ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Commerce

THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN BRIDGING LEARNING GAPS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

KEY WORDS: AI In Education, Students With Disabilities, Assistive Technology, Adaptive Learning, Accessibility, Inclusive Education

Preeti Kapoor Associate Professor, Commerce, Pt. J. L. N. Govt. College, Faridabad

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how artificial intelligence (AI) technologies—adaptive learning systems, AI-powered assistive tools, and generative models—can help bridge learning gaps for students with disabilities (SWD). Drawing on recent literature and policy reports, the study proposes a mixed-methods investigation combining quasi-experimental evaluation of an AI-adaptive platform, usage analytics, and qualitative interviews with students, teachers, and special educators. The research aims to measure impact on learning outcomes, engagement, and inclusion, while analyzing ethical, equity, and accessibility challenges. Findings are expected to show targeted learning gains for SWD using AI tools, conditional on factors such as teacher training, access, and model bias mitigation. Policy and design recommendations are provided for practitioners and institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Students with disabilities frequently face educational barriers—limited access to suitably adapted materials, lack of individualized support, and systemic inequities—that widen learning gaps relative to peers. Recent advances in AI (adaptive learning, speech and text processing, multimodal models, and generative AI) create new opportunities to deliver personalized, accessible instruction at scale. However, adoption raises questions around equity, accuracy, ethical use, and accessibility of AI solutions. This study investigates whether and how AI can reduce measurable learning gaps for SWD and what contextual factors shape effectiveness.

Literature Review

AI & Adaptive Learning for SWD

Adaptive learning systems use algorithms to tailor content sequencing and difficulty to an individual learner's performance. Systematic reviews and pilot studies suggest such systems can improve learning outcomes for students with learning disabilities when properly calibrated to learners' needs.

AI-Powered Assistive Technologies

Assistive technologies—text-to-speech, speech recognition, screen readers, OCR, predictive text—are being enhanced by AI to provide smarter, context-aware support. Reports from education organizations highlight the promise of these tools to improve accessibility and inclusion, but also warn of digital divide and unequal benefit distribution.

Generative AI and Content Creation

Generative AI can create simplified explanations, personalized practice items, and accessible multimedia. Early studies show promise (e.g., improved literacy with AI-driven game interventions), but also reveal concerns such as inaccuracies, academic integrity issues, and cost barriers for SWD.

Ethical, Equity, and Policy Concerns

Major policy and practitioner discussions focus on privacy, bias, accessibility compliance, and governance of AI tools in education. Regulatory attention and practitioner reviews emphasize careful vetting and inclusive design.

Gap in the Literature:

While reviews and small pilots exist, there is limited rigorous mixed-methods work measuring both quantitative learning gains and the lived experience (access, trust, usability) of SWD across diverse institutional contexts—especially in emerging markets. This study aims to fill that gap.

Theoretical Framework

This study integrates:

- **Universal Design for Learning (UDL) —** to evaluate whether AI tools provide multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement.
- **Socio Cultural Theory —** to analyze how AI-mediated interactions with teachers/peers shape learning.
- **Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) —** to probe teacher and student acceptance and perceived usefulness of AI tools.

Combining these frameworks supports analysis across pedagogical design, social context, and individual acceptance.

Research Questions & Hypotheses

RQ1: To what extent do AI-driven adaptive learning platforms improve learning outcomes (literacy/math) for students with disabilities compared to standard instruction?

H1: SWD using an AI-adaptive platform will show significantly greater learning gains (effect size $d \geq 0.3$) over one academic term compared to matched controls.

RQ2: How do AI-powered assistive technologies (speech-to-text, predictive text, multimodal content) affect engagement, autonomy, and classroom participation of SWD?

H2: Use of AI assistive tools will be associated with higher self-reported engagement and participation scores among SWD.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a concurrent mixed-methods design, integrating both quantitative (quasi-experimental and correlational) and qualitative (interviews, focus groups, and thematic content analysis) approaches.

The rationale for this design is to gain a comprehensive understanding of the impact of AI-based tools on students with disabilities (SWD) — combining measurable performance data with rich personal and contextual insights.

A concurrent mixed-methods design combining:

- Quasi-experimental component (treatment vs. matched control).
- Usage analytics from AI platforms.
- Qualitative interviews & focus groups with students, special educators, mainstream teachers, and parents.
- Policy & accessibility audit of deployed AI tools.

Participants & Setting

- 8–12 schools (K-12) or 2–3 higher-education institutions stratified by urban/rural and public/private status—sample drawn from Haryana
- Students: 200 SWD with diagnosed learning disabilities, sensory impairments, or neuro diverse profiles.
- Teachers/special educators: ~60 participants for interviews and training.

Intervention

- Deploy an AI-adaptive learning platform (reading/math) with integrated assistive features (text-to-speech, simplified explanations, formative AI feedback). Provide teacher training (2–3 days) and technical support.
- Duration: one academic term (12–16 weeks).

Population and Sampling

Population

- Students with diagnosed learning or physical disabilities enrolled in inclusive or special education programs.
- Teachers and special educators involved in these programs.
- Parents of selected students (for qualitative validation).

Sampling Method

- Stratified Purposive Sampling to Ensure Representation Across:
  - o Disability types (learning, visual, hearing, physical, neurodiverse).
  - o School type (government, private, NGO-based).
  - o Urban–rural settings.

Sample Size

Group	Sample	Method
Students (Treatment)	100	Using AI tool
Students (Control)	100	Traditional instruction
Teachers/Special Educators	60	Interview participants
Parents	30	Focus group/interview

Power analysis ($\alpha = 0.05$, power = 0.80, effect size d = 0.35) suggests ~85 students per group to detect meaningful effects — 100 per group ensures adequate margin for attrition.

Tools and Instruments

AI Platform Analytics

- Built-in system data: login frequency, task completion rates, accuracy scores, time-on-task.
- Adaptive learning recommendations and error logs to analyze learning paths.

Academic Performance Tests

- Standardized pre-test and post-test (literacy, numeracy, or subject-specific, depending on grade level).
- Scored using rubrics validated by special educators.

Engagement & Motivation Scales

- Student Engagement Instrument (SEI) adapted for SWD.
- Learning Autonomy and Self-Efficacy Scale (Likert 1–5).
- Reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha \geq 0.80$) confirmed via pilot.

Teacher and Parent Questionnaires

- Perceptions of AI tool usability, inclusivity, and impact on learning (5-point scale).
- Barriers such as technical issues, bias, and training needs.

Qualitative Tools

- Semi-structured interview guides for teachers and students (focus: experience, accessibility, trust, learning progress).
- Focus group discussions with parents (perceived impact and ethical concerns).

Observation Checklists

- In-class behavior, peer interaction, and technology use frequency tracked weekly.

Procedure

1. Pre-Implementation Phase

- o Obtain permissions and ethics clearance.
- o Conduct training sessions for teachers on AI tool operation and accessibility features.
- o Administer baseline (pre-test) assessments and surveys.

2. Implementation Phase (12–16 Weeks)

- o Treatment group uses AI tool daily or thrice weekly (minimum 3 hours/week).
- o Control group follows traditional pedagogy with no AI intervention.
- o Weekly technical check-ins and teacher feedback logs maintained.

3. Post-Implementation Phase

- o Conduct post-tests and collect platform analytics.
- o Administer post-intervention surveys.
- o Conduct interviews and focus groups for qualitative data.

Validity and Reliability

Type	Strategy
Internal Validity	Use of control group and matched sampling; pre-test/post-test design.
External Validity	Inclusion of multiple institutions; diverse sample (urban/rural, various disabilities).
Instrument Reliability	Cronbach's alpha, pilot testing, triangulation with teacher observations.
Researcher Bias Control	Standardized interview protocols, independent data coders.

Data Analysis

The data analysis will involve quantitative statistical analysis for objective metrics and qualitative thematic analysis for subjective insights.

Quantitative Analysis

Objective	Statistical Technique	Explanation
Compare pre-test and post-test scores (treatment vs. control)	Paired t-test / ANCOVA	To test learning gains while controlling for baseline differences.
Examine improvement across disability types	Two-way ANOVA	Tests interaction effect of AI use and disability category on performance.
Correlate engagement metrics (time-on-task, completion) with performance	Pearson correlation / Regression analysis	To identify whether higher engagement predicts higher learning gains.
Analyze changes in motivation/self-efficacy	Repeated Measures ANOVA	To determine attitudinal improvement over time.
Check predictive power of AI analytics on outcomes	Multiple regression / machine learning (optional)	To model which variables (usage patterns, tool features) predict success.

Software

- SPSS / R / Python (Pandas, Stats models) for statistical computation.
- Excel / Power BI for dashboard visualization of trends.

Statistical Significance

- $\alpha = 0.05$; effect size reported using Cohen's d and partial η^2.
- Confidence intervals (95%) for each major parameter.

Qualitative Analysis

Data Sources:

- Interviews, focus groups, open-ended teacher responses, observation logs.

Analytic Approach:

- Transcribe interviews verbatim.
- Code using NVivo / ATLAS.ti following Braun & Clarke's (2006) six-step thematic analysis:

1. Familiarization with data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes (e.g., accessibility, engagement,

trust, bias)
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining/naming themes
6. Writing analytic narrative

Triangulation:
- Combine qualitative findings with quantitative results (e.g., improved engagement correlates with self-reported autonomy themes).

Integration of Findings

A joint display matrix will be created to integrate both datasets:

Quantitative Result	Supporting Qualitative Theme	Interpretation
Higher engagement correlates with literacy improvement	"I could understand better when the app read aloud"	AI accessibility tools directly enhance comprehension.
Minimal gains in students with visual impairments	"The interface was not fully compatible with screen readers"	Technical design limits inclusion for certain groups.
Improved teacher efficiency	"It helped me focus on one-on-one support"	AI reduces routine workload, enabling targeted teaching.

Expected Statistical Outputs
- Descriptive stats (mean, SD, frequency).
- Inferential tables showing t, F, p, η^2 values.
- Graphical visualization (bar charts, regression plots).
- Thematic maps of qualitative codes.
- Integration summary aligning numerical and narrative findings.

Data Management and Ethics
- Data anonym zed and stored securely with password protection.
- Consent forms stored separately from response data.
- Participants can withdraw anytime.
- Sensitive disability data masked during publication.

Expected Results
- Moderate positive learning gains for SWD in the treatment group on literacy outcomes, especially for students with dyslexia and specific learning disabilities, consistent with prior pilot studies.
- Improved engagement and time-on-task for students who regularly use assistive features (text-to-speech, scaffolded prompts).
- Important moderators: teacher training quality, home internet/device access, accuracy and cultural/linguistic fit of AI content.
- Reported concerns: AI inaccuracies, cost/subscription barriers, potential over-reliance, and privacy/data concerns among parents and teachers.

Discussion & Implications

Practical implications
- Design: AI tools must be co-designed with special educators, prioritize multimodal access (audio, text, images), and include human-in-the-loop oversight.
- Policy: Institutions should develop vetting protocols for AI ed-tech vendors, privacy safeguards, and inclusion criteria.
- Training: Investing in teacher training (pedagogical + technical) magnifies AI effectiveness.

Theoretical Implications
- The study will extend UDL and technology acceptance literature by showing how AI can operationalize multiple means of representation and affect acceptance in special education contexts.

Equity Considerations
- Without subsidized access and robust teacher support, AI risks exacerbating gaps—hence policy focus on affordability and infrastructure is vital.
- Obtain informed consent/assent; ensure accessible consent materials.
- Data privacy and security: anonymize analytics; comply with national regulations (e.g., local data protection laws); minimal collection of sensitive personal data.
- Guard against over-automation: AI should augment, not replace, specialized human instruction.
- Bias mitigation: evaluate datasets for linguistic/cultural bias and audit model outputs regularly.

Limitations
- Generalizability may be limited if the sample is regionally concentrated.
- Short-term intervention may not capture long-term retention or independence effects.
- Rapidly evolving AI models may outpace the study's technical assumptions; continuous auditing is necessary.

CONCLUSION

AI holds significant potential to bridge learning gaps for students with disabilities through personalized adaptive learning and intelligent assistive tools. However, realizing this potential depends on equitable access, teacher capacity building, careful ethical governance, and rigorous, context-sensitive evaluation. This paper proposes a mixed-methods approach to generate actionable evidence for educators, policymakers, and ed-tech designers.

REFERENCES

1. Gibson, R. (2024). The Impact of AI in Advancing Accessibility for Learners with Disabilities. EDUCAUSE Review.
2. Mitra, S. (2024). AI-Powered Adaptive Education for Disabled Learners. SSRN
3. Zhang, L. (2024/25). Let's CHAT About Artificial Intelligence for Students With ...SAGE Journals
4. Paglialunga, A. et al. (2025). The Effectiveness of Artificial Intelligence-Based... (example pilot showing literacy gains). PMC.
5. Blaschke Report / CoSN. (2024). AI and Accessibility in Education.
6. U.S. Department of Education. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning (report
7. Zhao, X. (2025). The use of generative AI by students with disabilities in... ScienceDirect.
8. Kooli, C. (2025). AI-driven assistive technologies in inclusive education. ScienceDirect.