CONTEMPLATIONS ON EQUITY IN AI FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mannepuli Srujana
Research Scholar
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Opjs University, Churu, Rajasthan

Dr. Vijay Pal Singh
Research Guide
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Opjs University, Churu, Rajasthan

ABSTRACT

People with disabilities endure prejudice today. As artificial intelligence solutions become more important in decision-making and interaction, they may positively or adversely effect the treatment of individuals with disabilities in society. In a session with participants with various impairments, we discuss potential and hazards in four emerging AI application areas: job, education, public safety, and healthcare. In many cases, non-AI solutions are already discriminatory, and adding AI risks perpetuating these faults. We then address disability-related fairness techniques across the AI development lifecycle. AI systems' effects on users should be considered in their wider context. They should allow users and affected parties to complain about fairness and correct mistakes. A more inclusive and resilient system should incorporate disabled people when obtaining data to generate models and testing. Finally, we recommend a corpus of literature on human-centered design procedures and ideologies to help AI and ML developers develop algorithms that decrease damage and improve disabled people's lives.

Keywords:- *Accessibility, Inclusivity, Bias mitigation, Assistive technologies*

Introduction

AI-based systems are becoming widespread in various industries, raising concerns about potential exclusion or unfair outcomes for marginalized groups. AI justice for persons with disabilities has received less attention than for individuals of different races, gender, and other identities. People with mobility and visual impairments may use autonomous cars and voice agents (Pradhan, Mehta, & Findlater, 2018). AI solutions may lead to unjust results, such as reducing healthcare benefits for Idahoans with cognitive/learning impairments due to biased AI (K.W. v. Armstrong, No. 14-35296 (9th Cir. 2015) :: Justia, 2015). These scenarios indicate that AI for disabled people has great promises but has obstacles that need the upfront attention to ethics in the development process urged by researchers (Bird et al., 2019) and practitioners.

Disability-related AI fairness concerns arise from several sources. Lack of understanding of disability experiences and use cases might induce bias in the issue scoping stage of algorithmic development. Data sourcing and pre-processing must include persons with disabilities to avoid subsuming them by "normative" data as systems are based on data. This might cause a problem. Collecting data for models may be challenging due to confidentiality and privacy concerns, particularly for those with disabilities.

Related Work

The 2019 Gartner CIO survey (Costello, 2019) of 3000 organizations across various sectors found that 37% had adopted an AI solution, up 270% in four years. In parallel, there is growing acknowledgment that intelligent systems should be created with ethical considerations (Cutler et al., 2019)(IEEE & Systems, 2019) and fairness should be addressed upfront, not as an afterthought. The IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems is creating worldwide guidelines for these procedures (Koene et al., 2014).Model bias should be addressed during model training and testing (dalh, & Hatada, 2018). Due to data bias, the model may unintentionally encourage disability discrimination (Janssen & Kuk, 2016). As has been well-documented in banking (Bruckner, 2018) (Chander, 2017)(Hurley & Adebayo, 2016), we recommend increasing awareness of these tendencies to minimize previous bias in future algorithmic decisions. Finally, testing with varied users, especially outliers, is essential after incorporating a trained model into an application. This paper suggests ways to overcome these issues.

The rest of this article discusses AI Fairness for People with Disabilities as a practical and academic field. Our examples show how AI might affect persons with disabilities in four emerging AI applications: employment, education, public safety, and healthcare. We then identify AI algorithm development methodologies that defy systematic social exclusions at each level. Finally, we provide links to human-centered design literature to help AI and ML developers develop algorithms that decrease damage and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities. P7000 addresses ethical design issues, whereas P7003 addresses algorithm bias (Koene, Dowthwaite, & Seth, 2018). Recent academic initiatives, such as one at George-town's Institute for Tech Law & Policy (Givens, 2019) and a workshop at the ASSETS 2019 conference (Trewin et al., 2019), focus on AI and Fairness for People with Disabilities.

Any algorithmic decision-process may be biased, and the FATE/ML community is developing methods to identify and mitigate bias. Williams, Brooks, and Shmar-gad (2018) demonstrate how racial discrimination in employment and education may occur without social category information and how such biases are difficult to uncover. They support social category information in algorithmic decision-making, but they acknowledge the risks of disclosing sensitive social data like immigration status. According to Self et al. (2019), computational techniques alone are insufficient to guarantee fair results, since the social context of deployment must also be addressed.

Some concerns about AI fairness for people with disabilities or neurological or sensory differences are emerging (Fruchterman & Mellea, 2018)(Guo, Kamar, Vaughan, Wallach, & Morris, 2019)(Lewis, 2019)(Treviranus, 2019)(Trewin, 2018a), but research is scarce. Fruchterman and Mellea (2018) discuss the widespread use of AI tools in employment and recruiting and their potentially serious implications for people with disabilities, including the analysis of facial movements and voice in recruitment, personality tests that disproportionately screen out people with disabilities, and the use of discriminatory variables like employment gaps. "Representatives of disabled people should examine the proxies and models used by AI vendors for these "hidden" discrimination tools" (Fruchterman & Mellea, 2018).

Motivating Examples

In October 2018, 40 disability advocates, people with disabilities, AI and accessibility researchers and practitioners from industry and academia met in a workshop (Trewin, 2018b) to discuss fairness for people with disabilities in light of the growing use of AI solutions in many industries. In this section, workshop participants identify job, education, public safety, and healthcare possibilities and dangers.

Employment

Disabled people face employment discrimination. In one recent field research, reporting a handicap (spinal cord injury or Asperger's Syndrome) in a job application cover letter resulted in 26% less positive replies from employers, even if the impairment was unlikely to influence productivity (Ameri et al., 2018). Men and those without disability experience exhibit stronger negative emotional responses to inclusive employment (Popovich, Scherbaum, Scherbaum, & Polinko, 2003). Exclusion might happen accidentally. Qualified deaf candidates who utilize an interpreter may be filtered out for positions requiring verbal communication abilities, while being able to do the work well with accommodations. Since employment is poor in this demographic, further discrimination is very harmful: The 2018 employment rate for individuals with disabilities was 19.1%, whereas that of those without disabilities was 65.9% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019).

Employers increasingly use technology to hire. A key selling feature is the ability to ensure a fair recruiting process without prejudice or lack of information from individual recruiters. Machine learning algorithms screen candidates and match them to jobs. Today, AI-driven recruiting solutions examine online profiles, resumes, test results, and video interviews, potentially causing handicap discrimination (Fruchterman & Mel-lea, 2018). AI in HR and recruitment is growing (Faggella, 2019), yet Amazon's AI recruiting solution "learned" to discount women's credentials (Dastin, 2018).

The workshop identified several risk scenar- ios:

Deaf people may be the first to apply to organizations using sign language interpreting. Learning from the present workforce will maintain the status quo and historical biases in candidate screening. They may disqualify applicants with workplace disparities, including those who need accommodations.

Applicants utilizing assistive technology may take longer to answer questions on an online exam that is not well-designed for accessibility. Timing-based models may exclude assistive technology users. Resumes and job applications may not include a person's handicap, but other factors may be affected, such as work gaps, school attendance, and online task time.

Even a highly qualified candidate with modest facial affect may be filtered out by video analysis of eye look, speech, or facial motions. This screening is difficult for those with unusual appearances, voices, or facial expressions. It may reject autistic or blind candidates who do not make eye contact, deaf and non-verbal applicants, those with speech difficulties or facial paralysis, and stroke survivors.

Using data that excludes persons with impairments and relies on proxies influenced by disability increases the danger of discriminatory treatment in employment. We must avoid perpetuating previous prejudices, introducing new hurdles, or relying on accommodations for qualified candidates due to their differences.

Education

Disabled Americans have traditionally been denied free public education

(Dudley-Marling & Burns, 2014)(Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, & Al-gozzine, 2012). Nearly 20 years after Brown v. Board of Education desegregated public schools by race, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act mandated that all students receive a "free and appro-priate public education" in the "least restric-tive environment." One in five disabled students attended public schools, typically in segregated classes, before 1975 (Dudley-Marling & Burns, 2014). Disabled learners still face challenges in accessing integrated public learning environments, K-12 classroom technology, postsecondary online materials, and e-learning platforms (Dudley-Marling & Burns, 2014; Shaheen & Lazar, 2018; Burgstahler, 2015; Straumsheim, 2017; Cinquin, Guitton, & Sauze´on, 2019).

The fast shift from classroom to online learning is driving AI in education. Institutions may now reach more students cost-effectively via online learning. Global Market Insights (Bhutani & Wadhwani, 2019) anticipates a $6 billion market by 2024. The latest online learning systems employ AI to personalize learning and assessment for each student, among other uses. These solutions are provided by traditional LMS suppliers like Blackboard and more recently by MOOC providers like edX.

Personalized learning may greatly benefit learners with impairments (Morris, Kirschbaum, & Picard, 2010). This may range from adding graphics and pictures to existing information for visual learners to creating individualized user interfaces (Gajos, Wobbrock, & Weld, 2007). The device might enable video captions for non-native language speakers, including deaf students, to read along with lectures.

Any system that infers a student's knowledge and skills from online interactions risks misinterpreting and underestimating disabled pupils. Students with unusual learning methods or abilities may not be treated fairly. If a test or quiz has a strict time limit, a student with a cognitive handicap or test anxiety who processes material slowly might be considered less competent.

Disability information may be accessible in educational settings, making it difficult to offer individualized instruction for a broad variety of individuals without biasing disability groups.

Public Safety

More disabled persons are victims of violent crime than others (Harrell, 2017). Police officers can misinterpret disabled people as uncooperative or threatening and deny them Miranda warnings (US Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 2006). The 2015 Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing addresses law enforcement's implicit prejudice and discrimination against individuals with disabilities and technology's ability to remedy these issues. Using AI to detect public safety risks and enforce the law is contentious (McCarthy, 2019). This includes technologies for recognizing, recognising, and interpreting behavior (such as suspicious behavior). In addition to privacy concerns, mistakes and prejudice are genuine. Workshop participants saw both challenges and opportunities for individuals with disabilities, despite the emphasis on racial and gender inequality in public discourse and academia.

Autonomous cars must be expert at identifying humans in their surroundings. They must accurately identify people who use various wheelchairs and mobility equipment or move differently. A workshop attendee recounted a wheelchair-bound buddy who walks backwards. This is a strange way to travel about, yet recognizing and identifying outliers is crucial.

Another participant had seen a disheveled guy walking restlessly in an airport lounge, mumbling, evidently stressed. Humans and AI might see his actions as a threat. He may be exhibiting symptoms of anxiety, autism, or a significant fear of flying. Strong facial emotions in deaf signers may be misconstrued as anger or a security concern (Shaffer & Rogan, 2018). The person with an altered stride may be using a prosthetic, not a weapon.

Individuals with cognitive problems may be at increased risk of being misinterpreted as a danger. Adding the requirement to react swiftly to real threats creates a perilous scenario that demands cautious AI system design and deployment.

AI may also improve disability public safety. AI-based interpretation may learn to recognize many activities, such as hand clapping, pacing, and sign language, as normal. A recent blind survey and interview research (Branham et al., 2017) reveals that facial and image recognition technology might improve sensory disabled people's personal safety. They can help identify police officers and fraudsters impersonating them. They may alert blind or deaf people to weapons being displayed or discharged. They may provide facial clues for safer interactions with possible aggressors or police officers. These technology may help blind people capture their offenders with stronger proof.

The ethical implications of planned ventures in this sector should also reflect disability issues and be addressed in the design. A system might identify someone with an altered stride as a weapon suspect or someone using a prosthesis or mobility device. Facial recognition may aid in preventing misunderstandings, but it may compromise privacy and hurt disadvantaged populations (Hamidi et al., 2018a). AI must be used to maintain public safety while limiting harm to vulnerable groups and outliers.

Healthcare

Disability access to healthcare is still unequal, notably for persons with developmental impairments (Iezzoni, 2011) (Krahn, Walker, & Correa-De-Araujo, 2015). Inadequate care is commonly provided to non-verbal and cognitively impaired patients (Barnett, McKee, Smith, & Pearson, 2011) (Krahn & Fox, 2014) (Krahn et al., 2015). Due to cultural ignorance or language barriers, deaf people are commonly misdiagnosed with mental illnesses (Glickman, 2007) (Pollard, 1994). The present approach neglects unusual illnesses and genetic abnormalities that do not follow typical procedures (Wastfelt, Fadeel, & Henter, 2006). This may lead to unwanted institutionalization for older persons with declining health. Many promising technological breakthroughs, like AI, require to better include target consumers in the development process (Haigh & Yanco, 2002).

AI in healthcare might help individuals receive the treatment and prevention they need. Nonverbal people may have trouble expressing their problems. AI may replace patient advocacy for pain management and medicine delivery. In scenarios where impairments or communication skills impact treatment and adherence, AI may identify special needs situations, provide additional attention, and advocate for appropriate treatment. For uncommon illnesses or hereditary disorders, various data sets might be pooled to determine and offer solutions without practitioner expertise.

Unfortunately, there are no guidelines or regulations for evaluating the safety and effectiveness of these devices. If datasets do not accurately reflect the population, AI may struggle in areas with little or difficult data collection. People with uncommon medical conditions/disabilities may suffer. Speech pauses may misdiagnose Alzheimer's disease in people with disabilities who have trouble speaking, or the system may not operate for them. Non-native speakers may pause, but it's not a sign of illness.

As in employment, education, and public safety, building healthcare apps for excluded communities improves access rather than keeping individuals out. AI applications provide hazards and opportunities for disabled individuals across all domains. How and when can software developers integrate fairness for individuals with impairments to minimize risks and maximize benefits? The next sections answer this question at each AI development level.

Considerations for AI Practitioners

This section suggests methods AI practitioners might be aware of and promote disability justice and inclusion in their AI-based solutions. The section covers AI model creation processes such issue scoping, data sourcing, pre-processing, model selection and training, and application integration.

Problem Scoping

Some efforts may change lives more than others. The Bioss AI Protocol (Bioss, 2019) suggests asking the following five questions regarding AI work to discover fairness issues:

- Is the work advisory, allowing for human judgment and decision-making?
- Does the AI have authority over people?

Does the AI have agency (ability to behave in a given environment)?

- What talents and obligations may we relinquish?
- Do organizations still governed by humans have clear lines of accountability?

AI practitioners may also explore if disabled persons have faced prejudice in work, housing, education, and healthcare. Can the project improve? Determine specific outcomes to monitor during the project. Plan to address source data bias to prevent perpetuating discrimination. This may include increasing disability representation, addressing prejudice against certain populations, or identifying data gaps to clarify model constraints.

Ethical AI development requires an active engagement of multiple stakeholders and a variety of data (Cutler et al., 2019). To apply this strategy to persons with disabilities, identify 'outlier' individuals and involve them in the team using an inclusive design process (see next section). People whose statistics may deviate greatly from the average. The definition of an outlier varies by application. Even without specific disability information, many factors may be affected by a handicap, resulting in bias. Speech recognition may detect a stutter or slurred speech. In healthcare applications requiring height, this may entail adding a short individual. Outliers may also be persons from one group whose data resembles another. A sluggish test taker may not be suffering with the topic, but with typing or accessing the test using assistive technology. Identifying outlier persons early in the design process allows for consideration of their requirements, possible effects, and solutions.

This stage also benefits from a measuring strategy for outlier identification. If the plan contains predicted outlier and disability group outcomes, it may affect what data and persons are included and excluded.

Data Sourcing

Considerations for data sourcing for model building include:

Does the statistics include disabled persons, particularly those most affected by this solution? A corporation with little diversity may not include deaf or blind staff. If crucial groups are absent or unknown, gather or generate additional data to enhance the original source.

Could the statistics be biased against disabled people? Consider if the data reflects disability-related social prejudices. For instance, a housing application record may reveal past reluctance to choose individuals with disabilities. Consider filing a lawsuit if this circumstance is identified.

Is disability data explicitly represented? If so, practitioners may use bias detection tests and mitigation techniques to account for bias before training a model (Bellamy et al., 2018).

Combining data sources may create new data. Some organizations may not have entries in all sources due to source requirements. Be aware that disability categories may be excluded from the merged data set. Consider how to represent and manage persons without fingerprints when combining picture and fingerprint biometrics.

GDPR legislation (European Union, 2016) allow people to seek deletion of personal data and know what data is being stored and used. AI systems may not have specific disability information to apply fairness checks and corrections when enterprises restrict data storage and usage. By being aware of data bias, documenting data diversity, and raising issues early, practitioners can avoid building solutions that perpetuate inequalities and identify system requirements for accommodating underrepresented groups.

Data Pre-Processing

Cleaning and processing data for machine learning takes 80-90% of a normal data science project (Zhang, Zhang, & Yang, 2003), and the decisions taken at this step might affect the solution's inclusiveness.

- **Feature selection** may contain or omit disability-related elements. Besides explicit disability information, additional traits may be affected by disability status or social disadvantage, giving a proxy for disability status. A propensity for big typefaces may indicate vision impairment, while video captions may indicate hearing. Disability is also linked to household income, educational success, and other factors.
- **Feature engineering** Analyzing or combining data features yields additional features. For instance, determining a person's reading level, personality qualities, or days worked/days lived from their writing. Disabilities affect the derived characteristic in both cases.

While it is common practice to eliminate sensitive elements from models, this may not be the optimal strategy for algorithmic solutions. It might be challenging to avoid mentioning handicap status. When feasible, provide disability-specific features to assess and mitigate prejudice. Consult with identified outliers and stakeholder groups during issue scoping to better understand how disability might be reflected in data and the tradeoffs of utilizing or omitting specific characteristics and values.

Preserving Privacy

Disability beneficiaries may benefit most from smart systems, but they are also most exposed to data exploitation. Outliers aren't protected under existing privacy laws. Today, privacy advocates worldwide de-identify data to combat abuse and exploitation. The idea is that removing our identify from data prevents it from being exploited against us. The premise is that we will maintain our privacy while contributing data to better design choices.

Although disabled persons are most susceptible to data exploitation and misuse, they are also the simplest to re-identify. If you are the only wheelchair user in a neighborhood, you might be easily identified. If you're the only one who gets colostomy bags in your neighborhood, re-identifying your purchase data is straightforward.

What are some solutions if de-identification isn't a reliable way to protect the privacy of non-average people and data exclusion implies that highly consequential judgments will be made without their needs? The main emphasis is on an ill-defined concept of privacy. This implies self-determination, ownership of our narrative, the right to know how our data is used, and ethical handling of our tale to most people.

To help authorities regain control over personal data, the International Standards Organization has developed a personal data preference standard. This proposal responds to all-or-nothing terms of service agreements that require you to give up your private data rights to use a service. Terms of service agreements are often written in legal jargon that is difficult to comprehend, even for those with the time to read them. This makes it common to click "I agree" without reading the conditions and rights we gave up. The proposed standard will be part of AccessForAll (ISO/IEC 24751) (ISO/IEC, 2008). Parent standard structure matches customer demands and preferences with resource or service capability. It gives you a machine-readable vocabulary to express what you want and allows service providers and manufacturers to specify their goods' functionality. Platforms can connect diverse unmet customer requirements with the nearest product or service. Utilities enhance the standard by assisting consumers in identifying and refining their requirements and preferences for specific contexts and goals. This standard's personal data choice section lets users choose who may access their data, for what, how long, and under what circumstances. Services that want to utilize the data would state what data is required and what is optional. This will provide a platform to negotiate fairer service conditions. Service providers would declare data needs transparently and auditably. The standard will include utilities that educate and assist users about preference risks and ramifications. Canadian and European regulators will reference this standard when finished. This should restore some data usage autonomy.

Data co-ops are another self-determination and data method being examined by the Platform Co-op Consortium (Platform

Cooperativism Consortium, 2019). A data co-op allows data producers to regulate and share profits from their own data. Rare diseases, niche customer requirements, and specialist hobbies are ideal for this kind of data collection. For instance, smart cities may have many data domains with data co-ops. Example: navigation, traffic, utility use, trash management, leisure, and consumer expectations. Multiple data co-ops would then cooperate to inform urban planning choices.

Deployment in Real Applications

The trained model is integrated into an application via an interface or API at this step. Testing with varied users especially outliers is crucial. Understanding how various individuals would perceive and utilize an AI-based system is also crucial, such as whether they are more inclined to trust it or be embarrassed by its brief responses or lack of context.

Quality assurance should always incorporate disability testing by as many disability groups as feasible. This includes evaluating the system's user interface for accessibility and its performance on various data inputs. To test system limitations and failure mechanisms, the test process should purposely contain outliers.

Because impairment appears so differently, the application may portray a person unlike those in the training data. An automated telephone support system may have trouble understanding a speech-impaired person, particularly if they are not speaking in their native language. Developers may prevent prejudice by supporting textual input in addition to voice. Users should be able to disable AI interpretation.

Disability may potentially affect AI input accuracy. A video-based personality analysis that concludes an autistic candidate is untrustworthy because they didn't make eye contact with the interviewer is fed into an application screening model. Disabled persons must be able to review and update decision-making data.

The capacity to question and dispute AI judgments and get an explanation of the most relevant aspects is also crucial. If a handicap affected these criteria, the decision may be discriminatory. AI-based systems that impact humans should allow them to challenge judgments and enable a manual override for outliers if the model is faulty.

Since many AI systems learn and change their behavior over time, constant fairness monitoring for individuals with impairments should be included. Continuous audits and evaluations of performance, together with periodic explicit testing, may ensure that system modifications for performance improvement do not lead to discrepancies in decision-making for certain sub-populations. This is vital to guarantee that a system that improves everyone doesn't unjustly hurt others.

Design Approaches

We urge AI/ML engineers to incorporate persons with disabilities in issue scoping, testing/deployment, and other stages of AI development. AL/ML practitioners may struggle to discover diverse users, engage them ethically and respectfully, and consistently integrate their input to enhance systems.

Human-Computer Interaction has produced design philosophies, approaches, and strategies to guide the activity, exploring these concerns. Specific approaches to engaging people with disabilities include Universal Design

(Story, Mueller, & Mace, 1998), Ability-Based Design (Wobbrock et al., 2011), Design for User Empowerment (Ladner, 2015), and Design for Social Accessibility (Shinohara et al., 2018). We'll briefly discuss three ways AL/ML developers might include users into their workflow in this section. Our goal is not to provide a full overview of all or even a few strategies, but rather to provide connections to the literature for individuals who wish to learn more or find a partner with such knowledge.

Inclusive Design, Participatory Design, and Value-Sensitive Design are three human-centered design methods. These have diverse intellectual traditions, therefore their theoretical frameworks explicitly include individuals with impairments to varying degrees. Design processes seldom include disabled people, and designs rarely anticipate end-user demands to adapt (Derboven, Geerts, & De Grooff, 2016). We'll start by explaining why it's necessary to involve disabled persons in software development.

First, everyone has the right to fully participate in society, and digital inclusion is essential to that today. Everybody will encounter disability at some point, thus our technology must be flexible enough to accommodate the variety of human experience, especially in vital decision-making. This requires considering diversity from the start, thus the disability rights movement's motto of "noth-ing about us, without us."

Including disabled persons may inspire new design ideas and extend the product's audience. According to Harley & Fitzpatrick (2012) and Storni (2010), individuals with impairments, particularly elderly, are typically the pioneers of life hacking and personal innovation due to their need to adapt to a reality that does not meet their needs. Disability issues should be moved from the "edge" to the "center" of design thinking. In her groundbreaking Feminism in Human Computer Interaction, Bardzell proposed studying both the conceptual "center" and edge instances of a user distribution (Bardzell, 2010). She said that designers generally think of design as having a default "user" who is male, white, educated, and non-disabled. According to Bardzell, accommodating edge situations expands a design's market and strengthens it against unexpected changes in consumers, use, or settings. Other researchers agree (Krischkowsky et al., 2015; Muller et al., 2016; Tscheligi, 2014). The curb cut is a classic example of how designs designed with and for persons with disabilities may improve everyone's user experience (an example of "universal design"). Parents using prams, laborers with big wheeled cargo, and scooterists use curb cuts, which enable wheelchair users to cross the street. Both Downey and Jacobs (Downey, 2008) (Jacobs, 1999) argue for electronic curb cuts, such as the browser's zooming capability, which makes reading simpler for low-vision or distant readers.

We should involve persons with disabilities in our basic de-sign procedures to focus disadvantaged viewpoints. Fortunately, design that focuses marginalized consumers has a long history. We particularly value Inclusive Design (specifically as it emerged in Canada), Participatory Design, and Value Based Design when developing for and with persons with disabilities.

Conclusion

We have listed some ways AI solutions

might harm disabled people if academics and practitioners don't intervene. In certain cases, non-AI solutions are discriminatory, and adopting AI may perpetuate these issues. Disabled persons may encounter hiring discrimination. AI-driven recruiting systems that match excellent applicants to the workforce will maintain that status quo. An AI system that infers from a student's online interactions may mistake speed for proficiency if the student uses assistive technology. AI systems may mistake cognitively disabled people as threats in public safety. Speech impediments may be misdiagnosed in AI healthcare systems that utilize speech characteristics to assess cognitive deficits.

To prevent such erroneous judgments and potentially harmful effects, many actions are suggested. Based on their possible influence on users in their wider context of usage, AI systems should be prioritized for fairness evaluation and continuous monitoring. They should allow users and affected parties to report inaccuracies and fairness issues. Models should use data from disabled people. Edge instances, or "outlier" data, will make the system more inclusive and resilient. Self-identification raises privacy issues for those with disabilities, while not participating or disclosing might lead to exclusion from data models. The personal data choices standard increases participation while protecting user privacy. The AI application's UI and system settings must be tested with outliers before deployment. Where models fail, users should be allowed to workaround and overrule the system.

AI has been demonstrated to assist persons with impairments navigate cities, re-order medications at local pharmacies by phone or text, and increase public safety. Nearly everyone in the community has a family member, coworker, friend, or neighbor with a handicap. Although AI technology has significantly improved the lives of the handicapped community, we can still push for justice and equality and question the existing quo.

We must include handicapped users while designing community-helping AI. The AI design should prioritize handicapped persons. According to Eric Ries' The Lean Startup (Ries, 2011), we should employ minimal viable products (MVPs) that users improve.

In essence, an algorithmic and incremental strategy that challenges the current quo and standardizes justice and equality is required. This should be multi-industrial with significant stakeholders in diverse industries.

This document challenges daily activities that may hinder persons with disabilities and raises awareness of equality. Remember that promoting this aim takes time. Success will need gradual learning, thought-provoking peer conversation, and local and governmental improvements. We can only achieve sustainable results for disabled individuals utilizing AI systems after these fundamental adjustments.

REFERENCES

1. *Ameri, M., Schur, L., Adya, M., Bent- ley, F. S., McKay, P., & Kruse, D.(2018, mar). The Disability Employ-ment Puzzle: A Field Experiment onEmployer Hiring Behavior. ILR Re- view , 71(2), 329–364. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/ doi/10.1177/0019793917717474 doi: 10.1177/0019793917717474*

2. *Bardzell, S. (2010). Feminist HCI: Tak- ing Stock and Outlining an Agenda for Design. In Proceedings of the sigchi conference on human factors in computing systems (pp.*

1301–1310). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re-

3. trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/1753326.1753521 doi: 10 1145/1753326.1753521

4. Barnett, S., McKee, M., Smith, S. R., & Pearson, T. A. (2011, mar). Deaf sign language users, health inequities,and public health: opportunity for social justice. Preventing chronicdisease, 8(2), A45. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ pubmed/21324259http:// www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/ articlerender.fcgi?artid= PMC3073438

5. Bellamy, R. K. E., Dey, K., Hind, M., Hoffman, S. C., Houde, S., Kannan, K., . . . Zhang,Y. (2018, oct). AI Fairness 360: An Extensible Toolkit for Detecting, Under- standing, and Mitigating Unwanted Algo- rithmic Bias. Retrieved from http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.01943

6. Bhutani, A., & Wadhwani, P. (2019). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education Market Size worth $6bn by 2024. Global MarketInsights. Retrieved from https://www gminsights.com/pressrelease/ artificial-intelligence-ai-in -education-market

7. Bioss. (2019). The Bioss AI Protocol. Re- trieved 2019-08-30, from http://www .bioss.com/ai/

8. Bird, S., Hutchinson, B., Kenthapadi, K., Kici- man, E., & Mitchell, M. (2019). Fairness-Aware Machine Learning: Practical Chal- lenges and Lessons Learned. In Com- panion proceedings of the 2019 world wide web conference on - www '19 (pp. 1297–1298). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation cfm?doid=3308560.3320086 doi: 10.1145/3308560.3320086

9. Bjerknes, G., Ehn, P., & Kyng, M. (1987). Computers and Democracy - A Scandi- navian Challenge. Avebury.

10. Börjesson, P., Barendregt, W., Eriksson, E., & Torgersson, O. (2015). Design- ing Technology for and with Develop- mentally Diverse Children: A System- atic Literature Review. In Proceedings of the 14th international conference on interaction design and children (pp. 79– 88). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re- trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/2771839.2771848 doi: 10 1145/2771839.2771848

11. Borning, A., & Muller, M. (2012). Next Steps for Value Sensitive Design. In Proceed- ings of the sigchi conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1125–1134). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re-rieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/2207676.2208560 doi: 10 .1145/2207676.2208560

12. Branham, S. M., Abdolrahmani, A., Easley, W., Scheuerman, M., Ronquillo, E., & Hurst, A. (2017). "Is Someone There? Do They Have a Gun". In Proceedings of the 19th international acm sigaccess conference on computers and accessibil- ity - assets '17 (pp. 260–269). New York,New York, USA: ACM Press. Retrievedfrom http://dl.acm.org/citation cfm?doid=3132525.3132534 doi: 10.1145/3132525.3132534

13. Brewer, R. N., & Kameswaran, V. (2018). Un- derstanding the Power of Control in Au- tonomous Vehicles for People with Vi- sion Impairment. In Proceedings of the 20th international acm sigaccess confer- ence on computers and accessibility - assets '18 (pp. 185–197). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation .cfm?doid=3234695.3236347 doi: 10.1145/3234695.3236347

14. Bruckner, M. A. (2018). The Promiseand Perils of Algorithmic Lenders'Use of Big Data. Chicago-Kent Law Review, 93. Retrieved from https://heinonline.org/HOL/ Page?handle=hein.journals/ chknt93{&}id=15{&}div= {&}collection=

15. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. D. o. L. (2019). PERSONS WITH A DIS- ABILITY: LABOR FORCE CHAR-

16. ACTERISTICS — 2018. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/ news.release/pdf/disabl.pdf

17. Burgstahler, S. (2015, dec). Opening Doors or Slamming Them Shut? On- line Learning Practices and Studentswith Disabilities. Social

Inclusion,3(6), 69. Retrieved from http:// www.cogitatiopress.com/ojs/ index.php/socialinclusion/ article/view/420 doi:10.17645/si.v3i6.420

18. Chander, A. (2017). The Racist Algo-rithm? Michigan Law Review , 115(6), 1023. Retrieved from https://heinonline.org/HOL/

19. Cheon, E., & Su, N. M. (2016). Integrat- ing roboticist values into a Value Sen- sitive Design framework for humanoid robots. 11th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI). doi: 10.1109/HRI.2016.7451775

20. Cinquin, P.-A., Guitton, P., & Sauzéon, H. (2019, mar). Online e-learning and cognitive disabilities: A system- atic review. Computers & Educa- tion, 130, 152–167. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect S0360131518303178 doi 10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2018.12.004

21. Clark, C. B. (2018, jun). Many more stories: Co-design and creative com- munities. OCAD University. Re- trieved from http://openresearch ocadu.ca/id/eprint/2079/

22. Costello, K. (2019). Gartner Survey Shows 37 Percent of Organizations HaveImplemented AI in Some Form. Stam- ford, Conn.: Gartner. Retrieved from https://www.gartner.com/en/ newsroom/press-releases/2019

23. Cutler, A.,Pribik, M., & Humphrey,L. (2019). Everyday Ethics for Ar- tificial Intelligence (Tech. Rep.). IBM. Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com/watson/assets/ Dastin, J. (2018). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women - Reuters. Retrieved 2019-08-30, from https://www.reuters.com/ article/us-amazon-com-jobs

24. Derboven, J., Geerts, D., & De Grooff,

25. D. (2016). The Tactics of Everyday Practice: A Semiotic Approach to Appro-priation. Interaction Design and Architec- ture(s), 29(29), 99–120. Retrieved from https://lirias.kuleuven.be/ 389602?limo=0

26. Downey, G. (2008). Closed captioning: Sub-titling, stenography and the digital con- vergemce of text with television. Johns Hopkins University Press.

27. Draper, H., Sorell, T., Bedaf, S., Syrdal, D. S., Gutierrez-Ruiz, C., Duclos, A., & Amirabdollahian, F. (2014, oct). Ethical Dimensions of Human-Robot Interactions in the Care of Older Peo- ple: Insights from 21 Focus Groups Convened in the UK, France and the Netherlands. In International conferenceon social robotics (LNCS 8755 ed., pp. 135–145). Springer. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/ 10.1007/978-3-319-11973-1{ }14 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-11973-1 14

28. Dudley-Marling, C., & Burns, M. B. (2014). Two Perspectives on Inclusion in the United States, Global Education Review, 2014. Global Education Review , 1(1), 14–31. Retrieved from https://eric ed.gov/?id=EJ1055208

29. European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with re-gard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data,and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (Gen- eral Da.

30. Faggella, D. (2019, apr). Machine Learning in Human Resources – Applications and Trends.

31. Faucett, H. A., Ringland, K. E., Cullen,

32. A. L. L., & Hayes, G. R. (2017, oct). (In)Visibility in Disability and As- sistive Technology. ACM Trans. Ac- cess. Comput., 10(4), 14:1—-14:17. Re- trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/3132040 doi: 10.1145/ 3132040

33. Felzmann, H., Beyan, T., Ryan, M., & Beyan, O. (2016, jan). Imple- menting an Ethical Approach to Big Data Analytics in Assistive Robotics for Elderly with Dementia. SIGCAS Comput. Soc., 45(3), 280–286. Re-

34. trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/2874239.2874279 doi: 10 1145/2874239.2874279

35. Friedman, B., Hendry, D. G., & Born- ing, A. (2017). A Survey of Value Sensitive Design Methods. Foundations and

Trends R in Hu-

36. *man–Computer Interaction, 11(2),63–125. Retrieved from http:// dx.doi.org/10.1561/1100000015 doi: 10.1561/1100000015*

37. *Fruchterman, J., & Mellea, J. (2018). Expanding Employment Success for People with Disabilities — Benetech — Software for Social Good (Tech. Rep.). benetech. Retrieved from https://benetech.org/ about/resources/expanding*

38. *Gajos, K. Z., Wobbrock, J. O., & Weld, D. S. (2007). Automatically Gen- erating User Interfaces Adapted to Users' Motor and Vision Capabilities. In Proceedings of the 20th annual acm symposium on user interface soft- ware and technology (pp. 231–240). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re- trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/1294211.1294253 doi: 10.1145/1294211.1294253*

39. *Givens, A. R. (2019). Institute Announces New Project on Algorithmic Fairness for People with Disabilities. Institute for Technology Law and Policy, GeorgetownLaw.*

40. *Glickman, N. (2007). Do You Hear Voices? Problems in Assessment of MentalStatus in Deaf Persons With Severe Language Deprivation (Vol. 12). Ox- ford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/ 42658866 doi: 10.2307/42658866*

41. *Gomez Torres, I., Parmar, G., Aggarwal, S., Mansur, N., & Guthrie, A. (2019). Affordable Smart Wheelchair. In Ex- tended abstracts of the 2019 chi con- ference on human factors in comput- ing systems (pp. SRC07:1—-SRC07:6). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re-*

42. *trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/3290607.3308463 doi: 10.1145/3290607.3308463*

43. *Guo, A., Kamar, E., Vaughan, J. W., Wal-lach, H., & Morris, M. R. (2019, jul). Toward Fairness in AI for People with Disabilities: A Research Roadmap. Retrieved from http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02227*

44. *Haigh, K. Z., & Yanco, H. A. (2002). Automa-tion as Caregiver: A Survey of Issues*

45. *and Tchnologies (Tech. Rep.). AAAI. Hamidi, F., Müller, C., Baljko, M., Schorch,*

46. *M., Lewkowicz, M., & Stangl, A. (2016). Engaging with Users and Stakeholders: The Emotional and the Personal. In Proceedings of the 19th international conference on sup-porting group work (pp. 453–456). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re-*

47. *trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/2957276.2996292 doi: 101145/2957276.2996292*

48. *Hamidi, F., Scheuerman, M. K., & Bran- ham, S. M. (2018a). Gender Recog- nition or Gender Reductionism? InProceedings of the 2018 chi confer- ence on human factors in computing sys- tems - chi '18 (pp. 1–13). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=3173574.317 3582 doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173582*

49. *Hamidi, F., Scheuerman, M. K., & Bran- ham, S. M. (2018b). Gender Recogni- tion or Gender Reductionism?: The So- cial Implications of Embedded Gender Recognition Systems. In Proceedings of the 2018 chi conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 8:1—*

50. *-8:13). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Re- trieved from http://doi.acm.org/ 10.1145/3173574.3173582 doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173582*

51. *Hankerson, D., Marshall, A. R., Booker, J.,El Mimouni, H., Walker, I., & Rode,*

52. *J. A. (2016). Does Technology Have Race? In Proceedings of the 2016 chi conference extended abstracts onhuman factors in computing systems - chi ea '16 (pp. 473–486). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation cfm?doid=2851581.2892578 doi: 10.1145/2851581.2892578*

53. *Harley, D., & Fitzpatrick, G. (2012). Appropria- tion of social networking by older people:two case studies. In Ecsw 2011 work- shop on fostering social interactions in the ageing society: Artefacts - method- ologies - research paradigms. Aarhus, Denmark.*

54. *Harrell, E. (2017). Crime Against Persons with Disabilities, 2009-2015 - Sta- tistical Tables (Tech. Rep.). Bureauof Justice Statistics. Retrieved fromhttp://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm*

55. *Holbø, K., Bøthun, S., & Dahl, Y. (2013). Safe Walking Technology for People with*

Dementia: What Do They Want? In Proceedings of the 15th international acm sigaccess conference on comput- ers and accessibility (pp. 21:1—-21:8).