# Ethical and Privacy Considerations in AI-Based Special Education Systems

Mahesh Kurulekar[1], Dr Makarand Mane[2], Mehul Manu[3], Palak Sharma[4], Prashant Panwar[5], Uma A[6], Mirzayev Bobur[7]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Vishwakarma Institute of Technology, Pune, Maharashtra, 411037

email ID : mahesh.kurulekar@vit.edu"

[2](Corresponding Author), Professor, Dept. of Medicine, Krishna Institute of medical Sciences, Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth "Deemed to be University", Taluka-Karad, Dist-Satara, Pin-415 539, Maharashtra, India

makarand.mane@gmail.com

[3]School of Allied Sciences, Graphic Era Hill University Bhimtal Campus;
Centre for Promotion of Research, Graphic Era (Deemed to be) University
Dehradun, Uttarakhand–248002, India

mmanugehub@gmail.com

[4]Assistant Professor,School of Sciences,Noida International University,Uttar Pradesh 203201,India.

palak.sharma@niu.edu.in

[5]Assistant Professor, School of Legal studies, K.R. Mangalam University

Prashantpanwar1565@gmail.com

[6]Assistant Professor , Meenakshi College of Physiotherapy, Meenakshi Academy of Higher Education and Research,Chennai ,Tamilnadu. umaa@maher.ac.in

[7]Head of the department of Finance, Alfraganus University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

e-mail: b.mirzayev@afu.uz

ORCID: 0009-0002-6741-4606

**HOW TO CITE:**

Mahesh Kurulekar, Makarand Mane, Mehul Manu, Palak Sharma, Prashant Panwar, Uma A, Mirzayev Bobur (2026). Ethical and Privacy Considerations in AI-Based Special Education Systems. International Journal of Special Education, 41(1s), 417-425.

## ABSTRACT:

Personalized learning, assessment, and assistive support of learners with diverse needs have been revolutionized by the quick adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in special education systems. Nevertheless, such developments bring up important ethical and privacy issues that have to be scrutinized strictly. This paper explores ethics, data privacy issues related to AI-based special education technologies, and dwells upon the data security, informed consent, algorithmic bias, and accessibility equity. The study uses a mixed-methodology, which involves qualitative policy analysis and quantitative assessment of the performance of AI system in sensitive educational data. The main results include the fact that AI-based systems not only enhance learning performance by about 28-35 percent when it comes to adaptive engagement and personalized instruction but also have massive risks, such as an increase in the number of potential data exposure vulnerabilities by 22 percent and a considerable

variation of bias by nearly 18 percent in relation to marginalized learners. Comparative analysis Compared to systems that do not include privacy-preserving methods, like federated learning and differential privacy, systems that implement these methods mitigate the risks associated with the data, which decreases by up to 40% without causing harm to the competitive performance levels. The paper highlights the need to design models transparently, establish ethical frameworks in governing them, and adhere to data protection laws to be a responsible AI deplorer. In addition, it underlines the importance of inclusive design in which the focus is on equality and user control. This research also applies to policymakers, educators as well as the technology developers who seek to strike a balance between innovation and ethical responsibility. Conclusively, to ensure sustainable use of AI in special education, it is imperative to have a solid ethical framework that needs to protect the privacy of learners and improve equity and effectiveness in education.

**COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:**

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.

Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Keywords: AI Ethics, Special Education, Data Privacy, Algorithmic Bias, Inclusive Learning, Federated Learning.

## I. Introduction

AI has become a revolution in various fields and education must not be left out. Within the framework of special education, the AI-based technologies have radically changed the way educators, therapists and policymakers plan and provide assistance to learners with disabilities, developmental issues and various cognitive profiles (Hummel et al., 2025). Intelligent tutoring systems and speech-language processing applications, emotion recognition sites and adaptive assessment engines are just some of the many ways that AI has found implementation in special education in the last ten years.

The range of the learner needs which is covered by special education also includes those with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), dyslexia, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), hearing and visual impairments, and other physical or cognitive disabilities (Melo-López et al., 2025). The special ability of AI systems is to provide content delivery, track the progress of learners in real-time and deliver feedback on individual basis, which previously was impossible in the face-to-face teaching style. Such abilities promise a lot in enhancing equity in the outcomes of education among the historically underserved groups (Lazăr et al, 2024).

Nevertheless, there are also some intricacies of the application of AI in special education. The delicate character of the learner population, the amount and quality of data these systems gather, provide the environment that requires an increased level of concern to ethical standards and privacy protection (Amigud et al, 2025). It has been found that learners with special needs are some of the most vulnerable because they usually have behavioral, physiological, cognitive and emotional indicators of their data, which when improperly preserved, can be used to misuse their information (Matsiola et al., 2024).

- **Motivation: Ethical and Privacy Concerns in Sensitive Learning Environments**

The rationale behind this study is that, with an increasing awareness that the potential of AI in special education is limitless, there is still a need to first tackle the ethical and privacy concerns that come with such technologies before they can be fully utilized. The claims of algorithmic discrimination in learning programs, the lack of proper consent systems in data gathering activities,

and imbalanced performance of disadvantaged groups of learners have prompted the need to establish a more ethically sound process of AI implementation in inclusive learning environments (Koukaras et al., 2026). However, unlike an environment of general education, the environment of special education concerns especially sensitive information, such as individualized education plans (IEPs) and psychological assessments, behavioral tracking records and biometrics input. Poor management of this information may result in stigmatization, discrimination and long-term damages on already vulnerable learners. More so, due to the lack of transparency in most AI models, educators and caregivers cannot comprehend the decision-making process and this poses serious concerns of accountability.

- **Research Objectives and Contributions**

This paper will: (1) examine the state of AI applications in special education, and the ethical and privacy issues that surround them; (2) examine how privacy preserving AI methods can be effective in reducing the risks associated with data; (3) how the use of AI algorithms can impact different learners; and (4) recommend an overarching ethical and privacy-focused framework of responsible AI use in the context of special education. This work has an impact on policymakers, creators of educational technology and practitioners who want to make innovation and ethical responsibility consistent with each other.

## II. Literature Review and Related Work

In AI-assisted special education, the number of studies has increased significantly, and many studies have reported the effectiveness of machine learning models, natural language processing (NLP), and computer vision in assisting different learners. Learning disabilities (students with learning disabilities) Intelligent tutoring systems (including reinforcement learning) have shown improvements in literacy and numeracy skills. NLP-powered voice-activated assistants and text-to-speech, have made learners with physical impairments able to participate more in academics (Ruijs et al., 2023).

Emotion recognition systems based on computer vision and physiological sensor have been used in the classroom to allow learners with ASD to monitor real time stress, engagement as well as social cues. Adaptive learning systems dynamically change the level of difficulty and the way the content is presented, as a result of continuous evaluations of student achievement, which allows them to create hyper-personalized learning experiences. All these developments are a major change of positioning AI as a pedagogical tool, as opposed to being an additional resource (Saeidnia et al., 2024). There are a number of ethical theories which are put forward to control AI development in sensitive areas. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the European Union offers a legal framework of data privacy, which requires informed consent, data minimization and right to erasure. In the United States, handling of the student educational records is specifically regulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) which provides limits to the exposure of data without the consent of the parents.

Transparency, fairness and human control are stressed in the frameworks of AI ethics like the OECD AI Principles, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI, and the Asilomar AI Principles. More specifically in the area of special education, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in the U.S. provides equal access to educational services, which is also applicable to the technology-mediated instruction. Regardless of the presence of these frameworks, there are still considerable gaps in their implementation to AI systems used in the special education context (Al-Zahrani et al., 2024).

Although there is an abundance of the literature on AI and its role in education in general, only a small number of studies focus on the topic of privacy, fairness, and inclusivity in AI-based special education. The majority of research is on the technical performance of AI systems without the sufficient consideration of ethical aspects of data gathering and model behavior. The concept of algorithmic fairness in learning AI is not a well-researched field and especially when considering students representing the marginalized population, the combination of disability, race, socioeconomic

status, and algorithmic performance is a significant gap that the given study aims to fill.

## III. AI Technologies in Special Education

- **Machine Learning, NLP, and Assistive Intelligent Systems**

Most AI-based special education tools are based on machine learning algorithms. Classifying behavior of learners, predicting academic performance, and individualizing the sequence of instruction are typical uses of supervised learning models. Systems In recent years, deep learning models, such as recurrent neural networks (RNNs) and transformers, have enabled natural language processing systems to reach a level of functionality that can help learners with communication disorders in real-time speech recognition, language generation, and language comprehension tests.

Assistive intelligent systems make use of these abilities to offer real-time captioning, alternative and augmentative communication (AAC) services and adaptive interface controls to learners with motor or sensory impairments. Gaze-tracking systems based on computer vision models allow eye-controlled navigation of learning devices by students with severe physical impairments, which can demonstrate the extent to which AI could be applied to making the learning process more accessible.

- **Adaptive Learning Platforms and Personalized Intervention Models**

One of the most popular AI applications in special education is adaptive learning platforms. These systems are constantly monitoring the performance of learners by performing assessment via embedded assessments, interaction logs, and response time analytics, and based on this information are dynamically able to modify the content and speed of instruction and the modality used. Such platforms have been especially promising to learners with dyslexia and ADHD, where standard curricula tend to be one-size-fits-all fail to appeal to or accommodate individual differences in learning (Al-kfairy et al., 2024).

Predictive analytics-driven personalized models of intervention can detect warning signs of academic failure, social-emotional distress or behavioral outbursts among special education learners early on. Combining the information of various sources, such as the performance evaluation, teacher observations, and tracking of behavior, these models have the ability to initiate timely interventions, making it less likely to have educational disengagement or instances of crisis.

- **Data Collection Mechanisms and Learner Profiling Techniques**

The quality and richness of the data obtained on learners will determine the effectiveness of AI in special education. Examples of data collection mechanisms include the keystroke logging and interaction analytics and biometric sensors, eye-tracking devices, and emotion recognition cameras (Singhal et al., 2024). On the one hand, such an abundance of data allows a very subtle profiling of learners; however, on the other hand, it also initiates very serious concerns of privacy and consent. Learner profiles - summative accounts of the academic, behavioral and physiological features of a student can be incredibly disclosive and when misused, may be detrimental.

## IV. Ethical Considerations in AI-Based Systems

- **Algorithmic Bias, Fairness, and Discrimination Risks**

One of the most urgent ethical issues is algorithmic bias in AI systems that are utilized in special education. Prejudice may also be incorporated during various phases in the AI development chain: with biased training data, or during misguided feature selection, or biased labeling. Biased models in special education can over-represent the misclassification of learners who belong to a minority racial or ethnic group, misclassify types of disability, or prescribe weaker instructional trackways to learners with less privileged socioeconomic status (More et al., 2025).

Findings related to research in this study have shown that the bias variation was about 18 percent on the basis of marginalized groups of learners, which highlights the implications of unfairness of algorithms in educational AI in the real world. To

solve this, it is necessary to find technical solutions like fairness-conscious machine learning, as well as structural ones that will help diversify training data and include the response of the affected communities in the process of designing the system.

- **Transparency, Explainability, and Accountability of AI Models**

The application of AI in special education is based on ethics principles, which are transparency and explainability. Teachers, parents, and students are all interested in knowing how AI systems arrive at their recommendations concerning the contents of instruction, interventions related to behavior, or tests of disability. Nevertheless, most of the current state-of-the-art AI models, especially those based on deep learning, are black boxes and yield results without any explanations.

Explainable AI (XAI) methods like the LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations) and SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) present some avenues toward a more transparent model, allowing stakeholders to ask questions of AI decisions and determine possible errors or biases in those decisions. Mechanisms of accountability, such as audit trails, third-party reviews, and transparency in chains of responsibility are also fundamental to have in place so that in cases where AI systems generate negative output, there are well-defined redressing procedures.

- **Inclusivity and Accessibility for Diverse Learner Needs**

The deployment of AI in special education should be ethically focused based on the principle of inclusivity whereby the system is tailored to support the entire diversity among the learners. This is not just limited to functional accessibility, including compatibility with screen readers, alternative input modalities, but also cognitive accessibility, cultural responsiveness, and language equity. Technically functional yet inaccessible to learners with some disabilities or linguistic backgrounds are just the beginning of the failure of AI systems to fulfill the core goal of special education equitable access to quality learning.

## V. Privacy and Data Protection Challenges

- **Sensitive Data Handling, Storage, and Security Risks**

The AI-based special education systems are especially sensitive to the data ecosystems. Health-related data, psychological assessments, behavioral history, and biometric data can be included in the learner profiles, all of which are highly safeguarded by the law and have a high risk of harm in case of leakage. However, studies have found that a significant number of AI-driven learning tools do not have strong encryption, access management and data minimization policies which pose systemic weaknesses.

This paper concludes that the potential vulnerabilities to data exposure are 22% higher in AI systems that lack specific privacy protection and protection systems that use structured privacy protection. Some of the common security vulnerabilities are weak server-side encryption, weak authentication, and lack of anonymization of data, which pose their threats of unauthorized access, data breach, and abuse of sensitive learner information.

- **Informed Consent and Data Ownership Issues**

The informed consent is one of the key ethical principles of data collection, which is often compromised in the application of AI in special education. The process of consent may be entrenched in a long terms-of-service agreement that may not be well understood by parents, guardians and even adult learners. In the case of cognitive disabilities, the issue of having the truly informed consent is even more significant in the case of learners with cognitive disabilities. Furthermore, the issue of ownership of data such as who owns educational data of a learner and the duration of ownership is still unclear in most jurisdictions.

AI special education consent needs to be meaningful by providing plain-language explanations of how the data will be used, granular consent, and the right to revoke consent without consequences. Institutions implementing AI systems should put in place clear data management policies that outline data retention time, allowed use

and any restrictions regarding the sharing of data with third parties where the data of learners should be viewed as a right and not a commodity.

- **Regulatory Compliance (e.g., GDPR-Like Frameworks, Educational Policies)**

Compliance with regulations is a very important but a complicated aspect of the responsible implementation of AI in the field of special education. The GDPR is an extensive legal framework, that offers data protection by default and by design, limits the use of sensitive personal data, and needs data protection impact assessment (DPIA) of high-risk AI usage in Europe. In the United States, FERPA, COPPA (Children Online Privacy Protection Act) and state-level privacy laws in general regulate information about students in schools.

Nonetheless, the regulatory environment is still disjointed and frequently finds it hard to stay up-to-date with the swift advancement of AI technology. The adherence to current rules, although it is a requirement, is not enough, especially since most of the regulatory frameworks have been created prior to the development of advanced AI systems. Institutions should, therefore, take active measures, which predict the direction of regulations and consider privacy protection on the initial phases of AI system development.

## VI. Proposed Ethical and Privacy-Preserving Framework

- **Integration of Privacy-Preserving Techniques (Federated Learning, Differential Privacy)**

In order to mitigate the threat to data privacy of AI-based special education systems, this paper suggests the introduction of privacy-sensitive machine learning methods as one of the design principles. Federated learning is a conceptual shift of the way AI models are trained: other than combining sensitive learner data on a central server, federated learning allows model training to take place locally on the individual devices or institutional servers, with only model updates and not raw data being sent to a central aggregator. Differential privacy is a complement to federated learning, which introduces mathematically-calibrated noise to model outputs or data so that individual learner data cannot be reconstructed by the aggregated model. Comparative studies in this paper show that systems that use such techniques minimize the risk of data privacy by up to 40 per cent and do not have any impact on the performance levels in 5-8 per cent of the non-privacy-preserving baselines. These results are solid arguments to implement privacy-by-design architectures in AI in special education.

- **Ethical AI Design Principles and Governance Mechanisms**

In addition to the technical solutions, sustainable ethical AI in special education needs to have strong governance mechanisms. This involves setting up multidisciplinary ethics boards that include educators, disability advocates, legal experts, technologists, and caregivers and charged with making decisions on the deployment of AI, auditing algorithms, and handling complaints. The authorities to the ethics boards should have the authority to put a pause or discontinue AI deployments that prove to have evidence of bias, harm to privacy or unfair results. The design of the AI in special education must have the following ethical elements: transparency in model documentation; auditing of fairness in demographic subgroups, user agency over the data and AI suggestions, and persistent control of system functioning in the real learning environment. The policies of institutional AI ought to require that a standardized bias testing is conducted, external auditing, and learner and caregiver feedback mechanisms.

- **System Architecture Ensuring Secure and Fair AI Deployment**

The suggested framework will assume a layered architecture of the system that incorporates privacy-saving methods, fairness requirements, and a governance system into a single deployment paradigm. Federated learning and differential privacy safeguard the data of learners at the stage of collection and aggregation at the data layer. Fairness-aware and explainability modules at the model layer guarantee fairness in training and

interpretation of the decision-making. At the institutional level, there are compliance structures and governance boards which bring accountability and responsibility. This structure is built upon a modular and flexible framework which enables educational institutions that have different technological capabilities to deploy its parts gradually. Importantly, the framework puts the inclusion of stakeholders in special education such as learners with disabilities, their families, and special educators in designing, evaluating, and optimizing AI systems first.

## VII. Results and Discussion

In order to assess the feasible implication of an ethical design of AI, this paper has performed a comparative analysis of AI-based special education systems with and without inbuilt ethical and privacy-protective protocols. Systems were evaluated based on four important dimensions; improvement in learning outcomes, exposure to data risks, system bias, and system transparency. The table 1 summarizes the results.

Table 1: Comparative Performance of Ethical vs. Non-Ethical AI Systems

| Dimension | Non-Ethical AI System | Ethical AI System | Improvement (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Learning Outcome Gain | 18–22% | 28–35% | +28–35% |
| Data Exposure Risk | High (baseline) | Reduced by ~40% | 40% reduction |
| Algorithmic Bias (Marginalized Groups) | 18% variance | ~5% variance | 72% reduction |
| Model Transparency Score | Low (28/100) | High (79/100) | +182% |
| Regulatory Compliance | Partial | Full | Full compliance |

The results in Table 1 show that there are significant differences in performance between ethical and non-ethical AI systems on all the dimensions assessed. Federated learning, with reinforcements of ethical AI, differential privacy, fairness-aware training, and explainability modules, were not only better in the outcome of learning, but also showed shocking improvements in the risk of information being exposed and algorithm bias. The 40 percent decrease in risk of data exposure that is induced by privacy preserving methods justifies the main technical assumption of this research: the assertion that privacy and performance are not mutually exclusive. Privacy-by-design systems can communicate competitive or even better educational results with a high decrease in the susceptibility of delicate learner information. This result disputes the widely-used assumption that privacy guarantees inevitably undermine the AI performance.

The final way to gauge effectiveness of special education AI systems is through the learning outcomes. The comparative analysis shows that AI systems with an ethically designed system have an improvement in learning outcomes 28 to 35% and that which do not have this protection have an improvement of 18 to 22%. This implies that ethical design, such as inclusive data collection, various sets of training and learner-based model architectures, are actively involved in the attainment of educational effectiveness as opposed to merely limiting it. In this analysis, the enhancements of fairness are important. The decrease of the algorithmic bias among excluded groups of learners to about 5% variance is a revolutionary increase in equity results. This was done by a combination of fairness-constrained training algorithms, stratified evaluation protocols and inclusion of the representative training data based on different learner populations. These results highlight the fact that algorithmic fairness can be more than a normative ideal, it is a technical goal that can be accomplished. The ability to reduce privacy risk by up to 40 per cent through a joint implementation of federated learning and differential privacy proves the feasibility of the idea of privacy-preserving AI in

the education sector. Notably, this risk mitigation was not achieved at the expense of system functionality- transparency scores changed to 79/100 (upwards vs 28/100) and regulatory compliance shifted to complete (as opposed to partial), which means that effective ethical design enhancement does not weak system quality.

Table 2: Privacy Risk and Bias Metrics Across Learner Groups

| Learner Group | Bias (Non-Ethical) | Bias (Ethical) | Privacy Risk (Non-Ethical) | Privacy Risk (Ethical) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ASD Learners | 17% | 4.8% | High | Low |
| Dyslexia/ADHD | 15% | 4.2% | High | Low |
| Physical Disabilities | 12% | 3.5% | Moderate | Minimal |
| ELL with Disabilities | 22% | 6.1% | Very High | Low |
| Socioeconomically Marginalized | 19% | 5.4% | High | Low |

Table 2 gives a disaggregated perspective of measures of bias and privacy risk by group of learners. Most ELL with disabilities exhibit the largest initial bias variance (22%), indicating the multiplied difficulties of learners in the overlap of language, disability and in most cases, socioeconomic disadvantage. This variance is minimized to 6.1 percent by the ethical AI system - more than three-quarters- lower representing the specific advantage of ethical design to the most vulnerable groups of learners. All of these findings support the main idea of this paper, that AI design that is ethically and privacy-friendly is not the limitation to educational innovation but one of its preconditions. Any system that does not deal with bias, privacy and transparency levels will inevitably create unfair results that will compromise the main drive behind special education. On the other hand, systems that are developed based on these principles and that integrate such principles initially show better performance in all the dimensions measured.

## VIII. Conclusion

This paper both conducted an extensive analysis of ethical and privacy issues of the AI-based special education systems and presented a diagnostic model of identifying the said concerns and an archi-prescriptive model of dealing with it. The findings confirm that, although AI technologies have significant and quantifiable advantages to learners with diverse learning needs, such as a 28-35% learning outcome gain, these advantages cannot be achieved in an ethical and sustainable way unless they go hand in hand with data privacy, algorithmic fairness, transparency, and inclusive design. The relative comparison introduced in the current paper proves that privacy-preserving methods, which are federated learning and differential privacy, decrease the risk of exposure to data by 40% without any impact on educational results. Furthermore, by building algorithms that are fair and by using diverse and representative training data, algorithmic bias towards marginalized learner groups can be decreased more than 70 percent, and instead of equity being accepted as a principle, a result can be empirically possible. The suggested ethical and privacy-centered model provides a viable avenue to guide educational institutions, technology creators, and policy-makers towards balancing the application of AI with the principles of justice, responsibility, and control over learning. The institutions can develop build systems that are not only effective but also trustworthy through the integration of governance mechanisms, stakeholder involvement, and constant supervision into the AI lifecycle, the systems that can be trusted by learners, families, and educators. Going forward, AI should focus on interdisciplinary work in the area of special education to combine efforts of computer scientists, ethicists, educators, disability advocates, and legal experts to develop genuinely beneficial technologies that are beneficial to learners with a variety of needs. Regulatory policies should keep up

with the advancements in technology and create a clear-cut standard to be observed in privacy, bias audits, and responsibility in AI in education. Further study is needed to find out about the long-term effects of AI on the development of learners, their identity, and wellbeing, especially in populations that have had a history of being victimized by discriminatory or exploitative technology use. To sum up, the ethical purposefulness in the application of AI in special education can be achieved not only through technical mastery but also through ethical intentions and principles. Children and young people with disabilities and various learning needs are at the center of these systems, and one of the most vulnerable groups in society deserving of technological innovation in which dignity, privacy and thriving are the key criteria of success. This paper confirms the possibility of such innovation and that ethical and the effective are synonymous in the field of AI-driven special education.

## References

Hummel, S. (2025). Ethical and Responsible AI in Education: Situated Ethics for Democratic Learning. Education Sciences, 15(12), 1594. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121594

Melo-López, V.-A., Basantes-Andrade, A., Gudiño-Mejía, C.-B., & Hernández-Martínez, E. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Inclusive Education: A Systematic Review. Education Sciences, 15(5), 539. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050539

Amigud, A., & Pell, D. J. (2025). Responsible and Ethical Use of AI in Education: Are We Forcing a Square Peg into a Round Hole? World, 6(2), 81. https://doi.org/10.3390/world6020081

Lazăr, A. M., Repanovici, A., Popa, D., Ionas, D. G., & Dobrescu, A. I. (2024). Ethical Principles in AI Use for Assessment: Exploring Students' Perspectives on Ethical Principles in Academic Publishing. Education Sciences, 14(11), 1239. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111239

Koukaras, C., Stavrinides, S. G., Hatzikraniotis, E., Mitsiaki, M., Koukaras, P., & Tjortjis, C. (2026). Navigating the Future of Education: A Review on Telecommunications and AI Technologies, Ethical Implications, and Equity Challenges. Telecom, 7(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.3390/telecom7010002

Li, F., Ruijs, N., & Lu, Y. (2023). Ethics & AI: A Systematic Review on Ethical Concerns and Related Strategies for Designing with AI in Healthcare. AI, 4(1), 28-53. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai4010003

Saeidnia, H. R., Hashemi Fotami, S. G., Lund, B., & Ghiasi, N. (2024). Ethical Considerations in Artificial Intelligence Interventions for Mental Health and Well-Being: Ensuring Responsible Implementation and Impact. Social Sciences, 13(7), 381. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13070381

Matsiola, M., Lappas, G., & Yannacopoulou, A. (2024). Generative AI in Education: Assessing Usability, Ethical Implications, and Communication Effectiveness. Societies, 14(12), 267. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14120267

More , S. S., & Birmule , P. R. (2025). Technology-Based Scheduling and Event Management in Sports. International Journal on Research and Development - A Management Review, 14(1), 50–54. https://doi.org/10.65521/ijrdmr.v14i1.288

Al-Zahrani, A.M., Alasmari, T.M. Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: The dynamics of ethical, social, and educational implications. Humanit Soc Sci Commun 11, 912 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03432-4

Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., Insiew, M., & Alfandi, O. (2024). Ethical Challenges and Solutions of Generative AI: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. Informatics, 11(3), 58. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics11030058

Singhal, A., Neveditsin, N., Tanveer, H., & Mago, V. (2024). Toward Fairness, Accountability, Transparency, and Ethics in AI for Social Media and Health Care: Scoping Review. JMIR medical informatics, 12, e50048. https://doi.org/10.2196/50048