Engaging Non-Traditional Voices in AI Governance Isn't Just Inclusion — It's a Necessity

As AI systems continue to shape economies, influence policy, and restructure labor markets, the question of who gets to shape these systems becomes more urgent. The default voices in AI governance tend to be technologists, policymakers, and legal experts. While these stakeholders are essential, they do not represent the full spectrum of those impacted by AI. In fact, limiting governance to these traditional voices risks producing systems that are misaligned, inequitable, and ultimately untrustworthy.

Engaging non-traditional voices like community organizers, educators, artists, caregivers, youth leaders, and those historically excluded from technology design, is no longer a symbolic gesture of diversity. It is a functional imperative for building systems that serve society holistically. These individuals bring lived experiences, cultural intelligence, and ethical intuition that often elude even the most advanced models.

They surface context-specific risks, identify overlooked harms, and bring fresh perspectives that challenge institutional blind spots.

Consider AI applications in housing, healthcare, or education. These are domains where historical discrimination has left deep structural inequities. Without the input of those who have navigated these systems from the margins, we risk encoding past harms into future infrastructures. Inclusion here is not just ethical, it is a technical requirement for legitimacy.

How We Can Design Dialogue That Matters
Designing for inclusive dialogue means rethinking how we gather, structure, and elevate input across the AI lifecycle. It requires more than one-off focus groups or stakeholder surveys. Instead, we must build ongoing, co-creative partnerships that center trust and reciprocity.

First, we need to meet people where they are. That might mean convening local listening sessions in community centers rather than corporate boardrooms. It might mean funding creative fellows to produce storytelling artifacts that illuminate the human impact of AI. It definitely means compensating non-traditional contributors for their time, labor, and insight—not extracting it. Second, we need frameworks for participatory AI governance that treat engagement not as consultation, but as co-design. Community members should be involved not just in identifying problems, but in shaping metrics, success criteria, and accountability pathways. That might include citizen advisory boards, community model audits, or shared data stewardship initiatives. Finally, we need narrative infrastructure—ways to translate the insights of these dialogues into language that policymakers and technologists can act on. That might look like multimedia reports, interactive simulations, or immersive briefings that bridge emotional resonance with technical depth.

Finally, we need narrative infrastructure—ways to translate the insights of these dialogues into language that policymakers and technologists can act on. That might look like multimedia reports, interactive simulations, or immersive briefings that bridge emotional resonance with technical depth.

At a time when trust in AI is eroding and the consequences of misalignment are growing, it is not enough to design systems for the public. We must design them with the public. And that public must be as diverse, imaginative, and complex as the societies we serve.

Engaging non-traditional voices isn't a nod to inclusion. It is how we ensure that AI governance is credible, accountable, and future-ready.

Brittney Hannah is a data and AI strategist passionate about building responsible AI systems through cross-sector collaboration, innovative partnerships, and human-centered policy engagement.