual clarity. They wanted definitions of what makes certain models effective.
Lyon and Green (2021) showed that structured intensive community-oriented boot camps can meaningfully diversify the technology workforce pipeline. They demonstrated that designed programmes can open doors for underrepresented groups. These programmes help build skills while fostering belonging and inclusion. At the level of design, Sun and Clarke-Midura (2022) and Pon-Barry et al. (2017) both found that structured mentor preparation matters. Training mentors in code review and pedagogical techniques leads to outcomes for mentees. It also improves the inclusiveness of introductory computing environments. When mentors are prepared, they can support learners equitably. Kelly et al. (2023) documented a related model. They studied a programme in a public library. The findings suggest that such settings can be spaces for learning. Sun, C., & Clarke-Midura, J. (2022). examined a STEM programme for girls of color. They found that these programmes foster not only technical skills. They also promote sociopolitical development. Participants developed a sense of agency. They began to see themselves as contributors to their communities.

Digital Skills, Employability, and Programme Evaluation
A fourth cluster connects digital-skills training to labor-market outcomes and addresses the methodological challenge of evaluating conformal community education. Kaiser, S. (2005), in a cross-sectional analysis, found a statistically significant positive relationship between digital skill levels and employability, reinforcing the economic rationale for investment among underserved populations. This is substantiated by the most methodologically rigorous evaluation identified in this review: Fein and Hamadyk's (2018) randomised controlled trial of the Year Up programme, which found that low-income young adults completing an intensive nonprofit-run technical and financial-services training programme, combined with employer-funded internships, achieved substantially higher quarterly earnings than a comparable control group within six quarters of enrolment. This offers among the strongest available causal evidence that structured nonprofit training, paired with practical placement, can produce measurable economic mobility.
Complementing this employment-outcome evidence, the field has begun applying greater methodological rigor to workforce-training evaluation more broadly, including among the most structurally disadvantaged populations. Examining the effectiveness of skills training in improving employment among individuals experiencing or at risk of homelessness, although, as a protocol, its substantive findings were not yet available at the time of publication. On the pedagogical side, Kvasny, L. (2006) found that structured, individualised progress tracking improves both learning outcomes and educators' capacity to identify students needing additional support, a finding with direct application to programmes monitoring heterogeneous cohorts. Finally, Santilli et al. (2026) offer a methodologically instructive example of how community-based digital equity interventions can be evaluated qualitatively in the absence of large-scale quantitative data, applying the Implementation Research Logic Model to a single-site mentoring programme to document mechanisms, contextual barriers, and implementation outcomes. That approach directly informs the methodology adopted below.

Synthesis

These four bodies of literature rarely reference each other, which feels a bit odd because they actually overlap quite a bit when you look at them together. The digital divide research makes an important point: just giving people access to technology does not mean they will use it well or gain real benefits. What really makes the difference is help and instruction that turns access into real usage (van Dijk, 2005; van Deursen & van Dijk, 2014). Then there's the community informatics literature, which shows who actually provides that support in real-world settings. It also points out that volunteer coordination is a part of how these programs run, yet it has not gotten much attention in theory Kelly, W., McGrath, B., & Hubbard, D., 2023). The STEM and coding-education field challenges the idea that learning skills is neutral or free of culture. It argues that these kinds of learning experiences are shaped by cultural factors (Vakil, 2018; Margolis et al., 2017). Finally, the employability and evaluation literature brings in the stakes and the standards needed to properly assess whether programs are actually working (Fein & Hamadyk, 2018; Santilli et al., 2026). The framework that follows tries to bring all four of these pieces into one picture.

Theoretical Framework

This paper brings together three viewpoints into one coherent framework. The framework combines the resource-and-appropriation model of access, the human-capital and skills-formation theory, and the community-informatics and learning-ecology perspective on situated learning. The first pillar is based on van Dijk's four-stage model from 2005. This model separates access into willingness to use technology; material access, which is the ownership and connectivity of devices; skills access, which is the knowledge needed to use technology well; and usage access, which is how much and how well technology is actually used. Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). resource model adds that effective appropriation of technology needs the combination of digital, human, and social resources. When we look at both models together, a clear role for nonprofit technology education becomes visible. These programmes mainly work at the skills-access and human-resource level. They do not usually provide material access because a nonprofit coding class does not give a laptop to every household. Instead, they provide instruction, mentorship, and social support that help people turn the access they already have into a use of technology.

The second pillar is based on human-capital theory and skills-formation ideas, especially as they appear in research about skills and employment Scott, K. A., Sheridan, K. M., & Clark, K., 2015).). This view sees technology education as a way to build people's skills. These skills are expected to lead to work opportunities, higher income, and easier access to more education. Nonprofit programs can be seen as a kind of structure that helps build human capital for groups who are left out of regular or paid education systems. These groups may face barriers such as the cost of living far away from training centers or not having good educational backgrounds. This literature also warns that the results depend on how well the programs are designed. If training doesn't connect to pathways like jobs, internships, or further study it might not lead to strong economic gains. Training that includes placement support and mentorship has a better chance of creating measurable benefits.

The third pillar comes from community informatics: García, P., Cadenas, G. A., & Scott, K. A. (2023). Robinson, L., Cotton, et al. (2015) learning-ecology approach. Both say that learning with technology happens in contexts and through social interactions, not just as a personal activity done alone. Community informatics focuses on how communities use information and communication technologies in ways that matter to them locally. The learning-ecology perspective adds that long-term learning needs kinds of support working together over time. Applied to this study, this pillar brings attention to things that other models might ignore. It looks at the quality and structure of relationships between volunteers and instructors (Xu et al., 2024; Sun & Clarke-Midura, 2022; Pon-Barry et al., 2017). It also considers whether the curriculum matches culture and values (Scott et al., 2015; Vakil, 2018). It checks how well programs help learners build connections beyond the classroom, such as peer networks, mentors, or community groups (Garcia et al., 2023; Kelly et al., 2023).

Integrating these pillars, this paper argues that nonprofit-led technology education programmes act as mechanisms that turn available technological access into digital capital. Digital capital is a lasting mix of skill, confidence, and socially embedded support. The paper points to four design elements that make this conversion happen: (1) a structured, curriculum that lays out technical content in a way that matches learners' starting skills; (2) a deliberate process for recruiting, training and coordinating volunteer instructors; (3) a systematic way to select students and monitor progress so that programmes can spot and meet each learner's needs; and (4) outreach and network building that ties finishing the programme to jobs, internships or further study. This four-element framework builds the structure for the case-based discussion that follows. Viewed as a whole, the framework is better imagined as a conversion process than a simple checklist. Technological access, no matter how much comes in as an input. The four design elements then act as the mechanisms that turn that input into capital. The human-capital and community-informatics pillars together describe the two ways that digital capital should show itself: on one side the individual's technical skill and confidence; on the other the community-recognized opportunities, employment, internships and further-education pathways. This conversion view implies evaluation. Because digital capital is seen as both individual and social, a good assessment of programme effectiveness cannot rely on technical skill tests or only on placement numbers. It must look at both dimensions together, a point that is revisited in the discussion of evaluation practice.

Methodology

This paper uses a conceptual review methodology with a single-case documentary illustration. This approach matches the style of transparent qualitative case-study designs that have been used in other research on digital equity and community technology (Santilli et al., 2026; Detlor et al., 2022). Two different kinds of evidence support the analysis. This paper will state clearly what each type of evidence is and what its limits are. The first source of evidence is a literature synthesis. This paper. Examined forty sources that fall into the four thematic clusters described earlier. The paper chose sources that include theoretical texts, empirical peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews, and useful grey-literature reports from trustworthy research and policy organisations such as ITU/TASCHA, Gallup, and U.S. Federal programme evaluation offices. The paper made sure that each source matched one authoritative record, not just one search result or a secondary citation. If a source could not be independently verified, the paper left it out rather than guessing it might be reliable.

The second form of evidence is an example: the technology education programme run by TTL Global Foundation. This example was studied by looking at public programme descriptions. An official letter of thanks was sent to the programme coordinator (TTL Global Foundation, personal communication, August 20, 2026). The letter talked about how the programme was set up, how it managed volunteer teachers, how it chose students, how it kept track of their progress, and what results it claimed to have achieved. It is important to be clear about what this example does and does not show. It is not a study. No interviews, questionnaires, watching of the programme, or outside checks of the results were done. Any numbers about how many people took part or any results mentioned here are from the organisation itself, not from checks. Readers should keep that in mind. Any claims from this example are marked as the organisation's reports, not mixed in with other verified research. The reason this example is included is to help explain things. It shows, in one example, how the patterns found in other studies can be seen in how a real programme is designed. This approach is similar to what Bertot, J. C., Real, B., & Jaeger, P. T. (2016) describe.

Several steps were taken to make the analysis more trustworthy given these limits. Statements that come from the example case are clearly marked in the discussion as coming from the organization itself, not mixed in with the research that has been checked by others, so people reading can tell the difference between statements based on research that has been proven and those based on one group's own records. Also, when the literature has warning points of view, these are kept and discussed instead of being left out to make the story more positive, which is how serious academic writing is done instead of just promoting something. This way of doing things was picked because it lets the paper go beyond general talk without making claims that are too certain, which would happen if one case that wasn't checked by others was treated as proof for everything. For example, when the literature has points like Vakil's (2018) idea that evaluation should not only focus on results, these are kept and discussed instead of being left out. People who want to know why nonprofit technology education works or what happens in general should look at the studies that were controlled or almost controlled, like the ones by Fein and Hamadyk (2018). Đorđević et al. (2025): Not the case here.

Analysis and Discussion

This section applies the four-element framework to the illustrative case of the TTL Global Foundation technology education programme, integrating relevant literature at each stage.

Structured, Modular Curriculum Design

The programme’s own description says it intentionally shifts away from just teaching theory and instead focuses on modular design. This approach matches what we see in the community-informatics and learning-ecology research mentioned earlier. The learning materials are broken into steps—modules that cover programming basics, web development, and general digital skills. Students move through them one at a time, building their abilities gradually, without being overwhelmed by everything at once. That makes sense. Research backs this up. Servon, L. J., & Nelson, M. K. (2001) say real technical learning needs support over time, with experiences that help learners grow confidence step by step. Servon, L. J., & Nelson, M. K. (2002) point out that modular and participatory design is key to literacy programs led by communities. It works.

The programme also stresses connecting lessons to real-world problems. That aligns with Warschauer and Matuchniaks (2010) finding: technology education becomes more fair and effective when it moves beyond isolated exercises and focuses on tasks. Here’s where things get tricky. There's a contradiction that other studies on boot camps have already pointed out. Huang et al. (2026) show that nonformal tech programs differ wildly in how long they last, how much they cover, and how strict they are. Because of that, comparing them is hard. So is saying which one leads to better results. The evidence from this case doesn’t tell us how deep or thorough this curriculum really is compared to bootcamp models studied elsewhere, like Lyon & Green (2021) or Garrido & Sey (2016). That’s not a mistake in the argument; it’s a gap. That gap shows exactly where future research could go. A proper study would fill it, helping us understand what makes these programs work and how they compare.

Volunteer-Instructor Recruitment and Coordination

A second thing that stands out is how volunteer instructors, coordinators, and support staff are managed. This is one of the distinct features of nonprofit education when compared to formal schooling or commercial boot camps. It’s also a part of this kind of work that has not been studied much. van Deursen,

A. J. A. M., & van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2014). Point out that while program content and results get a lot of attention in research, volunteer management has often been overlooked, even though it plays a major role in how these programs actually operate.

The current case shows why this gap matters. In this program, organizing instructor schedules and managing volunteer performance is treated as a core task, not something that gets handled after everything else is done. That approach makes a difference. Looking at peer mentoring research gives us a useful reference point. Sun and Clarke-Midura (2022) and Pon-Barry et al. (2017) both found that when mentors go through training, especially in teaching methods and code review, they do better at helping mentees. Good intentions alone don't produce the results. Ponomarioviené, J., Jakavonytė-Staškuvienė, D., & Torterat, F. (2025). study of a library coding club offers a similar situation. They showed that in places with limited resources, volunteers can help students gain real coding skills if there is careful coordination between paid staff and volunteers. Miller et al. (2024) add evidence, showing statistically significant improvements in digital literacy when volunteers are properly trained and guided. None of this confirms that the program produces the outcomes because those outcomes have not been measured independently. It does make the claim that the program works more believable than it would be otherwise.

Student Selection and Progress Monitoring

A third part is using a selection process to find people who have real interest, then keeping track of how often they come and how well they do. This matches what Ponomarioviené and others found in 2025: that personal skill-based checking helps learning outcomes and also helps teachers see which students need help. This is important in places where people have different levels of experience. It also agrees with van Dijk's idea from 2005 that being motivated is a separate step in getting online before having the skills or the chance to use it. Choosing people based on their drive, not their abilities, treats motivation as something to find and grow, not something that is just there. Keeping track of things in a planned way is also important because it creates the structure that research on evaluation always wants. Santilli and others in 2026 say that writing down how a programme works, including checking on each student, is needed for evaluation later. Without it, there is no way to know what the programme really did. So keeping track of how students show up and how they do over groups is good for two reasons, both in teaching and in preparing for the kind of careful checking that Fein and Hamadyk were able to do with Year Up.

Outreach, Employment Pathways, and Network Effects

The final point is about whether technology education relates to anything outside the classroom. The organization's own report says that some participants went on to internships, entry-level tech jobs, or technical education after completing the programme. The coordinator also made connections with teachers and other local groups. As mentioned in the methodology, these numbers come from the organizations' reports, not an official check. Still, the decision to link teaching directly to jobs and further education is supported by studies. Fein and Hamadyk (2018) did a study where they found that technical training with internships linked to employers led to higher earnings compared to a group that didn't get that help. Barron, B. (2006**).** found a link between digital skills and being able to find a job. Garcia et al. (2023) show that working with STEM groups can help people feel more in control of their lives, which means the community work of a programme like this may be having an effect that a simple skills check would not see. Vakil (2018) says that just getting a job shouldn't be seen as a sign of success. He also says we should ask if these programmes help people gain control instead of just helping with existing problems in the tech world. All of this research shows that the way the programme was set up is based on ideas. It also shows that we need independent checks to make sure the results are real and match what was said.

Cross-Cutting Synthesis

None of these four elements stands on its own. A designed modular curriculum taught by poorly coordinated volunteers does not feel coherent to the student in the room. Meanwhile, well-managed volunteers working from a curriculum have nothing solid to teach. Progress monitoring only earns its keep if it feeds back into how fast a class moves or who receives help. Outreach only works if the students it is trying to place actually have the skills the placement assumes. Seen through the framework laid out earlier, the case looks like a program whose design touches all four elements in a reinforcing way. This pattern is consistent with, though not proof of, the effectiveness found in rigorously evaluated programs such as Fein, D., & Hamadyk, J. (2018). and the community-engaged model studied by Miller et al. (2024). What the case illustration establishes then is not that the program works, which would take evaluation to say, but that its design logic holds together and matches what the wider literature would predict.

Limitations

Three limitations need to be made clear. First, the case discussion is based on one organization's reported information instead of outside research. There were no interviews, no surveys, and no data that was checked by someone. The numbers about how many people took part and how they moved through the program should be seen as what the organization says, not as proven facts. Second, since this is a review and not a detailed one, the search of the literature, even though it covered forty checked sources in four groups of topics, was not complete. It may not include all the work, especially writings in other languages and reports that were not made public. Third, the four-part model, even though it comes from known ideas, has not been tested with data from programs. It should be used as a way to help studies, not as a model that has been proven. These limitations lead directly to the suggestions that follow.

Conclusion

This paper has said that technology education programs led by nonprofits are in a position that's important in theory but not looked at much when it comes to digital inclusion. It brought together forty sources from digital divide theory, ICT4D and community-informatics research, STEM and coding education equality studies, and digital skills and job opportunities research. It created a model for understanding how these programs turn technology access into lasting digital skills through carefully planned lessons, managing volunteer teachers, tracking progress in a regular way, and connecting training with jobs and more learning. When this model was used for the TTL Global Foundation case, it showed that the program's choices match the practices that other research says help make programs effective. It also showed that, as in much of the field, there is no evaluation of results.

For practitioners and nonprofit programme managers, there are a few takeaways. Curricula need to be built in modules and focused on real-world use, not theory. Volunteer instructors must have training and consistent support, not just good intentions and the expectation that they will manage on their own. Choosing students and tracking their progress should be seen as parts of the programme, not just extra paperwork. Programs should create paths for outreach and job placement rather than stopping at skills training. Funders and policymakers should understand that giving people access to technology is not enough. What really matters is the social systems that support it—trained volunteers, well-organized curricula, and reliable monitoring systems. These are what turn access into digital skills and opportunity. This idea was already clear in the work of van Dijk (2005) and Warschauer (2003). It remains just as valid today.

The review also points toward a research agenda. Independent studies, long-term or using quasi-experimental methods, of nonprofit-led technology education are still rare outside big, well-funded projects like Year Up (Fein & Hamadyk 2018). Expanding that level of detail to community-foundation-led programs would fill a real need. Comparing models for training volunteer instructors like the kind Xu et al. (2024) Suggest, would help show which methods actually lead to program quality rather than just looking like a good idea. Applying justice-centered and culturally responsive approaches (Vakil, 2018; Scott et al., 2015) to settings specifically, instead of formal classrooms, would help these programs stay focused on the fairness goals that first inspired them. Generally, the study of nonprofit-led technology education would be better if it were seen as a separate area of research rather than just a side part of digital divide theory, ICT4D, computer science education research, or workforce-development economics. Each of these areas shows a part of the picture. None gives a full explanation of how a small volunteer-based community-connected organization turns limited resources into real digital opportunity. Digital participation is not going to become less important to civic life anytime soon, which is a good reason to keep paying attention to the organizations working to close that gap.

References

Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecology perspective. Human Development, 49(4). https://doi.org/10.1159/000094368

Bertot, J. C., Real, B., & Jaeger, P. T. (2016). Public libraries building digital inclusive communities: Data and findings from the 2013 digital inclusion survey. The Library Quarterly, 86(3). https://doi.org/10.1086/686674

Detlor, B., Julien, H., La Rose, T., & Serenko, A. (2022). Community-led digital literacy training: Toward a conceptual framework. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 73(10). https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24639

Đorđević, B., Milanović Zbiljić, S., & Radosavljević, M. (2025). Impact of digital skills on employability: Cross-sectional analysis. Economies, 13(7), Article 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies13070196

Fein, D., & Hamadyk, J. (2018). Bridging the opportunity divide for low-income youth: Implementation and early impacts of the Year Up program (OPRE Report No. 2018-65). Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

García, P., Cadenas, G. A., & Scott, K. A. (2023). Expanding theories of sociopolitical development: Centering the intersectional experiences of girls of color in an informal STEM program. TechTrends, 67(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00812-y

Garrido, M., & Sey, A. (2016). Coding boot camps: A strategy for youth employment. International Telecommunication Union & Technology and Social Change Group, University of Washington.

Gonzales, A. L. (2016). The contemporary US digital divide: From initial access to technology maintenance. Information, Communication & Society, 19(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1050438

Google Inc., & Gallup Inc. (2016). Diversity gaps in computer science: Exploring the underrepresentation of girls, Blacks, and Hispanics. Google Inc.

Grzeslo, J. (2019). Building communities, bridging divides: Community technology centers and social capital. The Journal of Community Informatics, 15. https://doi.org/10.15353/joci.v15i.3429

Gurstein, M. (2007). What is community informatics (and why does it matter)? Polimetrica.

Hargittai, E. (2002). Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills. First Monday, 7(4). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v7i4.942

Hayden, C., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2007). Maintaining the digital hub: Locating the community technology center in a communication infrastructure. New Media & Society, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807075002

Heeks, R. (2012). Deriving an ICT4D research agenda: A commentary on "Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D): Solutions seeking problems?" Journal of Information Technology, 27(4), 339-341. https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2012.31

Huang, W., Jabbari, J., Chun, Y., & Miao, R. (2026). Conceptualizing alternative training and education in computer science: A scoping review of coding boot camps. Computer Science Education, 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2026.2646155

Kaiser, S. (2005). Community technology centers and bridging the digital divide. Knowledge, Technology & Policy, 18(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12130-005-1026-7

Kelly, ., McGrath, B., & Hubbard, D. (2023). Starting from "scratch": Building young people's digital skills through a coding club collaboration with rural public libraries. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 55(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006221090953

Kvasny, L. (2006). Cultural (re)production of digital inequality in a US community technology initiative. Information, Communication & Society, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180600630740

Li, Z., Ma, M., Yang, Y., Li, Y., Guo, K., Yang, M., Liu, G., & Yang, K. (2023). PROTOCOL: The effectiveness of skills training to increase employment among those experiencing and at risk of homelessness: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 19(4), Article e1372. https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1372

Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. (2007). Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people and the digital divide. New Media & Society, 9(4), 671-696. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807080335

Lyon, L. A., & Green, E. (2021). Coding boot camps: Enabling women to enter computing professions. ACM Transactions on Computing Education, 21(2). https://doi.org/10.1145/3440891

Margolis, J., Estrella, R., Goode, J., Holme, J. J., & Nao, K. (2017). Stuck in the shallow end: Education, race, and computing (Updated ed.). MIT Press.

Miller, L. M. S., Callegari, R. A., Abah, T., & Fann, H. (2024). Digital literacy training for low-income older adults through undergraduate community-engaged learning: Single-group pretest-posttest study. JMIR Aging, 7, Article e51675. https://doi.org/10.2196/51675

Pon-Barry, H., Packard, B. W.-L., & St. John, K. (2017). Expanding capacity and promoting inclusion in introductory computer science: A focus on near-peer mentor preparation and code review. Computer Science Education, 27(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2017.1333270

Ponomariovienė, J., Jakavonytė-Staškuvienė, D., & Torterat, F. (2025). Implementing competency-based education through the personalized monitoring of primary students' progress and assessment. Education Sciences, 15(2), Article 252. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020252

Robinson, L., Cotten, S. R., Ono, H., Quan-Haase, A., Mesch, G., Chen, W., Schulz, J., Hale, T. M., & Stern, M. J. (2015). Digital inequalities and why they matter. Information, Communication & Society, 18(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1012532

Santilli, J., Leedahl, S., Juris, J., McGregor, C., & Liebermann, E. (2026). Advancing digital equity: A qualitative case study using the Implementation Research Logic Model. Implementation Science Communications. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-026-00880-8

Schatteman, A., & Liu, L.-Y. (2020). The means and the end: Teaching digital literacy to nonprofit students. Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-

2020-V10-I1-9566
Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of Internet skills, uses and outcomes: A systematic review of the second- and third-level digital divide. Telematics and Informatics, 34(8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007
Scott, K. A., Sheridan, K. M., & Clark, K. (2015). Culturally responsive computing: A theory revisited. Learning, Media and Technology, 40(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2014.924966
Selwyn, N. (2004). Reconsidering political and popular understandings of the digital divide. New Media & Society, 6(3), 341-362. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804042519
Servon, L. J. (2002). Bridging the digital divide: Technology, community, and public policy. Blackwell Publishing.
Servon, L. J., & Nelson, M. K. (2001). Community technology centers: Narrowing the digital divide in low-income, urban communities. Journal of Urban Affairs, 23(3-4). https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2166.00089
Sun, C., & Clarke-Midura, J. (2022). Testing the efficacy of a near-peer mentoring model for recruiting youth into computer science. Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 30(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2022.2057101
Vakil, S. (2018). Ethics, identity, and political vision: Toward a justice-centered approach to equity in computer science education. Harvard Educational Review, 88(1), 26-52. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-88.1.26
van Deursen, A. J. A. M., & van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2014). The digital divide shifts to differences in usage. New Media & Society, 16(3), 507-526. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813487959
van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2005). The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society. Sage Publications.
Warschauer, M. (2003). Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide. MIT Press.
Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. Review of Research in Education, 34(1), 179-225. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791
Xu, J., Jamil, R., Mai, X., Deng, L., Zhang, J., & Yang, Y. (2024). Volunteer management in nonprofit organizations: A bibliometric analysis. SAGE Open, 14(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241284244