How Do Disabled Visual Artists Use GenAI Tools for Business Administration Tasks?

Jayne Hayward
HCI Research Centre, Department of Computer Science
Birmingham City University
Birmingham, United Kingdom
jayne.hayward@mail.bcu.ac.uk

Beatrice Vincenzi
HCI Research Centre, Department of Computer Science
Birmingham City University
Birmingham, United Kingdom
beatrice.vincenzi@bcu.ac.uk

Christina Karpodini
HCI Research Centre, Department of Computer Science
Birmingham City University
Birmingham, United Kingdom
christina.karpodini@mail.bcu.ac.uk

Arthur Theil
HCI Research Centre, Department of Computer Science
Birmingham City University
Birmingham, United Kingdom
arthur.theil@bcu.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper investigates how disabled visual artists use GenAI tools to manage administrative and business tasks essential to sustaining creative careers. Whilst previous research has focused on GenAI's role emerging in artistic work, our study highlights its potential in supporting non-creative aspects of artistic practice, which are often overlooked yet critical for workload management of disabled artists. Through in-depth semi-structured interviews with 5 disabled visual artists, we explore the perceived benefits and barriers of using GenAI, particularly in terms of accessibility, cognitive demands, ethical concerns, and financial constraints. Our findings suggest that whilst GenAI can increase productivity, reduce cognitive load, and promote equity, it also presents challenges related to transparency, bias, interface complexity, and job displacement fears. We conclude by calling for more inclusive and affordable GenAI tools, improved accessible interfaces, ethical governance, and personalised support to enable disabled creatives in their professional practices.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing, Accessibility**; • **Computing methodologies, Artificial intelligence**;

Keywords

Generative Artificial Intelligence, Accessibility, Creative Work, Assistive Technology, Disabled Workers, Art Business, Disability Employment Gap

ACM Reference Format:
Jayne Hayward, Beatrice Vincenzi, Christina Karpodini, and Arthur Theil. 2025. How Do Disabled Visual Artists Use GenAI Tools for Business Administration Tasks?. In *The 27th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS '25), October 26–29, 2025, Denver, CO, USA*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3663547.3759708

ASSETS '25, Denver, CO, USA

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0676-9/2025/10
https://doi.org/10.1145/3663547.3759708

1 Introduction and related work

Whilst there is a growing body of research investigating the perceptions around the use of Generative AI (GenAI) tools for supporting creative work amongst disabled artists [1–10], we currently lack a comprehensive understanding of how disabled visual artists use GenAI tools for non-creative work, such as administrative and business-related tasks. Disabled individuals comprise nearly a quarter of the United Kingdom's working-age population, yet they hold only 13.3% of filled jobs in 2023 in the creative industries according to the Department of Culture, Media, and Sports [11]. Within the visual arts sector, these disparities are exacerbated by precarious work, lack of institutional support, and systemic barriers in accessing opportunities [12]. This disability employment gap in the visual arts sector reveals significant barriers, including inaccessible workflows, limited accommodations, and inadequate access to assistive technologies designed for creative practices [14].

Furthermore, disabled visual artists may face elevated risks of precarious employment, isolation, and workforce attrition, which are worsened by the sector's reliance on freelance and contract-based work [13]. As a result, valuable talent is lost, and disabled artists continue to face significant barriers to employment and opportunities across the creative industries. We argue that administrative and business tasks such as marketing, opportunity-seeking, finances, and managing communications, are essential for sustaining a creative career, but often require time, energy, and resources that are particularly scarce for disabled artists. Whilst assistive technologies have been explored to support creative access [14–16], there is limited research on how emerging generative AI (GenAI) tools can support the non-creative, yet critical, aspects of artistic practice. GenAI adoption is rapidly increasing worldwide; specifically, in the UK, 14% of the workforce use such tools and most report productivity gains [17, 18]. However, concerns persist regarding bias, accessibility, and the ethical implications of AI systems, especially for marginalised groups [19–23]. Disabled artists, whose experiences are shaped by both creative and administrative demands, offer a unique perspective on the promise and pitfalls of GenAI. This study aims to address the following questions: (i)

Table 1: Interview Participants

Participant	Disability(ies)	Creative Discipline	Professional Experience	Age	Education	Country
P1	ADHD, Fibromyalgia, Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	Textile, Digital Paintings	4-7 years	24-34	University level	USA
P2	Epilepsy	Filmmaking	4-7 years	24-34	Postgraduate University level	UK
P3	Autism, ADHD, Dyslexia	Digital Art, 3D Modelling	1-3 years	18-23	University level	UK
P4	Autism, ADHD, Connective Tissue Disorder	Digital Art, Fine Art, Game Design	8-15 years	18-23	University level	UK
P5	Profound Deafness	UX/UI Designer	8-15 years	35-44	Postgraduate University level	UK

how do disabled visual artists use GenAI tools for administrative and business tasks? (ii) what benefits and challenges do they encounter? (iii) how do their perceptions and experiences inform recommendations for accessible GenAI design? To answer these research questions, we adopted a qualitative approach through semi-structured interviews. Our first-hand findings provide an initial understanding of GenAI's role in the business administration practices of disabled visual artists, highlighting areas that need attention and revealing personal experiences that could inform the design and improvement of current tools.

2 METHODS

We conducted a qualitative study, using in-depth semi-structured interviews and reflexive thematic analysis [24]. We recruited adults who self-identified as disabled visual artists across various disciplines. Additionally, we were looking for people who have been active or seeking employment in the visual arts, and have some experience with or awareness of GenAI tools. Table 1 illustrates the participants who took part in the study, including a diverse range of disabled experiences and creative disciplines: textile, digital arts (e.g., paintings, fine art, and 3D modelling), filmmaking, game design and UX design. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, primarily online via Microsoft Teams, and one interview was conducted in-person. Interviews aimed to explore participants' experiences, perceptions, and challenges regarding the use or non-use of generative AI tools for administrative and business tasks, with a focus on understanding both the benefits and barriers these technologies present in supporting their creative careers.

Through reflexive thematic analysis [24], combining a priori and emergent coding, was used to identify key themes regarding GenAI use, benefits, challenges, and ethical concerns. First, we familiarised ourselves with the data by reading through each transcript. Using Nvivo, we started coding transcripts starting with an initial set of codes from our research questions, objectives, and our prior knowledge on the subject (e.g., workload management, equity and fairness, ethical concerns, cost, AI biases, accessibility, etc.) but we were receptive for new codes to emerge from the data. Multiple iterations and refining of the codes were necessary to help with categorisation, and understanding of the data whilst referring back to the research questions and objectives.

3 INTERVIEW FINDINGS

3.1 GenAI Tool Use Cases: Perceived Benefits and Accessibility Challenges

3.1.1 Perceived Benefits: Most participants (P1, P4, P5) shared having good familiarity of GenAI tools, with one participant (P5) who feels very familiar and P3 who instead reports not having familiarity with these tools. Participants who use GenAI rely on AI chatbots (i.e., ChatGPT and Perplexity AI) for writing, structuring content, idea generation, and administrative tasks like CV building, marketing, and overcoming creative blocks. Image generation tools (e.g., Canva Magic Design, DALL-E), AI-powered assistants (Trello AI), and writing assistants (Grammarly) also feature in their workflows. According to interviews, GenAI tools helped manage workload and energy for those with cognitive and physical disabilities. For example, one participant described how breaking down large tasks into *"bite size chunks"*, that is, manageable steps using AI, aligns with their ADHD-related needs. Another participant stated that GenAI helped to *"prompt the brain to interconnect to other things as well"*, assisting them in mapping different elements to their business such as tracking vendors, materials, dates, and events.

Additionally, P1 referenced to *"Spoon Theory"* [25] to describe how GenAI reduces the energy cost of administrative work, allowing them to accomplish more. P1 described how people with chronic conditions have limited energy for daily tasks and how *"AI gives an opportunity"* to make tasks less energy demanding, allowing the person to *"get further in a task, or get more done in a day then they would have"*, enabling some to *"complete more goals and aspirations that they have without it completely draining their physical and emotional tank"*. Lack of awareness and insufficient training/support were key reasons for non-use. P3 shared that *"...the main problem is we need to learn how to use it (GenAI)"*, creating a learning burden for the user. Participants proposed a more personalised,

one-to-one assistance and clearer onboarding to facilitate adoption. Overall GenAI tools were seen as levelling the playing field, offering disabled visual artists greater parity with non-disabled peers by streamlining time-consuming or cognitively demanding tasks. However, participants were also highly concerned about the use of GenAI, in particular they expressed this tension between use and non-use of GenAI because of ethical, accessibility, environmental, and cost considerations.

3.1.2 Interface Complexity and Cognitive Load. Some GenAI tools (e.g., Canva Magic Design) were described as visually overwhelming, requiring significant time and effort to learn, which was deemed as challenging for neurodiverse users with ADHD. On the other hand, GenAI tools with straightforward language and clear hyperlinking (e.g., Perplexity AI) were preferred for their ease of use. The user interface of Canva Magic Design was described by P1 as *"the most convoluted one"* they had used, noting it was chaotic in design. P1 required additional time to understand the tool's capabilities. Perplexity AI was also reported by P5 to have a *"difficult interface"*, which would generate *"fast lines"* of text in a confusing format containing *"different words paragraphs"* that were overwhelming. The same participant found the Grammarly mobile application interface helpful, as it acted as an overlay on the mobile screen. Overall, participants highlighted the lack compatibility of GenAI tools with alternative input methods (e.g., eye tracking, switch control), limiting access for users with physical disabilities.

3.1.3 Language and Modality Barriers. A D/deaf participant (P5) experienced friction with text-based interfaces, especially where British Sign Language (BSL) grammar diverges from English. The lack of sign language translation or accessible video content was a notable gap. P5 recommended features like in-line BSL translation and improved captioning for video content. Similarly, P3 reported that specificity is necessary in their prompt writing during an *"execution piece"*, whereby they were initially unable to obtain the results they wanted without specific formatting of the prompt, and they obtained no feedback on how to solve the problem within ChatGPT. Additionally, P3 would also have to change the complexity of any text output when using it for writing tasks, as their lexicon would not be congruent with the tone of the AI. This was not directly reported as impactful for this particular participant, but it was noted that their initial barriers of learning the platform-appropriate inputs were of some significance, as they stated *"it wouldn't work"* and *"if you don't know the commands, it wouldn't do what you wanted it to do"*.

3.2 Ethical Concerns and Attitudinal Barriers

3.2.1 Transparency, Copyright, and Data Privacy. All participants, regardless of GenAI usage, expressed concerns about the lack of transparency in AI training data, the potential copyright infringement in the arts, and the insufficient user control over personal, and business data. There was a strong desire for clear disclosure regarding how business data is used, the implementation of opt-in consent mechanisms, and the establishment governmental regulations. In particular, 3 participants (2 of which use GenAI tools), expressed concerns about copyright and intellectual property. For instance, P1 was concerned about their data being *"used to feed their AI models"* by companies which led them to *"avoid certain AI"*. Additionally, P4 was against GenAI tools due to the idea of using the data of other creators for their own benefit *"without consent"* and described this as *"art theft"*. In this respect, P4 suggested a *"copyright scanner [...] an algorithm to detect copyrighted work"*. P5 reported distrust toward of the legitimacy of the numerous GenAI applications available on the mobile app markets, stating they did not *"trust app developers"* with their data. Transparency was also mentioned in relation to companies not being explicit with their intentions of user data; *"clearly stating"* what the user is *"signing up for"* versus *"not saying anything about it"* was echoed by P1. In terms of regulating AI tools, P4 emphasised their awareness of the lack of current regulations within the UK for GenAI, which influenced their inclination to resist the use of any GenAI tool for now. Additionally, P1 highlighted concerns and awareness of AI system bias, noting that it can *"become biased towards certain things"* due to the self-iterative, limited, and specific training data.

3.2.2 Job Displacement, Over-reliance on AI, and Loss of Voice. Some participants expressed concerns that the widespread adoption of GenAI tools could result in the displacement of administrative workers, foster over-reliance or loss of personality on these tools, potentially diminishing critical thinking and creative or business skills. However, others, whilst acknowledging these risks, prioritised the immediate benefits of accessibility and enhanced productivity. Job replacement concerns were reported by 2 participants: P3 had limited concerns that did not affect their use of GenAI, but were aware of *"using it to replace people"*. P4 expressed that whilst job security is at risk, the difference of a *"human touch"* will always be important. However, they did not believe that companies would have any qualms of reducing costs by utilising AI in favour of hiring workers, stating *"...if it does too good a job, businesses may go: I don't want to work with you. I'll just work with your AI"*, and *"you run a slippery slope of the more that we integrate it into everyday lives, the less we become necessary as artists, as people who work in admin"*. Additionally, P2 was concerned about the *"loss of voice"* when using GenAI tools for writing proposals, as these types of tasks would *"always need to inject some of your own personality and way of writing into that"*.

3.2.3 Personal Cost, Access and Environmental Impact: Subscription costs and credit limits for GenAI tools were cited as barriers, particularly for artists on limited incomes. Participants advocated for affordable or consolidated access to essential tools. For instance, P1 stated *"you have to pay $30.00 a month, the upkeep of that cost is a little excessive [...] [their partner] pay for 5 separate accounts"* due to the amount of credits/prompts they are limited to per account. P4 pointed out the environmental impact where GenAI have detrimental effects, a view that was also echoed by another disabled artist who shared their refusal of GenAI tools.

4 discussion, future work, and conclusion

4.1 Potential Benefits of GenAI Tools for Disabled Visual Artists

Our first-hand findings suggest that GenAI tools have the potential to significantly benefit disabled artists by helping manage limited

energy resources (referencing Spoon Theory) [25], manage workload and increase workflow efficiency, and reduce administrative burden. Whilst concerns regarding data privacy and copyright issues exist [26–30], GenAI tools demonstrate a promising pathway for increasing workplace equity and professional sustainability for disabled visual artists according to our participants.

4.2 Relevance and Accessibility of GenAI Tools

GenAI tools were mostly considered relevant to the participant's administrative and business tasks, as well as usage for image creation that supported their ideation and marketing processes. Participants with cognitive and physical disabilities experienced both benefits and could see the positive aspects of using GenAI tools. One participant held contradicting views on GenAI expressing whilst they struggle with organisation and management tasks due to their ADHD, noting that GenAI tools would be helpful for them, they did not feel the tools would be relevant within the game design industry due to the portfolio and networking being the focus. There is also the case of using GenAI tools for creating a portfolio and acquiring feedback, managing time to create one, obtaining advice on how to structure one's work, getting advice on how to approach agencies to find work or companies; as well as researching companies and artists. Tasks such as these take time and effort which many disabled visual artists may not have the capacity for. An AI powered search engine or Chatbot may help one find supportive strategies or information, or an AI powered assistant may assist with time management and analyse the user's strengths and weaknesses [31].

4.3 Ethical Considerations and Attitudes towards GenAI Tools

Within the interviews, the lack of ethical considerations of generative AI companies was found to be a prominent theme. Most participants are concerned with how their business data, and the data of other artists are being used. Their stance on GenAI tool use varies in what they deem as acceptable, and continue to use these tools to achieve their career tasks and goals. Job replacement was a topic of concern held by the minority to varying effect. There is a strong aversion to GenAI and how companies may incorporate these tools to replace jobs. This may lead to extensive job displacement that would lead to an increasing sense of helplessness amongst the disabled visual art community [32, 33].

4.4 Future work and conclusion

Future work could expand this study by involving a larger and more diverse group of disabled artists, including participants from different social and cultural contexts, and by exploring the impact of local legislation and support structures on GenAI adoption and accessibility for art-based businesses. This could inform both GenAI development and future policy to better support disabled artists. Our study reveals that GenAI tools hold considerable promise for supporting disabled visual artists with essential business and administrative tasks by reducing workload and increasing efficiency. Participants highlighted how GenAI alleviates cognitive and energy burdens, but also raised concerns about its current accessibility, ethical implications, and potential job displacement in the arts. Addressing these issues could enhance the use of future generation GenAI tools as ubiquitous assistive tools, enabling more inclusive participation in the creative industries.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all interview participants for their valuable insights and contributions to the research.

References

[1] Seonghee Lee, Maho Kohga, Steve Landau, Sile O'Modhrain, and Hari Subramonyam. 2024. AltCanvas: A Tile-Based Editor for Visual Content Creation with Generative AI for Blind or Visually Impaired People. In Proceedings of the 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS '24). ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 70, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1145/3663548.3675600

[2] Maitraye Das, Alexander J. Fiannaca, Meredith Ringel Morris, Shaun K. Kane, and Cynthia L. Bennett. 2024. From Provenance to Aberrations: Image Creator and Screen Reader User Perspectives on Alt Text for AI-Generated Images. In Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 900, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642325~

[3] Shu-Jung Han and Susan R. Fussell. 2025. Understanding User Perceptions and the Role of AI Image Generators in Image Creation Workflows. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 547, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713227Shu-Jung Han and Susan R. Fussell. 2025. Understanding User Perceptions and the Role of AI Image Generators in Image Creation Workflows. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 547, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713227~

[4] Kelly Avery Mack, Rida Qadri, Remi Denton, Shaun K. Kane, and Cynthia L. Bennett. 2024. "They only care to show us the wheelchair": disability representation in text-to-image AI models. In Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 288, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642166~

[5] Puneet Jain and Chris Lloyd Salter. 2025. "Can I use my mouth to navigate in VR?": Integrating Mouth Gestures in XR with (and for) Disabled Artists through Criptastic Hacking. In Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 652, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3706677

[6] Kate S Glazko, Mina Huh, Jazette Johnson, Amy Pavel, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2025. Generative AI and Accessibility Workshop: Surfacing Opportunities and Risks. In Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 783, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3706734~

[7] Ayaka Tsutsui, Kengo Tanaka, Yaman Yu, and Bektur Ryskeldiev. 2025. "I Am a Blind Seller!": Picture Taking Assistance for Visually Impaired Individuals for Participation as Sellers in Customer to Customer (C2C) Marketplaces. In Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 10, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3720150~

[8] Arlindo Gomes, Cristiana Soares, Francisco Simões, and Walter Correia. 2019. Art accessibility for blind people: a process to create and understand photography. In Proceedings of the 18th Brazilian Symposium on Human Factors in Computing Systems (IHC '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 13, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1145/3357155.3358456~

[9] Youjin Choi, JaeYoung Moon, JinYoung Yoo, and Jin-Hyuk Hong. 2025. Exploring the Potential of Music Generative AI for Music-Making by Deaf and Hard of Hearing People. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 762, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714298~

[10] Harry H. Jiang, Lauren Brown, Jessica Cheng, Mehtab Khan, Abhishek Gupta, Deja Workman, Alex Hanna, Johnathan Flowers, and Timnit Gebru. 2023. AI Art and its Impact on Artists. In Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 363–374. https://doi.org/10.1145/3600211.3604681~

[11] Department of Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS). 2024. Economic Estimates: Employment in the DCMS sectors, January 2022 to December 2022.

[12] House of Lords Library. 2025. Creative industries: Growth, jobs and productivity.

[13] Amy Genders. 2022. Precarious work and creative placemaking: Freelance labour in Bristol. *Cultural Trends*, *31*(5), 433-447.

[14] Chris Creed. 2018. Assistive technology for disabled visual artists: exploring the impact of digital technologies on artistic practice. *Disability & Society*, *33*(7), 1103-1119.

[15] Chris Creed. 2016. Assistive tools for disability arts: collaborative experiences in working with disabled artists and stakeholders. *Journal of Assistive Technologies*, *10*(2), 121-129.

[16] Dragan Ahmetovic, Nahyun Kwon, Uran Oh, Cristian Bernareggi, and Sergio Mascetti. 2021. Touch Screen Exploration of Visual Artwork for Blind People. In Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021 (WWW '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2781–2791. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442381.3449871

[17] Han Qiao, Jo Vermeulen, George Fitzmaurice, and Justin Matejka. 2025. To Use or Not to Use: Impatience and Overreliance When Using Generative AI Productivity Support Tools. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1122, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714103

[18] Minoli Perera, Swamy Ananthanarayan, Cagatay Goncu, and Kim Marriott. 2025. The Sky is the Limit: Understanding How Generative AI can Enhance Screen Reader Users' Experience with Productivity Applications. In Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1165, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713634

[19] Kate Glazko, Yusuf Mohammed, Ben Kosa, Venkatesh Potluri, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2024. Identifying and Improving Disability Bias in GPT-Based Resume Screening. In Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 687–700. https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658933

[20] Vinitha Gadiraju, Shaun Kane, Sunipa Dev, Alex Taylor, Ding Wang, Remi Denton, and Robin Brewer. 2023. "I wouldn't say offensive but...": Disability-Centered Perspectives on Large Language Models. In Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3593989

[21] Jennifer Mankoff, Devva Kasnitz, L. Jean Camp, Jonathan Lazar, and Harry Hochheiser. 2024. AI Must Be Anti-Ableist and Accessible. Commun. ACM 67, 12 (December 2024), 40–42. https://doi.org/10.1145/3662731

[22] Cynthia L. Bennett and Os Keyes. 2020. What is the point of fairness? disability, AI and the complexity of justice. SIGACCESS Access. Comput., 125, Article 5 (October 2019), 1 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3386296.3386301

[23] Maarten Buyl, Christina Cociancig, Cristina Frattone, and Nele Roekens. 2022. Tackling Algorithmic Disability Discrimination in the Hiring Process: An Ethical, Legal and Technical Analysis. In Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1071–1082. https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533169

[24] Victoria Clarke and Virginia Braun. 2014. Thematic analysis. *Encyclopedia of critical psychology*. Springer, New York, NY. 1947-1952.

[25] Christine Miserandino. 2017. The spoon theory. *Beginning with disability*. Routledge, 2017. 169-172.

[26] Haonan Zhong, Jiamin Chang, Ziyue Yang, Tingmin Wu, Pathum Chamikara Mahawaga Arachchige, Chehara Pathmabandu, and Minhui Xue. 2023. Copyright Protection and Accountability of Generative AI: Attack, Watermarking and Attribution. In Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (WWW '23 Companion). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 94–98. https://doi.org/10.1145/3543873.3587321

[27] Pamela Samuelson. 2020. AI authorship? Commun. ACM 63, 7 (July 2020), 20–22. https://doi.org/10.1145/3401718

[28] Pamela Samuelson. 2023. Legal Challenges to Generative AI, Part I. Commun. ACM 66, 7 (July 2023), 20–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3597151

[29] Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Himabindu Lakkaraju, and Nazneen Rajani. 2023. Generative AI meets Responsible AI: Practical Challenges and Opportunities. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 5805–5806. https://doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599557

[30] Sarah L. Woodin and Arthur Theil. 2021. Regulating Personal Cameras for Disabled People and People with Deafblindness: Implications for HCI and Accessible Computing. In Proceedings of the 23rd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 39, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1145/3441852.3476471

[31] Marlon Dumas, Fabiana Fournier, Lior Limonad, Andrea Marrella, Marco Montali, Jana-Rebecca Rehse, Rafael Accorsi, Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Dirk Fahland, Avigdor Gal, Marcello La Rosa, Hagen Völzer, and Ingo Weber. 2023. AI-augmented Business Process Management Systems: A Research Manifesto. ACM Trans. Manage. Inf. Syst. 14, 1, Article 11 (March 2023), 19 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3576047

[32] Ricardo Baeza-Yates. 2022. Ethical Challenges in AI. In Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1145/3488560.3498370

[33] Awni Rawashdeh. 2025. The consequences of artificial intelligence: an investigation into the impact of AI on job displacement in accounting. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management* 16.3 (2025): 506-535.