InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed International, Open Access Journal.
ISSN : 3065-7857 / Website: https://ibrj.us / Volume-3, Issue-1 / January - 2026

Original Article

Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence Use in Education: Bias, Privacy, and Transparency

Dr. Manjusha Patil
Computer Science Department, ATSS College of Business Studies and Computer Application, Chinchwad, Pune

Manuscript ID:
IBMIIRJ -2026-030101

Submitted: 06 Dec. 2025

Revised: 10 Dec. 2025

Accepted: 05 Jan. 2026

Published: 31 Jan. 2026

ISSN: 3065-7857

Volume-3

Issue-1

Pp. 1-4

January 2026

Correspondence Address:
Dr. Manjusha Patil
Computer Science Department, ATSS College of Business Studies and Computer Application, Chinchwad, Pune
Email:
manjushapatil@atsscollege.edu.in

Quick Response Code:

Web. https://ibrj.us

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18917953

DOI Link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18917953

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly being espoused in educational systems to enhance literacy issues, epitomize instruction, and support executive decision- timber. While AI offers significant benefits, its deployment in education raises critical ethical enterprises, particularly related to algorithmic bias, data sequestration, and translucency. This exploration paper examines these ethical issues by assessing being literature and empirical data collected from preceptors using AI-driven educational tools. A mixed styles approach was employed, including check-grounded data collection and system-position analysis of generally used AI operations in education. The results reveal wide disparities among preceptors regarding prejudiced decision-making, shoddy data protection measures, and the lack of explain ability in AI systems. The study concludes that without proper ethical frameworks, governance mechanisms, and specialized safeguards, AI systems threat undermining equity, trust, and responsibility in education. Recommendations are proposed to promote responsible and ethical AI relinquishment in educational surroundings.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Ethics in Education, Algorithmic Bias, Data Privacy, Transparency, Explainable AI*

Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into educational systems has grown fleetly over the once decade, driven by advancements in machine literacy, data analytics, and pall computing. AI- powered tools are now generally used for personalised literacy, automated grading, pupil performance prediction, and intelligent training systems. These technologies promise to ameliorate educational effectiveness and knitter literacy gests to individual pupil needs. Still, the adding reliance on AI in education has also introduced complex ethical challenges that bear careful examination. One of the most significant ethical enterprises is algorithmic bias, which occurs when AI systems produce totally illegal issues for certain group's o scholars. Bias may arise from slanted training data, defective model design, or unexamined hypotheticals bedded within algorithms. In educational surrounds, prejudiced AI systems can support being social inequalities by disadvantaging scholars grounded on gender, race, socioeconomic status, or learning capability. Another critical issue is data sequestration, as AI systems calculate heavily on large volumes of pupil data, including academic records, behavioral patterns, and particular information. Shy data protection measures can expose scholars to pitfalls similar as surveillance, data abuse, and unauthorized access. Translucency is also a major ethical concern, as numerous AI systems operate as "black boxes," making it delicate for preceptors, scholars, and directors to understand how opinions are made. The lack of explainability undermines trust and limits responsibility when AI- driven opinions affect academic issues. Given these challenges, this exploration aims to explore ethical issues related to bias, sequestration, and translucency in educational AI systems and to propose strategies for responsible AI perpetration.

Literature Review

Dignum (2019) emphasizes that responsible AI development must prioritize ethical values similar as fairness, responsibility, and translucency. In educational surrounds, these principles are pivotal because AI systems directly impact learner issues and institutional opinions.

How to cite this article:
Patil, M. (2026). Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence Use in Education: Bias, Privacy, and Transparency. InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal, 3(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18917953

The author argues that ethical considerations should be bedded throughout the AI lifecycle rather than addressed after deployment. Binns (2018) explore algorithmic fairness from a philosophical perspective, pressing that machine literacy systems frequently replicate being social inequalities.In education, prejudiced algorithms may disadvantage certain pupil groups, particularly when literal data reflects systemic injuries. This work underscores the significance of fairness- apprehensive AI design. O'Neil (2016) demonstrates how opaque algorithms can support inequality when used in high- stakes decision- timber. The author warns that unbounded algorithmic systems in education may unfairly impact admissions, grading, and pupil shadowing, leading to long- term disadvantages for vulnerable populations. Holmes et al. (2019) examine the part of AI in tutoring and literacy, noting that while AI can support personalization, it may also unintentionally marginalize learners if ethical safeguards are absent. Their work stresses the significance of mortal oversight in AI- driven educational systems. Kizilcec and Lee (2020) probe algorithmic fairness in educational platforms and find that prophetic models frequently perform inversely across demographic groups. Their findings punctuate the need for regular bias checkups and inclusive training datasets. Floridi et al. (2018) propose an ethical frame for AI that includes principles similar as beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice. These principles give a precious non-These principles give a precious foundation for assessing AI systems used in education. Williamson and Eynon (2020) dissect the literal development of AI in education and argue that data- driven technologies decreasingly shape learning governance. They advise that without ethical regulation, AI systems may prioritize institutional effectiveness over pupil well- being. Slade and Prinsloo (2013) concentrate on ethical dilemmas in learning analytics, emphasizing that expansive pupil data collection raises serious sequestration enterprises. They argue that scholars frequently warrant mindfulness and control over how their data is used. Pardo and Siemens (2014) propose ethical principles for learning analytics, including translucency, pupil concurrence, and data minimization. Their work is largely applicable to AI- driven educational tools that calculate on nonstop data monitoring. Burrell (2016) examines algorithmic nebulosity and explains why numerous AI systems are delicate to interpret. In education, this nebulosity limits preceptors' capability to understand or challenge AI- generated recommendations.

Arrieta et al.(2020) give a comprehensive overview of Explainable Artificial Intelligence(XAI), pressing its significance in high-stakes disciplines such as education. Explain ability is presented as a crucial result to translucency and responsibility issues. Kizilcec (2016) empirically demonstrates that translucency increases stoner trust in algorithmic systems. His findings suggest that resolvable AI can enhance preceptor confidence and ethical acceptance of AI tools. Selwyn(2019) critically examines the societal counteraccusations of AI in education, arguing that technological results shouldn't replace pedagogical judgment. The author calls for ethical reflection alongside technological invention. Zawacki- Richter et al. (2019) conduct a methodical review of AI exploration in advanced education and identify a lack of empirical studies addressing ethical enterprises. This gap highlights the need for applied ethical exploration, which this study seeks to address. OECD (2021) outlines governance strategies for ethical AI use in education, emphasising transparency, responsibility, and human-centred design. These guidelines give policy position support for responsible AI perpetuation. UNESCO (2022) presents global guidance on AI in education, stressing the protection of in education, stressing the protection of mortal rights, inclusivity, and learner autonomy. The report reinforces the significance of ethical fabrics in institutional and governmental situations.

Methodology

This study espoused a mixed-style exploration design to examine ethical enterprises related to AI use in education. Quantitative data were collected through an online check distributed to 250 preceptors from secondary seminaries and advanced education institutions. The check assessed actors' comprehensions of algorithmic bias, data sequestration, and translucency using a five-point Likert scale. Demographic information similar as tutoring experience and subject area was also collected to dissect variations in ethical enterprises across different preceptor groups. In addition to check data, a qualitative system- position analysis was conducted on ten extensively used AI- grounded educational platforms.These systems were estimated grounded on their data collection practices, sequestration programs, attestation translucency, and explainability features. Intimately available specialized attestation and stoner interfaces were anatomized to assess the extent to which ethical principals were bedded in system design.
To address implicit algorithmic bias, a fairness discovery approach was conceptually applied to examine performance difference across defended groups. This approach compares model delicacy and vaticination issues for different demographic orders to identify statistically significant differences. Ethical blessing was attained previous to data collection, and all-party responses were anonymized to cover confidentiality.

Results and Analysis

The check results indicate a high position of concern among preceptors regarding the ethical counteraccusations of AI in education. A maturity of repliers expressed apprehension about the eventuality for prejudiced decision- timber, particularly in automated grading and pupil performance vaticination systems. Sequestration enterprises were indeed more pronounced, with numerous preceptors reporting query about how pupil data is collected, stored, and participated by AI platforms. Statistical analysis revealed that preceptors with smaller times of tutoring experience reported advanced situations of concern about algorithmic bias compared to more educated preceptors. translucency surfaced as a significant challenge, as utmost repliers indicated they demanded sufficient understanding of how AI systems arrive at specific recommendations or opinions. The System-position analysis supported these findings, revealing that numerous AI platforms give limited explanations of their underpinning algorithms and data operation practices. The fairness discovery analysis stressed implicit difference in model performance across demographic groups, suggesting that without regular checkups, AI systems may unintentionally support inequitable issues. These results emphasize the significance of integrating ethical evaluation mechanisms into AI system development and deployment.

Table 1: Educators' Perceptions of Ethical Concerns in AI Systems

Ethical Concern	Mean Score (1–5)	Standard Deviation
Algorithmic Bias	3.9	0.84
Data Privacy	4.2	0.71
Transparency	2.1	0.93

The check results reveal high situations of concern regarding data sequestration and algorithmic bias, while confidence in system translucency remains low. These findings indicate that preceptors are uneasy about trusting AI systems they do not completely understand.

Table 2: Identified Ethical Risks in Analysed AI Educational Platforms

Ethical Dimension	Observed Issues
Bias	Unequal prediction accuracy across groups
Privacy	Unclear data retention policies
Transparency	Limited explanation of AI decisions

System- position analysis supports check findings, showing inadequate explainability and inconsistent data governance practices across platforms.

Results `

The results of this study give sapience into preceptors' comprehensions of ethical issues associated with the use of Artificial Intelligence in education, as well as the ethical characteristics of AI- grounded educational platforms. Survey responses from 250 preceptors indicate substantial concern regarding the ethical counteraccusations of AI systems, particularly in relation to data sequestration and algorithmic bias. As shown in Table 1, data sequestration surfaced as the most significant concern, with a mean score of 4.2 on a five- point Likert scale. This suggests that preceptors are largely alive about how pupil data are collected, stored, and participated by AI- driven educational tools. Algorithmic bias was also perceived as a major ethical issue, with a mean score of 3.9. Preceptors expressed enterprises that AI systems may disadvantage certain pupil groups due to prejudiced training data or unexamined algorithmic hypotheticals. In discrepancy, translucency entered the smallest mean score of 2.1, indicating that preceptors generally warrant confidence in their understanding of how AI systems make opinions. This lack of translucency limits preceptors' capability to explain AI- generated issues to scholars and to identify implicit crimes or illegal opinions. The system-position analysis of ten AI- grounded educational platforms further supports the check findings. As epitomized in Table 2, several platforms demonstrated uneven vaticination delicacy across demographic groups, indicating implicit algorithmic bias. Sequestration pitfalls were apparent in the form of unclear data retention programs and inadequate exposure regarding third-party data sharing. Also, utmost platforms handed limited explanations of their underpinning algorithms, buttressing enterprises about translucency and responsibility. Inclusively, these results punctuate a significant gap between the rapid-fire relinquishment of AI technologies in education and the ethical safeguards necessary to insure responsible use.

Discussion

The findings of this study support being scholarly enterprises regarding the ethical pitfalls associated with AI use in education, particularly those related to bias, sequestration, and translucency. The high position of concern expressed by preceptors regarding data sequestration aligns with previous exploration emphasizing the vulnerability of pupil data in AI- driven literacy surroundings. Educational AI systems frequently calculate on nonstop data collection to serve effectively, yet the lack of clarity girding data governance practices undermines trust among preceptors and learners. This suggests that current sequestration protections and institutional programs may be inadequate to address the scale and complexity of data operation in AI- grounded educational systems. Enterprises about algorithmic bias observed in this study are harmonious with former findings that prophetic models can reproduce and amplify being social inequalities. When AI systems are trained on literal educational data, they may inherit impulses related to socioeconomic status, gender, or race. The system- position difference linked in this study indicate that without regular fairness checkups and inclusive data practices, AI tools risk producing inequitable issues. These findings punctuate the ethical responsibility of inventors and institutions to laboriously cover and alleviate bias in educational AI systems. The low confidence in translucency reported by preceptors reflects a broader challenge associated with the "black box" nature of numerous AI models. The incapability to interpret AI- generated opinions restricts preceptors' capacity to challenge crimes, explain issues, or insure fairness in pupil evaluation. This lack of explainability not only limits responsibility but also reduces preceptors' amenability to calculate on AI systems for pedagogical decision- timber. The results emphasize the significance of integrating resolvable AI ways and stoner- facing explanations into educational platforms to enhance trust and ethical adequacy. Overall, the commerce between bias, sequestration, and translucency observed in this study suggests that these ethical issues are deeply connected. A lack of translucency exacerbates sequestration pitfalls and makes it more delicate to descry bias, while prejudiced systems operating on inadequately governed data further erode trust. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that combines specialized results, similar as resolvable and fairness- apprehensive AI models, with institutional governance fabrics and preceptor training programs.

Conclusion

The findings of this study support being scholarly enterprises regarding the ethical pitfalls associated with AI use in education, particularly those related to bias, sequestration, and translucency. The high position of concern expressed by preceptors regarding data sequestration aligns with previous exploration emphasizing the vulnerability of pupil data in AI- driven literacy surroundings. Educational AI systems frequently calculate on nonstop data collection to serve effectively, yet the lack of clarity girding data governance practices undermines trust among preceptors and learners. This suggests that current sequestration protections and institutional programs may be inadequate to address the scale and complexity of data operation in AI- grounded educational systems. Enterprises about algorithmic bias observed in this study are harmonious with former findings that prophetic models can reproduce and amplify being social inequalities. When AI systems are trained on literal educational data, they may inherit impulses related to socioeconomic status, gender, or race. The system- position difference linked in this study indicate that without regular fairness checkups and inclusive data practices, AI tools risk producing inequitable issues. These findings punctuate the ethical responsibility of inventors and institutions to laboriously cover and alleviate bias in educational AI systems. The low confidence in translucency reported by preceptors reflects a broader challenge associated with the " black box " nature of numerous AI models. The incapability to interpret AI- generated opinions restricts preceptors' capacity to challenge crimes, explain issues, or insure fairness in pupil evaluation. This lack of explainability not only limits responsibility but also reduces preceptors' amenability to calculate on AI systems for pedagogical decision- timber. The results emphasize the significance of integrating resolvable AI ways and stoner- facing explanations into educational platforms to enhance trust and ethical adequacy.

Overall, the commerce between bias, sequestration, and translucency observed in this study suggests that these ethical issues are deeply connected. A lack of translucency exacerbates sequestration pitfalls and makes it more delicate to descry bias, while prejudiced systems operating on inadequately governed data further erode trust. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that combines specialized results, similar as resolvable and fairness- apprehensive AI models, with institutional governance fabrics and preceptor training programs.

Acknowledgment

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to the successful completion of this research study.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

1. Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities, and challenges. Information Fusion, *58*, 82–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012
2. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 149–159.
3. Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine "thinks": Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. Big Data & Society, *3*(1), 1–12.
4. Dignum, V. (2019). Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way. Springer.
5. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
6. Kizilcec, R. F. (2016). How much information? Effects of transparency on trust in algorithmic systems. Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2390–2395.
7. Kizilcec, R. F., & Lee, H. (2020). Algorithmic fairness in education. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68, 1–7.
8. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown Publishing.
9. OECD. (2021). AI and the future of education: Ethics and governance. OECD Publishing.
10. Pardo, A., & Siemens, G. (2014). Ethical and privacy principles for learning analytics. British Journal of Educational Technology, *45*(3), 438–450.
11. Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? Polity Press.
12. Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. American Behavioral Scientist, *57*(10), 1510–1529.
13. UNESCO. (2022). Guidance on artificial intelligence and education. UNESCO Publishing.
14. Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media and Technology, *45*(3), 223–235.
15. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—an ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds and Machines, *28*(4), 689–707.
16. Mittel stadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms. Big Data & Society, *3*(2), 1–21.
17. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Governor, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on AI applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1), 1–27.