



Resisting AI Solutionism: Where Do We Go From Here?

Gisela Reyes-Cruz
School of Computer Science
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, United Kingdom
gisela.reyesacruz@nottingham.ac.uk

Velvet Spors
Gamification Group
Tampere University
Tampere, Finland
velvet.spors@tuni.fi

Michael Muller
Human AI Collaboration
IBM Research
Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
michael_muller@us.ibm.com

Marianela Ciolfi Felice
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden
ciolfi@kth.se

Shaowen Bardzell
School of Interactive Computing
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia, USA
sbardzell@cc.gatech.edu

Rua Mae Williams
Computer Graphics and Technology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana, USA
rmwilliams@purdue.edu

Karin Hansson
Natural Sciences, Technology and
Environmental Studies
Södertörn University
Huddinge, Stockholm, Sweden
karin.hansson@sh.se

Ivana Feldfeber
DataGénero
DataGénero
Bariloche, Argentina
datagenero@gmail.com

Abstract

The latest advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI), such as Large Language Models (LLMs), have provoked a massive expansion and adoption of AI applications across the board, with seemingly no sector left untouched by recent developments. Anywhere we look, from healthcare to the creative industries, from education to entertainment, from sustainability to knowledge work, AI is being adopted and adapted, funded and fundraised for, developed and designed for, researched and used for doing research. As AI continues to be treated as a necessary and unquestioned solution for a range of societal problems, we seek to ponder and challenge its perceived suitability and inevitability. Moreover, we wonder how we can go about resisting AI solutionism (i.e., the idea that technology provides solutions to complex social problems) and who gets to resist it, in particular if the structures that surround people and their specific positions constrain them from doing so. This workshop will focus on gathering and sharing lessons from experiences resisting, or attempting to resist, AI solutionism; taking stock and revisiting previous learnings from decades of work within and beyond HCI; and envisioning ways, perspectives, tools, and practices to orient ourselves and each other towards more pluralistic futures.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **Interaction design theory, concepts and paradigms**; *Human computer interaction (HCI)*; *Collaborative and social computing*.

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 made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).
CHI EA '25, April 26–May 01, 2025, Yokohama, Japan
© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1395-8/25/04
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3706732>

Keywords

artificial intelligence, ethics, data practices, human-centered AI, feminist AI, decolonial AI

ACM Reference Format:

Gisela Reyes-Cruz, Velvet Spors, Michael Muller, Marianela Ciolfi Felice, Shaowen Bardzell, Rua Mae Williams, Karin Hansson, and Ivana Feldfeber. 2025. Resisting AI Solutionism: Where Do We Go From Here?. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25)*, April 26–May 01, 2025, Yokohama, Japan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3706732>

1 Motivation

Amidst the perceived inevitability of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its unquestioned adoption as a go-to solution for most of the current issues, challenges and opportunities faced across sectors, some (civil society, activists, technologists, researchers, and more) continue to voice their concerns about some AI applications being more harmful than beneficial to society, given the way they are being developed and deployed [16, 58]. In particular, we note examples of collectives [7, 26, 34] raising awareness or opposing to the use and misuse of AI, due to its risk to undermine humans (e.g., livelihoods, human rights, quality of life, intermediated or displaced relationships) and the planet (i.e., the environmental impacts of AI).

Resisting or refusing technology is not a new concept in HCI (e.g., [19]), and more recently we have seen examples of collective and institutional organization against AI. Several movements have generated important attention, such as the SAG-AFTRA strike [51] to more of a rank-and-file labor perspective [62]. There have also been efforts, such as the Glaze Project [59], striving to protect artists from Generative AI systems, and manifestos calling for sabotaging [20], poisoning, and destroying AI [3]. What may distinguish this moment from prior work on refusal, is the undisclosed proliferation of AI into so many aspects of our lives [29, 35]. Each time an AI application works “for” us, it may also be reporting *on* us (e.g., [65]).

AI can be used today in potentially all areas that somehow automate decision-making processes; from healthcare – where AI is used e.g. predictive medicine, patient data and diagnostics, and clinical decision-making [2, 52], to warfare where the technology can be used in autonomous weapons and AI-informed control systems [54, 57], and information warfare [39, 61].

In this workshop we want to explore further ways of resisting, not necessarily AI per se, but the solutionist treatment it is receiving, i.e., *“the idea that technology provides solutions to complex social problems”* [36]. We invite participants to reflect on and envision futures around the following questions and topics in relation to AI:

- **What does resisting AI solutionism mean?** To reject, disrupt, poison, mess up, challenge, question, work around, destroy, etc. There are a number of resources and previous works that can be taken as inspiration and could serve as starting points for grounding ways of resisting AI solutionism. For instance, the Feminist Manifest-No [10, 19] lists 32 commitments to refusal and to action in relation to data practices, several of which are applicable to solutionist AI technologies. Another possible direction is the reversal of an oppressive technology, applying it back onto the oppressors. A famous example is TurkOpticon [27] – a service for Turkers to track the honesty of the people who promise to pay for work on Mechanical Turk. Likewise, Do et al. have been studying the concept of sousveillance on gig work platforms (i.e., the act of subordinates monitoring people in power) [15]. Another relevant practice is counter-mapping, in which a societally-disempowered group create their own maps to replace/displace the maps of the oppressors (e.g., [21, 30]).
- **What are we resisting?** Many perspectives can be simultaneously relevant here: are we resisting a) solutionist AI technologies, b) the harms done through those technologies, c) the practices that lead to those technologies, d) the social arrangement or configurations that enable those harms, e) the power dynamics surrounding those technologies? (e.g., which social actors have the power to declare what is data, and what is not data? [47]).
- **Who can (or cannot) resist?** Who has the privilege to resist, or to refuse solutionist AI technologies? What actions may be possible for people who cannot safely refuse? Who is doing the work outside the academe? e.g. NGOs, activists, artists, developers, communities [26].
- **Advancing (or not) the AI cause.** As HCI researchers and technologists we are, or may have to be, directly involved in projects that promote the development and deployment of AI. We seek to provoke discussions about our role and contributions to the AI cause, building on and amplifying examples of pro-social AI applications (e.g., [12]). How can we promote and contribute to AI development in non-solutionist ways? How can ‘human-centered AI’ actually center the diverse humans who create or are affected by the AI? What does it mean to center marginalised perspectives beyond collecting more diverse data (which can actually pose more harm than benefit to those groups) [5]? What do we do if more, and more diverse data, still produce oppressive AI systems? How can we combine contemporary AI and machine learning and

approaches such as Feminist theories to address concerns about algorithmic systems that go beyond generating Feminist critiques of AI to reimagine creative alternatives to the systems we critique?

- **How do we reimagine AI data practices?** In a world in which data has become powerful, some have highlighted how that power has been wielded unequally [14]. As the underlying structures and forces shaping AI continue to be rooted in racial, gendered, ableist capitalism, we ought to revisit and reimagine other forms of data practices for AI (e.g., Data Feminism [31]). What would it mean to have less data, or different data [40, 47, 56]? How can we work with composting data, self-erasing data, selectively-legible data, and ephemerality? How about those cases where social issues are made visible through data? What data is necessary for attending to pressing challenges (e.g., Femicide data and gender-based violence data in Latin America [12, 13, 45])? Data contain mistakes, discrepancies, duplicates, and irrelevant information, and must be cleaned to be useful. The process of cleaning and organizing data can be seen as “forgetting practices”, where data is “forgotten” when it does not fit in, or is edited to fit better [22]. [40]. The question is how, instead of forgetting data, we can use hidden data in a more productive way. Can we visualize the displacement mechanisms, and show what has been removed? What qualitative data is needed to create an AI application or to make sense of an AI system? How do we modify the data to make them fit-for-purpose? Feinberg described data as an object of design [18], and Mentis et al. [38] showed how telemedicine images are “crafted” by surgeons for use by other surgeons (see also the “manufacture of bodies in surgery” [25]). Muller et al. [42] note that ground truth labels/annotations were the products of complex social negotiations rather than any “objective” process. We must ask whose data, which data, and what data? [1]
- **What would it mean to privilege the outlier in AI?** Going beyond calls for creating more diverse datasets underpinning AI, for instance, Williams [63] calls for asking different questions when implementing AI; *“what would it mean to turn our math around? Rather than looking to big data for solutions to hegemonically defined problems, what if we used it to find the catalysts of inequality themselves?”*. Bardzell [5, p. 1306] advocated for this kind of approach too: *“Pluralist design encourages an alternative sensibility to design, foregrounding questions of cultural difference, encouraging a constructive engagement with diversity, and embracing the margins both to be more inclusive and to benefit from the marginal as resources for design solutions.”* How can we use AI to identify, and see the development of, prejudices and structures? Misogyny, racism and other obscure views can come to the surface when large quantities of human data produced online is used as a basis in machine learning [6, 8, 46]. How can this “dirty” data be used creatively?
- **Challenging AI practices and avoiding harmful consequences.** Concerns have been raised about the practices currently observed in AI development involving extractivism,

poor material conditions, resources (mis)distribution, and neocolonial mindsets, to name a few (see, e.g., [48]).

- There is a EuroWestern assumption that data should be shared in an open manner (e.g., [61]). However, some marginalized or minoritized groups do not want to share their data because of its sensitivity or their vulnerability - e.g., the demand for “#DataBack” among Indigenous Nations ([17]; for related concerns, see also [49]), as part of a larger struggle for Indigenous Sovereignty [9], data justice, and the rematriation of stolen children, ancestors, and artifacts [11]. How can we balance data-sharing and data-protecting?
- It is becoming clear that the “same” data and situations are viewed differently by people who have had different life experiences (e.g., [24]). Within HCI, we often speak of *boundary objects* as examples of such phenomena (e.g., [55]). Minoritized and marginalized groups often have to maintain two or more distinct views of social reality: their own view for cultural survivance, and the majoritarian view for self-protection. How can we support and (when necessary) protect these forms of *two-eyed seeing* [28, 32, 44, 50]? What can we learn from holding multiple epistemologies in mind (and heart), without needing to determine which one is “correct”?
- What can we learn from Feminists and other alternative perspectives on AI from the Global South? [12, 37, 43, 45, 64].
- How can we grapple with or resist the consequences of de-skilling labor caused by AI? As far back as the 18th century, part of the agenda of automation was to move the knowledge of work from the workers to various forms or operationalizations of managerial supervision and control [53]. How can we prevent or mitigate this kind of misappropriation of labor’s knowledge [41]? Are there better future visions than the displacement of labor and labor’s power?
- What methods are particularly Feminist in their nature, characteristics, or sensitivity? What is - or what could be - in our “Toolbox of Feminist Wonder” [23]?

2 Workshop objectives

The workshop objectives include:

- To critically reflect about the meaning and practices of resisting in relation to solutionist AI technologies.
- To gather and expand a collection of approaches for resisting AI solutionism.
- To consider whether there are (or whether we could envision) AI applications that align with human needs and social justice.
- To collect provocations, stories, and a potential roadmap for people unable to resist AI solutionism.
- To support people in their refusal, whatever form it may take, mapping the freedoms, agency, choice-making, and material circumstances.

3 Organizers

- **Dr. Gisela Reyes-Cruz** is a Transitional Assistant Professor and Early Career Researcher at the University of Nottingham, UK. Her work investigates real-world interaction, trust, and public acceptance of a range of autonomous and robotic systems, drawing from sociological approaches and social-justice oriented principles. Her recent interests are focused on understanding the landscape of ‘Responsible AI’ and interrogating what it entails.
- **Dr. Velvet Spors** is a creative technologist and post-doctoral researcher working at Gamification Group, based at Tampere University in sunny Finland. Their research centers around Feminist notions of care as a core value to investigate how technology shapes ourselves, and our relations to others, and the wider world beyond. Currently, they are researching the potentials of video games as a mediator for how human beings make sense of nature, and sustainability.
- **Dr. Michael Muller** (he/him) works in a senior research scientist role at IBM Research, on the traditional and contemporary lands stewarded by the Wampanoag, Massachusett, Pawtucket, and Naumkeag Peoples since time immemorial. He researches at the overlap of computer science, human-centered AI, social science, and social justice, currently focusing on human-AI co-creativity. His longer-term emphasis is on AIs as humanly-constructed entities that reflect the intentional and unintentional goals, assumptions, and fears of their human creators.
- **Dr. Mariana Ciolfi Felice** is an Assistant Professor at KTH (Sweden). Her research on critical Feminist computing mostly lies at the intersection between interactive technology and the body, from an anti-technosolutionist stance, and informed by qualitative and mixed methods. Mariana is also committed to the development and visibility of critical HCI from Latin America. Currently, she investigates anti-technosolutionist, Feminist approaches to AI development.
- **Dr. Shaowen Bardzell** is a Professor in the School of Interactive Computing at Georgia Institute of Technology, where is also the School chair. A common thread throughout her work is the exploration of the contributions of Feminisms, design, and social science to support technology’s role in social change.
- **Dr. Rua Williams** is an Assistant Professor in User Experience Design at Purdue University and PI of the CoLiberation Lab. As a former SSRC Just Tech Fellow (2022-2024), Dr. Williams’s work explores how disabled people imagine and build their own sociotechnical worlds, often in spite of and orthogonal to existing structures of bias, stigma, and exclusion. They also investigate how issues in technology policy and research practice interact to disrupt disabled people’s bodily autonomy and access to meaningful public life. They regularly publish on AI impacts on disabled people and have a book called *Disabling Intelligences* coming out next year.

- **Dr. Karin Hansson** is a professor of media technology at Södertörn University. Her research is situated in the intersection of interaction design, communication studies, and critical design and she has written extensively about technology-based participation from a design and democracy perspective. She is currently project leader of the research project #MeToo Activism in Sweden and part of the Metadata Culture working group at Stockholm University.
- **BSc. Ivana Feldfeber** is an expert in data science and social impact. She holds a postgraduate diploma in Data Science, Machine Learning, and its Applications. Ivana is the co-founder and Executive Directress of DataGénero, the first Gender Data Observatory in Latin America. In this role, she works with governments and companies to build inclusive data processes, train teams, write recommendations and help decision-makers to make better data policies.

4 Plans to publish workshop contributions

Participants will be invited to submit a 2-3 page position paper using the ACM Primary Article Template (single column)¹. Following the submission deadline and before the workshop begins, we will publish the contributions of participants who have granted permission on the workshop website, and potentially on ArXiv if participants agree. This will ensure that their work is accessible to attendees prior to the conference. In addition, we will publish the position papers submitted by participants as workshop proceedings on the workshop website. We hope that this will also generate interest among individuals who are not attending the workshop but would like to engage and learn about approaches to these topics.

5 In-Person and hybrid plans

We prefer to conduct a one-day fully hybrid workshop, so as to include people who may not be able to travel to the physical conference site. There is now a strong basis in practice for conducting a workshop or a small conference as a hybrid event - e.g., summaries from CHIPLAY², CHIWORK³ [33], and a series of reports from SIGCHI⁴ [4, 60]. We will ask attendees in advance if a Zoom, Meetup, or Teams environment will be able to meet their needs. We may consult with the CHI 2025 Accessibility co-chairs if we need further advice.

6 Accessibility

We expect submissions to align with accessibility requirements, such as PDF tagging and metadata. The organizers will offer support for ensuring the PDF submissions are accessible before sharing with the rest of attendees and publishing them online. We will reach out to our workshop participants to assess how we can best accommodate any additional accessibility needs for the event day.

7 Asynchronous materials

Workshop contributions will be distributed with all the participants before the day. We will create shared Google Slides with participant

introductions and ice-breakers. Other collaborative documents to be used before, during and after the workshop day, such as a Miro board, will be prepared and shared in advance.

8 Workshop activities

The full-day workshop will be composed of three main activities. Depending on the number of submissions, we hope to include both plenary sessions and small-group activities and/or discussions.

- **Introductions: ways of struggling and resisting AI.** To begin with, there will be in-person and asynchronous introductions and ice-breaker activities asking participants to share examples about ways of resisting AI (or not being able to) that they have encountered or found compelling (e.g. from personal experience, in the literature, in the media, in fiction).
- **Identifying themes: where are we now?** Participants will discuss and identify, from the participants' introductions and submissions, ways of resisting solutionist AI technologies from a variety of perspectives.
- **Envisioning: where do we go from here?** Taking together the introductions and provocations so far, participants will be asked to discuss with each other case studies of AI-solutionism and practices of resisting. These could be from projects in which they are currently working, building from their workshop submissions, or from examples mentioned during the workshop. The main objective is to sketch actionable ways (perspectives, tools, practices) of navigating resistance to AI.

9 Post-workshop plans

After the workshop, we aim to publish a short output (e.g. interactions article, blog post) summarising key takeaways discussed and outlined during the workshop. We will further gauge interest in follow-up activities such as a future workshop building from these initial insights and/or the proposal of a special issue in a relevant journal.

10 Call for participation

In this workshop we want to explore ways of resisting, not necessarily AI per se, but the solutionist treatment it is receiving, i.e., "*the idea that technology provides solutions to complex social problems*" [36]. Participants are invited to submit a 2-3 page position paper using the ACM Primary Article Template (single column) presenting recent, ongoing work, or personal reflections on topics related to resisting AI solutionism. Participants should aim to respond to some of the following:

- Tell us about some resisting (e.g. from personal experience, a project, the literature, the media, in fiction).
- How do you envision resisting AI solutionism?
- What could you, or others, not resist when advancing the AI cause?
- How do we reimagine AI data practices?
- What would it mean to privilege the outlier in AI?
- How could we challenge harmful AI practices and consequences?

¹<https://chi2025.acm.org/chi-publication-formats/>

²<https://chiplay.acm.org/2023/blog/chi-play-2023s-approach-to-hybrid/>

³<https://chiwork.org/hybrid-experience/>

⁴<https://chi2024.acm.org/2023/11/09/hybrid-experience-at-chi-2024/>

We encourage submissions from diverse, simultaneous standpoints, and how they interact when groups are discussing boundary objects e.g., university/workplace standpoints (hierarchies) and also cultural standpoints.

Submissions will be reviewed based on relevance to the workshop. At least one author of each accepted position paper must register and attend the workshop (in-person or remotely).

We have made a preliminary website to circulate our call for participation here: <https://resisting-ai-solutionism.carrd.co/>.

11 Expected size of attendance

In light of the current enthusiasm and critique surrounding AI, we anticipate generating significant interest among conference attendees. We expect between 15 and 20 participants to attend in person, with additional participants joining us online.

Acknowledgments

GRC is supported by the UKRI Trustworthy Autonomous Systems Hub and Responsible AI UK [Grant numbers EP/V00784X/1, EP/Y009800/1]. VS is supported by the Academy of Finland, UNITE flagship Grant No. 337653 (Forest-Human-Machine Interplay).

References

- [1] Alison Adam. 2006. *Artificial knowing: Gender and the thinking machine*. Routledge.
- [2] Ahmed Al Kuwaiti, Khalid Nazer, Abdullah Al-Reedy, Shaher Al-Shehri, Afnan Al-Muhanna, Arun Vijay Subbarayalu, Dhoha Al Muhanna, and Fahad A Al-Muhanna. 2023. A review of the role of artificial intelligence in healthcare. *Journal of personalized medicine* 13, 6 (2023), 951.
- [3] Ali Alkhatib. [n. d.]. *Destroy AI*. <https://ali-alkhatib.com/blog/fuck-up-ai>
- [4] Alberta A Ansah, Adriana S Vivacqua, Sailin Zhong, Susanne Boll, Marios Constantinides, Himanshu Verma, Abdallah El Ali, Alina Lushnikova, Hamed Alavi, Sean Rintel, et al. 2023. Reflecting on hybrid events: Learning from a year of hybrid experiences. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–4.
- [5] Shaowen Bardzell. 2010. Feminist HCI: taking stock and outlining an agenda for design. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1301–1310.
- [6] Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Virtual Event, Canada) (FAccT '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- [7] Masha Borak. [n. d.]. *As Brazil debates AI bill, calls for facial recognition bans emerge*. <https://www.biometricupdate.com/202407/as-brazil-debates-ai-bill-calls-for-facial-recognition-bans-emerge>
- [8] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 81)*, Sorelle A. Friedler and Christo Wilson (Eds.). PMLR, 77–91. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html>
- [9] Stephanie Russo Carroll, Desi Rodriguez-Lonebear, and Andrew Martinez. 2019. Indigenous data governance: strategies from United States native nations. *Data science journal* 18 (2019).
- [10] Marika Cifor, Patricia Garcia, TL Cowan, Jasmine Rault, Tonia Sutherland, A Chan, Jennifer Rode, Anna Lauren Hoffmann, Niloufar Salehi, and Lisa Nakamura. 2019. Feminist data manifest-no.(2019). URL: <https://www.manifestno.com> (2019).
- [11] Jewel Cummins, Alexander Soto, Jane Anderson, Ulia Gosart, Alexander Ward, and Stephanie Russo Carroll. 2023. Enhancing Stewardship of Indigenous Peoples' Data, Information, and Knowledge in Libraries and Archives through Indigenous Data Governance. *Library Trends* 72, 1 (2023), 13–47.
- [12] DataGenero. [n. d.]. *AymurAI - For an open and gender-sensitive justice*. <https://sites.google.com/view/aymurai-en>
- [13] Catherine D'Ignazio. 2024. *Counting feminicide: Data feminism in action*. MIT Press.
- [14] Catherine D'Ignazio and Lauren F Klein. 2023. *Data feminism*. MIT press.
- [15] Kimberly Do, Maya De Los Santos, Michael Muller, and Saiph Savage. 2024. Designing Gig Worker Sousveillance Tools. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–19.
- [16] Lukasz A Drozdz and Marina Tavares. 2024. Generative AI: A Turning Point for Labor's Share? *Economic Insights* 9, 1 (2024), 2–11.
- [17] Cheryl Ellenwood and Raymond Foxworth. 2024. Data Back: Indigenous Material Culture, Philanthropy, and Indigenous Data Sovereignty. *The Public Historian* 46, 2 (2024), 123–143.
- [18] Melanie Feinberg. 2017. A design perspective on data. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 2952–2963.
- [19] Patricia Garcia, Tonia Sutherland, Niloufar Salehi, Marika Cifor, and Anubha Singh. 2022. No! Re-imagining data practices through the lens of critical refusal. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6, CSCW2 (2022), 1–20.
- [20] Algorithmic Sabotage Research Group. [n. d.]. *Manifesto on 'Algorithmic Sabotage'*. <https://algorithmic-sabotage.github.io/asrg/manifesto-on-algorithmic-sabotage/>
- [21] Daniel Gutiérrez-Ujaque and Dharman Jeyasingham. 2022. Towards a critical pedagogy of atmosphere in Social Work Education: Using Counter-Mapping to examine the emplaced Power relations of Practice. *The British Journal of Social Work* 52, 2 (2022), 738–758.
- [22] Karin Hansson. 2023. visual methods for desire and wonder in the digital heritage. *Feminist Review* 135, 1 (2023), 162–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01417789231201860> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/01417789231201860>
- [23] Karin Hansson, Shaowen Bardzell, Aparajita Bhandari, Marion Boulicault, Dylan Thomas Doyle, Sheena Erete, Teresa Cerratto Pargman, Shaimaa Lazem, Michael Muller, Maria Normark, et al. 2023. A Toolbox of Feminist Wonder: Theories and methods that can make a difference. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 476–480.
- [24] Sandra Harding. 2013. Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is “strong objectivity”? In *Feminist epistemologies*. Routledge, 49–82.
- [25] Stefan Hirschauer. 1991. The manufacture of bodies in surgery. *Social studies of science* 21, 2 (1991), 279–319.
- [26] DAIR Institute. [n. d.]. *About - Data Workers Inquiry*. <https://data-workers.org/about/>
- [27] Lilly C Irani and M Six Silberman. 2016. Stories We Tell About Labor: Turkooption and the Trouble with "Design". In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 4573–4586.
- [28] Nuria Jaumot-Pascual, Tiffany D Smith, Christina B Silva, Maria Ong, and Matthew Madison. 2024. The Role of Giving Back and Two-Eyed Seeing for Engineering & Computer Science Indigenous Students Transitioning to the Workplace. In *Proceedings of the 2024 on RESPECT Annual Conference*. 206–214.
- [29] Bronwyn Jones, Rhianne Jones, and Ewa Luger. 2022. AI 'Everywhere and Nowhere': addressing the AI intelligibility problem in public service journalism. *Digital Journalism* 10, 10 (2022), 1731–1755.
- [30] Dorothy Kidd. 2019. Extra-activism: Counter-mapping and data justice. *Information, Communication & Society* 22, 7 (2019), 954–970.
- [31] Lauren Klein and Catherine D'Ignazio. 2024. Data Feminism for AI. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (FAccT '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 100–112. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658543>
- [32] Margaret Kovach. 2021. *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto press.
- [33] Andrew L Kun and Orit Shaer. 2023. Designing an Inclusive and Engaging Hybrid Event: Experiences From CHIWORK. *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 22, 3 (2023), 52–57.
- [34] The Algorithmic Justice League. [n. d.]. *Mission, Team and Story: The Algorithmic Justice League*. <https://www.ajl.org/about>
- [35] Gavin Lew, Robert M Schumacher Jr, Gavin Lew, and Robert M Schumacher Jr. 2020. AI-Enabled Products Are Emerging All Around Us: Technology is everywhere. *AI and UX: Why Artificial Intelligence Needs User Experience* (2020), 55–85.
- [36] Silvia Lindtner, Shaowen Bardzell, and Jeffrey Bardzell. 2016. Reconstituting the Utopian Vision of Making: HCI After Technosolutionism. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (San Jose, California, USA) (CHI '16). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1390–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858506>
- [37] Hernán Maina, Laura Alonso Alemany, Guido Ivetta, Mariela Rajngewer, Beatriz Busaniche, and Luciana Benotti. 2024. Exploring Stereotypes and Biases in Language Technologies in Latin America. *Commun. ACM* 67, 8 (Aug. 2024), 54–56. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3653322>
- [38] Helena M Mentis, Ahmed Rahim, and Pierre Theodore. 2016. Crafting the image in surgical telemedicine. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*. 744–755.
- [39] Frida Muñoz Plaza, Inés Hernández San Román, and Marco Antonio Sotelo Monge. 2024. A Technical Exploration of Strategies for Augmented Monitoring and Decision Support in Information Warfare. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security* (Vienna, Austria) (ARES '24).

- Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 74, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3664476.3670922>
- [40] Michael Muller and Angelika Strohmayer. 2022. Forgetting practices in the data sciences. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–19.
- [41] Michael Muller, Justin D Weisz, Stephanie Houde, and Steven I Ross. 2024. Drinking Chai with Your (AI) Programming Partner: Value Tensions in the Tokenization of Future Human-AI Collaborative Work. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work*. 1–15.
- [42] Michael Muller, Christine T Wolf, Josh Andres, Michael Desmond, Narendra Nath Joshi, Zahra Ashktorab, Aabhas Sharma, Kristina Brimijoin, Qian Pan, Evelyn Duesterwald, et al. 2021. Designing ground truth and the social life of labels. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–16.
- [43] The Southeast Asian Hub of the Incubating Feminist AI project. [n. d.]. *Feminist AI in Southeast Asia*. <https://feministai.pubpub.org/seasia-feminist-ai>
- [44] Cindy Peltier. 2018. An application of two-eyed seeing: Indigenous research methods with participatory action research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17, 1 (2018), 1609406918812346.
- [45] Patricia Peña, Daniela Moyano, Jocelyn Dunstan, and Catalina Rufs. 2023. *Digital Gendered Violence in Chile: Development of a system for report, monitoring and response-orientation based on a feminist chatbot | Sofia*. <https://feministai.pubpub.org/pub/wjfw5sx9>.
- [46] Dana Pessach and Erez Shmueli. 2022. A Review on Fairness in Machine Learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 3, Article 51 (Feb. 2022), 44 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3494672>
- [47] Kathleen H Pine and Max Liboiron. 2015. The politics of measurement and action. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems*. 3147–3156.
- [48] Paola Ricaurte. 2019. Data epistemologies, the coloniality of power, and resistance. *Television & New Media* 20, 4 (2019), 350–365.
- [49] Tara Robertson. 2018. Not all information wants to be free: The case study of On Our Backs. In *Applying Library Values to Emerging Technology: Decision-Making in the Age of Open Access, Maker Spaces, and the Ever-Changing Library (Publications in Librarianship# 72)*. American Library Association, 225–239.
- [50] Jenny Rowett. 2018. Two-Eyed Seeing: A research approach and a way of living. *Antistasis* 8, 1 (2018).
- [51] Jeff Schuhrke. 2024. Lights, Camera, Collective Action: Assessing the 2023 SAG-AFTRA Strike. *New Labor Forum* 33, 2 (2024), 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10957960241245445> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/10957960241245445>
- [52] Silvana Secinaro, Davide Calandra, Aurelio Secinaro, Vivek Muthurangu, and Paolo Biancone. 2021. The role of artificial intelligence in healthcare: a structured literature review. *BMC medical informatics and decision making* 21 (2021), 1–23.
- [53] Richard Sennett. 2008. *The craftsman*. Yale University Press.
- [54] Dasharathraj K Shetty, Gayathri Prerepa, Nithesh Naik, Ritesh Bhat, Jayant Sharma, and Parva Mehrotra. 2023. Revolutionizing Aerospace and Defense: The Impact of AI and Robotics on Modern Warfare. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Information Management & Machine Intelligence (Jaipur, India) (ICIMMI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 19, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3590837.3590856>
- [55] Susan Leigh Star and James R Griesemer. 1989. Institutional ecology, translations and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social studies of science* 19, 3 (1989), 387–420.
- [56] Angelika Strohmayer and Michael Muller. 2023. Data-ing and Un-Data-ing. *Interactions* 30, 3 (2023), 38–42.
- [57] Yi Sun, Ju Liu, and Qing Sun. 2023. From StarCraft II to Military Combat: The Framework of Auxiliary Decision System on Marine Warfare Based on Artificial Intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 2022 11th International Conference on Computing and Pattern Recognition (Beijing, China) (ICCPR '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 595–602. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581807.3581895>
- [58] Joice Tang, McKane Andrus, Samuel So, Udayan Tandon, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Vera Khovanskaya, Sean A Munson, Mark Zachry, and Sucheta Ghoshal. 2023. Back to “Back to Labor”: Revisiting Political Economies of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 522–526.
- [59] The Glaze/Nightshade Team. [n. d.]. *The Glaze Project*. <https://glaze.cs.uchicago.edu/>
- [60] Adriana S Vivacqua, Neha Kumar, Nicola J Bidwell, Kagonya Awori, Kathrin Gerling, Dhruv Jain, Andrew L Kun, and Naomi Yamashita. 2023. Realizing Values in Hybrid Environments: A SIGCHI Perspective. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 405–407.
- [61] R Polk Wagner. 2003. Information wants to be free: Intellectual property and the mythologies of control. *ColUM. l. rev.* 103 (2003), 995.
- [62] Emmanuelle Walkowiak and Trent MacDonald. 2023. Generative AI and the workforce: What are the risks? *Available at SSRN* (2023).
- [63] Rua Williams. [n. d.]. *On Being an Outlier*. <https://www.goethe.de/prj/geg/en/thm/tru/25453339.html>
- [64] Feminist AI Research Network América Latina y el Caribe. [n. d.]. *Inteligencia Artificial Feminista: Hacia una Agenda de Investigación para América Latina y El Caribe*. <https://feministai.pubpub.org/lachub-libro>
- [65] Shoshana Zuboff. 2023. The age of surveillance capitalism. In *Social theory re-wired*. Routledge, 203–213.