

1           **Generative AI for Teachers with Vision Impairments in the Global South: A**  
2           **Bridge Too Far?**

3  
4           MANOHAR SWAMINATHAN, Microsoft Research, India  
5  
6           TARINI NAIK, Microsoft Research, India  
7

8           Multimodal generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) offers new affordances for inclusive education, particularly for children with  
9           vision impairments (CVIs), by enabling alternate representations that align with non-visual mental models. While GenAI tools are  
10          rapidly reshaping mainstream educational practices worldwide, their design and deployment often presume a digitally literate, sighted  
11          teaching workforce and well-resourced institutional contexts. In this paper, we address a critical gap in HCI and accessibility research:  
12          the near-total absence of empirical studies on teachers with vision impairments (TVIs), who play a central pedagogical role in schools  
13          for the blind across the Global South. Through in-depth interviews with 15 TVIs in Karnataka and a nationwide survey of 105 TVIs  
14          across 15 Indian states, we surface the everyday teaching practices, technological aspirations, and systemic constraints that shape  
15          their engagement with digital technologies, including GenAI. Our findings reveal a disjunction between the potential of GenAI and  
16          the readiness of the institutional and infrastructural ecosystem in which TVIs operate. We document pervasive challenges, including  
17          limited access to devices and connectivity, insufficient training, resistance from school management, and entrenched barriers to STEM  
18          education, while also highlighting sites of resilience, innovation, and professional commitment. This study advances the HCI discourse  
19          by centering disabled educators as key agents in the design of accessible educational futures. We argue that realizing GenAI's inclusive  
20          potential requires moving beyond assistive technology retrofits toward co-designed, contextually grounded systems that respond to  
21          the lived realities of TVIs in the Global South.  
22  
23

24  
25           **CCS Concepts**

- 26           • **Human-centered computing → Empirical studies in accessibility; Empirical studies in HCI.**  
27

28  
29           Additional Key Words and Phrases: Accessibility, Education, Vision Impairment, Generative AI, Global South, Teachers, Inclusive  
30          Design  
31

32           **ACM Reference Format:**

33           Manohar Swaminathan and Tarini Naik. 2026. Generative AI for Teachers with Vision Impairments in the Global South: A Bridge Too  
34          Far?. 1, 1 (January 2026), 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>  
35

36           **1 Introduction**

37           Recent developments in generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), especially concerning large language models (LLMs)  
38          and their multimodal functionalities, have resulted in a widespread emergence of tools applicable across various fields  
39          including education, accessibility, and communication. As scalable systems capable of processing and generating text,  
40          audio, image, and video have materialized, GenAI now presents significant opportunities for transforming the ways  
41          42

---

43           Authors' Contact Information: Manohar Swaminathan, Microsoft Research, Bangalore, Karnataka, India, manohar.swaminathan@microsoft.com; Tarini  
44          Naik, Microsoft Research, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India, tarininaik.design@gmail.com.

45           Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not  
46          made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components  
47          of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on  
48          servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

49           © 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

50           Manuscript submitted to ACM

51  
52           Manuscript submitted to ACM

53 individuals learn, instruct, and engage with information across different languages, formats, and settings. Within  
 54 the educational sphere, GenAI is experiencing rapid adoption as developers and scholars investigate its potential to  
 55 deliver adaptive, customized, and expandable learning solutions across all educational stages—from preschool through  
 56 adult education and continuous learning. Although mainstream discussions acknowledge valid concerns regarding  
 57 misinformation, fairness, and over-reliance, a substantial portion of the conversation remains hopeful, emphasizing  
 58 technologies that can function as smart tutors, evaluation aids, or innovative partners. Nevertheless, as these innovations  
 59 continue to influence education's trajectory, important questions emerge regarding whose needs are being addressed  
 60 and whose are being overlooked. The potential of GenAI to promote inclusivity remains predominantly theoretical for  
 61 people with disabilities (PWDs), notwithstanding some early encouraging implementations. For example, applications  
 62 like Be My AI, which employs image description technology driven by multimodal LLMs, have offered blind and  
 63 low-vision individuals an extraordinary level of autonomy in routine activities. Nevertheless, a substantial void exists in  
 64 investigating how GenAI could address more intricate, context-specific educational requirements, especially for children  
 65 with vision impairments (CVIs) and teachers with vision impairments (TVIs). Our emphasis in this research centers on  
 66 a crucial but insufficiently studied stakeholder population in accessible education: TVIs employed in Indian schools  
 67 for the blind. This population occupies an essential intermediary position in determining the educational possibilities  
 68 available to CVIs, yet has garnered scant attention in previous research on assistive technology, inclusive teaching  
 69 practices, or HCI for accessibility.

70 India is home to the world's largest population of CVIs [1, 6]. These children often study in resource-constrained  
 71 residential schools for the blind, which differ significantly from inclusive or mainstream education environments.  
 72 Teachers, many of whom are themselves blind or low-vision, often manage multi-grade classrooms with minimal  
 73 support and limited access to infrastructure, teaching materials, or digital tools. The conditions of these schools have  
 74 been further exacerbated by historical patterns of technological exclusion, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic,  
 75 when CVIs across the country experienced significant learning loss due to the inaccessibility of online education  
 76 systems.

77 Despite the central role of teachers in these settings, there is little empirical work examining their pedagogical  
 78 practices, technological aspirations, or lived experiences with computing. Existing literature on technology integration  
 79 in Indian classrooms rarely includes special schools, and even less so the experiences of TVIs. Research on disability  
 80 and assistive technology in the Global South similarly continues to be sparse, often failing to engage with the material,  
 81 infrastructural, and sociocultural realities that shape the design and deployment of technology for marginalized users.

82 In this work, we position TVIs in schools for the blind in India as critical agents in the broader effort to make GenAI  
 83 and computing technologies more inclusive and locally relevant. Our study investigates both the readiness and the  
 84 capacity of TVIs to adopt GenAI technologies, and the socio-technical constraints that shape this potential. We ground  
 85 our investigation in the following research questions:

- 86 • **RQ1: What is the readiness of TVIs, and their capacity to leverage computing technologies—including  
 87 GenAI—to enhance their effectiveness as teachers in schools for the blind?**
- 88 • **RQ2: What are the barriers and opportunities in the school environment and the broader socio-  
 89 technical context that influence their ability to integrate such technologies into their teaching  
 90 practice?**

91 By foregrounding the perspectives of TVIs in India, our work contributes to a growing body of HCI4D and accessible  
 92 computing scholarship that calls for inclusive, situated, and participatory approaches to technology design. We argue that  
 93 Manuscript submitted to ACM

105 without proactive efforts to center the voices of educators with disabilities—particularly in the Global South—emerging  
106 educational technologies risk reproducing longstanding patterns of exclusion, rather than dismantling them.  
107

## 108 **2 Related Work**

### 110 **2.1 AI in Education**

112 GenAI's educational potential has attracted significant research attention, spanning intelligent tutoring, automated  
113 assessment, and personalized feedback. Notable examples include Khan Academy's Khanmigo assistant [5] and Duolingo  
114 Max [4]. Global South startups like Teachmint and Unacademy in India, and Squirrel AI in China, demonstrate expanding  
115 innovation in AI-driven educational tools for resource-constrained environments.  
116

### 118 **2.2 AI for People with Visual Impairments**

120 Emerging evidence suggests GenAI offers powerful capabilities for people with visual impairments (PVIs) when designed  
121 with accessibility as core. Be My AI enables conversational image descriptions, while tools like Seeing AI, Google  
122 Lookout, and Envision AI provide object recognition and text reading. However, most tools target everyday living  
123 rather than formal education and assume technological familiarity, device access, and digital literacy often absent in  
124 Global South contexts. UNICEF reports nearly half of individuals with disabilities worldwide live in poverty [7], with  
125 over two-thirds in low-income countries lacking reliable internet. The World Bank notes acute shortages of assistive  
126 technologies and inclusive training in low- and middle-income countries [8].  
127

### 130 **2.3 AI for Teachers with Visual Impairments**

131 TVIs remain largely invisible in current GenAI discourse. Most studies assume sighted teachers in well-resourced  
132 classrooms. In the Global North, CVIs receive support from sighted educators, leaving TVIs absent from scholarly  
133 and industry discussions. In contrast, India's educational landscape features residential schools for the blind—often  
134 underfunded and reliant on philanthropic support—where many teachers themselves have visual impairments. While  
135 prior assistive technology work focuses on personal or workplace use, limited exploration exists regarding how  
136 TVIs integrate these technologies into teaching practice. Our work addresses this gap by foregrounding TVIs' lived  
137 experiences and technological practices.  
138

## 141 **3 Methodology**

143 We employed mixed methods combining semi-structured interviews with TVIs in Karnataka and a nationwide survey  
144 across Indian states, with ethics approval from Microsoft Research's Institutional Review Board.  
145

### 147 **3.1 Study Procedure**

148 Research was conducted March 2024-January 2025. We recruited 15 TVIs from 10 Karnataka schools through Vision Empower  
149 Trust, conducting 45-120 minute interviews in-person or virtually. Participants received INR 1000 compensation.  
150 At interview conclusions, we demonstrated ChatGPT and Be My AI, conducting 20-minute follow-ups approximately  
151 20 days later. Fourteen participants responded to follow-ups.  
152

153 Based on qualitative themes, we developed a 46-question survey using Microsoft Forms with screen reader compatibility  
154 and seven regional language options. Distributed through Vision Empower's network of 150 schools across 17  
155

157 states reaching 407 TVIs, we received 105 valid responses (26% response rate) from 15 states, with Karnataka yielding  
158 the largest participation.  
159

### 160 3.2 Participants 161

162 Interview participants included 15 TVIs (10 women, 5 men): 9 totally blind, 6 with low vision. Nine handled six or more  
163 grade levels; ten taught three or more subjects including English (9), Mathematics (8), Kannada/Hindi (6), Social Science  
164 (7), and Science (5). Experience ranged from under 5 years (2) to over 15 years (6).  
165

166 Survey participants spanned 15 states, primarily Karnataka (n=35), Odisha (n=24), Tamil Nadu (n=15), and Telangana  
167 (n=11), demonstrating similar diversity in experience, gender, and responsibilities.  
168

### 169 3.3 Data Analysis 170

171 We employed exploratory sequential mixed-methods design [3]. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis [2] with  
172 open coding and iterative refinement by two authors. Core themes included technology adaptation across teaching  
173 tasks, systemic constraints, institutional norms, and digital engagement barriers. Survey data utilized descriptive  
174 statistics, analyzed by state given distinct education boards and administrative frameworks. Analyses examined whether  
175 Karnataka themes appeared across states or if regional variations emerged.  
176

### 177 3.4 Limitations 178

179 Limitations include: (1) 15 Karnataka-only interview participants potentially limiting generalizability; (2) survey  
180 responses predominantly from four states; (3) coverage challenges due to schools' small size and geographic dispersion;  
181 (4) potential bias toward digitally engaged participants.  
182

## 183 4 Findings

184 We present findings across five dimensions: technology's teaching role, systemic challenges, institutional landscape,  
185 teacher attitudes, and GenAI awareness.  
186

### 187 4.1 Technology's Role in Teaching 188

189 Technology usage varies significantly across preparation, classroom interaction, and assessment stages.  
190

191 *4.1.1 Preparation Phase.* TVIs face substantial preparation challenges due to delayed Braille textbook delivery and  
192 predominantly manual processes. Books frequently arrive late, forcing reliance on personal knowledge or external  
193 resources. One teacher noted covering only 25% of Science curriculum due to late books (P6). Teachers increasingly use  
194 YouTube and Google for educational content, particularly visual explanations, though resources require adaptation for  
195 CVIs. As P14 explained, visual content must be made accessible through touch and tactile materials.  
196

197 Lesson planning remains manual, using Braille slates and styluses for multiple subjects and grades. Only one teacher  
198 accessed a Brailler, often unusable due to maintenance issues. High costs (approximately \$550) make Braillers largely  
199 inaccessible.  
200

201 *4.1.2 Classroom Interaction.* Institutional norms constrain classroom technology use. For subjects requiring visual  
202 explanations, TVIs depend on sighted colleagues, creating coordination challenges. Despite restrictions, some teachers  
203 creatively leverage YouTube videos and voice assistants like Alexa for interactive quizzes. However, institutional  
204 skepticism limits innovations, with mobile phone or YouTube use interpreted as lack of teaching effort. P11 stated: "If  
205 Manuscript submitted to ACM  
206  
207  
208

209 we play anything on YouTube...they think we are just following YouTube instead of teaching by ourselves. It is quite  
210 insulting."  
211

212 4.1.3 *Revision and Assessment.* Revision relies heavily on oral repetition and memorization due to limited structured  
213 resources. Teachers conduct frequent oral revisions since students rarely possess individual materials. P6 contrasted this  
214 with mainstream education where students take notes and highlight important content. Examination remains entirely  
215 analog, using Braille responses or scribe assistance, with students transitioning to scribes for public board exams.  
216

## 217 4.2 Systemic Challenges

218 TVIs face deeply embedded systemic barriers limiting meaningful technology integration.  
219

220 4.2.1 *Institutional Restrictions.* Strict mobile phone regulations make incorporating digital tools difficult, with technol-  
221 ogy use perceived as lack of effort rather than instructional aid.  
222

223 4.2.2 *Multi-Grade Teaching Burden.* Unlike mainstream schools, TVIs frequently teach multiple subjects across multiple  
224 grades simultaneously. All 15 interviewed teachers taught multiple grades ( $M=6.5$ ,  $SD=2.9$ ), with 9 responsible for six or  
225 more levels. P6 described combined classrooms: "1st-3rd has one classroom, 4th-5th has one classroom, and 6th and 7th  
226 share one classroom." This arrangement complicates lesson planning and classroom management.  
227

228 4.2.3 *Teaching Outside Expertise.* Teacher shortages require TVIs to teach subjects beyond formal training, significantly  
229 increasing preparation burden. Nine of 15 teachers taught three or more subjects despite expertise in only one or two  
230 areas. Teachers particularly struggle with STEM subjects requiring diagrams and experiments. P3 noted: "If a student  
231 asks me to explain a graph, I cannot show them because there is no tactile diagram available."  
232

233 4.2.4 *Lack of Infrastructure.* Many schools lack necessary assistive technology infrastructure. Essential tools like  
234 brailleers, screen readers, and smartphones are either unavailable or poorly maintained.  
235

## 236 4.3 Institutional and Social Landscape

237 Broader institutional policies and societal attitudes significantly shape technology integration.  
238

239 4.3.1 *Right to Education and Automatic Promotion.* India's Right to Education Act mandates automatic promotion  
240 regardless of academic performance. While reducing dropouts, this often results in students progressing without  
241 adequate Braille literacy or foundational skills. TVIs also shoulder responsibility for awareness-raising and student  
242 recruitment, with P6 noting: "Every year, we do a survey...go door to door finding VI kids and try to enroll them."  
243

244 4.3.2 *NGO Interventions.* Absent comprehensive governmental support, NGOs like Vision Empower Trust and  
245 Winvinaya Foundation provide critical interventions addressing systemic inequities. Teachers described these as  
246 transformative. P9 stated: "Since Vision Empower started their program...They have sent a lot of science and math  
247 teaching material." NGOs also facilitated first-time smartphone access for many teachers. However, programs remain  
248 limited in scope, constrained by funding and geography.  
249

250 4.3.3 *Braille Literacy vs. Technology.* Significant debate exists around balancing Braille literacy with technology  
251 adoption. While appreciating digital tools, teachers remain committed to Braille as foundational. P3 stated: "Even if  
252 there is technology, we should not forget Braille...home food is Braille script, and hotel food is technology." Others  
253

<sup>261</sup> fear voice-based tools encourage surface-level comprehension, advocating blended approaches where Braille remains  
<sup>262</sup> central.  
<sup>263</sup>

#### <sup>264</sup> **4.4 Teachers' Perspectives**

<sup>265</sup> Teacher perspectives are shaped by motivation, exposure, support systems, and confidence.

<sup>266</sup> *4.4.1 Commitment and Curiosity.* Some teachers exhibit proactive attitudes. P3 shared: "I use Google and YouTube  
<sup>267</sup> a lot. I also use reading mode." P8 emphasized: "In case there is a new app...I try to learn it myself," indicating digital  
<sup>268</sup> self-efficacy. P13 experimented with ChatGPT: "I installed ChatGPT. I used it to clear my doubts."  
<sup>269</sup>

<sup>270</sup> *4.4.2 Disinterest and Reluctance.* Conversely, some showed limited interest. P11 clearly stated: "I am not interested. I  
<sup>271</sup> feel mobile is not required. I use phone only when needed." Even among curious teachers, usability frustrations led to  
<sup>272</sup> abandonment. P7 noted: "I used it 2-3 times. I was finding it difficult and I uninstalled it."  
<sup>273</sup>

#### <sup>274</sup> **4.5 GenAI Awareness**

<sup>275</sup> We introduced ChatGPT and Be My Eyes at interview conclusions, assessing willingness to experiment.

<sup>276</sup> *4.5.1 Engagement with ChatGPT.* Several teachers attempted using ChatGPT following interviews, but accessibility  
<sup>277</sup> barriers during login often caused frustration. P1 reported: "I tried everything, I am not able to continue." However,  
<sup>278</sup> P10 expressed enthusiasm: "I can learn English with this tool...There is no English teacher in our school," highlighting  
<sup>279</sup> GenAI's dual role for teaching preparation and self-learning.  
<sup>280</sup>

<sup>281</sup> *4.5.2 Be My AI Awareness.* Most participants had never used or were vaguely aware of Be My Eyes. Some integrated  
<sup>282</sup> it for reading labels and identifying objects, though P2 highlighted limitations: "There are very less female volunteers...Sometimes this is a very big problem." Notably, except one, no TVIs knew Be My AI prior to demonstration,  
<sup>283</sup> suggesting well-publicized GenAI accessibility tools haven't reached this community.  
<sup>284</sup>

<sup>285</sup> *4.5.3 Language and Accessibility.* Preference for local language support emerged as recurring theme. Teachers expressed  
<sup>286</sup> that Kannada integration would significantly improve usability. Accessibility barriers during onboarding significantly  
<sup>287</sup> impacted adoption.  
<sup>288</sup>

#### <sup>289</sup> **4.6 Survey Analysis**

<sup>290</sup> Our pan-India survey examined whether Karnataka patterns appeared across states. Analysis confirms overwhelming  
<sup>291</sup> workloads, infrastructure gaps, and technology adoption constraints appear consistently across surveyed states, though  
<sup>292</sup> intensity varies.  
<sup>293</sup>

<sup>294</sup> Findings indicate that while teachers recognize technology benefits and demonstrate adoption where possible,  
<sup>295</sup> infrastructure gaps and insufficient institutional support continue shaping practice. Even states with better infrastructure  
<sup>296</sup> face gaps in accessible teaching aids and institutional backing, with no consistent relationship between salary, workload,  
<sup>297</sup> and technology adoption.  
<sup>298</sup>

#### <sup>299</sup> **5 Discussion**

<sup>300</sup> Our findings reveal a fundamental paradox: while TVIs express enthusiasm and commitment toward technology,  
<sup>301</sup> systemic barriers significantly limit adoption. Across all teaching stages, teachers independently turn to YouTube,  
<sup>302</sup> Manuscript submitted to ACM  
<sup>303</sup>

Table 1. Teacher Workload and Planning Methods Across States (n=85)

Category	Karnataka	Odisha	Tamil Nadu	Telangana
<b>Workload Demands</b>				
Grade levels	Avg: 5	up to 13	4-6	Similar
Subjects taught	Up to 6	Up to 14	3-4	2-4
Combined classes	60%	29%	Lower	Lower
<b>Lesson Planning Methods</b>				
Brailler use	32.3% (11/35)	62.5% (15/24)	40% (6/15)	Lower
Handwritten	32.3% (11/35)	8.3% (2/24)	Similar to Braillers	Lower
Digital documents	35.5% (12/35)	12.5% (3/24)	Lower	55.5% (6/11)

Table 2. Technology Usage and Perceived Benefits Across States (n=85)

Category	Karnataka	Odisha	Tamil Nadu	Telangana
<b>Technology Usage</b>				
For preparation	77.1% (27/35)	45.8% (11/24)	86.7% (13/15)	81.8% (9/11)
For teaching	71.4% (25/35)	45.8% (11/24)	80.0% (12/15)	81.8% (9/11)
<b>Perceived Benefits</b>				
Knowledge	76.2% (16/21)	66.7% (8/12)	86.7% (13/15)	81.8% (9/11)
Lesson planning	47.6% (10/21)	41.7% (5/12)	60.0% (9/15)	54.5% (6/11)
Classroom	38.1% (8/21)	20.8% (3/12)	53.3% (8/15)	45.5% (5/11)

Table 3. Infrastructure Availability Across States (n=85)

Resource	Karnataka	Odisha	Tamil Nadu	Telangana
Internet	26% (9/35)	17% (4/24)	40% (6/15)	55% (6/11)
Tactile aids	60% (21/35)	67% (16/24)	33.3% (5/15)	9.1% (1/11)
Hands-on kits	23% (8/35)	21% (5/24)	40% (6/15)	18.2% (2/11)
Lab facilities	3% (1/35)	Similar	Higher	Higher
Books	Not specified	Not specified	Available	63.6% (7/11)

Google, and voice assistants, yet efforts remain fragmented due to school norms, limited training, and infrastructure gaps. This disconnect underscores the need to look beyond individual readiness toward structural change.

### 5.1 Schools as Gatekeepers

One significant barrier lies not in teacher readiness but in school culture. Teachers reported that using YouTube or mobile phones is viewed as lack of effort, forcing them to seek permission for minor interventions. This institutional skepticism creates cycles where teachers—despite initiative—are discouraged from experimentation. This repositions "readiness" from individual capacity to systemic design. Without institutional buy-in and policy support, even motivated teachers struggle with sustainable integration.

### **365 5.2 GenAI's Promise**

**366** Within constrained environments, GenAI holds immense potential as mediator—between teachers and inaccessible  
**367** content, between complex subjects and tactile/audio-first delivery, and between rigid schooling structures and dynamic  
**368** CVI needs. GenAI could convert video content into tactile descriptions, generate differentiated materials for multi-grade  
**369** classrooms, create accessible STEM representations, and serve as personal learning assistants for teachers instructing  
**370** outside expertise areas.

### **373 374 375 5.3 Designing for Context**

**376** Yet implementation must be deeply contextualized. ChatGPT and Be My Eyes saw only partial uptake due to poor  
**377** login accessibility, unfamiliar interfaces, limited regional language options, and gendered concerns around volunteer  
**378** interaction. Design implications include: (1) multilingual support for regional languages; (2) accessible onboarding  
**379** fully compatible with screen readers; (3) context-aware content generation understanding schools for the blind; (4)  
**380** gender and privacy considerations for human-assisted tools; (5) offline and low-bandwidth modes given inconsistent  
**381** connectivity.

### **384 385 386 5.4 Global Disparities**

**387** In the Global North, TVIs experiment with ChatGPT for lesson planning and content structuring, though formal research  
**388** remains limited. This may reflect that Global North CVIs typically receive support from sighted educators in inclusive  
**389** classrooms. In contrast, Global South TVIs—often blind themselves in segregated schools—encounter multiple friction  
**390** points including inaccessible interfaces, unreliable connectivity, and limited linguistic relevance. These disparities reflect  
**391** structural differences, with Global North efforts benefiting from systemic support while Global South adoption remains  
**392** fragmented and reliant on individual initiative or NGO interventions. GenAI development assumes user contexts (stable  
**393** internet, English proficiency, device ownership) that don't hold in Global South settings, risking widened inequities.

### **396 397 398 5.5 From Individual Effort to Systemic Support**

**399** Future AI interventions must move beyond narratives of teachers as isolated innovators toward system-supported  
**400** infrastructure. TVIs should not shoulder discovery, adaptation, and advocacy burdens alone. Successful GenAI integration  
**401** requires multi-level intervention:

**402** **Policy:** Education departments must update policies recognizing appropriate technology use, countering perceptions  
**403** that technology indicates laziness.

**404** **Institutional:** Schools need dedicated technology coordinators helping TVIs troubleshoot and integrate tools, with  
**405** mandatory compensated professional development.

**406** **Infrastructure:** Reliable connectivity, functional devices, and maintained assistive technologies must be standard  
**407** provisions, not occasional luxuries.

**408** **Design:** Technology companies must engage TVIs during design, not just deployment, using co-design approaches  
**409** centering disabled educators' lived experiences.

**410** **Community:** Peer support networks among TVIs can share best practices, troubleshoot challenges, and collectively  
**411** advocate for resources.

417 Current reliance on individual initiative and NGO interventions, while admirable, is neither sustainable nor scalable.  
 418 Without systemic change, GenAI's promise for inclusive education will remain unrealized for most TVIs and CVIs in  
 419 the Global South.  
 420

## 421 6 Conclusion

422 Our study foregrounds TVIs' lived experiences in India—an essential yet overlooked group in inclusive education and  
 423 emerging technology conversations. While multimodal GenAI holds significant promise for enhancing CVIs' educational  
 424 experience, findings reveal stark contrasts between this promise and material, infrastructural, and institutional realities  
 425 in which teachers operate.  
 426

427 TVIs demonstrate remarkable resilience, creativity, and commitment leveraging technology despite institutional  
 428 barriers and resource constraints. However, systemic challenges—restrictive policies, overwhelming multi-grade burdens,  
 429 inadequate infrastructure, insufficient training—severely limit meaningful digital tool integration. The disconnect  
 430 between GenAI's potential and ecosystem readiness represents a critical gap requiring attention.  
 431

432 Our work contributes to emerging HCI and AI for education agendas insisting on equity as foundational design  
 433 principle. By positioning TVIs as co-designers of educational futures, we call for paradigm shifts in how AI tools are  
 434 imagined and deployed, moving beyond universal design assuming sighted, resourced users toward context-specific,  
 435 participatory processes centering disabled educators' needs and expertise in the Global South.  
 436

437 Future work should explore: (1) co-design processes actively involving TVIs in developing GenAI educational tools; (2)  
 438 longitudinal studies examining sustained GenAI integration impact with proper support infrastructure; (3) comparative  
 439 analyses across Global South contexts understanding regional variations; (4) policy research investigating educational  
 440 system restructuring supporting technology-enabled inclusive pedagogy.  
 441

442 Without such paradigm shifts addressing entire support ecosystems, GenAI's promise might remain just that.  
 443 Realizing GenAI's inclusive potential requires systemic transformation recognizing TVIs as essential change agents in  
 444 creating truly accessible educational futures.  
 445

## 446 Acknowledgments

447 We thank the teachers who generously shared their time and insights. We thank Rajesh S. Paali, Venkatesh Deshpande,  
 448 Rajeswari Pandurangan, Devidatta Ghosh, and Rishi Vadhana from Vision Empower Trust for invaluable support  
 449 with recruitment, coordination, and translation. We also thank Roshni Poddar, Nischith Shadagopan, Anush Kini, and  
 450 Adharsh Kamath for interview phase assistance.  
 451

## 452 References

- 453 [1] Business Standard. 2022. India loses 118 billion dollars annually in GNI due to childhood blindness: Report. [https://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/india-loses-118-bn-annually-in-gni-due-to-childhood-blindness-report-122090901204\\_1.html](https://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/india-loses-118-bn-annually-in-gni-due-to-childhood-blindness-report-122090901204_1.html)
- 454 [2] Victoria Clarke and Virginia Braun. 2017. Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 12, 3 (2017), 297–298.
- 455 [3] John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell. 2018. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- 456 [4] Duolingo Team. 2023. Introducing Duolingo Max, a Learning Experience Powered by GPT-4. <https://blog.duolingo.com/duolingo-max/>
- 457 [5] Khan Academy. 2023. Khanmigo AI Tutor. <https://www.khanmigo.ai/>
- 458 [6] Simi Mehta, Anshula Mehta, and Arjun Kumar. 2022. Need to prioritize eye health in India. <https://www.counterview.in/2022/10/need-to-prioritize-eye-health-in-india.html>
- 459 [7] UNICEF and ITU. 2020. How many children and young people have internet access at home? <https://data.unicef.org/resources/children-and-young-people-internet-access-at-home-during-covid19/>
- 460 [8] World Bank Group. 2022. Every Learner Matters: Unpacking the Learning Crisis for Children with Disabilities. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/sustainablecities/every-learner-matters-unpacking-learning-crisis-children-disabilities>