



# Chapter 9

## Risks of AI Bias and Inequities in Learning


**S. Praveenkumar**

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4830-5237>  
*SRM Institute of Science and  
Technology, India*


**Nilesh Anute**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6599-813X>  
*Sri Balaji University, India*

**V. Vaissnave**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7333-531X>  
*SRM Institute of Science and  
Technology, India*


**T. Ragupathi**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2482-5096>  
*SRM Institute of Science and  
Technology, India*


**Shyam Fardale**

*Datta Meghe Institute of Management  
Studies, India*

**P. Selvakumar**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3650-4548>  
*Department of Science and Humanities,  
Nehru Institute of Technology,  
Coimbatore, India*

**T. C. Manjunath**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2545-9160>  
*Rajarajeswari College of Engineering,  
India*

### ABSTRACT

*As artificial intelligence (AI) systems become increasingly embedded within the education sector, there is growing concern about the issue of AI bias and its far-reaching implications for fairness, equity, and student outcomes. AI applications such as adaptive learning platforms, automated grading systems, student performance prediction models, and admissions algorithms are designed to enhance efficiency, personalize instruction, and support data-driven decision-making. However, these systems are only as unbiased as the data they are trained on and the assumptions embedded in their algorithms. If not carefully designed and audited, AI technologies*

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-2302-2.ch009

*can perpetuate, or even exacerbate, existing inequalities related to race, gender, socioeconomic status, language proficiency, and ability. This makes the conversation around AI bias in education not just a technical issue but a deeply ethical and social one. Bias can also be introduced during the design and implementation stages of AI development.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

As artificial intelligence (AI) systems become increasingly embedded within the education sector, there is growing concern about the issue of AI bias and its far-reaching implications for fairness, equity, and student outcomes. AI applications such as adaptive learning platforms, automated grading systems, student performance prediction models, and admissions algorithms are designed to enhance efficiency, personalize instruction, and support data-driven decision-making. However, these systems are only as unbiased as the data they are trained on and the assumptions embedded in their algorithms. If not carefully designed and audited, AI technologies can perpetuate, or even exacerbate, existing inequalities related to race, gender, socioeconomic status, language proficiency, and ability. This makes the conversation around AI bias in education not just a technical issue but a deeply ethical and social one. Bias can also be introduced during the design and implementation stages of AI development. Developers, often lacking diversity themselves, may unknowingly embed their own cultural or cognitive biases into the systems they build.

Moreover, the lack of transparency in proprietary AI algorithms—often protected by intellectual property laws—prevents educators, policymakers, and researchers from fully understanding how decisions are made. This opacity hinders accountability and makes it difficult to identify and rectify biased outcomes. Without robust auditing, inclusive design processes, and participatory development practices, these systems risk becoming “black boxes” whose decisions profoundly impact students without explanation or recourse. Addressing AI bias in education requires a multifaceted approach involving technical, ethical, and policy-oriented interventions. From a technical perspective, developers must prioritize fairness by using diverse, representative, and high-quality training datasets. Techniques such as de-biasing algorithms, counterfactual fairness modeling, and adversarial testing can help identify and mitigate potential biases.

At the same time, human oversight is critical—educators, ethicists, and data scientists must collaborate to ensure that AI decisions are regularly reviewed, explained, and justified. Bias detection and auditing tools must be embedded in the AI lifecycle from design to deployment. Policymakers also play a critical role in setting standards, regulations, and oversight mechanisms to ensure ethical AI de-

26 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/risks-of-ai-bias-and-inequities-in-learning/387770](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/risks-of-ai-bias-and-inequities-in-learning/387770)

## Related Content

---

### Approaches and Applications of Virtual Reality and Gesture Recognition: A Review

Sudha M R, Sriraghav K, Sudar Abisheck S, Shomona Gracia Jacoband Manisha S (2017). *International Journal of Ambient Computing and Intelligence* (pp. 1-18). [www.irma-international.org/article/approaches-and-applications-of-virtual-reality-and-gesture-recognition/187064](http://www.irma-international.org/article/approaches-and-applications-of-virtual-reality-and-gesture-recognition/187064)

### Risk Perception and Management

Cemre Yoldas (2026). *Intersecting AI, Neurofinance, and Behavioral Finance for Decision Making* (pp. 437-458). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/risk-perception-and-management/405836](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/risk-perception-and-management/405836)

### Edge Computing-Based Internet of Things Framework for Indoor Occupancy Estimation

Krati Rastogiand Divya Lohani (2020). *International Journal of Ambient Computing and Intelligence* (pp. 16-37). [www.irma-international.org/article/edge-computing-based-internet-of-things-framework-for-indoor-occupancy-estimation/262646](http://www.irma-international.org/article/edge-computing-based-internet-of-things-framework-for-indoor-occupancy-estimation/262646)

### AI-Facilitated Formative Assessment: Reimagining Feedback in the English Language Classroom

Sushant Kishore (2026). *AI-Powered English Teaching* (pp. 125-152). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/ai-facilitated-formative-assessment/384170](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/ai-facilitated-formative-assessment/384170)

### Topical Repute on Artificial Intelligence-Based Approaches in COVID-19 Supervision: Distinct Kingpin on Drug Re-Purposing Blueprint

Shamayita Basuand Jana Shafi (2022). *Principles and Methods of Explainable Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare* (pp. 180-210). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/topical-repute-on-artificial-intelligence-based-approaches-in-covid-19-supervision/304181](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/topical-repute-on-artificial-intelligence-based-approaches-in-covid-19-supervision/304181)