Disabled academics: a case study in Canadian universities

Bea Waterfield, Brenda B. Beagan & Merlinda Weinberg

Published online: 07 Dec 2017.

Submit your article to this journal ⬈

View related articles ⬈

View Crossmark data ⬈

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Disabled academics: a case study in Canadian universities

Bea Waterfield[a], Brenda B. Beagan[b] and Merlinda Weinberg[c]

[a]Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada; [b]School of Occupational Therapy, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada; [c]School of Social Work, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada

ABSTRACT

Though Canadian universities are legally required to accommodate disabled employees, disabled faculty still experience difficulties navigating neoliberal performance standards and medicalized conceptualizations of disability. Drawing on data from a qualitative study with Canadian university faculty, this paper explores the experiences of five disabled academics. Our analysis draws on post-structural understandings of neoliberalism, discourse, disciplinary power, and governmentality, as well as Rosemarie Garland-Thomson's concepts of the fit and misfit. Though the sample is small, this analysis suggests universities pose disabling contexts for academics. Disability is cast as individual responsibility, leaving disabled academics navigating accommodations without institutional support. The normative academic constructed through a discourse of efficiency and productivity is the measure against which disabled academics are evaluated, requiring self-governance to produce themselves as 'good enough' academics. Although higher education environments are increasingly diverse, disabled academics are still having to prove their right to exist in academia, hindering their abilities to participate fully.

Points of interest

- This study suggests that disabled academics are not fully welcomed and included within higher education environments.
- Disabled academics in this study received little institutional support for accessing accommodations.
- Furthermore, disabled academics in this study worked hard to prove themselves as 'good enough' academics.
- Having little institutional support and working to prove themselves good enough left disabled academics in this study feeling isolated and unable to participate in some aspects of their careers.

CONTACT Bea Waterfield ✉ beatrice.waterfield@dal.ca

- It is not enough to invite disabled academics into the university if they are not able to integrate and participate in all areas of their careers.

Introduction

Recently, universities and higher education environments have been required to develop policies around accommodations and supports for disabled students (Goode 2007; Mullins and Preyde 2013). In the United Kingdom, higher education programs have enforced accommodations such as the Disability Student's Allowance to aid in financial costs, disability coordinators at individual universities, and policies that outline disabled students' rights and responsibilities (Goode 2007). Similarly, Canadian post-secondary education institutions offer standardized accommodations and support centers for disabled students (Mullins and Preyde 2013), and some employ universal design for learning (e.g. University of Guelph 2017, McGill University 2017), promoting inclusiveness and accessibility for disabled students. Some Canadian universities have strong critical disability studies programs (e.g. York University 2017, University of Windsor 2017) and Canadian scholars have advanced disability studies in higher education.

Yet, despite increased attention to disabled students (for example, Cameron 2016; Cunnah 2015; Easterbrook et al. 2015; Ennals, Fossey, and Howie 2015; Goode 2007; Lourens and Swartz 2016; Mullins and Preyde 2013; Uditsky and Hughson 2012; Venville, Street, and Fossey 2014), disabled faculty members have received far less attention (American Association of University Professors 2012), particularly in Canada (Crooks, Owen, and Stone 2014). One report on Canadian universities suggested that accommodations for disabled faculty depend on university size (Crooks et al. 2011). Furthermore, few universities have offices providing support to disabled faculty and fewer than half have written policy regarding processes for accommodation (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013, 154).

Although Canadian universities are required by law to implement policies and procedures to address the needs of disabled employees, disabled faculty still experience difficulties navigating neoliberal performance standards and medicalized conceptualizations of disability as an individual impairment and individual responsibility. Such perceptions position disabled academics as unable to meet the standards of university environments, leaving the disabled academic as an 'unexpected worker' within higher education (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013; Titchkosky 2008). Furthermore, although most Canadian universities provide accommodations for disabled faculty, seeking out accommodations can be a cumbersome process, with inconsistent information not readily available, making concrete the notion that disabled faculty do not fit in higher education environments (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013).

Drawing on data from a larger study of faculty at Canadian universities who self-identify as members of marginalized groups, this article explores the experiences of five disabled academics. Our analysis draws on the post-structural theory of neoliberalism, Michel Foucault's (1995) approaches to discourse, disciplinary power, and governmentality, as well as Rosemarie Garland-Thomson's (2011) concepts of fit and misfit. Although using a small sample, this article suggests that while neoliberal performance standards are increasingly affecting all academics, they affect disabled academics uniquely because they are encoded with ableism. Ultimately, the article aims to open an area of discussion surrounding the experiences of disabled academics and how, although higher education environments are increasingly becoming more diverse, disabled academics are still having to prove their right to exist, hindering their abilities to participate fully within all aspects of their work lives.

A word about language

While person-first language ('person with a disability') is normative in many arenas, some disability rights scholars have argued that this positions disability as something people have or do not have, as opposed to emphasizing the social and environmental barriers that may disable a person (Titchkosky 2010). While the intent is to resist defining people by disability, person-first language may simply mask disabling processes, meanwhile rendering disability an individual rather than social issue and hindering politicized analysis. In this article we use the language of disabled person, acknowledging that disability is not something one has so much as something one experiences in particular social conditions. This shifts the focus to structures and disabling processes, as well as systematic disadvantages and inequities (Deal 2007; Goodley 2013).

Theoretical framework: Michel Foucault and Rosemarie Garland-Thomson

The lives of disabled people are directly shaped by dominant discourses of disability that circulate through multiple forms and institutions. Michel Foucault's work positions discourse 'as a system of representation' – a way of talking about and constructing a topic that entails truth (Hall 2001, 72). Discourse shapes and influences individual conduct by governing what is acceptable or even thinkable, thus creating normalized regimes of truth about a topic. Discursive power operates through creating bodies of knowledge in relation to which individuals act, interact, and relate (Foucault 1995), with individuals becoming 'vehicles of power, not … points of application' (Reeve 2002, 496). The medical model of disability is a dominant discourse that shapes the ways in which higher education environments implement policies and procedures (Hibbs and Pothier 2006).

Disciplinary power employs discourses to guide individual behavior within social institutions (Hibbs and Pothier 2006). More specifically, disciplinary power's 'aim [is] to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct or merits' (Foucault 1995, 143). Classification, categorization, and objectification render subjects governable through regulatory practices that rely on normalizing standards (Tremain 2001). For example, university accommodations for disabled students are implemented using policies that draw on a medical discourse of disability, which places full responsibility on the disabled student to document need, within legitimated categories, and manage repeated negotiations to prove continued need and the absence of advantage (Waterfield and Whelan 2017). Student accommodation processes make evident 'the disciplinary nature of power in its self-regulating and productive aspects' as it is the individual who is required to take the initiative to accomplish their own conditions for 'equity' (Hibbs and Pothier 2006, 202).

A key feature of Foucault's neoliberal governmentality is the way citizens come to govern themselves from the 'inside', a de-centered process of power 'with individuals playing an active role in their own self-governance' by monitoring their actions in relation to discourses that produce certain norms and truths (Webb 2006, 15). These processes of self-governance and governance of others are subtle and not always conscious, as individuals rely on dominant discourses to take up varying identities (Pfahl and Powell 2011, 453). In other words, individuals govern themselves in accordance with or opposition to those discourses by taking up particular subject positions, identities made relevant and available discursively, and constituted through interacting and conversing with others (Edley 2001, 210). Thus, subject positions are contingent on the social context through which individuals are moving and interacting, and the dominant discourses present within those environments. In higher education in western societies, dominant discourses of productivity alongside recirculated social discourses of disability as non-productive leave disabled academics in a precarious position (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013).

This precarious position is akin to Rosemarie Garland-Thomson's (2011) notion of 'fit' and 'misfit', which are useful for understanding how discourses and normalized regimes categorize disabled individuals and influence interactions. Garland-Thomson (2011, 594) understands environments as 'material contexts of received and built things ranging from accessibly designed built public spaces, welcoming natural surroundings, communication devices, tools, and implements, as well as other people'. When one fits within their environment, a 'harmonious, proper interaction occurs' between the body and the environment. Thus, the individual fits with the discourse and normalized regimes present within that environment. In contrast, a misfit occurs when an environment and the interactions that occur within it do not sustain and welcome the individual's body, casting the individual as 'a square peg in a round hole' (2011, 593).

Like subject positions for Foucault, Garland-Thomson's fitting and misfitting are always contingent on the environments individuals are surrounded by and the discourses within them that discipline bodies through constructing normative standards.

The effects of neoliberalism on higher education and performance

One of the most prominent discourses governing higher education today is neo-liberalism. It promotes economic competitiveness, emphasizing that individuals must compete with one another and take the necessary steps to earn success and reward, regardless of social adversity. Implied in this discourse is the notion that all individuals begin on the same playing field and are able to participate within higher education in the same way. Here arises the notion of 'responsibilisation', where individuals are understood as autonomous subjects expected to manage risk and account for their well-being (Rose 1999). Such notions are dominant in the increasing global competitiveness within higher education, resulting in universities becoming sites to be 'marketed, sold and profited from' (Morrissey 2013, 799). This context places particular demands on any academics who differ from the expected norms.

Illustrating the effect of neoliberal ideologies in higher education, Morrissey (2013, 2015) draws on Foucault's notions of disciplinary power and governmentality to demonstrate how administrators conceptualize the role of academics. Disciplinary power operates through the university to establish a normative 'optimal' academic who can be governed through 'managerial practises of performance evaluation', enabling administrators to classify academics who stray from this normalized regime as deviant and un-productive (Morrissey 2013, 799). Thus, through neoliberal discourses of productivity, individualization, and competitiveness, administrators create 'regimes of performance' (Morrissey 2015) wherein the normative optimal academic becomes the reference point for academics to govern themselves. Canadian universities have been highly engaged in branding exercises, strategic plans, and marketing; academics are exhorted to demonstrate their value through such indicators as grant funding, patents, training of 'highly qualified personnel', social media 'likes', journal impact factors, and standardized indices for productivity such as the h-index and the i10-index measuring citations.

This discourse around the normative academic relies on objective measures of performance and demands a level of compliance within the university. As Brabazon (2015, 57) states, 'superficial compliance – of performance management meetings and key performance indicators – activate a culture where boxes are ticked, but deeper questions of value, quality, meaning and method are left unasked'. Emphasizing that academics have an individual responsibility to meet these performance standards allows the university to continue assessing value through quantifying productivity. Individual accounts such as annual reports, tenure, and

promotion files are concrete manifestations of such 'regimes of performance' and normative standards.

Constructions of disability within the professions and academia

While there is scant literature regarding the experiences of disabled academics, there is a growing body of research in other professions, throughout North America and the United Kingdom, particularly regarding access to accommodations and 'fitness to practice'. In the health professions in particular, often-named concerns that center on patient safety appear to equate disability with professional incompetence (for example, Bevan 2013; Bulk et al. 2017; Joyce, McMillan, and Hazleton 2009; McKee et al. 2013; Moll et al. 2013; Stanley et al. 2011). According to the Canadian Association of Professionals with Disabilities (2015) the notion of professional implies expert, leader, specialist – which is widely perceived as incommensurable with disabled person. Disabled people are expected to be recipients of professional attention, not professionals themselves. Furthermore, challenging this framing of the professional creates as many challenges with colleagues and managers as it does with clients and patients (Kontosh et al. 2007).

In professional environments, individuals are encouraged to disclose disability to access accommodations, yet frequently encounter underlying notions of disability as a weakness or hindrance to professional and competent job performance (Bulk et al. 2017; Roulstone and Williams 2014). To access accommodations, disabled professionals must navigate disclosure repeatedly and at multiple levels (Stanley et al. 2011). They frequently conceptualize disclosure as a strategic process through which they discern potential long-term consequences of disclosure and decide whether or not to disclose in the context of stigma and potential professional exclusion (Stanley et al. 2011, 26). A series of studies with nurses and physicians suggests that disabled professionals face systemic barriers to career progress, a narrowing of career options and trajectories, and pressure to leave or remain in positions based solely on availability of accommodations (Neal-Boylan 2012, 2014; Neal-Boylan et al. 2012). They may not seek accommodations because the process is too stressful or for fear of being seen as incompetent, they may be unable to get accommodations, and/or they may simply avoid disability disclosure altogether. Navigating disclosure is an ongoing, energy-consuming process for disabled professionals.

Similar performance standards and disabling notions of lesser competence are also present within higher education environments (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). In their study with 45 Canadian academics diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, Crooks, Owen, and Stone (2014) found that people struggled with fluctuating abilities. Navigating disclosure (when, where, whether, how), was an ongoing challenge; a few participants chose not to disclose, and those who chose to disclose did so only when necessary to request accommodations

(Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). Many took advantage of the flexibility of academic work life to be less physically present, teaching online and using distance technology for meetings (Crooks, Owen, and Stone 2014). This made continued productivity possible, but was also very isolating. Disabled academics implemented personal strategies for energy conservation especially in teaching, and several acknowledged a long-term impact on career plans, especially regarding any ambitions for administrative positions (Crooks, Owen, and Stone 2014). Over half of the participants did not seek accommodations, some saying it would be too stressful, with stress exacerbating multiple sclerosis symptoms (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). Others experienced too much fatigue to pursue accommodations. Those who sought accommodations typically did so through informal channels. More than half of those who sought accommodations through formal channels faced negative and often inconsistent responses. The researchers concluded that the university is 'coded' as 'a place for able-bodied workers' (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013, 167), where disabled academics become 'unexpected workers'.

These studies emphasize that non-disclosure and not seeking needed accommodations allow the university to continue with the un-disrupted assumption of an able-bodied worker (Crooks, Owen, and Stone 2014; Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). Titchkosky (2008, 44) suggests that a dominant 'truth' in the university context is the notion that if disabled individuals encounter problems when accessing resources, they are individually responsible for overcoming these barriers, as disability is inherently an individual impairment This leaves intact the notion of a normative optimal academic (Morrissey 2013), one who is not disabled and who is responsible for managing any problems that they may encounter in the university.

This perception of disabled academics as non-normative – as misfits – echoes a well-documented individualism that pervades the experiences of disabled university students. Although there is typically an established process to access accommodations, students find it burdensome, complicated, and demeaning (Author A 2017; Cunnah 2015; Easterbrook et al. 2015). Faculty perceptions often reinforce the individualism, suggesting that individual students need to speak up, overcome shame, disclose, follow proper processes, and advocate for themselves (Gabel and Miskovic 2014). This ignores the identity struggles students may face (Easterbrook et al. 2015; Ennals, Fossey, and Howie 2015). Disclosure of disability is highly selective, relying on a complex weighing of risks and benefits, and (particularly for those with mental health issues) students often opt for non-disclosure (Ennals, Fossey, and Howie 2015; Venville, Street, and Fossey 2014). Disclosure may mean accommodations are possible, but accommodations are stigmatized, widely perceived as 'special advantages' (Bulk et al. 2017; Cunnah 2015; Easterbrook et al. 2015; Mullins and Preyde 2013). Students must choose between invisibility and negative 'extravisibility'

(Goode 2007, 42) wherein they are no longer seen fully as persons (Easterbrook et al. 2015).

Accommodation processes for disabled students perpetuate a discourse of individual responsibility (Hibbs and Pothier 2006), with students expected to prove disability through (often costly) documentation in a lengthy bureaucratic process experienced as a 'complex system of paperwork, meetings, and organization' (Mullins and Preyde 2013, 153). Some students refer to this as 'battling the system' (Goode 2007, 44). In a classic illustration of self-governance, disabled students are held 'responsible for being familiar with their rights under the law, the process for obtaining accommodations, and the ability and willingness to produce evidence of disability' (Gabel and Miskovic 2014, 1151). With the inevitable 'sacrifices of time and energy' imposing additional burdens (Easterbrook et al. 2015, 1515), not surprisingly disabled students may become isolated (Ennals, Fossey, and Howie 2015). When the normative standards code 'student' as inherently 'not disabled', the disabled student is cast as a misfit (Cameron 2016).

While the literature on disabled faculty is scant, it seems likely that there are similar experiences to disabled students in higher education environments. Exploring how five disabled academics experienced and navigated university environments and academic career expectations, this article illuminates the relationship between neoliberal performance expectations and the dominant discourse of disability within higher education. Through an in-depth exploration of how disabled academics accessed accommodations, disclosed disability, and worked to prove themselves 'good enough', the article aims to spark an important conversation surrounding the experiences of disabled academics.

Methods

This analysis draws on data from a larger study of faculty at Canadian universities who self-identify as members of marginalized groups, those traditionally under-represented due to race, ethnicity, indigeneity, gender or sexual identity, working-class background, and/or disability. Participants were recruited through researchers' professional networks, moving beyond those through snowball sampling. Letters of invitation were sent by potential participants to their networks, and on to the networks of those people. Thirty participants volunteered, from a range of academic fields and a range of intersecting social locations or subject positions. Each participant was interviewed once, for 60–120 minutes. All processes were approved by the university research ethics board.

Following discussion of informed consent, semi-structured qualitative interviews grounded in critical theory explored everyday experiences of belonging and marginality, inclusion and exclusion. Some interviews were conducted face to face, some by telephone; all interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim, and pseudonyms were assigned to each participant and any identifiable

information was removed to ensure confidentiality. Using consensus-building through weekly team meetings, data were coded by two research assistants using Atlas/ti data analysis software. Iterative analysis involved the authors and members of the larger team to enhance rigor. Transcripts were read repeatedly, attending to meaning passages, and moving back and forth between individual transcripts and cross-participant comparisons. A summary narrative was compiled for each participant and returned to them for feedback, as a form of member-checking.

This article draws on data from a sub-sample of five participants who identified with the category of disability. The sample is small, yet because information-rich participants were sought, the depth of the interviews allows for considerable qualitative analysis. Given the nature of qualitative research, the article's goal is not to speak to the overall experiences of disabled academics, but rather to open up a discussion around disabled academics within higher education by illustrating the nuanced experiences of five participants. Table 1 describes the participants.

Participants were located in large and small universities, across Canada, in a range of disciplines and all participants were tenured. Unfortunately, this sub-sample was comprised exclusively of women. They were mostly in their 40s and 50s, and had been in the professoriate from 20 to 30 years. Although all participants volunteered for the study because we were seeking 'disabled academics', they did not all identify with that terminology. This makes language use challenging for the article. We use the language each person used for herself, although we speak collectively of disabled academics. We also recognize that details of the university context and discipline would greatly enrich the analysis. Unfortunately, disclosing those details would render participants highly identifiable.

Data analysis was conducted by the lead author, who drew on coded data, cross-referenced interview transcripts, and continually returned to full transcripts. During weekly team meetings, the analysis was strengthened by collective interrogation of emerging themes to ensure reflexivity; this provided a form of researcher triangulation and peer review to enhance credibility and confirmability of the analysis. Some of the authors and team members identify as disabled, some do not – which together enriched analysis.

Table 1. Participant demographics.

Name	Gender	Identity	Discipline
Kathryn	Female	Identifies as having a disability related to chronic pain	Law/social work/education
Lana	Female	Uses the social model of disability and identifies as disabled with chronic illness	Social studies/gender studies
Joan	Female	Identifies as having challenges related to chronic pain	Law/social work/education
Emily	Female	Identifies as disabled with a psychiatric illness	Arts/humanities
Amber	Female	Identifies as physically disabled	Business/management/economics

Results

Individualizing the social: accessing accommodations as responsibilization

Participants described highly individual processes for accessing accommodations within their universities where they were each responsible for identifying necessary accommodations and bringing forward those accommodations for review from human resource departments. As opposed to having certain accommodations available and ready for negotiation, these participants were expected to take responsibility for disability themselves, perpetuating the idea that disabilities are individual 'impairments'. When participants took on this individualized responsibility they were met with implied notions that they were asking for too much.

For example, in seeking accommodations for her chronic illness, Lana found that she received no support from her university and the 'onus' was placed on her to figure out what she needed and how to access those accommodations. At the time, Lana was 'pretty ill' which made the process feel cumbersome and erratic: 'It always felt like reinventing the wheel, because maybe somebody else had gone through this before, but they [human resources] didn't seem to have [kept] any records about things'. She felt very 'frustrated' that the process lacked any support or guidance from the university, and found seeing the process through to completion exhausting, especially while experiencing symptom flare-ups. Her experience points to the lack of standardized accommodations available for faculty, implying that disability is an individual problem to be managed by the individual themselves.

Similarly, Kathryn was expected to identify necessary accommodations and propose those to human resources at her university. She often felt she was perceived as 'needy' when requesting new accommodations, and she found it emotionally challenging to constantly identify her needs for administrators to assess and approve: 'It's almost like you have to "out" what your needs are, and that you're needy, right? And provide that documentation'. Furthermore, Kathryn experienced instances where she felt like she should not ask for 'too much' when accessing accommodations. In her initial hiring negotiations, an administrator brought up a previous case of having to accommodate a faculty member:

> How it was put to me was, 'You know, your predecessor, who was in the disability field, needed to have their own secretary or admin staff support. Do you need anything like that?' And you know with the underlying message [being] 'You *better not* need anything like that'! (Original emphasis)

Although Kathryn was granted accommodations, they were those deemed 'appropriate' by the university. Like Lana, she was held individually responsible to govern herself in accordance with normalized standards of productivity, figuring out what she needed to make her fit with those standards, while ensuring she did not set herself apart from the normative 'optimal' academic by asking for 'too much'. Even during the accommodations negotiation process, Kathryn was informed that her university was only prepared to do so much, implying that

disabled faculty disrupt the university's standards by demanding 'too much' in terms of accommodations.

Not only were instances of 'asking too much' implied around accommodations that were seen as too burdensome, but some participants struggled to obtain even basic accommodations. Both Kathryn and Joan needed designated parking close to their offices; for both, this only happened after colleagues advocated for them. Joan remarked:

> I had some isolated incidents, things like struggling very hard to get parking close to the building. And I had a lot of support from my colleagues who threatened to go out and paint wheelchair signs on the parking spots, if the university didn't do it.

This was echoed by Kathryn: 'It was a huge issue. Like, my colleagues had to really push to make sure that I had a designated spot that wasn't going to cost me more than the normal parking'. The importance of support is apparent for both participants.

All of the participants spoke to the neoliberal and individualizing structures of their universities that were entrenched in the accommodation process. Full responsibility was placed on the participants to determine their necessary accommodations and navigate the process of accessing those accommodations by themselves. Such instances illustrate the power of the dominant discourse of disability, wherein disability is seen as an individual impairment, and disabled individuals are responsible for governing themselves such that they conform with normative standards. Even when accessing basic accommodations, participants were aware that they might be 'asking too much' of the university. Rather than offering processes and potential proactive solutions to make the university environment accessible for disabled faculty, the administration expected faculty to manage and account for their disabilities by themselves – taking time and energy away from other aspects of their careers, thus becoming part of a disabling social and institutional context.

Disclosing disability

Neoliberal standards in higher education support the dominant discourse around disability, perpetuating notions that disabled academics are less productive and less able to perform and function well in the academy. The disabled academics in this study constructed subject positions in relation to this dominant discourse in three significant ways: Some intentionally positioned themselves as 'hardworking' and 'good enough' in order to challenge the implications of this discourse through strategic disclosure; some participants resisted the discourse by selective disclosure to undermine stigma and ensure fit; and others subverted this discourse, using disability to strengthen their academic work. Furthermore, these subject positions were taken up in ways that were relative to the degrees of fit or misfit participants experienced within their contexts, and prevalent discourses around disability.

Joan reported that early in her career she did not feel the need to disclose disability because she felt able to perform at an optimal level. Before feeling it was necessary (and safe) to disclose, Joan endeavored to position herself as a 'hardworking and productive' academic:

> I would say those early years were quite successful years in the sense that I was productive. I was publishing a lot. I was participating in a lot of faculty things … Those early years are really critical in forming impressions of you. How other people see you … I established a reputation as someone who was working hard and producing and the struggle side of it was largely private.

When she began to feel that chronic pain was affecting her performance, Joan disclosed. Because she had already constituted herself as hardworking and productive, Joan secured her fit within the normalized regimes of the university, making disclosure less daunting. Nonetheless, she faced anxiety with each new Dean:

> [The new Dean] came, so I had no sense of who she was going to be, and I was quite nervous because she didn't have the benefits of those early years, you know, to see that I had been a really active contributor. And she was coming in and was sort of seeing me at what I felt was not a very good place.

Thus, Joan's experience of fitting within the university was tenuous and contingent on stability in context; she risked being cast as a misfit when she could no longer depend on the hard-working and productive academic subject position she had established early in her career.

Describing disability as an 'adversary that need[ed] to be conquered', Amber also drew on a previous embodiment of a subject position to navigate the potential risks of disclosure. She positioned herself as 'good enough' to fit the university's normative standards, demonstrating to potential employers that disability had been 'conquered' in the past. She disclosed from the outset:

> I kind of assured [the university] that in the past, [disability] had never really detrimentally affected my performance, and that I doubted that it would. And I kind of assured them that I would do my utmost to ensure – I wasn't apologizing for my disability, but I was really aware of the opportunity for being outed, per se. You know? The concept of someone kind of going, 'Oh, is this somebody that we want to take a chance on?'

Here Amber drew on the dominant individualizing notions of disability in taking up a subject position as 'good enough' academic to assure her employer that she could meet the neoliberal performance standards. By assuring the university that disability had never hindered her productivity in the past, she was able to position herself as fitting within the university.

One participant, Emily, disclosed very selectively, eventually informing only one work colleague about her psychiatric illness. She sought to resist the dominant discourse of mental illness as 'crazy' and to avoid granting power through knowledge to some of her colleagues who had previously been 'quite hostile' to her and might think of her as 'crazy' if they were aware of her illness: 'I don't trust my colleagues with this information … To disclose to them, is giving them way too much power over me. They would use that, and I do not trust that I would not be

punished for this'. Emily went on to say that broader social discourses of mental illness circulate within academia, enhancing the risk of disclosure: 'There's so much stigma around it, that's why I haven't disclosed to anyone because people would just be like, "Oh man, she's crazy". You know? "She's not capable of doing anything". Or "We're afraid of her, because she's crazy"'.

Avoiding disclosure to (potentially hostile) colleagues enabled Emily to take up the subject position of 'good enough' academic, securing her ability to fit within her department. She did selectively disclose to one colleague, whom she had grown to trust, to ensure that someone understood what she was experiencing: 'It's actually really helpful if someone at work knows what I'm going through, if things are difficult. And that I'm not just being a difficult person'. Not always trusting her own ability to govern herself in accordance with normative standards, Emily feared unwittingly 'crossing a line'; she trusted her colleague to tell her honestly when she needed 'to calm down'. Thus, selective disclosure helped Emily to successfully embody the subject position of optimal academic.

Finally, Kathryn described using disability as a teaching tool to connect with students and make her work relevant and meaningful. In her teaching and research, Kathryn views disability as political and social identity, clearly contradicting dominant medicalized conceptions of disability. Acknowledging her inevitable status as a misfit allowed Kathryn to take up the subject position as misfit in a way to enrich her scholarship. She discloses immediately: 'Right off the bat I tell [students] … and I think it's important to do that because I'm saying very clearly that it's okay to identify with having a disability and to acknowledge it'. Kathryn subverted the expectation that accommodation will render disability more-or-less irrelevant, enabling everyone to perform as optimal (non-disabled) academics:

> I carry a [device] around with me to meetings, and there would have been one time I would have been hesitant to do that outside of my department. I'm not anymore. If somebody asks me, I'll tell them. I think I've come to a place where I guess I want more diversity in this institution and I want more of it to be visible. And if my [device] provides a little bit of that visibility then good on it.

Instead of attempting to fit with neoliberal performance standards and regimes of normalization, Kathryn took up the subject position as misfit by using disability to strengthen her scholarship and connections. This, however, resulted in a particular type of socially engaged, participatory scholarship, and a collaborative sharing of authorship credit that – while it met Kathryn's political standards – became a challenge when she faced academic normative standards in the tenure and promotion process: 'It was a horrible experience. I remember just feeling like my work was totally de-valued. Like, it just, it didn't matter. It wasn't "real" scholarship'. Lana also did community-based research, and echoed this: 'the research that you do can be considered not as good, because you know, it's not "pure" research'.

Through the participants' selective and strategic uses of disclosure, we can see how they took up a variety of subject positions in relation to the dominant discourse of disability evident within the university. This was done by constituting

themselves as 'hardworking', strategically taking up the dominant discourse of disability by proving themselves 'good enough', rejecting institutional demands for disclosure and using selective disclosure to counter the subject position of 'difficult person', or subverting the dominant discourse of disability by taking up the subject position as misfit as a politicized subjectivity. All of these instances illuminate how participants constituted themselves as subjects in relation to fitting and misfitting within university contexts.

Questioning belonging in academia and working above and beyond to compensate for disability

Dominant discursive constructions of disabled people as 'unproductive' and 'not performing' were echoed throughout participants' interviews. All participants used language such as 'not good enough', 'guilty', unable to 'pull [their] own weight', 'less valuable', and having to 'prove themselves' in relation to misfitting within the university. Participants engaged in self-governance as a way to prove themselves as productive and valuable academics; however, they found this process emotionally draining, and time and energy consuming, with negative effects on other aspects of their work.

Kathryn spoke to this self-governing when discussing the 'baggage' associated with her condition; she often felt people viewed her primarily through the lens of disability, assuming that she was less productive than an 'optimal' academic. To combat this, Kathryn would constantly work to meet job demands, even while in hospital or too unwell to physically go to work:

> I wouldn't stop working. But there's times that I was in hospital a lot … I used to get criticized for continuing to work, from the medical end of things. I'd be in a hospital bed marking papers. But from an employment perspective, I was more of a risk because I had health issues … there was baggage attached.

Kathryn worked hard to govern herself and ensure that she was compensating for her misfitting within the university. Inevitably, working above and beyond took a toll on Kathryn at certain points in her career, as she found it hard at times to put energy into other aspects of her job, such as teaching and administrative work.

Lana often felt she was not 'putting in enough' as an academic, particularly when it came to publishing expectations and being present at social gatherings. She found juggling these expectations with her chronic illness emotionally draining; when her symptoms intensified, she needed to preserve energy for the more essential aspects of her work, like teaching and administrative work. The potential for then being constructed as a misfit in academic settings was intensified by being a woman and single mother, which further influenced how she governed herself in allocating time and energy. Childcare responsibilities hindered the flexibility required to meet informal – but important – expectations about being present at some kinds of formal and informal workplace events.

As mentioned earlier, Joan worked hard early in her career to constitute herself as a 'reputable' academic. She repeatedly described not feeling like a 'good enough' academic because she found it hard to attend conferences and social gatherings:

> A vital part of being an academic is going to conferences and travelling and doing that stuff. And that's pretty much ruled out for me now. So that's been hard, staying connected to other parts of the country and the world … Inevitably the sense you get over years of being less present and having fewer connections across the country than other people do, you do develop a sense of being less valuable.

Joan also did a lot of her teaching and administrative work using distance technology, which meant she was less physically present than colleagues. She avoided social events because they were too taxing. In turn, she felt like she had to 'constantly prove herself' and 'be good at everything' she did feel able to do as a way to compensate for not quite fitting in some areas: 'I probably work harder than most people, simply to overcompensate for the fact that I feel like I'm less of a contributor, because I'm not physically present as much'. Proving herself 'good enough' in some areas helped ensure fit with the university's normalized regimes.

Emily engaged in similar self-governing in relation to her publishing record. She did not always have the energy and focus required for writing. As a result, when she felt able to write, she found that she needed to 'take advantage' of that and try to publish as much as possible:

> When I have the times when I'm feeling all right, I do feel the need – it's not just the desire – but I feel the need to do as much as possible, so that I can prove, that, that I'm not lazy, that I do do all these things, and that I am engaged.

Like Joan, Emily overcompensated at times to ensure she was meeting expectations. She also found ways to prove herself productive in other areas of her work, such as administration: 'I do feel the need to sort of prove that, "Here's another way that I'm doing my job really well". And that I'm valuable, right? That I have value to the department and the university'. Ultimately Emily said that because of her insecurity around her publishing record, she felt like 'a bit of a failure in that respect' and needed to remind herself of her successes as an academic, and work extra hard when she felt able.

Amber also described needing to prove her capability and worth as an academic: 'We drive ourselves, at a certain point, just to make sure that nobody says that we're not pulling our weight or doing our share.' For Amber this was complicated by the fact that health issues had hindered her completion of a PhD program, and she was teaching with a master's degree plus additional credentials. While this was not unusual in her field, or her department, it complicated her sense of feeling good enough:

> I don't ever want someone to point at me and say, 'Oh well, she doesn't do – You know, we can't expect as much from her, because oh well, you know that she's disabled, right?' And so, I think I overcompensate. And it's probably a combination of both the disability concept and the educational qualification.

Like other participants, Amber governed her own performance, overcompensating to subvert the dominant discourse of disability as hindering capability and productivity. Extra work helped to prove that she fit with normative standards.

All of these instances demonstrate how participants engaged in governing themselves to ensure that they were meeting job requirements. This self-governance took the form of working above and beyond to forestall misfitting in the neoliberal university context, resisting the dominant discourse of disability, but upholding normative performance standards. Inevitably, overcompensating had negative consequences for some participants; constant questioning of self-worth and needing to constantly prove themselves took time and energy which were then not available for other aspects of their jobs, or their lives.

Discussion

A dominant discourse framing disability as individualized and medicalized is evident within higher education environments, with the consequence that disabled individuals do not always 'fit' (Garland-Thomson 2011; Hibbs and Pothier 2006; Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). In this article, we suggest that this medical discourse of disability may be intensified by neoliberal performance standards that create normalized regimes of the 'optimal' and productive academic and further perpetuate ableism within higher education (Morrissey 2013, 2015). The resulting normative standards inform how disciplinary power affects workplace experiences for the disabled academics in our sample.

We can see how neoliberal standards are informed by, and influence, the dominant discourse surrounding disability, because disability was constituted as an impairment posing risk to participants' ability to perform and 'fit' within the normalized regimes and expectations of the university. Thus, we can see the self-regulating aspect of disciplinary power in how all participants were held individually responsible for measuring up to normative standards of the optimal academic, through self-classification in accordance with existing categories, managing their needs through identifying necessary accommodations, proposing these to human resource departments, and navigating the process through to completion. This takes time and energy away from other aspects of their work (Hibbs and Pothier 2006, 202). As Morrissey (2013) argues, neoliberal managerialism has infused higher education more broadly. Disabled academics faced those normalizing standards of performance, productivity, and accountability in the context of a disability discourse that already constituted them as less capable, and less productive (Gabel and Miskovic 2014; Hibbs and Pothier 2006; Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013). The lack of routine accommodation processes suggests that disability is viewed as contradictory, aberrant – an academic is expected to be not disabled. The disabled person is thus constructed as a non-optimal academic, and disabled academics as 'unexpected workers' (Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013) who do not easily fit (Garland-Thomson 2011) that context.

In response to the dominant discourse, which constructed them as misfits for the 'optimal academic' subjectivity, disabled academics in this study used disclosure strategically in order to take up alternate subject positions. One participant consciously took up the subject position of hardworking, productive academic before disclosing disability. This position was precarious as it relied on people's past knowledge of her performance, knowledge that diminished over time. Participants drew on the managerial practices of the university to constitute themselves as 'good enough' academics, a subjectivity that relied on some form of current or past evidence. In contrast, one participant resisted being constituted as crazy or dangerous, choosing instead to be seen as a sometimes difficult person, and selectively disclosing to one colleague entrusted to ensure that she remained within the realm of what was considered acceptable performance. One participant mounted a more direct challenge, subverting the dominant discourse by taking up the subject position of misfit and using disability as a teaching tool to connect with students and forefront disability politics. However, both participants who were able to take up a misfit subject position taught in disciplines that were specific to disability.

If disabled academics are defined in dominant discourse as less capable and productive (Gabel and Miskovic 2014; Hibbs and Pothier 2006; Stone, Crooks, and Owen 2013), the managerial practices through which academics are exhorted to self-govern, disciplining themselves to meet normative performance standards (Morrissey 2013, 2015), may be particularly onerous for disabled academics. All of the participants worked diligently to 'prove' themselves as 'good enough' academics, countering their positioning as misfits in the neoliberal university context. They all perceived they were overcompensating, working harder than others, and described the time and energy required to always be seen to be pulling their weight and ensuring they were meeting normative standards. This took the form of participants working even when in the hospital, having to 'be good at everything', taking advantage of any available time to publish, being over-involved in administrative work, and fighting for recognition of their form of scholarship. Thus, all participants recognized disability as constituting them as misfits within the university and through constant self-governance they sought to prove their value as 'good enough' academics.

Although these experiences are from a small sample, this article suggests that neoliberal standards and dominant medicalized discourses around disability intertwine and affect the experiences of disabled academics, creating a disabling social institutional context by encoding ableism as ostensibly neutral performance expectations. As a result, disabled academics in this study engaged in extra work around navigating the accommodation process, constructing alternate subject positions in different contexts, and constantly feeling that they had to prove good enough. Inevitably, the practices of self-governance in the context of disability took energy and time away from other aspects of their work, such as conference participation and other informal events that connected them with colleagues. Because of this, all participants voiced feeling unable to participate in their careers

to their fullest capabilities, which at times was isolating and further reinforced their status as misfits in academic contexts. Even when overcompensating and working hard to prove their value, participants still sometimes felt 'guilty' and like 'failures'. Although the fear of never doing enough may be common in academia, it may be heightened for disabled academics as the neoliberal performance standards and discourse around disability automatically position them as misfits within the university and create disabling conditions within which they must perform and measure up.

In his analyses of neoliberal governance in universities, John Morrissey (2013, 2015) argues that the academic subjectivity that is becoming normalized through managerial practices must be resisted: 'There are powerful and persuasive registers of autonomy, entrepreneurship, accountability and responsibilisation at the heart of the neoliberal managerial university today, which we simply cannot concede' (2015, 628). He echoes others in suggesting that we need to author alternative academic subjectivities; in short, different ways of enacting 'good enough academic'. While the dominant vision of the university today is centered on economics, infused with language of efficiency and accountability to the public good, he suggests we need to draw on other visions of academia, 'inflected with other values that are equally compelling and persuasive' (2015, 629). While neoliberal discourses insist we are individually responsible for our own self-regulation, our own successes and failures, and not responsible for others, universities have long had a broader public mandate.

Morrissey (2015) encourages academics to articulate alternative truths and responsibilities, civic and educational responsibilities, to students and the broader public, to foster intellectual independence and critical thought, to create transformative knowledge and ideas, to inform public debate through critique and the role of the public intellectual. He insists that academics 'must work together to insist upon, author and enact alternative subjectivities, and take seriously the challenge of demonstrating to a more broadly constituted public the very *raison d'être* of the contemporary university' (2015, 630). We would suggest that in the context of current university attention to 'diversity' and 'equity', this may be a prime moment to construct new standards that give space for disability and other marginalizing social identities to fully fit with the university. To do so, universities must reflect on the current standards employed that perpetuate ableist notions of disability. As Brabazon (2015, 59) writes, 'such commitments … [require] a flattening of power structures and decision making at a time of heightened managerialism and neoliberalism in higher education'.

It is not sufficient to invite some disabled academics to enter the professoriate if they are then expected to perform as exact replicas of non-disabled academics. Disabled academics bring value to the university, in their scholarship and their teaching, as well as their expertise. When they are required to waste time, energy, and emotion enacting 'optimal (non-disabled) academic' this is a waste of their

unique skills, abilities and experiences, with significant costs to them, their students, the research community, and the broader public.

Limitations and conclusion

Ideally this research would analyze the ways disability experiences are affected by the immediate context, the institution, and the discipline. That was not possible here without risking confidentiality. Larger studies are needed to explore those influences in a representative sample. Ideally research would longitudinally explore the experiences of disabled academics over time, as they will undoubtedly change through a career and life course. Furthermore, future research should analyze how university polices regarding disabled faculty affect everyday work experiences.

This article has explored the experiences of a small sample of disabled academics within neoliberal higher education environments. Attending to both the normalized regimes of neoliberal managerial performance standards and the dominant discourse of disability, as well as the context-specific potential for fitting and misfitting, directs attention to the constitution of the university as a disabling context for academics. The normative, expected academic constructed through the language of efficiency, productivity, and accountability is non-disabled, rendering the disabled academic a misfit. The disabled academic, then, is expected to self-regulate in accordance with normalized standards, erasing social difference and producing themselves as 'good enough' academic through categorization, classification, and documentation; identification of and responsibilization for individual accommodations; and working as much as needed to not disrupt a regime in which productivity is measured, counted, and evaluated. Although most of the subject positions taken up by participants employed or engaged with these governing practices, there are also hints of the potential for resistance, through enacting alternate subjectivities, ones grounded in other values and truth systems. Such resistance carries the possibility to promote values that could inform higher education, values of civic responsibility, critical democracy, public intellectualism, equity, and justice. In such a university, disabled academics might more obviously fit.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

References

American Association of University Professors. 2012. *Accommodating Faculty Members who have Disabilities*. https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/49CCE979-73DF-4AF4-96A2-10B2F111EFBA/0/Disabilities.pdf.

Bevan, J. 2013. "Disabled Occupational Therapists – Asset, Liability … or 'Watering Down' the Profession?" *Disability & Society* 29 (4): 583–596. doi:10.1080/09687599.2013.831747.

Brabazon, T. 2015. *Enabling University: Impairment, (Dis)ability and Social Justice in Higher Education*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Bulk, L. Y., A. Easterbrook, E. Roberts, M. Groening, S. Murphy, M. Lee, P. Ghanouni, J. Gagnon, and T. Jarus. 2017. "'We Are Not Anything Alike': Marginalization of Health Professionals with Disabilities." *Disability & Society* 32 (5): 615–634. doi:10.1080/09687599.2017.1308247.

Cameron, H. E. 2016. "Beyond Cognitive Deficit: The Everyday Lived Experience of Syslexic Students at University." *Disability & Society* 31 (2): 223–239. doi:10.1080/09687599.2016.1152951.

Canadian Association of Professionals with Disabilities. 2015. *As it Stands Now*. http://www.canadianprofessionals.org/about.htm.

Crooks, V. A., M. Owen, and S.-D. Stone. 2014. "Chronic Illness and the Canadian Knowledge Worker: The Role of the Body and Embodiment in Shaping the Production of Academic Work." In *Working Bodies: Chronic Illness in the Canadian Workplace*, edited by S. D. Stone, V. A. Crooks, and M. Owen, 196–209. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.

Crooks, V. A., S.-D. Stone, M. Owen, and V. Casey. 2011. *Accommodating Academics with Disabilities and Ongoing Health Concerns in the Workplace: A Report on Canadian Universities*. https://www.academia.edu/778146/Accommodating_Academics_with_Disabilities_and_Ongoing_Health_Concerns_in_the_Workplace_A_report_on_Canadian_Universities?auto=download.

Cunnah, W. 2015. "Disabled Students: Identity, Inclusion and Workbased Placements." *Disability & Society* 30 (2): 213–226. doi:10.1080/09687599.2014.996282.

Deal, M. 2007. "Aversive Disablism: Subtle Prejudice Toward Disabled People." *Disability & Society* 22 (1): 93–107. doi:10.1080/09687590601056667.

Easterbrook, A., L. Bulk, P. Ghanouni, M. Lee, B. Opini, E. Roberts, G. Parhar, and T. Jarus. 2015. "The Legitimization Process of Students with Disabilities in Health and Human Service Educational Programs in Canada." *Disability & Society* 30 (10): 1505–1520. doi:10.1080/09687599.2015.1108183.

Edley, N. 2001. "Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions." In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates, 189–228. London: Sage Publications.

Ennals, P., E. Fossey, and L. Howie. 2015. "Postsecondary Study and Mental Ill-Health: A Meta-Synthesis of Qualitative Research Exploring Students' Lived Experiences." *Journal of Mental Health* 24 (2): 111–119. doi:10.3109/09638237.2015.1019052.

Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Gabel, S. L., and M. Miskovic. 2014. "Discourse and the Containment of Disability in Higher Education: An Institutional Analysis." *Disability & Society* 29 (7): 1145–1158. doi:10.1080/09687599.2014.910109.

Garland-Thomson, R. 2011. "Misfits: A Feminist Materialist Disability Concept." *Hypatia* 26 (3): 591–609.

Goode, J. 2007. "'Managing' Disability: Early Experiences of University Students with Disabilities." *Disability & Society* 22 (1): 35–48. doi:10.1080/09687590601056204.

Goodley, D. 2013. "Dis/Entangling Critical Disability Studies." *Disability & Society* 28 (5): 631–644. doi:10.1080/09687599.2012.717884.

Hall, S. 2001. "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse." In *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, edited by M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates, 72–81. London: Sage Publications.

Hibbs, T., and D. Pothier. 2006. "Post-Secondary Education and Disabled Students: Mining a Level Playing Field or Playing in a Minefield?" In *Critical Disability Theory: Essays in Philosophy, Politics, Policy, and Law*, edited by D. Pothier and R. Devlin, 195–223. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Joyce, T., M. McMillan, and M. Hazleton. 2009. "The Workplace and Nurses with a Mental Illness." *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 18 (6): 391–397. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0349.2009.00629.

Kontosh, L. G., I. Fletcher, M. Frain, and J. Winland-Brown. 2007. "Work Place Issues Surrounding Healthcare Professionals with Disabilities in the Current Labor Market." *Work* 29 (4): 295–302.

Lourens, H., and L. Swartz. 2016. "Experiences of Visually Impaired Students in Higher Education: Bodily Perspectives on Inclusive Education." *Disability & Society* 31 (2): 240–251. doi:10.1080/09687599.2016.1158092.

Mcgill University. 2017. *Universal Design*. https://www.mcgill.ca/osd/facultyinfo/universal-design.

McKee, M. M., S. Smith, S. Barnett, and T. A. Pearson. 2013. "What are the Benefits of Training Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Doctors?" *Academic Medicine* 88 (2): 224–232. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31827c0aef.

Moll, S., J. M. Eakin, R.-L. Franche, and C. Strike. 2013. "When Health Care Workers Experience Mental Ill Health: Institutional Practices of Silence." *Qualitative Health Research* 23 (2): 167–179. doi:10.1177/1049732312466296.

Morrissey, J. 2013. "Governing the Academic Subject: Foucault, Governmentality and the Performing University." *Oxford Review of Education* 39 (6): 797–810. doi:10.1080/03054985.2013.860891.

Morrissey, J. 2015. "Regimes of Performance: Practices of the Normalised Self in the Neoliberal University." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 36 (4): 614–634. doi:10.1080/01425692.2013.838515.

Mullins, L., and M. Preyde. 2013. "The Lived Experience of Students with an Invisible Disability at a Canadian University." *Disability & Society* 28 (2): 147–160. doi:10.1080/09687599.2012.752127.

Neal-Boylan, L. 2012. "An Exploration and Comparison of the Worklife Experiences of Registered Nurses and Physicians with Permanent Physical and/or Sensory Disabilities." *Rehabilitation Nursing* 37 (1): 3–10. doi:10.1002/RNJ.00005.

Neal-Boylan, L. 2014. "Nurses with Disabilities: Their Job Descriptions and Work Expectations." *Rehabilitation Nursing* 39 (4): 169–177. doi:10.1002/rnj.122.

Neal-Boylan, L., A. Hopkins, R. Skeete, S. Hartmann, L. I. Iezzoni, and M. Nunez-Smith. 2012. "The Career Trajectories of Health Care Professionals Practicing With Permanent Disabilities." *Academic Medicine* 87 (2): 172–178. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31823e1e1c.

Pfahl, L., and J. Powell. 2011. "Le gitimating School Segregation. The Special Education Profession and the Discourse of Learning Disability in Germany." *Disability & Soceity* 26 (4): 449–462.

Reeve, D. 2002. "Negotiating Psycho-emotional Dimensions of Disability and their Influence on Identity Constructions." *Disability & Society* 17 (5): 493–508. doi:10.1080/09687590220148487.

Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roulstone, A., and J. Williams. 2014. "Being Disabled, Being A Manager: 'Glass Partitions' and Conditional Identities in the Contemporary Workplace." *Disability & Society* 29 (1): 16–29. doi:10.1080/09687599.2013.764280.

Stanley, N., J. Ridley, J. Harris, and J. Manthorpe. 2011. "Disclosing Disability in the Context of Professional Regulation: A Qualitative UK Study." *Disability & Society* 26 (1): 19–32. doi:10.1080/09687599.2011.529663.

Stone, S.-D., V. A. Crooks, and M. Owen. 2013. "Going Through the Back Door: Chronically Ill Academics' Experiences as 'Unexpected Workers.'" *Social Theory and Health* 11 (2): 151–174. doi:10.1057/sth.2013.1.

Titchkosky, T. 2008. "'To Pee or Not to Pee?' Ordinary Talk about Extraordinary Exclusions in a University Environment." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33 (1): 37–60.

Titchkosky, T. 2010. "The Not-Yet Time of Disability in the Bureaucratization of University Life." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 30 (3/4). http://www.dsq-sds.org/article/view/1295/1331.

Tremain, Shelley. 2001. "On the Government of Disability." *Social Theory and Practice* 27 (4): 617–636.

Uditsky, B., and E. Hughson. 2012. "Inclusive Postsecondary Education – An Evidence-Based Moral Imperative." *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities* 9 (4): 298–302.

University of Guelph. 2017. *Accessible Education*. http://opened.uoguelph.ca/student-resources/Accessible-Education.

University of Windsor. 2017. *Disability Studies*. http://www1.uwindsor.ca/disabilitystudies/.

Venville, A., A. Street, and E. Fossey. 2014. "Student Perspectives on Disclosure of Mental Illness in Post-Compulsory Education: Displacing Doxa." *Disability & Society* 29: 792–806. doi:10.1080/09687599.2013.844101.

Waterfield, B., and E. Whelan. 2017. "Learning Disabled Students and Access to Accomodations: Socioeconomic Status." *Capital and Stigma. Disability & Society* 32 (7): 986–1006. doi:10.1080/09687599.2017.1331838.

Webb, S. A. 2006. *Social Work in a Risk Society. Social and Political Perspectives*. NYC: Palgrave Macmillan.

York University. 2017. *Graduate Program in Critical Disability Studies*. http://cds.gradstudies.yorku.ca.