

Accommodation Repricing

Disability, generative AI subscriptions, and the accessibility tax as a variable the vendor controls

The user did not change tiers. The tier changed around the user.

FIVE FORMS OF THE SAME EVENT

The access need is unchanged. The user's conduct is unchanged. What moved is a term set by a party the user cannot negotiate with.

The monthly price rises.

The capability moves from the tier the user is on to a tier above it.

A flat allowance becomes a metered credit.

The metered credit shrinks against an allowance the vendor has never published.

The capability leaves the consumer product entirely and is offered only through an enterprise agreement.

A disabled person who uses a commercial subscription to draft correspondence, transcribe speech, summarize an inaccessible document, or rehearse a difficult conversation is doing something the literature has now documented at length. What that literature has not described is what happens when the subscription changes.

THE CONTRIBUTION, IN ONE MOVE

From level to change. Everything else follows from it.

THE ACCESSIBILITY TAX LITERATURE

Names the direct and indirect financial costs disabled people pay because the surrounding environment is inaccessible, and has been extended to generative AI, where pricing models were found to create tiered accessibility: financial resources determine the quality of access support available. That is a level. It describes what a person can obtain at a given price at a given moment.

THE ABANDONMENT LITERATURE

Asks why access tools fall out of use, with categories consistent across three decades: the device performed poorly, it was a poor match, the person was not consulted, the person's needs changed, training was absent. Every one locates the cause in the artifact or in the user. None describes a supplier who changes the terms after the user has adapted.

THE JOIN

Accommodation repricing is a cost that moves, imposed by a party neither literature models, producing a loss of access that neither literature can classify. The first has the cost but treats it as static. The second has the loss but attributes it to the tool or the person.

A static tier is a barrier a person can assess before committing, and in principle decline. A moving tier is a barrier that arrives after the decision and after the switching costs have accumulated, at a moment when declining means giving up the accommodation.

III

What Is Established

ic;font-weight:400;color:#C6C8C3;margin-top:24px;max-width:1000px;">Widespread, necessary, and already named

A person who continues to use a tool they distrust, because the alternative is losing access, is not exercising consumer choice.

GENERATIVE AI IS IN USE AS ACCOMMODATION

The tools are mainstream commercial products, not devices dispensed through an assessment and funding pathway.

25 videos, 25 autistic creators

A digital coach, a communication assistant, and a conversational partner, with reported harm reduction, savings of time and energy, and facilitation of accommodations to inaccessible environments.

30 interviews, 18 analyzed

Distinct uses of commercially available chatbots mapped into nine broader categories, with writing and ideation the most common.

A multi-week diary study

Uses and prompting strategies characterized among neurodivergent individuals.

Autistic employees

Documented use for workplace and social communication.

Sustained users

Code switching, emotional regulation, and information access, with users reclaiming agency in systems that diminish their autonomy and self determination.

The same body of work has begun to ask what happens over time. One of these studies states plainly that very little is known about how disabled people use these systems over an extended period. That is the question this paper takes up, from the supply side.

THE RELIANCE IS NOT DISCRETIONARY

7 cross-disability focus groups.

20 participants, who voiced substantial skepticism and many of whom continued to use the technology out of necessity.

Where the technology is necessary for access or for safety, that necessity exposes disabled people to risks they would not otherwise accept.

This is the finding that converts a consumer product into an accommodation for analytic purposes.

The same study describes participants navigating tradeoffs through what accessible computing has named a consequence calculus, originally developed in work with chronically ill people. That concept describes a decision procedure a person runs. The accessibility tax describes a cost the person is charged. This paper extends the cost, and treats the procedure as the thing the cost is an input to. When the cost moves, the calculus is re-run on terms the person did not set.

THE VOCABULARY EXISTS

Two impositions, distinguished, and one of them already carried into generative AI.

THE DISABILITY TAX

Additional emotional and intellectual labor. The related term crip tax appears in academic use from 1999.

THE ACCESSIBILITY TAX

The direct and indirect financial costs of navigating environments and technologies built on an assumption of nondisability. Carried into generative AI, it was found to include financial costs, disclosure costs, and additional labor such as prompt engineering.

TIERED ACCESSIBILITY

Financial resources determine the quality of access a disabled user receives. That is the closest prior work to this paper's subject, and the foundation it builds on rather than a gap it fills.

What has not been described is the accessibility tax as a variable that moves. Tiered accessibility is a snapshot. Accommodation repricing is the derivative.

IV

The Supply Side, Stated Briefly

Bargain then ripoff, invest then harvest

For a disabled user the switching cost is not a retraining expense that can be amortized. It is the loss of an accommodation.

TWO REFINEMENTS THAT MATTER HERE

A reduction that is undetectable in principle from inside the product forecloses every response that depends on the user first perceiving it.

QUANTITY MOVES BEFORE PRICE DOES

Suppliers passing through cost increases prefer to reduce quantity rather than post a price increase, because consumers are measurably less sensitive to quantity reduction, a preference shown not to diminish with repeated exposure.

Applied to a metered digital product, the allowance can shrink without any published number changing, because in several cases no quantity term is published at all. Consumption is displayed as a proportion of an allowance whose absolute size the vendor has not disclosed and reserves the right to alter.

THE LITERATURE'S OWN STATED LIMIT

The switching cost literature has been explicit that it models small buyers as passive, nonstrategic price takers and does not address buyers able to act strategically. This population sits at the far end of that limitation.

Between 2023 and 2026 major vendors moved capabilities between tiers, replaced flat allowances with metered credits, reduced allowances without notifying subscribers already inside paid annual terms, introduced allowances whose size was not published, and suspended new subscriptions on capacity grounds.

For a disabled user the switching cost is not a retraining expense that can be amortized. It is the loss of an accommodation.



Three Positions

The protections attach to the category, and they do not travel

In the third position the disabled user is not a party to the transaction that removes the accommodation.

THREE POSITIONS, INCREASING EXPOSURE

The obligations attach to the category of assistive technology, and they do not travel with the function into the commercial category.

POSITION ONE

Prescribed assistive technology

An assessment, usually a funding pathway, an expectation of training, and a professional relationship responsible for the fit between person and device. Those obligations attach to the category, and they are the reason the category exists as an administrative object.

POSITION TWO

A consumer subscription

Terms of service, a price, and a right of unilateral amendment. An experience good whose value is unknown before purchase, sold on a subscription with a reserved right of amendment, to a buyer for whom the product is an accommodation, is a set of conditions under which the buyer bears essentially all of the risk.

POSITION THREE

A platform procured by an institution

The capability can be metered or withdrawn in a transaction the disabled user is not a party to at all. No notice right, no cancellation right, no refund, and no counterparty. They discover the change by finding that the feature is gone.

The migration from the first category to the second was described from inside occupational therapy before generative AI existed as a consumer product: as mainstream products came to meet needs that had previously required specialist products, the result was a spectrum of products decoupled from access to independent advice and support services.

THE THIRD POSITION, SHARPENED

The transaction that causes the loss occurs between the vendor and the institution. The disabled user is not a party to it.

Leverage

The absence of leverage is total rather than merely practical, because there is no contract to leverage.

Emerging educational technologies including artificial intelligence, automated assessment, and online proctoring have been taken up rapidly across higher education, often without sufficient critical examination of how they affect disabled students and faculty. Analysis of learning management systems, tutoring tools, and proctoring platforms shows that technologies which appear inclusive can simultaneously impose normative expectations and create new burdens.

Information

The asymmetry is complete, because the terms were never shown to the user at all. Enterprise and institutional pricing is generally unpublished, so even a documentary audit cannot see it from outside.

Substitution

The institutional deployment is frequently the reason no separate accommodation is in place. The feature inside the platform was the accommodation, and its presence is why no other arrangement was made.

A scoping review of 87 studies of generative AI in higher education identifies disability access as one of six equity dimensions running through the field, alongside the digital divide and socioeconomic stratification. Institutional acceptance varies by institution, which itself produces inequality in access and use. Work in this area has already recommended that institutions conduct technology review and vendor evaluation with disability in view. The commercial terms of supply, and the vendor's reserved right to alter them, belong on that list.

VI

Abandonment Without a Decision

What the taxonomies count, and what they cannot

Not one category describes an action taken by the supplier after the person began using the device.

THE FOUNDING STUDY

29.3%

abandonment across 227 users of assistive devices, with four factors significantly related to non-use.

A figure widely reported as approximately 30 percent is frequently attributed to a 2004 monograph that is a synthesis rather than a study. This paper uses the primary figure, and uses the four factors as evidence rather than as background.

Every category locates the cause in the artifact, in the matching process, or in the person.

- The user's opinion was not taken into account during selection.
- The device was easily obtained.
- The device performed poorly.
- The user's needs or priorities changed.

The most substantial recent catalogue in augmentative and alternative communication reports eight contributing factors, synthesized from a survey of 43 users and 68 professionals with in-depth interviews with 18 users: ease of use, reliability, technical support, voice and language, the decision making process, service delivery, family perceptions and staff training, and communication rate. Neither that list nor its design-perspective companion contains price. A complete reading finds no discussion of cost, funding, affordability, or purchase anywhere in its body.

THE OBJECTION, AND THE ANSWER

Cost is in the literature as a barrier to getting the thing. This is about what happens after you have it.

COST AT ACQUISITION

Devices are expensive, funding is limited, coverage is inconsistent, and people who need a device do not obtain one. A real and well documented harm, and a property the device has at the moment of the acquisition decision. It is a fact about whether the person can get the thing.

The gap is not an oversight. Abandonment research developed around durable devices with a one time acquisition and an ongoing service relationship. In that form the supplier's pricing decision is exhausted at the point of sale, so it appears in the taxonomy as an acquisition barrier and nowhere else. A subscription relocates that decision to a point after adoption and makes it recurring.

COST AFTER ADOPTION

The person acquired the tool, adapted to it, built work and communication practices around it, and then the supplier moved a term. The abandonment that follows is not a decision about fit and not a change in needs. It is a decision made elsewhere and delivered to them.

That is a reason to extend the taxonomy rather than to fault it. The proposed extension is minimal: a category for discontinued use attributable to a change in supplier terms, distinct from user decision and from device failure, and recorded against the supplier rather than against the person or the product.

VII

Objections

Four, treated here rather than deferred

The strongest objection must be conceded in part.

OBJECTION ONE, CONCEDED IN PART

The two accounts are complementary, and the second completes the first.

THE POWER ALREADY DESCRIBED

Institutional and interpersonal: service systems, gatekeeping, normative expectations about how disability should be performed, the cultures of the organizations through which devices are obtained. It is exercised by people and institutions in relationship with the disabled person, and the tactics of minor resistance are available precisely because those relationships are ongoing and negotiable at the margins.

THE POWER DESCRIBED HERE

Contractual and unilateral, exercised by a party with no relationship to the disabled person at all, through a term the person did not negotiate and in most cases never read. It is not exercised on the person; it is exercised on the product, and reaches the person through the product. There is no counterpart to minor resistance against a rate limit.

READ TOGETHER

That work asks accessibility design to lower the cost of choice. Accommodation repricing is a mechanism that raises the cost of choice, on a schedule the person does not control, after the choice has been made. The power aware account supplies the analytic move, and this paper supplies a source of power it does not cover.

OBJECTION TWO · DISABLED PEOPLE ADAPT, HACK, AND REFUSE

The one technology in the disabled person's life that is genuinely unalterable by them is the one that is not in their hands.

Every practice in the crip technoscience repertoire presupposes an artifact the user can get their hands on. Alteration, reinvention, tinkering, repair, hacking, workaround, and refusal all operate on something material and present. A wheelchair can be modified. A communication device can be reprogrammed, and its owner can decline to use it as the clinician intended.

A metered subscription is not that kind of object. The constraint is enforced remotely, by contract and by server, on infrastructure the user does not possess and cannot inspect. There is nothing to open. Where the allowance is expressed as a proportion of an undisclosed quantity, there is not even a number to reason about.

That is not a claim that disabled people are passive. It is a claim about a property of this specific product form. Refusal remains available, and non-use can be strategic. But refusal of an accommodation is a different act from refusal of a normative expectation, and the argument is precisely that the cost of that refusal is being set by someone else and moved upward without notice.

OBJECTIONS THREE AND FOUR

Technoableism explains the arrival. This paper takes up what happens next.

The counterfactual test

Suppose a vendor's presentation were beyond reproach: written by disabled people, free of every cure narrative, accurate about what the tool does, and explicit that it addresses an inaccessible environment rather than a deficient person. The harm described here is unchanged, because it consists in the accommodation sitting behind a meter that someone else controls and can move.

A narrower version of the objection is that existing evaluative instruments for educational technology already cover this ground. They do not. Those instruments evaluate what a technology does to disability as a category: whether it conserves disability as a valued form of human difference or normalizes it away. Those are questions about design and discourse. Accommodation repricing is a question about the commercial terms of supply, and a technology can score well on every design axis while being supplied on terms that permit its withdrawal next quarter.

Sequential, not competitive

If the governing assumption is that technology resolves disability and structural accessibility is secondary, then a market solution appears sufficient and the funded pathway is never built. That assumption is upstream, and it is a reason the accommodation ended up as a commercial subscription instead of an entitlement with obligations attached.

Why no new name

A new term must do work existing terms do not. Both ends of the mechanism are already named: the accessibility tax on the cost side, and invest-then-harvest on the supply side. Placing an established term at each end is stronger than a neologism at the middle, because both ends are independently verifiable.

Accommodation repricing is offered as a label for an event, not as a theory of a new form of oppression. It claims that a specific thing happens and invites the reader to check whether it does. It is meant to be checkable rather than defended.

WHO THE MECHANISM REACHES

Any measurement of harm taken from the subscriber base understates it by exactly the number of people the price has already excluded.

Already priced out

Disabled people priced out before the change occurred appear in no study of users, because they are not users.

A larger share of income

Where disability is associated with lower employment and lower income, an increase that is an inconvenience at one income is a cancellation at another, and an average will conceal the distribution.

Inside a procured platform

They hold no contract and therefore have no notice, no cancellation, and no remedy in the ordinary consumer sense.

Where the remedy fails

Notice obligations are the conventional answer to unilateral amendment. Notice by email, buried in a change log, or presented as a modal dialogue during a task does not reach a person whose executive function, attention, memory, or sensory access is the site of their disability.

That subclass should be treated as a design requirement rather than an edge case. Any remedy that depends on the user noticing something must specify how it reaches the people least able to notice, or it is not a remedy for them. The point compounds with the disclosure problem: where the quantity term is unpublished, there is nothing for even an attentive user to notice.

IX

The Audit

Measurable from public artifacts, without recruiting a participant

A claim about behavior that rests only on other people's literature is an assertion. The audit is what makes it checkable.

THE INSTRUMENT, AND WHY IT MEASURES SUPPLIERS

The user side question is saturated. The supply side has never been measured at all.

WHAT IS COLLECTED

Pricing pages, plan comparison tables, published allowance and rate limit documentation, terms of service, help documentation describing accessibility relevant capabilities, and changelogs, across the 2023 to 2026 window. Historical states are recovered from public web archives, so every observation carries a dated capture with a citable address.

The coding scheme records, per capability: what the capability is in access terms; which tier it sits in and at what price; whether the quantity term is published as an absolute number, as a proportion, not at all, or in a unit not commensurable with the preceding capture; whether a change was announced and through what surface; whether it reached subscribers already inside a paid term; whether any accessibility specific concession exists; and whether the capability remains available in any tier.

THREE OUTPUTS

A time series per capability showing tier position, price, and disclosure state, which is the empirical object neither literature has. A disclosure typology distinguishing published quantity terms from unpublished ones. And a notice typology recording which changes were announced, to whom, through what channel, and how far in advance.

It is also the ethically cheaper instrument. Establishing that a vendor moved a term requires reading the vendor's own pages. Establishing what that did to a disabled person requires asking them to narrate a loss they could not prevent, which is worth doing only when they can be compensated for the account.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS · ONE SURFACE, TWELVE QUARTERS

The price never moved. A study designed to detect price increases would have found nothing.

Q4 2023 to Q3 2026 The headline price of the individual paid tier was ten dollars per month at the first capture and ten dollars per month at the last.

Q2 2024 The paid tiers carried an explicit statement of unlimited messages and interactions.

Q3 2025 A metered unit had been introduced alongside that claim. The unlimited guarantee was narrowed to a single named model, and access to the current models was capped at 300 units per month on the same ten dollar tier, with additional units sold at four cents each.

Q3 2026 The metered unit was replaced altogether by a balance denominated in dollars, and the same tier carried fifteen dollars of monthly credit.

A user cannot determine from the two surfaces whether fifteen dollars of credit is more or less than 300 units of the previous kind, because the vendor did not publish a conversion and the unit of account changed. The comparison a person would need in order to notice a reduction is not available to them, and it is unavailable because of how the change was expressed rather than because the person failed to look.

A second observation concerns where the numbers live. At the final capture the plan comparison table describes the free tier's allowance as limited chat and agent usage, with no figure. The figure has not been deleted; a complete reading of the page finds it surviving in a footnote. This is recorded as a partial rather than a total withdrawal of disclosure, and the distinction matters. The claim is that a quantity moved off the surface where a person choosing between plans would encounter it.

SOURCES Gilly (2026), *Accommodation repricing audit* [Data set and code]. Capture index, coding scheme, and coded series deposited in full.

WHAT THE PASS SHOWS, AND WHAT IT CANNOT

None of it was announced as a price increase, because none of it was one.

A supplier holding customers with switching costs left the posted price untouched and adjusted the quantity behind it, which is the behavior the consumer economics literature describes, and then altered the unit in which that quantity was reported. For a general customer this is a pricing question. For a customer whose use of the product is an accommodation, each of those adjustments lands on a capability they have organized their working life around.

Stimulus, not response

It cannot establish how many disabled people lost access or what it cost them. It establishes only that the terms moved and how.

Archive bias

Restricted to vendors with archived public pricing surfaces, which biases toward larger firms in wealthier markets. Absence of a capture is not evidence of absence of a change.

The unpublished case

Enterprise and institutional pricing is largely unpublished, a particular limitation for the procured platform position, where the operative transaction is precisely the one not on a public page.

Vendors move

Two indexed surfaces ended abruptly in September 2025 and resumed within a week at a different domain, so an auditor who does not check for relocation will record a discontinued product where there was only a redirect.

THE DESIGN SPACE

Four directions, set out as a space rather than a recommendation.

Local execution

Where an access task does not require frontier capability, running it on the user's own hardware removes it from a meter entirely. The cost becomes a one time purchase and electricity, and the supplier loses the ability to reprice a capability the user already holds. This is also the one direction that restores the missing property, because a capability running on the user's own device is an artifact the user can get their hands on.

Notice and change obligations

Advance notice of price, tier, and quantity changes; published absolute quantity terms rather than proportions of undisclosed allowances; and protection of subscribers inside a paid term. Subject to the reaching problem, which any such obligation must address rather than assume away.

Portability

The accumulated context that makes a tool useful as an accommodation, including stored preferences, custom instructions, and history, is itself a switching cost. Making it exportable and importable reduces the cost of leaving and therefore reduces the supplier's ability to harvest.

Coverage and procurement

Extending assistive technology funding pathways to cover mainstream subscriptions where they serve an assistive function would restore the obligations the migration stripped away. In the procured platform position the lever sits with the institution: contractual continuity terms, notice to affected users rather than to the purchasing office alone, and inclusion of supply terms in vendor evaluation.

LIMITATIONS, AND WHAT WOULD DEFEAT THE CLAIM

A taxonomy that includes supplier initiated change in terms as a category would defeat this.

The conceptual claim

It rests on an argument about what two literatures do and do not contain, and is falsifiable by counterexample. The two examined here contain no such category, but the literature is large and the claim is stated about those two.

No causal claim

This paper does not establish that any disabled person has lost an accommodation because of a pricing change. It establishes that the conditions for that loss exist, that the exposed population has been documented as dependent, and that no existing taxonomy would record the loss correctly if it occurred.

A label, not a construct

Accommodation repricing has not been validated and has no established measurement properties. It should be judged on whether it makes a real phenomenon easier to see and to check. The pricing record used as background is also drawn from a period of unusual volatility in one industry.

Extending the audit answers the absence of any supply side time series. Coding the remaining indexed surfaces across both vendor classes would convert a demonstration into a prevalence estimate, and requires no participants.

A prospective cohort through an announced pricing change would answer the causal gap: recruited before the change, access practices documented in advance, followed through, in co-design with disabled researchers and with participants compensated. It should be attempted only where compensation is funded.

THE FINDING

A harm that no existing instrument can register is a harm that will be counted as nothing.

When the accommodation is a commercial subscription, the price, the metered quantity, and the capability are all terms the supplier may move after the user has reorganized around them. The protections that would attach to the same function delivered as prescribed assistive technology do not travel with the function into the commercial category.

The abandonment literature, which exists to explain why access tools fall out of use, attributes that loss to the artifact, to the match, or to the person, and has no category for a loss produced by a supplier decision made after adoption. Where the capability is embedded in a platform procured by an institution, the disabled user is not even a party to the transaction that removes it, and the transaction itself is not published.

Naming the event is the modest part of the contribution. The substantive part is that the loss it produces is currently unrecordable: not visible as an accessibility tax, because that concept describes a standing cost, and not visible as abandonment, because that concept describes a user decision. This one is arriving on a schedule set by someone other than the people it lands on.

References

Travis Gilly, *Accommodation Repricing*, working paper, August 2026 (v0.7). Complete list of 33 entries, in the order the paper gives it, across 3 slides.

- Çakır, M. (2021). Retail pass-through of package downsizing. *Agribusiness*, 38(2), 259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21724>
- Farrell, J., & Klemperer, P. (2007). Coordination and lock-in: Competition with switching costs and network effects. In M. Armstrong & R. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial Organization* (Vol. 3, pp. 1967-2072). Elsevier.
- Foley, A., & Ferri, B. A. (2012). Technology for people, not disabilities: Ensuring access and inclusion. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(4), 192-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01230.x>
- Foley, A., & Ferri, B. A. (2026). DISCO-Tech: A framework for resisting ableism in emerging technologies. *Teachers College Record*, 128(3), 166-194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681261444567>
- Foley, A., & Melese, F. (2025). Disabling AI: Power, exclusion, and disability. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2025.2519482>
- Glazko, K., Lewis, A., Kosa, B., et al. (2025). Autoethnographic insights from neurodivergent GAI "power users." In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713670>
- Gourville, J. T., & Koehler, J. J. (2004). *Downsizing price increases: A greater sensitivity to price than quantity in consumer markets* (Working Paper). Harvard Business School. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.559482>
- Kim, I. K. (2023). Consumers' preference for downsizing over package price increases. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 33(1), 25-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12548>
- Gilly, T. (2026). *Accommodation repricing audit* [Data set and code]. Real Safety AI Foundation. <https://github.com/princesshobbes/accommodation-repricing-audit>
- Hamraie, A., & Fritsch, K. (2019). Crip technoscience manifesto. *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, 5(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.28968/cftt.v5i1.29607>
- Ho, K., Hogan, J., & Scott Morton, F. (2017). The impact of consumer inattention on insurer pricing in the Medicare Part D program. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 48(4), 877-905.
- Hsueh, S., Van Dusen, D., & Caspi, A. (2025). Minor resistance: The everyday politics and power dynamics of assistive technology adoption. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663547.3746465>

References, continued

- Jang, J., Moharana, S., & Carrington, P. (2024). "It's the only thing I can trust": Envisioning large language model use by autistic workers for communication assistance. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642894>
- Johnson, J., Lewis, A., Mankoff, J., & Banner, O. (2026). "I don't trust it, but I use it": Navigating trust, privacy, and identity in disabled people's use of generative AI. In *Proceedings of the 2026 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-17). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3772318.3790652>
- Jones, C. T., Rice, C., & Lam, M. (2021). Toward TechnoAccess: A narrative review of disabled and aging experiences of using technology to access the arts. *Technology in Society*, 65, 101537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101537>
- Judge, S., & Townend, G. (2013). Perceptions of the design of voice output communication aids. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 48(4), 366-381.
- Klemperer, P. (1987). Markets with consumer switching costs. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 102(2), 375-394.
- Klemperer, P. (1995). Competition when consumers have switching costs. *Review of Economic Studies*, 62(4), 515-539.
- Mullen, K., Xue, W., & Kudumu, M. (2024). "I'm treating it kind of like a diary": Characterizing how users with disabilities use AI chatbots. In *Proceedings of the 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Article 133, 7 pp.). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663548.3688549>
- Lewis, T., & Yildirim, H. (2005). Managing switching costs in multiperiod procurements with strategic buyers. *International Economic Review*, 46(4), 1233-1269.
- Mack, K., Martinez, J. J., & Lewis, A. (2025). Modeling accessibility: Characterizing what we mean by "accessible." In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663547.3746344>
- Mack, K., McDonnell, E. J., & Findlater, L. (2022). Chronically under-addressed: Considerations for HCI accessibility practice with chronically ill people. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517428.3544803>

References, concluded

- McNally, K., Wright, K., & Goldkind, L. (2024). Disability expertise and large language models: A qualitative study of autistic TikTok creators' use of ChatGPT. *Social Media + Society*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051241279549>
- Ni, W., & Li, J. C. (2026). Mapping the impact of generative AI in higher education: A scoping review of psychological and equity dimensions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1856854>
- Olsen, S. H., Cork, S. J., & Anders, P. (2022). The disability tax and the accessibility tax. *Including Disability*, (1), 51-86. <https://doi.org/10.51357/id.vi.1170>
- Orellano-Colón, E. M., Mann, W. C., & Rivero-Méndez, M. (2015). Hispanic older adults' perceptions of personal, contextual and technology-related barriers for using assistive technology devices. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*, 3(4), 676-686.
- Phillips, B., & Zhao, H. (1993). Predictors of assistive technology abandonment. *Assistive Technology*, 5(1), 36-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400435.1993.10132205>
- Rauchberg, J. S. (2022). Imagining a neuroqueer technoscience. *Studies in Social Justice*, 16(2), 370-388. <https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v16i2.3415>
- Shew, A. (2023). *Against technoableism: Rethinking who needs improvement*. W. W. Norton.
- Steel, E., Buchanan, R., & Layton, N. (2017). Currency and competence of occupational therapists and consumers with rapidly changing technology. *Occupational Therapy International*, 2017, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/5612843>
- Tang, X., Lin, T., & Li, J. (2026). Crippling AI: Reimagining AI through lived disability experiences. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3805689.3806744>
- Xue, W., Kudumu, M., Sriram, S., Mullen, K., Boyd, A., & Gadiraju, V. (2025). Characterizing uses and prompting strategies of LLM-based chatbots among neurodivergent individuals. In *Proceedings of the 27th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663547.3759721>
- Waller, A. (2019). Telling tales: Unlocking the potential of AAC technologies. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 54(2), 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12449>