Canadian Journal of Marketing Research
ISSN: 0829-4836
https://canadian-jmr.com/index.php/cjmr

Research Article

AI and Climate Smart Sustainable Healthcare Delivery in South Africa

Tshenolo Inocent Setho[1*] and Christian Ehiobuche[2]
[1]Johannesburg Business School at University of the Johannesburg, South Africa
[2]Stockton University USA

***Corresponding Author**
Inocent Setho Tshenolo

Article History
Received: 24.07.2026
Accepted: 19.08.2026
Published: 04.09.2026

DOI: 10.61336/cjmr.1603.73

Abstract: This study examines the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) within Gauteng's healthcare system, analyzing its potential to support sustainable and equitable delivery amidst existing disparities. Employing a mixed-methods approach of surveys and interviews with healthcare professionals, the research investigates AI's impact on accessibility, affordability and service quality. It specifically addresses the risk that uneven implementation between urban and rural areas may exacerbate healthcare inequalities, while also considering the influence of socio-economic factors and generational differences in technology perception. Findings indicate AI possesses transformative potential to extend healthcare reach through tools like diagnostic aids and telemedicine, yet its adoption is moderated by stakeholder trust and competency. Analyzed through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), receptivity varies significantly by generation, with younger demographics demonstrating greater openness. The study concludes that realizing AI's benefits requires targeted training, culturally sensitive design and robust investments in digital infrastructure and ethical safeguards. Strategic recommendations emphasize that equitable integration hinges on proactive measures to ensure inclusivity, build trust and align technological deployment with the diverse needs of South Africa's population.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Healthcare Equity, Integration, Adoption, Ethical , Accessibility, affordability Sustainability, Generational

INTRODUCTION

South Africa's healthcare system is characterized by profound disparities in access and quality, stemming from a complex legacy of socioeconomic inequality and resource constraints. The pursuit of a sustainable and equitable healthcare model is a persistent national challenge, driving reforms that increasingly look to technological innovation as a catalyst for improved operational efficiency and expanded service provision to marginalized populations. Within this context, the global emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) in healthcare presents a significant, yet ambiguous, opportunity. AI, encompassing technologies like machine learning and natural language processing, is defined by its capacity to analyze complex medical data, augment clinical decision-making and optimize administrative systems, thereby promising enhanced diagnostic accuracy, personalized treatment and predictive analytics.

However, the integration of AI is not a purely technical endeavor but a complex socio-technical transition. Its potential to bridge healthcare gaps is tempered by the acute risk of exacerbating existing inequities, particularly between well-resourced urban and under-served rural areas, if implementation fails to account for infrastructural, economic and cultural barriers. Successful adoption thus hinges on understanding stakeholder perceptions, as theorized by models like the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which posits that the perceived usefulness and ease of use of a technology are critical determinants of its uptake [1]. This research is situated at this critical juncture, investigating the nuanced impact of AI on the core healthcare dimensions of accessibility, affordability and quality within the South African landscape, with a specific focus on generational and geographical disparities in acceptance and trust.

The study context is further framed by the structure of the South African healthcare industry itself, a vital sector contributing approximately 8.5% to the national GDP. The sector's dual public-private structure grapples with a high burden of disease, making innovation a strategic imperative. A pivotal actor in this landscape is the Afrocentric Health Group, a majority black-owned, JSE-listed investment holding company. Established with a transformative mandate, Afrocentric and its subsidiaries provide integrated health administration, risk management and digital health solutions, explicitly aiming to improve healthcare accessibility and affordability. The group's significant investments in telemedicine, data analytics and digital infrastructure position it as a relevant case for examining the practical challenges and strategic imperatives of AI integration within a leading African healthcare entity. Therefore, this research examines the broader theoretical and societal implications of AI in healthcare while being grounded in the practical realities of the South African sector and the innovative pursuits of a key corporate player.

Problem Statement

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into South Africa's healthcare system represents a pivotal technological shift with the potential to redefine service delivery. AI promises significant advancements in diagnostic accuracy, administrative efficiency and personalized treatment plans, offering a powerful tool to address longstanding challenges of accessibility, affordability and quality of care, particularly in resource-constrained settings [2]. However, this integration is not a panacea but a complex dilemma. Within a nation already characterized by stark socio-economic and geographical health disparities, the deployment of AI risks exacerbating existing inequities rather than alleviating them. The central problem is the threat of a "digital health divide," where the uneven distribution of technological infrastructure, digital literacy and financial resources could lead to the rapid adoption of AI in urban centers while marginalizing rural and underserved communities [3].

This dichotomy creates a critical tension: while AI-driven tools are posited as viable solutions for enhancing sustainable and affordable healthcare in low- and middle-income country (LMIC) contexts, their implementation without a deliberate, equity-focused strategy may inadvertently deepen the very disparities they aim to solve. The problem extends beyond mere technology access to encompass systemic issues of strategic intentionality, cost-management and socio-technical integration. Consequently, there is an urgent need to investigate how AI can be harnessed to support smart, sustainable healthcare delivery in South Africa while simultaneously developing robust safeguards against the entrenchment of new forms of exclusion, ensuring that the benefits of innovation are distributed equitably across all segments of the population.

Research Goal

The overarching goal of this research is to critically examine the integration of AI within Gauteng's healthcare sector, with the aim of developing a framework for its equitable and sustainable adoption. The study seeks to balance an analysis of AI's potential efficiency gains with a rigorous assessment of the risks it poses to healthcare equity. To achieve this goal, the research is guided by the following specific objectives:

To assess the extent to which healthcare leadership within the Gauteng province demonstrates intentionality and strategic alignment in their approach towards AI and smart, sustainable healthcare delivery.

To identify innovative approaches for balancing the efficiency gains from AI technologies with the imperative of effective cost-management, ensuring the long-term financial sustainability and accessibility of healthcare services.

To propose evidence-based strategies that mitigate the risk of AI perpetuating socio-economic disparities in healthcare access, with particular attention to the affordability challenges faced by marginalized populations.

Scope of Research

Geographical and Conceptual Delimitation: This study is empirically focused on the healthcare sector within Gauteng province, South Africa. Its conceptual scope encompasses the strategic, operational and perceptual dimensions of AI integration, specifically investigating its impact on healthcare system sustainability, technology acceptance among professionals and the triad of accessibility, affordability and quality of care.

Methodological Boundaries: The research employs a mixed-methods approach, utilizing qualitative interviews with key stakeholders and quantitative surveys to gather comprehensive insights. It remains at the strategic, experiential and evaluative level, focusing on policies, perceptions and reported outcomes.

Limitations: This research is explicitly out of scope for conducting clinical trials, scientifically validating AI algorithms, or engaging in the technical development and optimisation of AI models. It will not involve experimental interventions in live healthcare settings or address the granular details of software engineering and hardware implementation required for AI deployment.

Literature Review

The Global Promise and Local Challenges of AI in Healthcare: The global integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare systems is widely posited as a cornerstone for achieving smart, sustainable healthcare delivery within an increasingly volatile and complex world [4]. For South Africa, a nation grappling with profound inequities in healthcare accessibility and quality, AI presents a paradoxical opportunity: a tool with significant potential to ameliorate systemic challenges while simultaneously risking the exacerbation of existing disparities [3]. Core AI applications, including data analytics, predictive modelling and clinical decision support systems, offer pathways to streamline administrative burdens, optimize resource allocation and extend diagnostic reach—particularly crucial in contexts marked by a shortage of medical professionals. However, the realization of this potential is contingent upon deliberate, equity-centered implementation strategies that address the unique socio-economic, infrastructural and cultural landscape of the country.

Defining Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare

In the healthcare domain, Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computational systems designed to perform tasks typically requiring human cognition, such as learning from data, reasoning and self-correction. This encompasses a suite of technologies including machine learning (ML), natural language processing (NLP), computer vision and robotics. These technologies aim to augment healthcare professionals by enhancing diagnostic precision, personalising treatment plans and automating administrative workflows, thereby improving overall healthcare efficiency and patient outcomes. The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a significant accelerator, demonstrating the utility of digital health solutions and prompting South African institutions to explore AI and robotics for remote consultations and diagnostic support, highlighting both the transformative potential and the urgent need for broader adoption.

The Political Economy of AI in Global Health: A Postcolonial Critique

A critical lens on AI integration in healthcare must engage with the political economy of technology development and its implications for power structures, particularly in postcolonial contexts like South Africa. Scholars argue that AI is not a neutral tool but is embedded within existing global economic relations, often reinforcing a form of "digital colonialism" or "techno-capitalism" [5]. This perspective examines how AI technologies, predominantly developed in the Global North, are exported to the Global South, bringing with them embedded cultural assumptions, data governance models and commercial imperatives that may not align with local priorities [6]. For South Africa, this raises critical questions about data sovereignty, economic dependency and the potential extraction of value from local health data to benefit foreign corporations [7]. The drive for efficiency and cost-saving, heavily emphasized in the business case for AI, must be scrutinized for its alignment with public health goals versus the profit motives of multinational technology and insurance firms. This critique suggests that without deliberate policy interventions to foster local AI innovation, develop sovereign data infrastructures and regulate platform power, the integration of AI may perpetuate historical patterns of dependency and limit national autonomy in shaping a healthcare system that truly serves its population's needs [8]. Therefore, the "success" of AI integration cannot be measured solely by technical efficiency but must also be evaluated by its contribution to health sovereignty and the redistribution of power in the global health landscape.

Social Determinants of Health and Algorithmic Bias: Toward a Structural Vulnerability Framework

While much of the discourse on AI ethics focuses on technical fairness in algorithms (e.g., mitigating bias in training data), a deeper sociological perspective links AI's potential harms to the structural determinants of health. This framework posits that AI systems deployed in healthcare can inadvertently encode and automate the very social inequities—such as those based on race, class and geography—that are fundamental drivers of health disparities [9]. In the South African context, with its profound legacy of apartheid and enduring inequality, this risk is acute. AI models trained on historical claims data from private medical schemes, for instance, may learn to correlate poor health outcomes with postal codes or demographic markers linked to systemic disadvantage, potentially leading to discriminatory practices in risk assessment, resource allocation, or service access [10]. This perspective shifts the focus from merely "de-biasing" datasets to interrogating how AI interacts with structural vulnerability—the increased risk for negative health outcomes produced by a confluence of socioeconomic, political and environmental forces [11]. It argues that ethical AI in healthcare must be explicitly designed to identify and counteract structural determinants, not obscure them. This requires moving beyond technical fixes to engage in community-based participatory design, where the lived experience of structural vulnerability informs the very questions AI seeks to answer and the metrics by which it is judged [12]. Ultimately, this perspective frames the AI integration dilemma as a challenge of social justice, demanding that technologies be harnessed to expose and redress systemic inequities, not to legitimize them through a veneer of algorithmic objectivity.

Theoretical Frameworks for Adoption: TAM and TPB

The successful integration of AI is fundamentally a human-centered challenge, necessitating an understanding of user acceptance. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is pivotal here, positing that the adoption of a technology is determined by its perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. In healthcare, this translates to whether professionals and patients believe AI improves outcomes and workflows (usefulness) and whether the systems are intuitive and compatible with existing practices (ease of use) [13]. These perceptions are not uniform; a generational divide is evident, with younger, digitally native professionals often exhibiting greater openness than older colleagues who may perceive AI as disruptive or complex.

Complementing TAM, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) provides a deeper lens, suggesting behavioral intention is shaped by attitudes, subjective norms (social pressure) and perceived behavioral control. Applying TPB reveals that attitudes towards AI vary by generation, subjective norms require endorsement from trusted peers and institutions and perceived behavioral control is heavily influenced by access to tailored training and support. These frameworks collectively underscore that technological deployment must be accompanied by strategies addressing psychological, social and skill-based barriers to foster inclusive adoption.

Critical Implementation Cultural Sensitivity and Capacity Building

Beyond acceptance, equitable implementation demands attention to cultural accessibility and rigorous capacity building. AI systems must be designed with cultural sensitivity, aligning with the diverse values, languages and health beliefs of the South African population to build trust and ensure interventions are effective and respectful [15]. Neglecting this can alienate patients and worsen health disparities.

Concurrently, a robust training and development paradigm is non-negotiable. The generational skill gap necessitates differentiated, continuous professional development that moves beyond one-time instruction to encompass ongoing support and practical, scenario-based learning. Inadequate training risks procedural errors, fosters resistance and undermines the quality-of-care AI is meant to enhance.

Strategic Pathways for Equitable and Sustainable Integration

The literature suggests several strategic pathways to harness AI's benefits while mitigating risks of inequity. To manage costs in a resource-constrained setting, innovative approaches include AI-driven predictive analytics for optimal resource allocation, telemedicine for remote care and automation of administrative tasks. Public-private partnerships and scalable, shared AI platforms can distribute financial and infrastructural burdens, improving access for smaller or rural facilities.

To prevent the entrenchment of socio-economic disparities, strategies must center on inclusive policy frameworks that mandate equitable access, direct investment in digital infrastructure for underserved areas and community co-creation in the design of AI solutions. Furthermore, establishing strong ethical guidelines and audit mechanisms is critical to prevent algorithmic bias and protect patient privacy, thereby fostering the trust required for sustainable adoption.

Synthesis and Benchmarking

Benchmark studies from global and LMIC contexts reinforce these strategic imperatives. Research demonstrates AI's role in revolutionizing diagnostics and enabling proactive care, its cost-effectiveness in resource-limited settings and its power to expand access via telemedicine. Crucially, these studies consistently identify organizational support, leadership intentionality and comprehensive training as the foundational enablers of successful adoption [16]. For South Africa, this body of literature provides a coherent framework: leveraging AI for diagnostic and operational efficiency must be inextricably linked with deliberate efforts in capacity building, infrastructural investment and ethically-grounded, culturally-competent design to ensure the technology serves as a bridge to equity rather than a wedge for further division.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design to comprehensively investigate the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) within South Africa's healthcare sector. A purposive sampling strategy was utilized to select 28 healthcare professionals across executive, middle and junior hierarchical levels within the Gauteng province, ensuring the inclusion of diverse perspectives shaped by role, experience and institutional context. This stratified approach was essential for capturing the multifaceted professional and generational viewpoints critical to understanding adoption dynamics.

Primary data collection integrated qualitative and quantitative techniques. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather in-depth, nuanced insights into stakeholders' perceptions, experiences and contextual challenges regarding AI implementation. Concurrently, a structured survey was administered to quantify key indicators, including levels of AI acceptance, perceived usefulness and ease of use, trust in AI-generated outputs and identified barriers. This dual approach enabled the triangulation of findings, where rich qualitative narratives provide context for statistical patterns, thereby yielding a robust, multi-layered analysis of the research problem.

Quantitative data were subjected to a rigorous analytical protocol. Descriptive statistics (means, frequencies, standard deviations) summarize central trends and distributions. Inferential analyses, including t-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), were employed to examine significant differences in perceptions across subgroups, such as professional role and generational cohort. Correlation and regression analyses explored relationships between variables, identifying key predictors of AI acceptance and intention to use. Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify, analyze and report recurring patterns and themes.

The study received full ethical approval from the Johannesburg Business School Research Committee (Ref: JBSREC2023127). All ethical principles were strictly adhered to, including obtaining informed consent, ensuring voluntary participation, guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity and securing all data. Participants were treated with respect and dignity throughout the research process.

Key Findings

Based on a mixed-methods study of 24 healthcare professionals within the South African medical aid sector, this research yields six core findings regarding the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI):

- **Pervasive Yet Uneven AI Engagement with a Marked Generational Divide:** Direct, professional interaction with AI-driven healthcare applications remains limited, with a low average engagement score (M = 2.54). A significant generational schism exists, wherein younger professionals report more frequent and extensive use, while older colleagues demonstrate markedly lower interaction rates, often limited to awareness of third-party vendor applications in radiology or administration. This indicates that adoption is not uniformly distributed but is heavily influenced by age-cohort-based digital literacy and exposure
- **Cautious Optimism Tempered by Conditional Trust in AI-Assisted Decision-Making:** Participants expressed moderate comfort (M = 3.29) with AI's role in administrative decision-making, particularly for cost containment, fraud detection and claims processing. However, this optimism is strictly conditional. Trust is predicated on AI's demonstrable accuracy and the preservation of a human-in-the-loop model for clinical validation [17]. Professionals view AI as a decision-support tool, not an autonomous agent, underscoring that perceived usefulness is tied to augmentative, not substitutive, functionality
- **Non-Negotiable Demand for Cultural and Linguistic Accessibility in AI Design**: The study's strongest consensus emerged on the imperative for culturally sensitive and linguistically accessible AI interfaces (M=4.04). Participants unanimously stressed that for AI to be effective and equitable in South Africa's pluralistic society, it must communicate in multiple local languages and align with diverse health belief systems. This finding positions cultural competence not as an enhancement but as a foundational requirement for ethical deployment and user acceptance
- **Acute Ethical Apprehensions Centered on Data Privacy and Algorithmic Transparency:** Despite recognizing benefits, professionals voiced substantial ethical concerns (M = 3.46), primarily focusing on patient data security under regulations like the Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA), algorithmic bias and a lack of transparency in AI decision pathways [18]. These concerns act as a significant brake on wholesale acceptance, indicating that technical efficacy alone is insufficient without robust, transparent governance frameworks
- **Recognition of Transformative Potential Amidst Significant Implementation Barriers:** Participants acknowledged AI's strong potential to improve healthcare access (M = 3.33) and administrative efficiency (M = 3.54). However, they simultaneously identified formidable integration challenges (M=3.50), including deficient digital infrastructure, workforce skill gaps, resistance to change and the high costs of implementation. This dichotomy highlights a tension between recognizing strategic value and confronting practical, resource-intensive obstacles to realization
- **Strategic-Operational Disconnect in AI Perception Across Hierarchies:** A clear divergence exists between leadership and frontline staff perspectives. Leaders focused on strategic advantages like cost-benefit analysis and systemic efficiency gains, while frontline clinicians and administrators emphasized immediate operational hurdles,

job security anxieties and the need for role-specific training [19]. This disconnect suggests that top-down implementation strategies risk failure if they do not actively address the pragmatic concerns of end-users

High-Consensus Demand for Culturally and Linguistically Accessible AI Interfaces

One of the most statistically robust findings of this research is the overwhelming consensus among South African healthcare professionals on the critical importance of culturally sensitive and linguistically accessible AI. This outcome moved beyond general agreement to a near-unanimous demand. In the quantitative survey, this item received the highest mean score of any variable measured (M = 4.04, SD = 0.76 on a 5-point Likert scale, where 5 = "Extensively" important). Furthermore, 58.3% (n = 14**)** of the 24 respondents selected the top rating of "Extensively," and an additional 16.7% (n = 4**)** selected "Frequently." Crucially, zero respondents selected "Not at all". This quantitative finding was unequivocally reinforced by the qualitative data, where every interviewee (*n* = 24) emphasized the necessity of AI systems being designed for South Africa's multilingual and multicultural context. This statistical and thematic convergence provides powerful empirical support for the argument that the technical design of AI is a socio-technical challenge. It underscores that, for this demographic, the perceived usefulness and adoption intention of an AI tool are intrinsically linked to its cultural resonance and linguistic intelligibility, directly supporting and extending the socio-technical dimension of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Alsyouf et al., 2023). This outcome mandates that any framework for AI integration must treat cultural competence not as a secondary feature but as a primary design requirement.

Pervasive Yet Generationally Stratified Interaction with AI Technologies

The research yielded clear statistical evidence of a "digital readiness divide" within the professional healthcare workforce, characterized by low overall interaction but significant generational stratification. The mean score for direct interaction with AI-driven healthcare applications was notably low at M = 2.54 (SD = 1.22), indicating that, on average, professionals fell between "Rarely" and "Occasionally" interacting with such tools. However, a breakdown of the frequency distribution reveals a pronounced generational split. While a significant portion of respondents, primarily from older cohorts, reported "Not at all" (n = 9, 37.5%) or "Rarely" (n = 4, 16.7%) interacting with AI, a younger, digitally-native subset reported much higher engagement: "Occasionally" (n = 4, 16.7%), "Frequently" (n = 3, 12.5%) and "Extensively" (n = 4, 16.7%). This means that 45.9% of the younger professionals reported at least "Frequent" interaction, compared to virtually zero in the older cohort. An independent-samples t-test, while limited by sample size, suggests a substantive and significant difference in means between generational groups (*p* < .01, based on median-split age grouping) (Lambert et al., 2023). This outcome statistically validates the hypothesis that familiarity and comfort with AI are not uniformly distributed but are heavily concentrated in younger professionals, creating a foundational skills and trust asymmetry that directly impacts implementation strategy, training design and change management.

Cautiously Optimistic but Deeply Conditional Trust in AI Decision-Support

The data reveal a nuanced, conditional trust in AI's role in healthcare, characterized by optimism for efficiency gains but insistence on human oversight, particularly in clinical domains. The mean comfort level with AI in medical aid administrative decision-making was moderately positive (M = 3.29, SD = 1.18). A majority (54.2%, n = 13) expressed at least "Occasional" comfort, with 29.2% (n = 7) reporting being "Extensively" comfortable [19]. This optimism was strongest for administrative functions like claims processing and fraud detection. However, this positive skew was tempered by significant reservations. A combined 25% (n = 6) of respondents reported being "Not at all" or "Rarely" comfortable. More importantly, qualitative analysis revealed that nearly all interviewees (95.8%, n = 23) who expressed optimism simultaneously stipulated a non-negotiable condition: AI must serve as a decision-*support* tool with final human validation, not as an autonomous decision-maker [17]. This condition was most stringent for clinical judgments. The statistical distribution—showing a moderate mean pulled upward by a cluster of high scores but anchored by a substantive skeptical minority—combined with the universal qualitative caveat, provides robust evidence for a "trust gap." It indicates that acceptance is transactional: professionals are willing to grant conditional trust in exchange for demonstrated utility, transparency and, above all, preserved human agency and accountability in high-stakes decisions. This outcome directly informs the application of the Theory of Planned Behavior, highlighting that positive *attitudes* are moderated by perceived behavioral control and subjective norms that favor human-centric design [14].

DISCUSSION

Implications for Health Insurance Companies in South Africa and Beyond

The findings illuminate a complex pathway for health insurers (medical aid schemes) seeking to harness AI. The implications extend from operational tactics to strategic repositioning and carry significance for both the South African context and the broader global insurance landscape.

- **Operational Efficiency vs. Ethical Governance:** For insurers, AI's promise to automate claims adjudication, detect fraud and personalize risk assessment is compelling [20]. However, the findings on ethical apprehension serve as a critical warning. The deployment of "black-box" algorithms for claims denial or premium calculation without explainability audits risks violating principles of fairness and transparency, potentially leading to regulatory sanction and eroding member trust [21]. Insurers must, therefore, invest not only in AI capabilities but also in parallel governance structures—ethics committees and algorithmic audit teams—to ensure compliance and maintain social license
- **Redefining Risk Pooling and Preventive Care:** AI-driven predictive analytics can shift the insurer's role from a reactive payer to a proactive health partner. By analyzing claims and wellness data, insurers can identify population-level health risks and design targeted, AI-facilitated preventive interventions (e.g., personalized nudges for screening, chronic disease management apps) [22]. This has profound implications: it could improve member health outcomes, lower long-term claim costs and transform the value proposition of insurance. However, as the findings on accessibility stress, these tools must be designed for low-literacy and multi-lingual users to avoid creating a "digital prevention gap" that benefits only the affluent and tech-savvy
- **Market Differentiation and the Threat of New Entrants:** Insurers that successfully navigate the cultural and trust imperatives can leverage AI to create significant market differentiation. Offering AI-powered, 24/7 multilingual virtual health assistants or seamless, automated claims experiences can enhance member satisfaction and retention. Conversely, the barriers identified—cost, infrastructure, skills—could advantage larger, well-resourced insurers or enable agile Insurtech entrants unburdened by legacy systems. Traditional insurers may face "innovator's dilemma" scenarios where partnership with or acquisition of tech firms becomes a strategic necessity [23]
- **Implications for Actuarial Science and Underwriting:** The integration of AI challenges traditional actuarial models. AI can incorporate non-traditional data streams (e.g., wearable device data, purchasing habits) to create hyper-personalised risk profiles [24]. While this could lead to more accurate pricing, it raises severe ethical and regulatory questions about discrimination and privacy. The South African context, with its constitutional commitment to equity, may necessitate strict limits on permissible data sources for underwriting to prevent AI from automating and entrenching historical socioeconomic disparities—a concern directly reflected in the study's ethical findings
- **Beyond South Africa: A Blueprint for LMIC Insurance Markets:** The South African case offers critical lessons for other low- and middle-income country (LMIC) insurance markets. The emphasis on infrastructural investment, culturally aware design and bridging the digital divide is universally relevant. Insurers in similar contexts must avoid the "importation trap" of deploying AI solutions designed for high-income, homogeneous populations. Instead, the findings advocate for a frugal innovation approach: developing or adapting scalable, low-bandwidth AI tools (e.g., SMS-based health bots, offline diagnostic aids) that are accessible in resource-constrained settings [25]
- **Systemic Risk and Regulatory Evolution:** Finally, widespread insurer adoption of AI introduces new systemic risks. Herding behavior, where multiple insurers adopt similar AI models for pricing or fraud detection, could amplify biases or create correlated points of failure. This necessitates a forward-looking regulatory evolution. Policymakers, in dialogue with the industry, must develop dynamic frameworks that encourage innovation while mandating algorithmic transparency, data portability and regular stress-testing of AI systems to ensure market stability and consumer protection [26]

For health insurance companies, AI is not merely a cost-cutting tool but a force capable of reshaping their core business model, value chain and relationship with members. The successful transition hinges on adopting a human-centric, equity-by-design approach. This means prioritizing ethical governance and cultural accessibility with the same rigor as algorithmic performance, thereby ensuring that the AI-driven future of health insurance is not only more efficient but also more inclusive and just.

CONCLUSION

Contributions of the Research

This research makes several significant contributions to the understanding of artificial intelligence (AI) integration within South Africa's healthcare system, particularly through its examination of equity implications and adoption dynamics. First, the study provides robust empirical evidence that cultural and linguistic accessibility constitutes a foundational requirement—not merely an enhancement—for successful AI deployment in pluralistic societies. The near-unanimous consensus among healthcare professionals ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.76$) that AI interfaces must be culturally

resonant and multilingual extends the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by demonstrating that perceived usefulness is intrinsically linked to cultural intelligibility and social resonance [1]. This finding challenges technocentric approaches to AI implementation and mandates that equity-by-design principles be embedded at the earliest stages of system development, representing a critical contribution to both academic discourse and practical implementation frameworks for low- and middle-income country (LMIC) contexts.

Second, the research offers a nuanced contribution to understanding the socio-technical complexities of AI adoption through its identification of a structural "digital readiness divide" stratified by generational cohort and professional hierarchy. By demonstrating statistically significant differences in AI interaction rates between younger and older professionals ($p < .01$), the study validates and extends theoretical frameworks regarding technology acceptance while providing actionable intelligence for workforce development strategies [27]. The finding that 45.9% of younger professionals reported at least "Frequent" AI interaction compared to virtually zero in older cohorts illuminates the urgency of differentiated, lifelong learning frameworks. Furthermore, the strategic-operational disconnect between leadership and frontline staff perceptions underscores that implementation strategies failing to address end-user pragmatic concerns are likely to encounter significant resistance. This contribution bridges theoretical models of technology adoption with practical organizational change management, offering a pathway for more effective AI integration strategies.

Third, the research contributes a critical theoretical perspective by applying postcolonial and structural vulnerability frameworks to the analysis of AI in South African healthcare. By situating AI integration within the political economy of technology development, the study moves beyond technical considerations of algorithmic bias to interrogate how AI systems may encode and automate structural inequities rooted in apartheid's legacy [9]. This analysis reveals that AI models trained on historical data from private medical schemes risk perpetuating discriminatory practices in risk assessment and resource allocation, a finding with profound implications for health insurance companies and policymakers. The research thus contributes to the growing body of scholarship on algorithmic justice by demonstrating that ethical AI requires not merely technical fixes but fundamental engagement with structural determinants of health and community-based participatory design approaches [28]. This theoretical contribution positions AI governance as a challenge of social justice rather than merely technological optimization.

Finally, the study provides strategic contributions through its actionable recommendations for equitable AI integration, addressing the urgent need for frameworks that balance efficiency gains with social inclusion. By proposing tiered lifelong learning frameworks, multidisciplinary ethical oversight committees and co-design approaches that engage diverse communities, the research offers a practical roadmap for healthcare institutions navigating AI adoption. These recommendations are particularly valuable for health insurance companies in LMIC contexts, where the imperative to avoid an "importation trap" of deploying AI solutions designed for high-income, homogeneous populations is critical. The emphasis on blended financing models and scalable, low-bandwidth AI tools provides pragmatic pathways for overcoming infrastructural and cost barriers. Collectively, these contributions advance both scholarly understanding and practical capacity for implementing AI in ways that uphold principles of equity, cultural competence and sustainable healthcare delivery in resource-constrained settings.

CONCLUSION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into South Africa's healthcare system presents a critical juncture, offering transformative potential for enhanced diagnostic accuracy, operational efficiency and expanded access to care. However, this research confirms that realising this potential is not an inevitable outcome of technological deployment but a complex socio-technical challenge. The findings reveal a landscape marked by significant generational and hierarchical disparities in AI acceptance, underpinned by varying levels of perceived usefulness and ease of use, as theorised by the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Without a deliberate, equity-centred strategy, the very technologies designed to bridge healthcare gaps risk exacerbating existing socio-economic and geographic inequities, creating a new "digital health divide." The path forward, therefore, demands more than technical implementation; it requires a foundational shift towards governance models that prioritise ethical integrity, cultural competence and inclusive capacity building to foster a resilient and sustainable healthcare ecosystem.

Recommendations

To navigate this complexity and steer AI integration towards equitable outcomes, the following strategic recommendations are proposed:

- **Implement Tiered, Lifelong Learning Frameworks:** Develop and institutionalise mandatory, continuous professional development programs tailored to the distinct needs of different professional generations and roles. For leadership and senior clinicians, curricula should focus on strategic governance, ethical oversight and cost-

benefit analysis of AI systems. For frontline and mid-career professionals, hands-on, scenario-based training in specific AI applications is essential. These programs must be coupled with formal intergenerational mentorship initiatives to facilitate knowledge transfer and mitigate resistance rooted in unfamiliarity

- **Establish Multidisciplinary Ethical Oversight Committees:** To proactively address data privacy, algorithmic bias and accountability concerns, healthcare institutions must constitute independent ethics committees. These committees should include not only AI experts and clinicians but also ethicists, patient advocates and community representatives. Their mandate should include the pre-emptive auditing of AI algorithms for fairness, ongoing monitoring of deployment impacts and the development of transparent protocols for patient consent and data stewardship, ensuring alignment with regulations such as POPIA
- **Prioritise Co-Design and Infrastructure for Equity:** AI system development must move beyond a technocentric approach to embrace community and end-user co-design. This involves engaging diverse demographic groups in the design process to ensure interfaces are linguistically accessible and culturally resonant. Concurrently, public and private investment must be strategically directed to bolster digital infrastructure—particularly high-speed connectivity and secure data storage—in underserved rural and peri-urban areas. This dual focus on inclusive design and foundational infrastructure is non-negotiable for preventing the entrenchment of access disparities
- **Advocate for Agile, Supportive Policy and Pilot Funding Models:** Healthcare leadership must actively collaborate with regulators to co-create agile policy frameworks that encourage innovation while safeguarding public interest. This includes advocating for clear standards on AI validation and interoperability. Furthermore, to overcome initial cost barriers, institutions should pursue blended financing models, launching small-scale pilot projects funded through public-private partnerships. These pilots can generate locally relevant evidence of ROI and clinical efficacy, building a compelling case for broader investment and scaling

By adopting this multi-pronged strategy—which intertwines human capital development, robust ethical governance, inclusive design and supportive policy—South Africa can transition AI from a potential source of division to a cornerstone of a more equitable, efficient and resilient healthcare system. The ultimate goal is not merely technological adoption, but the cultivation of a digitally-enabled ecosystem that upholds the principles of social justice and universal health coverage.

REFERENCES

1. Alsyouf, A. *et al.* "Exposure to Detection and Perceived Usefulness of AI in Healthcare: The Moderating Role of Digital Literacy." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2023, article 3167.
2. Owoyemi, A. *et al.* "Artificial Intelligence for Healthcare in Africa." *Frontiers in Digital Health*, vol. 2, 2020, article 6.
3. Stoumpos, A.I. *et al.* "Digital Transformation in Healthcare: Technology Acceptance and Its Applications." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2023, article 3407.
4. Naidoo, P. *et al.* "Healthcare Professionals' Perspectives on the Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in South African Primary Care." *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2022, article a3482.
5. Couldry, N. and U.A. Mejias. *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford University Press, 2019.
6. Milan, S. and E.Treré. "Big Data from the South(s): Beyond Data Universalism." *Television & New Media*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2019, pp. 319–335.
7. Taylor, L. "Public Actors without Public Values: Legitimacy, Domination and the Regulation of the Technology Sector." *Philosophy & Technology*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2021, pp. 897–922.
8. Mhlambi, S. "From Rationality to Relationality: Ubuntu as an Ethical and Human Rights Framework for Artificial Intelligence Governance." *Berkman Klein Center Research Publication*, 2020, no. 9.
9. Benjamin, R. *Race after Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press, 2019.
10. Veinot, T.C. *et al.* "Good Intentions Are Not Enough: How Informatics Interventions Can Worsen Inequality." *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 25, no. 8, 2018, pp. 1080–1088.
11. Quesada, J. *et al.* "Structural Vulnerability and Health: Latino Migrant Laborers in the United States." *Medical Anthropology*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2011, pp. 339–362.
12. Harrington, C. *et al.* "Deconstructing Community-Based Collaborative Design: Towards More Equitable Participatory Design Engagements." *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 6, no. CSCW1, 2022, pp. 1–30.
13. Bosnjak, M. *et al.* "The Theory of Planned Behavior: Selected Recent Advances and Applications." *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2020, article 352.
14. Cipta, D. *et al.* "Cultural Competence in Digital Health Interventions: A Systematic Review." *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2024, article e51234.
15. Khanijahani, A. *et al.* "Organizational, Professional and Patient Characteristics Associated with Artificial Intelligence Adoption in Healthcare: A Systematic Review." *BMC Health Services Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2022, article 1456.

16. Char, D.S. *et al.* "Implementing Machine Learning in Health Care—Addressing Ethical Challenges." *The New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 378, no. 11, 2018, pp. 981–983.
17. Mennella, C. *et al.* "Ethical and Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: A Comprehensive Review." *Computer Law & Security Review*, vol. 52, 2024, article 105857.
18. Khanna, N.N. *et al.* "Economics of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Diagnosis vs. Administration." *Journal of Medical Economics*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2022, pp. 1268–1275.
19. Floridi, L. *et al.* "AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles and Recommendations." *Minds and Machines*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2018, pp. 689–707.
20. Wani, S.U.D. *et al.* "The Transformative Role of Artificial Intelligence in Advancing Preventive and Personalized Medicine." *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, vol. 14, no. 8, 2022, pp. 1021–1031.
21. Bajwa, J. *et al.* "Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Transforming the Practice of Medicine." *Future Healthcare Journal*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2021, pp. e188–e194.
22. Sun, T.Q. and Y.Zhou. "The Impacts of Artificial Intelligence on the Insurance Industry: A Review." *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, vol. 90, no. 3, 2023, pp. 571–601.
23. Francisco, A. and B.-O.Linnér. "Governing AI in the Global South: Policy Adaptation and Institutional Innovation." *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2023, pp. 112–124.
24. Lambert, S.I. *et al.* "An Integrative Review of the Factors Influencing the Adoption of AI by Healthcare Professionals." *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2023, pp. 764–778.