Bridging Barriers to Digital Accessibility: An Opportunity for Technical Editors

Julian Luck
Portland State University

Bridging Barriers to Digital Accessibility: An Opportunity for Technical Editors

Julian Luck

Abstract

Digital content is overwhelmingly inaccessible across the web, and web accessibility is a particularly wicked problem. Technical editors with accessibility specializations serve as a part of the solution, however, the market for these professionals is emerging and poorly understood. The purpose of this research is to explore this emerging market and determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for these editors. Considering the limited body of knowledge surrounding this market, I utilize a variety of diverse web resources including peer-reviewed journal publications, blogs, forums, and trusted web accessibility resources and organizations. The findings, contextualized by my identity as a disabled editor specializing in this field, include strengths in the freelance economy, professional certifications and resources, editorial training and skill, and community; opportunities include job growth and education; weaknesses include low visibility for editors; and threats include challenges faced by disabled editors, accessibility overlays, legal risks, and editorial rates. This research is not exhaustive, and is one of the first in its field. Further research is needed to explore gaps within the market and rapidly changing factors such as accessibility legislation and the impact of tools such as generative artificial intelligence.

Disability in the Digital Space

Up to one in four adults (27%) in the United States have some type of disability (CDC 2023), and this number is expected to increase as the population continues to trend majority older (Beshay 2024). Despite this percentage, the majority of web content remains inaccessible to people with disability. A 2016 survey found that 86% of disabled users face difficulties accessing web content even when using assistive technologies such as screen readers (Williams and Brownlow 2016). This metric is unsurprising, as 95.9% of the top one million home pages on the web have one or more detected accessibility conformance failures (WebAIM 2024).

The World Wide Web Consortium's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) is the most established standard for global digital accessibility. On April 24, 2024, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) ruled to revise the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to require compliance from federal and private agencies to the WCAG version 2.1 Levels A and AA, a win for accessibility advocates everywhere (USDOJ 2024). Prior to this ruling, the ADA required web content to be accessible but stated no official standard, and the WCAG had only been adhered to imperfectly by federal agencies, if at all by private agencies. Due to the low compliance rates, retrofitting necessary content for accessibility is likely to be a significant feat for these entities moving forward. In addition, by not defining a standard the legislation encouraged ambiguity and misinformation to impede any significant improvements to overall web accessibility (Wentz et al. 2011). Finally, both public and private entities are often not legally impacted by web accessibility noncompliance due to loopholes in the legislative framework, further complicating this already complex problem (Wentz et al. 2011).

Technical Editors as a Solution?

Web content needs to be made accessible to people with disability, and legislation finally reinforces this need, but the question remains: **who is going to do the work?** Technical editors that specialize in accessibility serve as a potential answer, but the market for these professionals is emerging and poorly understood. Technical editors generally prepare documents with a range of topics and edit for clarity, grammar, format, style, and more. Beyond editing, technical editors are experts in communication, and many of them subject-matter experts. The work of a technical editor often includes formatting web-based documents to adhere to accessibility standards provided by the WCAG, but many accessibility specialists enter into this field from the world of web design and user experience, while others are self-taught through fulfilling requests for accommodations or in order to avoid legal repercussions within their workplace. Fewer generalist editors pursue specializations in accessibility, and despite educators pushing to incorporate more accessibility training into technical editing pedagogy, digital accessibility is not commonly taught in technical editing programs (Bennett et al. 2021; Clem and Cheek 2022).

The purpose of this research is to explore this emerging market and determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats faced by editors with accessibility specializations. By gaining a nuanced understanding of this market, my goal is to uncover effective strategies for editors in this sector to navigate challenges and leverage strategic opportunities, especially for emerging professionals. The ramifications of this analysis extend beyond the technical editing niche and across nearly every industry, as every industry is impacted by inaccessibility. With this research, I hope to demystify this field and encourage editors—especially those who experience disability themselves—to use their unique capabilities to access and become leaders within this field.

Defining Accessibility, Barriers, and Standards

This research draws from the social model of disability, which states that "disability" is a result of the environment creating barriers, rather than the disability itself (Olkin 2002). In the context of this research, the web content itself is what creates a barrier: "Like usability, accessibility is a quality—in this case, it means how easily and effectively a product or service can be accessed and used…disability is a conflict between someone's functional capability and the world we have constructed. In this social view of disability, it is the *product* that creates the barrier, not the *person*…" (Horton and Quesenbery 2014, 3).

Some examples of digital content features that can cause barriers include small fonts, confusing or inflexible layouts, complex or jargon-heavy language, reliance on mouse usage to interact with the content, low color contrast, and images without alternative textual descriptions. While these features mainly impact those with disability, improving digital accessibility generates more robust content and creates a better user experience for all. After all, "…disability is a universal human experience and a matter of degree" (WHO 2020).

Accessibility standards defined by the WCAG aim to promote the equity of technical documents to accommodate a range of abilities in interacting with and making sense of web material (Web Accessibility Initiative 2024). These guidelines are built upon the four guiding principles of accessibility known by the acronym POUR: perceivable, operable, understandable, and robust. The success criteria for these guidelines are also organized into three levels of conformance that meet the needs of different users: A (lowest), AA (midrange), and AAA (highest or best practice). The WCAG was most recently updated to version 2.2, but the DOJ ruling will only require version 2.1 levels A and AA, with level AAA not legally required but suggested.

The "Burden" of Accessibility

The ADA has made significant contributions to web accessibility that have improved the lives of many Americans with disability, but legislation cannot solve this problem alone. Covered entities, both public and private, are able to claim "fundamental alteration" or "undue burden" under ADA law if the nature of the web content would be fundamentally altered by remediation, or if a particular component of the web content would be significantly difficult or expensive to remediate (Wentz et al. 2011). Educational institutions and corporations are known to frequently argue these claims to avoid compliance (Kanayama 2003; Lazar and Jaeger 2022) and the recent DOJ ruling does not amend this legislative loophole.

Retrofitting or building accessible versions of existing content also requires considerable time and resources. This reality, combined with claims of undue burden, often places the responsibility on the user to submit feedback and request accommodations to inaccessible content (Wentz et al. 2011). This remedial approach can be partly explained by long held and inaccurate assumptions that accessible content sacrifices aesthetics or only serves a small percentage of users, among various other claims (Kanayama 2003). When accommodations are met, usually long after they were requested, the remediated versions are frequently out of date or have fewer features and capabilities than the original (Wentz et al. 2011). These attitudes illuminate the complexity of digital accessibility, but also the gap that technical editors with accessibility specializations could fill.

Methodology

SWOT Analysis and Search Criteria

A Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis is a tool that systematically assesses internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as external opportunities and threats of a particular business or market. In this context, a SWOT analysis was performed on the market for technical editors with accessibility specializations using the search method expanded upon below.

Google searches served as the primary method for gathering information on technical editors, accessibility trends, and accessibility resources available for the public. The Portland State University library database (library.pdx.edu) was also utilized to find relevant articles and literature surrounding technical editing practices, pedagogical perspectives, and market trends. As articles were reviewed for relevant information, notes were taken that would later make up the four sections of this SWOT analysis. Within each section, collected ideas are expanded upon and contextualized by my own experience as a disabled editor and by the testimonies of other editors found through sources such as blogs and forums.

Search queries included "inclusive technical editing", "inclusive editing businesses", "inclusive technical editing businesses", "accessible technical editing", "accessibility technical editing", "accessibility technical editing freelance", "accessibility technical editing businesses", "accessibility-focused technical editing", "accessibility editor", and "disabled editor". Searches were conducted between October 1, 2023, and May 1, 2024, with a focus on retrieving information from diverse sources. Only the first page of Google search results was systematically reviewed, and relevant content was explored or used to better specify search terms. Articles on both Google and the library database would often lead to other relevant articles or sources, which

were then explored haphazardly. Credibility and relevance assessments were made for each source, considering factors such as authorship, publication date, and the authority of the hosting website. Articles were organized using Zotero.

As this research is emerging, peer-reviewed articles were explored alongside blogs, news articles, Reddit, freelance portfolios, LinkedIn, and other sources that offered personal testimony from both disabled and non-disabled experts. In part, this research relies as much on the limited body of academic research as it does the experience and perspectives of accessibility professionals currently in this field.

Limitations and Subjectivity

There may be inherent limitations due to the nature of Google searches, including potential bias in search results and the inability to access certain types of information. Similarly, I only took into consideration the articles which seemed relevant to my research, and may have missed important information in articles or search results that were not reviewed.

This research is by no means exhaustive. It is also crucial to acknowledge that certain components of this study draw from my personal understanding and experience of disability. My experience with exclusionary practices, compounded with my own identity as a disabled individual, introduces a level of bias and subjectivity to this research. However, my personal experience and understanding also adds a layer of nuance and depth. While this study incorporates established methodologies, my insights are intended to provide a complementary and unique layer of understanding to the overall research process, as well as provide context and encouragement for more disabled technical editors to explore this field. Despite these limitations, this research provides relevant insights for the technical editing industry and a starting point for future research that may expand upon these topics.

Strengths

Growth in the Freelance Economy

One strength of this market is the ongoing growth of the freelance economy. The editorial economy in general has been moving toward a freelance majority (Harpur and Blanck 2020; Sannon and Cosley 2022), and highly specialized editors are being sought out for freelance technical editing services more often than they are hired into roles or as retainers. Several reasons for this shift in the market exist (Harpur and Blanck 2020; Sannon and Cosley 2022), but a few include affordability, as companies will only have to pay the editor's rate and not benefits or fees associated with having an employee; companies can seek out highly specialized editors for specialized tasks and projects, better serving their audience or clientele; and post-COVID-19 attitudes have prompted an overall workforce shift from in-person to remote. In addition, freelance or "gig" work is an ideal source of income for many of those who have a disability: in my own experience as a disabled person, working a fulltime, nine-to-five job comes with barriers that are particularly contingent to burnout. When performing freelance work, disabled editors have more flexibility with working hours, workload, workspace, and even social interactions that may be rigid in a traditional working environment.

Robust Professional Certifications and Resources

Another strength identified within this market are the professional certifications and resources available to editors aiming to specialize in accessibility. The International Association of Accessibility Professionals (IAAP) is a membership-based organization that supports professionals in accessibility work and offers five professional certifications, including the Certified Professional in Accessibility Core Competencies (CPACC), Web Accessibility

Specialist (WAS), Certified Professional in Web Accessibility (CPWA), Accessible Document Specialist (ADS), and Certified Professional in Accessible Built Environments (CPABE) certifications. For those in this field, these certifications can be lucrative—the CPACC certification, which is the most general of the five, has only around 3,600 active certification holders in the world. Some of the more specialized certifications offered, such as the ADS, only have around 147 active certification holders in the world. Though these certifications require specialized knowledge, hands-on experience, training, and commitment to obtaining continuing education credits to remain certified, they provide a way to credential oneself and stand out in the current market.

The resources available for technical editors in this field are also plenty. Open-source tools such as bookmarklets, free screen readers and assistive technology tools such as NVDA, the PDF Accessibility Checker PAC 2024, and the e-book accessibility checker Ace by DAISY are all free to access or download via the web. A plethora of regular webinars and events offer additional free training to those looking to pursue the field. Once these editors become situated in the field, many employ paid remediation tools such as CommonLook or axesPDF, while others explore paid training programs to support greater work efficiency, but the cost to entry is relatively low if professionals are self-taught.

Editorial Training and Skill

Though many accessibility professionals enter the field through web design, those that enter the field after becoming editors have a unique advantage. Technical editing programs prepare the editor well for accessibility work: the emphasis on grammar, syntax, and format—all of which can cause accessibility concerns—are prominent in technical editing and even

copyediting programs. Professional programs also train editors to employ empathy when communicating with stakeholders and suggesting edits, which is crucial for accessibility work.

Editorial frameworks have recently shifted to include more feminist and social-justice-based principles, acknowledging the importance of how editors shape our current language and thus our cultural ideas (Colton and Holmes 2018; Jones 2016). As language shapers, technical editors have a unique vantage point to both advocate for accessibility and edit out ableist language that may exist within technical documentation. Since editors are needed in nearly every field, the impact of this work could be significant.

In addition, there are skills that may be enhanced by disabilities and advantage disabled editors seeking to enter this editorial profession. A dyslexic editor on the subreddit r/Dyslexia summarizes this well: "Often people think I am joking when I say I am a dyslexic editor. But I honestly think it has made me a better editor. Partly because I question everything, and that's important for editing. Partly because dyslexia has made me hyper-aware of connotation and other word subtleties." (Reddit 2022).

Community

Finally, the professional community of accessibility specialists is small but mighty, which is a particularly important strength. Although the community can be difficult to access unless you have an entry point such as a professional connection to someone in the field, there exists a vibrant Slack channel (A11y Slack), podcasts (e.g. Chax Chat), Facebook pages, meetup sites, and regular events for those in the field to connect, share, and learn together. In addition to the expansive peer support network that exists, other organizations have begun to emerge such as Disability in Publishing, a developing nonprofit organization that offers events, professional networking, resources, and a space to find and build community with other disabled publishing

professionals. Accessibility specialists also commonly experience disability themselves, or have close friends or family that experience disability. These individuals can understand the unique barriers that disabled people face and are often therefore rooted in a collective vision of disability justice and worldwide universal design.

Opportunities

Job Growth

The results related to job growth or decline in this field were limited. A 2021 article in the Wall Street Journal details a recent increase in job postings for accessibility roles, noting that the number of job listings with "accessibility" in the title had grown 78% that past year (Alcántara 2021). Despite the rise in job postings, an overall lack of professionals exists within this field, especially those who are skilled as both editors and accessibility specialists.

A 2021 WebAIM survey that examined web accessibility personnel also presents interesting findings: first, the survey found that web accessibility personnel tend to be older, with the majority of respondents over the age of forty-five, while only 13.1% were under the age of thirty (WebAIM 2021). As the survey highlights, the impact felt on the field will be large as older professionals begin to retire, leaving important jobs unfilled, which will contribute to a lack of accessibility support for a majority aging population in the United States. Second, the survey indicated that only 2.7% of respondents were non-binary, genderqueer, or gender non-conforming, and only 29.1% were disabled (WebAIM 2021). This signals a need and an opportunity for more diverse professionals to enter this field, especially those that are younger, disabled, and gender diverse. This survey did not include race as a category, though I might speculate that this industry is likely majority white, similar to the editorial industry as a whole.

Racial data in the next iteration of this survey would provide a more robust understanding of gaps and opportunities for growth within this industry.

With the recent DOJ ruling and legislation occurring across the globe in support of greater web accessibility, more businesses and organizations may opt for creating "born accessible" content—that is, the idea that web content is accessible from the moment it is published (Wentz et al. 2011). Retrofitting for accessibility after web content is already published can be time consuming and costly, and often difficult to complete, whereas creating web content that is born accessible can save businesses money, time, and potential legal repercussions (Wentz et al. 2011). These motivations may create new opportunities for technical editors with accessibility specializations to find work as businesses begin to feel the legal pressure to comply with the WCAG. Overall, this research suggests that this field is rapidly growing, and there exists many opportunities for a diverse body of professionals to enter into the profession.

Accessibility Education

Despite the strengths of current technical and professional editing programs, they are lacking when it comes to actually training editors for accessibility work (Clem and Cheek 2022; Jones 2016). Of the programs that do exist to train editors to do accessibility work, they tend to be lengthy, costly, intensive, or a combination of the three. Most accessibility work requires additional certifications outside of a four-year degree, making this field less accessible to many—although certifications from IAAP are not necessary, those with additional certifications and training beyond a four-year degree are more likely to be successful in their careers and to perform adequate remediation work.

Many educators are pushing for this to change by building updated models for technical editing pedagogy based on social justice and feminist theories (Clem and Cheek 2022; Jones 2016), and some professional and technical writing programs and colleges do offer digital accessibility courses, such as Portland State University. Companies that offer accessibility tools and services will often also offer affordable training or courses, such as the Deque University program offered by Deque, a web remediation and digital accessibility service company. There exists an opportunity for digital accessibility education to improve, which would serve emerging professionals in this field.

Weaknesses

Low Visibility for Editors

There is a lack of visibility for freelance editors that specialize in accessibility. Although the Editorial Freelancers Association has a member directory, multiple searches for different accessibility keywords returned only two editors from the directory with skill in accessibility work (one returned with general skill in "accessibility" and one with "508 compliance"). Editors may also be present on the A11y Slack channel, but there is no way to search for individual users or determine whether they are trained editors unless the user self indicates via a post. Similarly, no unified space or association exists for technical editors that specialize in accessibility to share their qualifications. The most comprehensive directory exists on the IAAP website, which lists those who hold accessibility certifications, but those seeking accessibility services with little knowledge of the field may not know that this directory exists.

Google searches for technical editors with accessibility specializations returned similarly weak results. Though some freelancers were found, the majority of those found held profiles on

LinkedIn or Reedsy, neither of which serve as platforms with good visibility. These platforms also rely heavily on search engine optimization (SEO), so editors that lack descriptions optimized for SEO are at a disadvantage. Additionally, no editors were found that were not freelancers.

Threats

Barriers for Disabled Editors

A large threat within this market applies directly to editors that also experience disability themselves. Disabled workers face many barriers in traditional working environments, and editorial roles are no exception. For example, an autistic editor may find difficulty with managing social relationships with clients despite their expert editorial skill, while editors with low or limited vision may require specialized software to complete tasks that are not provided by their workplace. Even after receiving accommodations, disabled editors must perform a significant amount of "invisible work," where the process of navigating assistive technology or disability to complete work can add additional time or complexity to a job that non-disabled editors do not face (Das et al. 2019). Disabled editors are also up against non-disabled editors in a highly competitive market, and covert and overt hiring discrimination is persistent. Unsurprisingly, relevant industries support this sentiment by reporting a staggeringly low number of disabled editors; for example, the Lee and Low 2023 Diversity Baseline Survey found that only 18.9% of the publishing industry's editorial workers are disabled (Lee and Low Books 2024).

Although freelance editorial work may alleviate some of the barriers faced in traditional working environments, there also exist threats for disabled freelance editors. In a study on the

risks and opportunities for disabled "gig" workers, Sannon and Cosley (2022) found that some disabled freelancers find difficulties with the work itself, such as when managing rigid deadlines set by clients while simultaneously managing their disability(s). Due to slower working times, some disabled freelancers may feel compelled to work for reduced rates despite their experience or training (Sannon and Cosley 2022). Sannon and Cosley (2022) also point out weaknesses that exist within editorial freelance platforms, such as sites like Upwork and Reedsy. In order to find work on these sites, users must first create a profile and then secure high ratings in order to compete with other freelancers for clients. The lengthy process of building one's rating can hinder job mobility and limit freelancers to staying on one site instead of pursuing alternative platforms and potentially better rates. In addition, editorial freelancers on Upwork and Reedsy are notoriously known to offer extremely low rates, which devalue the profession and harm editors everywhere.

Many disabled people also hold intersecting identities that magnify barriers within their roles and limit visibility in the market. For example, a disabled white woman is more likely to get consistent freelance work than a disabled Black woman due to prominent racial bias within the editorial industry (Lee and Low Books 2024). Identities such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, and appearance may compound with disability to further disadvantage these editors. Though new resources such as editorial lists specific for editors of color are emerging, there still exists a gap in the number of disabled editors of color, or disabled editors who identify outside the gender binary, versus white, cisgender, and non-disabled editors (Lee and Low Books 2024).

Editorial work also requires a significant amount of mental labor, especially when the editor specializes in accessibility. Technical documents can contain harmful biases, complex language, or haphazard organizational structures that are emotionally draining and time

consuming to remediate. Editors must also attune to the emotions of their clientele, the content of the documents themselves, and be experts in avoiding burnout. The emotional labor required for editorial roles may prove difficult for some disabled editors with particular emotional or psychological needs, such as editors with neurodiversity or print disabilities, especially if the editor lacks necessary support.

Finally, while disabled editors are a rising body of professionals, many editors don't have the lived experience or expertise to do accessibility work adequately. Accessibility work can be done by non-disabled professionals with enough training, but no amount of training can contend with the lived experience of disability in creating nuanced accessible content. The aforementioned Lee and Low 2024 survey results signal a need and market opportunity for more disabled representation in publishing and other communications professions. People with disability should be leading this field due to their unique capabilities and expertise informed by lived experiences.

Accessibility Overlays and Other Legal Risks

Lawsuits against companies that are noncompliant with accessibility standards are at an all-time high, and many are filed against repeat offenders. Web accessibility consultancy firm UsableNet found in their 2023 year-end report that there were more than 4,600 lawsuits filed in 2023, and over 700 of them were against companies that had a previous ADA digital lawsuit (UsableNet 2023). Upcoming compliance deadlines enforced by the recent updates to the ADA will likely accelerate lawsuits in the coming years.

Accessibility overlays—a paid software tool that aims to fix web content accessibility concerns—have emerged following compliance lawsuits and the need to retrofit inaccessible content. Despite their rise in popularity, accessibility overlays are overwhelmingly shunned by

professionals in the field, and many have actively spoken out against their use on public platforms (Feingold 2021). Advocates against overlays claim that they do not actually fix the underlying accessibility issues within the web content's coding, that they often interfere with existing assistive technologies, and that they have not been shown to protect businesses from lawsuits (Feingold 2021). The UsableNet report supports this last claim, finding that "over 900 companies with an accessibility widget or overlay on their website received a lawsuit in 2023" (UsableNet 2023).

In response, overlay companies have begun to file lawsuits against those that speak out against them. Advocates are asserting that these lawsuits are SLAPP lawsuits, otherwise known as a Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (Feingold 2021). This global phenomenon has affected both companies and individuals alike (Feingold 2021). For example, FACIL'iti, a global company based in France that sells and licenses overlays, sued web designer and web accessibility consultant Julie Moynat for speaking out against FACIL'iti publicly on X (previously Twitter) in 2021 (Feingold 2021). As of December 9, 2023, the lawsuit is still ongoing (Moynat 2023). In December 2023, FACIL'iti also sued French digital accessibility company Koena for speaking out against overlays on the same platform, and Koena was ultimately fined 26,256 euros (over $28,000) and ordered to remove the posts (Feingold 2021).

Beyond using or speaking out against overlays, accessibility professionals can also face legal repercussions if the remediation work that they have done is not compliant with the WCAG. If an editor works to remediate a company's website but makes a mistake on one key accessibility component, and that company is then sued for noncompliance, the editor can also face legal repercussions. Freelance editors may face barriers to building solid contracts that protect them from mistakes within their work, and changing website themes and WCAG

guidelines can further complicate the process of maintaining compliance. Emerging professionals looking to join this field, especially those within freelance roles, should be aware of the legal risks and take early action with comprehensive contracts and protections before completing any work.

Unclear Editorial Rates

Editorial rates are well defined by the Editorial Freelancers Association's Editorial Rates chart, including rates for technical editing services (Editorial Freelancers Association 2024). Conversely, rates for technical editors that specialize in providing accessibility services such as document remediation lack a clearly defined standard. The Editorial Freelancers Association does have a rate suggested for "Other Editing" ($48.75–$62.50 per hour), which includes "508 accessibility" and "plain language editing" at the bottom of their Editorial Rate chart. I reached out to the Editorial Freelancers Association for more information on editorial rates for technical editors specializing in accessibility, but I received no email response. In addition, I have not found this rate to be well supported by professionals in the field: members of the A11y Slack channel have begun to circulate a document with self-reported rates and salaries which would suggest that the Editorial Freelancers Association rates are outdated. This document details that digital accessibility specialists currently make anywhere from $65 to $150 per hour, depending on the responsibilities within their role. This suggests that the work constitutes greater pay, and that this field can potentially be a lucrative career. However, with the lack of standardized rates, editors may face their work being undervalued. The salary document is not listed as a resource due to maintaining these professionals' confidentiality, but interested individuals may contact me for access.

Generative AI and Other Considerations

Some businesses and editors have begun to use Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT 4 to generate captions, alternative text for images, and check for grammar mistakes, among other uses. Specific programs like Grammarly are also widely marketed as replacing the need for an editor and maximizing workplace efficiency. Despite the buzz around these tools, experts across many fields agree that GenAI will not fully replace a human editor, and that these tools may even be inappropriate or harmful in certain situations (Bennett et al. 2021; Cerézo 2023; Kaebnick et al. 2023; Nuñez 2023). For example, Bennett et al. (2021) in their article on image descriptions and representation found that GenAI image descriptions are not trustworthy and may even introduce bias or harm to disabled users. Further research is needed to explore the impacts or potential uses of GenAI in accessibility work.

Technical editors with specializations in accessibility face a range of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. There is an overwhelming need for more editors that specialize in accessibility, especially those with diverse identities and abilities. Future research may wish to expand upon the subtleties within this market or on the complexities that GenAI may introduce in this field, however, this market is characterized by more strengths and opportunities than weaknesses and threats. Overall, the extensive professional training opportunities, disabled user demand, intensifying legal requirements, social responsibility, and editors' unique capabilities for empathy and compassion ripen this emerging career market and necessitate technical editors to explore specializations in accessibility.

Bibliography

Alcántara, Ann-Marie. “More Companies Are Looking to Hire Accessibility Specialists.” *The Wall Street Journal*, September 1, 2021. https://www.wsj.com/articles/more-companies-are-looking-to-hire-accessibility-specialists-11630501200.

Bennett, Cynthia L., Cole Gleason, Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Jeffrey P. Bigham, Anhong Guo, and Alexandra To. 2021. “It’s Complicated”: Negotiating Accessibility and (Mis)Representation in Image Descriptions of Race, Gender, and Disability. *In Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI ’21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 375, 19 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3411764.3445498

Beshay. “U.S. Centenarian Population Is Projected to Quadruple Over The Next 30 Years.” *Pew Research Center*, April 14, 2024. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/01/09/us-centenarian-population-is-projected-to-quadruple-over-the-next-30-years/#:~:text=There%20are%20currently%20roughly%2062,estimated%2023%25%20of%20the%20population.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. Disability and Health Data System [Internet]. Updated May 15, 2023. Available from: http://dhds.cdc.gov

Cerézo, Arvyn. “Will AI Threaten Publishing Jobs?” Book Riot, June 16, 2023. https://bookriot.com/ai-and-publishing-jobs/.

Clem, Sam, and Ryan Cheek. “Unjust Revisions: A Social Justice Framework for Technical Editing.” *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 65, no. 1 (March 1, 2022): 135–50. https://doi.org/10.1109/tpc.2021.3137666.

Colton, Jared Sterling, and Steve Holmes. “A Social Justice Theory of Active Equality for Technical Communication.” *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 48, no. 1 (May 3, 2016): 4–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616647803.

Das, Maitraye, Darren Gergle, and Anne Marie Piper. “‘It Doesn’t Win You Friends.’” *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 3, no. CSCW (November 7, 2019): 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359293.

Editorial Freelancers Association. “Editorial Rates - Editorial Freelancers Association,” April 12, 2024. https://www.the-efa.org/rates/.

Feingold, Lainey. “Legal Update: Accessibility Overlay Edition.” Law Office of Lainey Feingold. Originally published November 3, 2021, updated on December 7, 2023. https://www.lflegal.com/2021/11/overlay-legal-update/#article-updates.

Harpur, Paul, and Peter Blanck. “Gig Workers With Disabilities: Opportunities, Challenges, and Regulatory Response.” Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation 30, no. 4 (November 4, 2020): 511–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-020-09937-4.

Horton, Sarah, and Whitney Quesenbery. A Web for Everyone: Designing Accessible User Experiences. Rosenfeld Media, 2014.

Jones, Natasha N. “The Technical Communicator as Advocate.” Journal of Technical Writing and Communication 46, no. 3 (April 11, 2016): 342–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616639472.

Kaebnick, Gregory E., David Christopher Magnus, Audiey Kao, Mohammad Hosseini, David Resnik, Veljko Dubljević, Christy Rentmeester, Bert Gordijn, and Mark J. Cherry. “Editors’ Statement on the Responsible Use of Generative AI Technologies in Scholarly Journal Publishing.” Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy 26, no. 4 (December 1, 2023): 499–503. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-023-10176-6.

Kanayama, Tomoko. “Leaving It up to the Industry: People With Disabilities and the Telecommunications Act of 1996.” *The Information Society* 19, no. 2 (April 1, 2003): 185–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240309456.

Lazar, Jonathan, and Paul Jaeger. “Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People With Disabilities.” Issues in Science and Technology, July 1, 2022. https://issues.org/lazar-online-internet-access-people-with-disabilities/.

Lee and Low Books. “WHERE IS THE DIVERSITY IN PUBLISHING? THE 2023 DIVERSITY BASELINE SURVEY RESULTS.” Lee & Low Blog, March 19, 2024. https://blog.leeandlow.com/2024/02/28/2023diversitybaselinesurvey/.

Moynat, Julie. “Help for My Lawyer’s Fees in the FACIL’iti Lawsuit Against Me.” La Lutine Du Web, December 9, 2023. https://www.lalutineduweb.fr/en/help-lawyer-fees-faciliti-lawsuit/.

Nuñez, Michael. “Letter from the editor: How generative AI is shaping the future of journalism and our newsroom.” Venture Beat, May 2, 2023. https://venturebeat.com/ai/letter-from-the-editor-how-generative-ai-is-shaping-the-future-of-journalism-and-our-newsroom/.

Olkin, Rhoda. “Could You Hold the Door for Me? Including Disability in Diversity.” *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology* 8, no. 2 (January 1, 2002): 130–37. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.8.2.130.

Reddit. "Anyone else here an editor?." [deleted], February 28, 2022. https://www.reddit.com/r/Dyslexia/comments/t3ncr5/anyone_else_here_an_editor/.

Sannon, Shruti, and Dan Cosley. “Toward a More Inclusive Gig Economy: Risks and Opportunities for Workers With Disabilities.” *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6, no. CSCW2 (November 7, 2022): 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1145/3555755.

United States Department of Justice [USDOJ]. “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability; Accessibility of Web Information and Services of State and Local Government Entities.” Federal Register, April 24, 2024. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/24/2024-07758/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-disability-accessibility-of-web-information-and-services-of-state.

UsableNet. “2023 ADA Digital Accessibility Lawsuit Report.” UsableNet, 2023. https://info.usablenet.com/thank-you-2023-end-of-year-report-on-digital-accessibility-lawsuits?submissionGuid=99d1d998-1c8e-4ccd-9c9a-58295b3c5b9c.

Vision Australia. “What Is Print Disability,” n.d. https://www.visionaustralia.org/business-consulting/print-accessibility/what-is-print-disability#:~:text=A%20print%20disability%20is%20a,Parkinson's%20disease%2C%20arthritis%20or%20paralysis.

Web Accessibility Initiative. “WCAG 2 Overview.” Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI), March 7, 2024. https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/.

WebAIM. “Survey of Web Accessibility Practitioners #3 Results,” January 26, 2021. https://webaim.org/projects/practitionersurvey3/.

WebAIM. The WebAIM Million: The 2024 report on the accessibility of the top 1,000,000 home pages. March 28, 2024 https://webaim.org/projects/million/

Wentz, Brian, Paul T. Jaeger, and Jonathan Lazar. “Retrofitting Accessibility: The Legal Inequality of After-the-fact Online Access for Persons With Disabilities in the United States.” First Monday, November 5, 2011. https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v16i11.3666.

Williams, Rick, and Steve Brownlow. “The Click-Away Pound Report 2016.” *Click-Away Pound*. Freeney Williams Ltd / Click-Away Surveys Ltd, December 1, 2016. https://www.clickawaypound.com/cap16finalreport.html.

World Health Organization [WHO]. “Disability: People With Disability Vs Persons With Disabilities,” December 7, 2020. https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/people-with-disability-vs-persons-with-disabilities.