

---

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
1 Introduction: Why Does Disability Matter for Media?	1
2 Understanding Disability and Media	20
3 Media's Role in Disability	36
4 The News on Disability	57
5 Beyond Disabled Broadcasting	77
6 Disability and Media Work	94
7 Conclusion: Doing Justice to Disability and Media	113
<i>Bibliography</i>	124
<i>Index</i>	146

# 1 Introduction: Why Does Disability Matter for Media?

---

Every day we encounter disability in our lives in some form or other. Many of us live with disability and impairment. Many more have friends, lovers, family, work mates, and acquaintances who experience disability, often without our realizing. Disability is just part of ordinary life. Often it fades into the background. Other times disability emerges as a difference worth discussing or becomes a problem for ourselves, others, and social institutions. In many of the societies, cultures, and groups to which we belong, disability is increasingly 'normal'. It's just part of living in 'super'-diverse – or even pretty homogenous – societies. It has taken a long while for disability to gain the acknowledgement it deserves, and there's a lot to be tackled in terms of equality, social participation, and full cultural citizenship. But what does disability have to do with media? Well, it turns out, as we outline in this book, quite a bit.

Consider a day in the life of many of us. When we walk across the street, whether strolling, pushing a pram or wheelchair, or riding a bike or scooter, we might whiz down a 'curb cut' – the smoothed down bit of the pavement or sidewalk that allows us easy access to the road. Or we might navigate a shopping centre, park, or airport trying to find accessible toilets. In our university or school, we might look out for a hearing loop in the lecture theatre, use a sign language interpreter or person to transcribe lectures or take notes, or use accessible technology to use the Internet.

In various contexts, we are all familiar with the iconic signs that represent 'disabled'. Take, for instance, the classic image of the wheelchair user familiar to people all around the world. This is a white stylized image of a person in a wheelchair, on a blue background. The colours are so widely known that the blue is often referred to as 'handicapped blue'. First devised in 1968 by Danish design student Susanne Koefed, then modified by Karl Montan (who added the circle representing the

## 2 Disability and the Media

head of the seated figure) (Ben-Moshea and Powell, 2007), the icon is part of an international standard defining a set of graphic symbols that provide public information in all locations and sectors where the public has access (International Organization for Standardization, 2007, 2013). The International Symbol of Access is used in a wide range of situations where the access is not just about physical access for wheelchair users. Not surprisingly, it has been critiqued by those who argue it excludes as well as enables or includes. A group of US-based designers associated with the Accessible Icon Project have produced an alternative Symbol of Access which aims to signify a more active – rather than passive – image of disability. Such efforts have built on the work of artists such as British-based Caroline Cardus. In partnership with community and disability arts charity Inter-Action MK, Cardus created a 2004 travelling exhibition of alternative disability signs entitled *The Way Ahead* (Disability Arts Online, 2004). These three signs offer alternative ways to understand and communicate about disability than those we customarily encounter.

As this brief discussion indicates, when we examine the taken-for-granted ideas and assumptions about the International Symbol of Access – the most common of all signs of disability – it turns out that disability is much richer, more complex, and more present in everyday life than is generally realized. These symbols of disability are a concrete example of how we communicate about disability. In the kinds of societies across the world today, much communication takes place via media of one sort or another. So it is a very short road from communication to media, when it comes to disability now and into the future.

Even in the poorest countries and societies, media such as radio, television, cinema, music, advertising, and the increasing use of mobile phones form the ways in which billions of the world's people communicate, participate in society, exercise their political rights, make meaning, and create culture. Media has great importance in the contemporary world because it provides the channels, networks, formats, and languages through which much of life takes place and finds meaning. When we inspect the wide diversity of contemporary media, in our particular media worlds, it is surprising how often disability makes an appearance and then, if we care to – and know how to – look more deeply, how foundational disability is to the structuring of media. And, vice versa, how much media is implicated in the shaping of disability. Before we get underway, let's talk first about what we mean by disability and how to define it.

## Disability – What Does It Mean?

Disability is often associated with physical impairment – for instance, something that a person is born with or acquires (through a car or work accident, for instance) that makes them permanently disabled. One of the most common images that comes to mind of disability is a person in a wheelchair – so it is no surprise that the International Symbol of Access is exactly this. Such a person, in the past at least, was often described as ‘wheelchair-bound’. They may have a condition such as paraplegia or quadriplegia, with loss of bodily functioning due to spinal cord injury. Another common image of disability is a person who has a sensory disability – for instance, someone who is Blind, Deaf, or has a communication disability (for instance, who cannot speak and was formerly described as ‘mute’). There are a number of other kinds of disability also widely recognized, such as intellectual disability (formerly associated with ‘Down’s syndrome’), or autism.

We mention these images because often when disability is encountered these are the ways it is imagined. For us, and many other people now, disability means something quite different. While there is a kernel of truth to these images of disability, not least because they speak to the experience and lives of actual people with disability, they also constitute a major barrier. Such images are, in effect, unhelpful, ‘disabling’ stereotypes. Such stereotypes of disability are really out of date and inaccurate. And, rather like racist, sexist, national, class, or homophobic stereotypes, they distort social reality – constituting a real barrier not only to understanding but also to the transformation of society that is really needed to embrace disability, not reject it out of fear and loathing.

Fortunately, we now have better, more accurate, and fairer ways to define and understand disability. Let’s start with the widely accepted international definition called the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). In 2001, this definition was adopted by all 191 countries who are ‘member states’ of the World Health Organization (WHO). While still problematic, the definition is a step forward in how disability is understood. Firstly, it is an interactive, dynamic definition of disability: ‘A person’s functioning or disability is conceived as a dynamic interaction between health conditions and environmental and personal factors’ (WHO, 2001: 8). Both functioning and disability are ‘multidimensional’ (WHO, 2001: 8). Secondly, disability is the ‘umbrella term for any or all of: an impairment of body structure or function, a limitation in activities, or a restriction in participation’

#### 4 Disability and the Media

(WHO, 2001: 8). So when the classification is broken down further, it is under the following headings:

- body functions and body structures;
- activities and participation; and
- environmental factors.

The first two of these, body functions and structures, most resemble the way that disability has been understood in recent time – as something to do with impairments, defects, or health issues that affect the body.

So this first element of the classification includes eight different kinds of body functions: mental functions; sensory functions; pain; voice and speech functions; functions of cardiovascular and other systems; functions of digestive, metabolic, and endocrine systems; genitourinary and reproductive systems; and neuromusculoskeletal and movement-related functions. The second element lists eight matching body structures, starting with structures of the nervous system; eye, ear, and related structures; structures involved in voice and speech; and so on.

At this point, you are probably thinking that you have wandered into a medical or health sciences lecture, perhaps no problem for a student studying to be a doctor or disability professional, but what does it have to do with media?

This is where the third and fourth elements of the classification give us a clue. Here activities are brought into the picture: learning and applying knowledge; tasks; communication; mobility; self-care; interpersonal interactions and relationships; and community, social, and civic life. And then are the environmental factors that affect disability, such as products and technology; natural and human-made environments; support and relationships; attitudes; services, systems and policies.

So what emerges from this ICF definition is that disability is not just a medical or health condition. Disability involves the interaction among our bodies, activities, societies, and environments. This ICF definition has been adopted by many governments (not all) and is often used in the gathering of official statistics on disability. This definition provided the conceptual framework for the most authoritative international report on disability, the first *World Report on Disability*, undertaken by WHO with the World Bank and released in 2011.

The *World Report on Disability* gave the following global estimates of prevalence of disability (based on two WHO surveys from 2002 to 2004). It estimated that 2.9% of the world's population could be regarded as having severe disability. Further, that 15.3% of the world's population

could be seen as having moderate and severe disability. The figures vary by region and country and also by gender. Women overall were estimated to have a higher prevalence of disability – 11%, not least because of the higher number of older women in the population than older men (World Health Organization, 2011: 7). Measuring disability is a very complex, problematic, and hotly debated area, so for brevity we will leave the figures and disputes here and instead return to the discussion of how disability is defined, and why this is highly relevant for the understanding of media.

As the *World Report on Disability* outlines:

Disability is the umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions, referring to the negative aspects of the interaction between an individual (with a health condition) and that individual's contextual factors (environmental and personal factors). (World Health Organization, 2011: 4)

At the outset, the report notes the importance of improving social participation by 'addressing the barriers which hinder persons with disabilities in their day to day lives' (World Health Organization, 2011: 4). The report points out that a 'person's environment has a huge impact on the experience and extent of disability' (World Health Organization, 2011). In particular, it reports that 'inaccessible environments create disability by creating barriers to participation and inclusion' (World Health Organization, 2011). The report illustrates environment barriers with three examples:

- a Deaf individual without a sign language interpreter
- a wheelchair user in a building without an accessible bathroom or elevator
- a blind person using a computer without screen-reading software. (World Health Organization, 2011: 7)

Interestingly, the first example has to do with language, and the third example has to do with the defining media of our time – computers and software. The report also goes on to note that 'knowledge and attitudes are important environmental factors':

Raising awareness and challenging negative attitudes are often first steps towards creating more accessible environments for persons with disabilities. Negative imagery and language, stereotypes, and

## 6 Disability and the Media

stigma – with deep historic roots – persist for people with disabilities around the world. (World Health Organization, 2011: 7)

Here we arrive at the heartland territory for media students, teachers, workers, and researchers. The media is paramount for awareness-raising, attitude formation, circulation of ideas, personal expression, social identity, and cultural currency. If disability is not just medical, or psychological, but also a mix of these with the social, then at a deep level it involves that great organ of the social – the media.

### Social (Disability) Media

So let us pause at this point, in order to summarize, draw out, and discuss some of the implications of the definition of disability.

To start with, it is clear from the WHO report, as well as from nationally available statistics and research, that depending on the definition adopted people with disabilities number a surprisingly large portion of populations (often estimated at 20% in some Western countries). Disability is also highly heterogeneous and diverse: people can have intellectual impairment, mental health problems, physical or sensory impairments, degenerative illnesses, and so on. Disability is not just one thing. And disabilities often interact with each other to produce complex, unstable, changing conditions. So there are lots of big and little differences in disability, which means that people with disabilities cannot all be approached in the same way. Disability is dynamic: people can be born with impairments, acquire them, have them from time to time, and, if we live long enough, we will all surely count as disabled. So disability changes over the course of each person's life. The nature of disability is often shape-shifting and hard to pin down.

For all these reasons, and a few more, polarizing people into 'us' (people with disabilities) or 'them' (those without disabilities) is surprisingly hard to do. Actually, so too is declaring that there are those of us who are truly disabled (and deserving), and those who are able-bodied.

Most people, after all, have some sort of crutch, support, helping technology, bodily variation, impairment, infirmity, or weakness. The most common technology of disability, it is often said, is a pair of glasses (not the wheelchair).

Add to which, disability also takes on different meanings and implications across different social, cultural, and linguistic communities. In Britain, for instance, 'disabled' people is the preferred term, whereas

in the United States and elsewhere, it is more widely accepted usage to speak of 'people with disabilities'. 'Crip' is a time-honoured term of abuse, but it's also now been reclaimed by people with disabilities – not least in terms like 'crip theory', the title of one of the most famous recent US academic books on disability (McRuer, 2006).

Yet while disability takes very different forms, there are also many aspects common to the experience of the different groups and individuals with disabilities. To hazard a generalization, common experiences often revolve around exclusion, discrimination, oppression, and inequality in work and income. People with disabilities tend to have a lower income, poor access to education, lower levels of participation in society, and are often still segregated from mainstream society via specialized institutions.

To grasp this complex yet common phenomenon, we need to go further in thinking about disability and understanding its social, political, and cultural dimensions. In unpacking the ICF definition, we have noted the emerging consensus that disability is not just a medical or health problem that deserves 'special' attention. As we will discuss later, this is a view summed up as the 'medical model' of disability. Instead, it is crucial to understand that disability is formed through social, cultural, political, and other dimensions of life. This view of disability, as we will discover, is often referred to as the 'social model' (although it involves a wide range of other philosophies of disability too). Part of the point of the 2001 ICF definition is trying to strike a balance between the 'medical' and 'social' models of disability. The *World Report on Disability* takes this international understanding and definition of disability into a much deeper exploration of its social, cultural, and political conditions.

Central to this process is the role played in defining disability by people with disabilities themselves. As WHO itself emphasizes, the contemporary definition of disability is not settled – it is evolving. The other key international frame of reference that puts people with disabilities and the achievement of justice and freedom for all of us when it comes to disability is the 2006 United Nations *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (CRPD). The CRPD provides the first unequivocal international recognition of the oppressive situation of people with disabilities, specifically that basic human rights are routinely denied to the world's disabled. This Convention enjoins, and indeed requires, the governments of the world that are signatories to take action to safeguard the human rights of persons with disabilities. The provisions of the Convention should be henceforth distributed to all schoolchildren

## 8 Disability and the Media

and committed to our memories, but, for the present, let us recite only Article 1:

The purpose of the present Convention is to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity.

Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.

As this book unfolds, we will further explore the deceptively simple yet richly complicated concept of disability now put firmly on the international and national agenda by the CRPD and the other documents we have discussed. However, before we head to this terrain, let us consider the various objections disability often raises – and that you, the reader, might share at this point.

It is certainly the case that there are many people who would wish to call the whole concept of disability into question. Many feel that to describe someone as ‘disabled’ is not only to put that person in a kind of ghetto but also to treat as categorical what is only relative. Aren’t we all disabled, in the sense that some of us, though pretty smart in some areas, are physically gauche, or hopeless at ball games, or poor at maths? And so isn’t it better to talk, as some do, about being ‘differently abled’. If so, where would this leave our idea of disability? Indeed, what kind of disability are we discussing here?

In response to objections such as these, it is important to develop a more nuanced argument about why disability is still the central concept to grasp this phenomenon (though it is a notion that comes replete with its problems and limitations). After all, disability does indeed touch all, or at least most, of our lives – though, as we’ve been suggesting, not as typically still understood.

We can start with the idea that disability is what society makes of it in response to the experience and fears of impairments in human bodies and minds. These are the frameworks, myths, and power relations that form our social perceptions. Such an idea is embodied in the influential ‘social model’ of disability advanced by British activists and theorists such as Mike Oliver. Briefly put, the social model holds that there is a binary between ‘impairment’ (for instance, the material,

bodily experience of being blind or deaf) and ‘disability’ (the barriers that society creates around certain impairments). Having an impairment does not in itself mean that someone is incapable of functioning, living, or participating in society – it is more the case that society, routinely, as a reflex, ‘disables’ people.

In society today, disability’s cultural work of negotiating difference and ‘enforcing normalcy’ (Davis, 1995) involves the media as a vitally important arena. Powerful ideas about disability are circulated via the media. Key ideas and beliefs about normalcy, health, our bodies and identities – and indeed the nature of life itself (and when it should be commenced or ended) – pervade and structure media, and through this are deeply embedded governing assumptions in culture itself. Disability, then, is a key concern in media – so what are some concrete ways in which this plays out?

### **A Day of Media with Disability**

To briefly evoke some sense of the vast landscape of disability and media, try this exercise. Keep a diary of your media consumption for a day (or better still, a week) and make of a note of each occurrence of disability-related material.

Everyone’s media diary will be different, but here’s one possible (if not typical) journal. The first things people often notice are news and current affairs items about people with disabilities. As we wrote this introductory chapter, our attention was captured by a new item reporting that one of our music heroes, the folk-rock blues-harp player Jim Conway, boarded his plane – but the airline refused to assist him to transfer from his wheelchair to his seat (Visentin, 2014). Another item included a nightly news bulletin covering an item on a new Medical Research Future Fund with exciting possibilities for curing disability and disease (Law, 2014). In the UK press, we heard more about the cuts to welfare entitlements for unemployed people with disabilities (Butler, Taylor, and Bell, 2013) – something which echoes around the world, where eligibility tests for benefits are often being ‘tightened’ to encourage the disabled and other unemployed to seek and find work (Ireland, 2014). On a seemingly positive note, there are many ‘inspirational’, ‘uplifting’ stories about ‘overcoming’ disability on websites, complete with videos, such as that of young Mexican lawyer Adriana Macias, born without arms, whose credo is that there is ‘no obstacle to success in life – positive attitude is the essential tool to achieve individual and collective

**10** Disability and the Media

projects' (Disability in Action, 2014). So far, so good. There is plenty of media material on people with disabilities, just in the daily news. But what if we dig deeper, and look a little farther afield.

When we turn on the television, download television programmes, or watch TV or video on our Internet or mobile devices, for entertainment, there's a wealth of media we could tag as disability-related. It is not just television shows about people with disabilities. There is some of that, but not a lot. Although, many series do have one or two characters, and there are increasing numbers of programmes that focus on disability (Rodan, Ellis, and Lebeck, 2014; Ellis, 2015). In crime dramas, the appeal often comes from eccentric, quirky, 'defective detectives' – crime-solving characters, whose disability (from physical impairments and blindness, through autism, to psychological, mental health, or episodic conditions) is part of how their creators present them as different and interesting. In new 'cult TV' series like *Orange Is the New Black* or *Breaking Bad*, we find that the most interesting portrayals of disability are not the most obvious ones – but that they are central to the plot and conception of the show. A narrative kicks into action, for instance, because of a character's invisible or barely visible, as well as very obvious, disability. Much the same applies to cinema. In the movies, with their relatively long duration, disability is often the key subject for exploration.

By now, our media diaries should be bulging with disability-inflected examples. If we turn to the dynamic, fast-moving environment of digital media, there are even more significant examples of disability to be encountered. And many of these instances of disability in digital media require us, even more so, to set aside and rethink our preconceptions. Consider, for instance, that for many people with disability digital media provides – sometimes for the first time – opportunities to access, consume, and make media. Smartphones and tablets are often discussed – not unproblematically, we hasten to add – as a 'revolution' in media for many groups of people with disabilities, whether people with intellectual disabilities, or Deaf-Blind people. By the courtesy of the Internet, social and mobile media technologies, including blogs, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and a wide range of other platforms around the world (less familiar to English-speaking audiences), all of us can easily encounter material produced by 'producers' with disability (amateur users who produce content). Some of this material is not so obviously about disability, but rather is produced through communication by people with disabilities – sometimes with other people with disabilities, sometimes with people who might or not identify as disabled.

# Index

- Abbott, S., 78  
 AbilityNet, 110–11  
 able-bodiedness, 33–4  
 Abruzzese, A., 83  
 Accessible Icon Project, 2  
 active audience, 37  
*Adjusting the Picture*, 95–7  
*Age, The*, 65  
 ageing, 57, 99  
 agoraphobia, 90  
 Ali, C., 101  
 Alper, M., 49  
*Amazing Race, The*, 81  
*America's Next Top Model*, 81  
 American Foundation for the Blind  
 (AFB), 111, 119  
*American Idol*, 81  
 American Music Awards, 12  
 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA),  
 50, 61, 82, 107  
 Anderson, B., 34  
 Anderson, P. J., 58  
 Anner, Z., 121  
 anti-discrimination law and  
 policy, 52  
 anxiety, 88, 90  
 Armbrust, R., 98  
 Arp, R., 78  
 Ashley X, 106–8  
 Association of Radio Reading  
 Services, 42  
 attitude formation, 6  
 audio description, 48–50,  
 54–5, 118  
 Augusto, C. R., 111  
 Auslander, G., 68–9  
 Auslander, P., 34  
*Austin Powers*, 14  
 Australian 1992 Disability  
 Discrimination Act, 52  
 Australian Lionel Logue, 36  
 autism, 3, 10, 107, 109–10  
 awareness-raising, 6  
 Bad Cripple, 106  
 Baldwin, S. C., 44  
 Ball, J., 9  
 Banks, M., 102  
 Barlett, J., 34  
 Barnes, C., 23, 25–6, 96,  
 110, 120  
 Barthes, R., 40  
 Barton, L., 23  
 Bauman, H.-D. L., 44  
*Becker*, 87  
 Ben-Moshea, L., 2  
 Bennett, J., 78  
 Berlant, L., 59  
*Big Brother*, 81  
*Biggest Loser, The*, 63, 81  
 biomedical model of disability, *see*  
 medical model of disability  
 Black, S., 34  
 Blake, R., 97, 99  
 Blanck, P., 43  
 Blind Citizens Australia, 118  
 blind consumers, 37, 118  
 blind cricket, 34  
 blind culture, 34

- blogging, 105–6  
   Ashley X, 106–8  
   audience engagement, 106  
   audio blogging, 109  
   Compuserv, 105  
   investigation of, 109  
   media representation, 106  
   social activism, 105  
   stereotyping, 106  
   stigma, 106  
   Terry Schiavo, 106–8  
   text blogging, 109  
   USENET groups, 105  
 Blood, R. W., 60  
 Blumberg, A., 13  
 Bobbit, R., 37  
 Bogdan, R., 13  
 Boltanski, L., 21  
*Bones*, 86–7  
 Bow, A., 42  
 Boyd-Barrett, O., 58–9  
 Boyle, R., 70  
 Braille, 18, 37, 41, 43–4, 55, 81  
   availability of, 18  
   blind consumers, 37  
   display, 44  
   media histories, 37  
   print culture, 41  
 Braille, Louis, 41  
*Breaking Bad*, 10, 78–9, 87–8, 92  
 Breeden, L., 97–100, 102  
 Briggs, C., 11  
 Brisenden, S., 22  
*Britain's Missing Top Model*, 84  
*British Wireless for the Blind*, 42  
 Broadcaster's Disability Network, 95  
 Brooks, D., 95  
*Brothers and Sisters*, 81  
 Brown, T., 78  
 Bruns, A., 109–10  
 Buchanan, R., 45  
 Burns, S., 58, 69  
 Business Disability  
   Forum, 95  
 Butler, P., 9  
 Butson, T., 64, 66  
 Cahill, M., 111, 119  
 Calabrese, A., 52  
*Call the Midwives*, 84  
 Campbell, F., 23, 33  
   Contours of Ableism, 33  
 Canadian Association of Broadcasters  
   (CAB), 96  
 Cardus, Caroline, 2  
 Catherine, A. L., 84  
 Cavanagh, R., 96  
 Cederbom, A., 50  
 Chadwick, A., 59  
*Chicago Hope*, 84  
 Chivers, S., 28  
 Churchill, Winston, 36  
 citizen journalism, 59, 108  
 Clark, N., 84  
 Clarke, M. J., 78  
 Clogston, J. S., 59  
 CNN, 58, 107–8  
 cognitive impairments, 90  
 Cole, J., 103  
 Coleman, S., 59  
 Columna, L., 110  
 comedy model of disability, 14  
 Communications Act, 46  
 community media, 100–3  
   community television, 101–2  
   community video projects, 102  
   digital media technologies, 102–3  
   public access, 101  
   resources, 100  
   social process of mediation, 101  
   technical expertise, 101  
   technological changes, 102  
 community-based projects, 94–5  
 computing, emergence of, 38  
 congenital impairments, 23  
 contemporary media, 38–40  
   disability-specific media  
     practices, 40

## 148 Index

- contemporary media – *continued*  
 influence of '24-7' news cycles, 39  
 intensive, sustained, and central  
 role, 38  
 serviceable ideas, 39  
 social shaping of disability, 39  
 controversial depiction of  
 disability, 85  
 Convention on the Rights of Persons  
 with Disability (CRPD), 7–8,  
 38, 51, 53  
 Conway, Jim, 9  
 Corker, M., 31, 69  
 Couch, A., 92  
 Couldry, N., 71, 101  
 Creed, B., 80  
*Criminal Minds*, 86–7  
 Crip theory, 7, 33  
 Crisell, A., 37  
*CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*, 81, 87  
 Cullen, K., 50  
 cultural centrality, 27, 40  
 cultural citizenship, 51–3  
 cultural currency, 6  
 cultural dimension, 7, 23, 31, 35  
 cultural experimentation, 93  
 cultural imperialism, 59  
 cultural theory, 33  
 culture wars, 107  
 Cumberbatch, G., 16, 27, 80, 92  
*Images of Disability on Television*,  
 16, 27  
 Curtin, M., 78  
 Cyrus, M., 11–13
- Dant, T., 77  
 Darke, P., 28, 98  
 Davidson, J., 109  
 Davidson, M., 34  
 Davies, C., 16, 27, 100  
*Framed: Interrogating Disability in the  
 Media*, 16, 27, 100  
 Davis, L. J., 9, 16, 20, 23, 47  
 Dayan, D., 70–1
- Days of our Lives*, 118  
 De Botton, A., 59  
 de Castro, M., 48  
 deaf culture, 34, 44–5  
 deaf-blind, 10  
 defective detectives, 10  
 degenerative illnesses, 6  
 depression, 90  
 Deuze, M., 102  
 dexterity impairments, 48  
 digital cultures and technologies, 39  
 digital media, 10–11, 35, 39, 47, 59,  
 62, 70, 102–3, 117  
 disability-related material, 11  
 informal, 102  
 social shaping of disability, 39  
 digital television, 18, 38, 40, 48–50,  
 55, 118  
 access, 118  
 accessibility features, 48–9  
 benefits, 48  
 social inclusion and exclusion, 50  
 disability activist, *see* King, Sheila  
*Disability and Culture*, 31  
*Disability and the Media*, 14, 16–17, 67  
 disability culture, 15, 17, 19, 34, 89,  
 93, 118  
 Disability in Action, 10  
 disability signs, 2  
*Disability Studies Reader*, 20  
 disability theorization, 82, 105  
 disability village, 22–3  
 disability's role in culture, 30–5  
 cultural narratives, 32  
 culture and language, 31  
 feminist approaches, 31  
 importance of disability culture, 34  
 neglect of cultural representations,  
 30–1  
 political relevance of culture, 31  
 disability-as-inspiration, 62–3  
 disabled audiences, 82–4  
 disabled village, 22  
 disabling images, 82–4

- Dolphi, C., 50  
 Down's syndrome, 3, 23  
 Downey, G., 46  
*Downtown Abby*, 84  
 Dowrick, P. W., 102  
 Drake, S., 107  
 Dreher, T., 120  
 Dries, K., 11  
 dwarfing disability, 11–14
- e-accessibility, 49  
 effectiveness of disability, 86  
 Effron, M., 87  
 electronic program guide (EPG), 49  
 Ellcessor, E., 43, 50  
 Ellis, K., 10, 17, 28, 33, 43, 50, 81,  
 110–11, 118–19  
*Disability and New Media*, 17  
*Disability, Obesity and Ageing*, 17  
*Disability and Popular Culture*, 17  
 employer fear, 96  
 Employer's Forum on Disability, 95  
 Enns, A., 28  
 entertainment sources, 14  
 Entman, R. M., 60  
 environment barriers, 5  
 eugenics, 28  
 European Congress on Media, 47  
 European Congress on Media and  
 Disability, 47  
 Evans, V., 48
- Facebook, 10, 14, 22, 32, 103, 109–12,  
 119, 121  
 abilitynet's rating, 110  
 accessibility overhaul, 111, 119  
 accessibility problems, 100–1, 110  
 audiences, 10  
 vexed relationship, 119
- Fearnley, Kurt, 63–4  
 Finkelstein, V., 22  
 Flora, G., 45–6  
*For Colored Girls*, 91  
 Forde, S., 101
- forms and formats, 40–7  
 blind, 41–4  
 deaf, 44–7  
 Forsham, B., 87  
 Fox, 107  
 framing theory, 60, 66  
 business model, 60  
 cultural pluralism model, 61  
 legal model, 61  
 medical model, 60  
 minority/civil rights model, 61  
 social pathology model, 60  
 supercrip model, 60
- Fraser, N., 120  
 freedom of expression, 51–3  
 Freeman, H., 11  
*French Chef, The*, 46  
*Friday Night Lights*, 79, 87  
*Fugitive, The*, 86  
 Fulcher, G., 31
- Game of Thrones*, 79, 84, 88  
 Garland Thomson, R., 32  
 Gartner, A., 25  
 Gay and Lesbian Alliance against  
 Defamation (GLAAD), 77, 81–3  
 gender, 5, 14, 32, 57, 66, 75, 101,  
 104, 114  
 geopolitical power struggles, 114  
 Gerber, D., 14  
 Germeroth, K., 90  
 Gilbert, K., 72  
 Gill, R., 102  
*GimpGirl*, 103–4  
 Ginsburg, F., 31  
 GLAAD (Gay Lesbian Alliance Against  
 Defamation), 77, 81–3  
*Glee*, 84, 86–7, 98–9  
 Goggin, G., 17, 29, 50, 52, 72, 97,  
 109, 120  
*Laughing at/with the Disabled*, 29  
 Gold, N., 68–9  
 Goldman, E., 50  
 Golfus, B., 113–14

## 150 Index

- Goodley, D., 20–1, 23, 33  
 Gratton, C., 71  
 Gray, J., 59, 82, 93  
 Greater Los Angeles Council on Deafness (GLAD), 46  
 Gregg, M., 103  
*Grey's Anatomy*, 82, 84  
 Gripsrud, J., 59  
*Guide for Media and Disabilities*, 97
- Hall, L., 66  
 Haller, B., 17, 45, 59–61, 64, 67, 90–1, 93, 106–7, 110, 121  
*Representing Disability in an Ableist World*, 17, 60  
 handicapped blue, 1  
 Harpe, W., 99–100  
 Harrenstien, K., 110  
 Hartley, J., 88  
*Hawaii Five-O*, 86  
 Hawking, Stephen, 73  
 Haycraft, H., 41  
 Haynes, R., 70  
 Hayward, K., 96, 99  
 hearing impairment, 37–8, 46, 48, 50  
   television programmes for, 46  
 Henley, L., 49, 118  
 Hepp, A., 11, 39, 71  
 heterosexuality, 33  
 Hevey, D., 102, 110, 120  
 Hoffman, J., 52  
 Hollier, S., 109–11, 119  
*Sociability: Social Media for People with a Disability*, 109  
 Hollywood Life, 12  
 Holt, J., 78  
 Honneth, A., 120  
 Horin, A., 65–6  
*House*, 81, 84  
 Howe, P. D., 73–4  
 Howley, K., 101  
*Huffington Post*, 13  
 Hughes, B., 23  
 human rights, 7–8, 20, 23, 51–3, 112  
   domestic, 52  
   limitations, 53  
   recognition of, 51  
 humour, 90–2  
 Hutchins, B., 70
- ideas circulation, 6  
 impairment  
   cognitive, 90  
   congenital, 23  
   dexterity, 48  
   hearing, 37–8, 46, 48, 50  
   intellectual, 6  
   physical, 3, 6, 10  
   sensory, 6, 8  
   vision, 41–3, 48–50, 110, 119  
 Ingstad, B., 31  
 Inimah, G. M., 80  
 intellectual disability, 3, 10, 23, 29, 49, 119, 122  
 intellectual excitement, 56  
 intellectual impairment, 6  
 Inter-Action MK, 2  
 International Association of Audio Information Services (IAAIS), 42  
 International Classification of Functioning (ICF), 3–4, 7  
 International Communication Association, 39  
 International Labour Organization (ILO), 67–8  
 International Symbol of Access, 2–3  
 internet cultures, emergence of, 38  
 internet radio, 43, 109  
 internet-enabled television, 40  
 Ireland, J., 9  
 Ishiyama, R., 79–80  
 iTunes, 40, 78
- Jacobs, J., 109–10  
 Jaeger, P., 50  
 Jane, H., 12–13  
 Jansen, S. C., 102

- Jenkins, H., 121  
*Convergence Culture*, 121
- Jensen, K. B., 59
- Jewell in the Crown, The*, 86
- Joe, T., 25
- Joehl, S., 50
- Jones, C., 62
- Jones, J. P., 59
- Jones, M., 98
- Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability*, 33
- journalism  
 as a profession, 26  
 citizen journalism, 59, 108  
 investigative, 58  
 nature of, 69  
 norms and conventions, 66  
 popularity of disability guidelines, 28
- Kama, A., 79  
*Disability in Television*, 79
- Katz, E., 70–1
- Kent, M., 17, 43, 111, 118  
*Disability and New Media*, 17
- King George VI, 36–7
- King's Speech, The*, 36
- King, D. L., 101
- King, Sheila, 63–4
- Kingett, R., 50
- Kirkbride, L. T., 96–7
- Kirkpatrick, B., 37
- Klijin, M., 80–1
- Klobas, E., 25  
*Disability Drama in Television and Film*, 25
- Knox, D., 100
- Koefed, Susanne, 1
- Koepsell, D. R., 78
- Koller, V., 59
- Kraidy, M., 59
- Krotz, F., 39, 71
- Krstic, L., 96
- Kubitschke, L., 50
- Kudlick, C., 55
- Kuppers, P., 34, 89
- Kuusisto, S., 44, 106
- Ladd, P., 45
- language rights for sign language users, 69
- Last Leg, The*, 92
- Laurin, S., 50
- Lavery, D., 78
- Law & Order*, 86–7
- Law, J., 9, 39
- Lazarus, E., 107
- learning disabilities, 110
- Lebeck, P., 10, 17, 81  
*Disability, Obesity and Ageing*, 17
- Lefever, K., 70
- Legg, D., 73
- Legit*, 92
- Lepre, C. R., 84
- Levy, A., 57
- Lewiecki-Wilson, C., 69
- Life's Too Short*, 92
- Lin, J., 57
- Linder, L. R., 101
- LinkedIn, 109
- Little People Big World, 84
- Littlest Groom, The*, 14
- live-entertainment freak shows,  
 decline of, 14
- Livejournal, 103
- Livingstone, S., 39, 82
- Lloyd, J., 120
- Logan, E., 78
- Longmore, P., 88
- Lost*, 89, 92
- Lotz, A. D., 88
- Lubet, A., 33
- Macias, Adriana, 9
- Mahowald, M. B., 23
- malalignment, 114
- Manderson, L., 60
- Marc, D., 87

## 152 Index

- marginalization, 114
- Markotić, N., 28
- Marr, M. J., 28
- Marshall, C. W., 87
- Masterchef*, 81
- material realities, 32
- Mathooko, P., 80
- McRuer, R., 7, 33–4
- measuring disability, 5
- media accessibility, 47–53
  - approaches to, 47
  - digital television, 48
- media approach, 28–30
  - affirmative portrayal, 28–9
  - feminists' interventions, 29
  - narrative approaches, 30
  - problematic role in
    - communicating, 29
- media coverage, 29, 57, 64, 72–3, 106
- media formats for the blind, 41–4
  - accessible Internet platforms, 44
  - automated reading machines, 41
  - Braille, 41, 43–4
  - community broadcasting, 42
  - digital technologies, 42
  - internet, 42–3
  - on-demand radio, 44
  - radio reading, 41–2
  - talking books, 41
- media formats for the deaf, 44–7
  - deaf theatre, 44
  - electronic media, 45
  - print media, 45
  - sign language, 44–5
- media material, 10
- media regulators, 117
- media representation, 19, 28, 57, 72, 80, 95, 101, 106, 110
- mediatization of everything, 39
- medical drama, 83–4
- medical model of disability, 21–4
  - biological and medical causes, 21
  - consequence of, 22
  - deficit model, 22
  - focus, 21
  - inaccurate and damaging nature, 22
  - transformative advances, 21
- Medical Research Future Fund, 9
- Mele, C., 101
- Mercer, G., 23, 96
- Metcalf, G., 78
- Miller, T., 70
- Mills, M., 39, 43
- Minnesota Talking Books Network, 42
- Misener, L., 74
- Mitchell, D., 30, 32, 83, 92–3
- Mitte, R. J., 78
- Mittle, J., 89
- mobile media technologies, 10
- Mojk, M. E., 28
- Mollow, A., 34
- Monk*, 87
- Montan, Karl, 1
- moral model, 21
- Moreno, L., 48
- Morley, D., 11, 82
- Moser, I., 39
- MSNBC, 107
- MTV, 11–12
- MTV video awards, 11–12
- Mukulu, E., 80
- Müller, F., 80–1
- Mullin, J., 50, 61
- Mullins, Aimee, 61
- Mulvin, D., 39
- Murphy, P. D., 59
- My Gimp Life*, 91–4, 110
- MySpace, 110
- narrative prosthesis, 32, 83, 85, 92
- National Association of the Deaf (NAD), 50
- National Disability Awards dinner, 64.
  - See also* Fearnley, Kurt
- nationalism, 34
- Negrine, R., 16, 27, 80, 92
  - Images of Disability on Television*, 16, 27

- Nelson, J. A., 26, 95, 110  
*New York Times*, 13  
 Newell, C., 17, 50, 52, 72, 97  
   *Digital Disability*, 17  
 news, 58–67  
   AAP, 58  
   Al-Jazeera, 59  
   as gatekeeper and watchdog, 58  
   BBC, 58  
   business models, 58  
   classic account, 59  
   CNN, 58  
   convergent digital media, 59  
   cultural landscapes, 59  
   distinctive formats, 58  
   Fox, 58  
   framing theory, 60  
   industrial structures, 58  
   prevalence of stereotypes of disability, 59  
   professional norms, 58  
   reframing, 67–9  
   Reuters, 58  
   stereotypical portrayal of disability, 62  
   transformations, 59  
 niche online disability media, 108  
 NinjaCate, 11  
*No Limits*, 101  
 Nomeland, M. M., 44  
 Nomeland, R. E., 44  
 non-apparent disabilities, 82  
 Noonan, M., 29  
   *Downunder Mystery Tour*, 29  
 Noonan, T., 109  
 Norden, M., 16, 27  
   *Cinema of Isolation*, 16, 27  
 Northen, M., 34  
*Nurse Jackie*, 82  
 Nye, P. W., 41, 92  
  
 O'Donnell, P., 120  
 obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), 85  
  
 Ofcom, 48–9, 95  
 Ogola, G., 58  
 Oliver, M., 8, 23  
 Olson, K., 106–8  
 on-screen representation, 98  
 online media, 13, 43, 123  
 oppression, 7, 31, 44, 114  
 oralism, 44  
*Orange Is the New Black*, 10, 79, 84, 87  
*Ouch!*, 104  
 OWN channel, 121  
*Oz*, 87, 89  
  
*Packed to the Rafters*, 99  
 Padovani, C., 52  
 Papachrissi, Z., 59  
 Paralympian  
   Fearnley, Kurt, 63, 65  
   Mullins, Aimee, 61  
 Paralympics, 58, 65, 69–75, 92, 116, 118  
   battles over media, 70  
   broadcast and media-related rights, 71  
   economics of the Olympics, 71  
   media attention, 73  
   media portrayal, 75  
   news coverage, 72  
   opening and closing ceremonies, 74  
   patronizing language, 73  
   stereotypes and offensive, 73  
   transformations in media, 71  
*Parenthood*, 81  
 Patrick, Nicolas, 66  
 Peck, B., 96–7  
 Peers, D., 72  
 personal expression, 6  
 personal narrative model, 103, 105, 108  
 Philo, G., 84  
 physical disability, 32

## 154 Index

- physical impairment, 3, 6, 10  
 Pirkis, J., 60  
 Pointon, A., 16, 27, 100  
     *Framed: Interrogating Disability in the Media*, 16, 27, 100  
 Pooley, J., 102  
 post-colonialism, 33, 56  
 post-linguistically deaf, 46  
 Potter, T., 87  
 Powell, J. J. W., 2  
 Pratt-Smoot Act, 41  
 prejudice, 28, 31, 89, 98, 113  
 prevalence of disability, 4–5  
 Price, M. E., 71  
 print handicapped, 37, 42  
*Project Runway*, 81  
 promises of media, 120–3  
*Proud Mary*, 85  
*Push Girls*, 84  
 Putnis, P., 60
- race, 14, 32–3, 40, 56–7, 66, 75, 101, 114, 116  
 racism, 11  
 radio  
     for blind, 18, 42, 55  
     for print handicapped, 37  
     importance of, 37  
     internet radio, 43, 109  
     on-demand radio, 44  
     radio reading service, 41–2  
     representations of, 37  
     social function and power, 36  
     talk or talk-back radio, 37  
*Ramp Up*, 62, 104  
 Rantanen, T., 59  
 Rapp, R., 31, 119, 121  
 Raynor, O., 96, 99–100  
 RCA, 41  
 reality TV, 14, 63, 80–1, 84, 99  
 Redfern Legal Centre, 66  
 Reeve, Christophe, 74  
 Rehabilitation Act, 46  
 Rennie, E., 101  
 representation, 84–90, 119–20  
     complex expressions and articulations, 84  
     representational strategies, 83, 90  
 rethinking access, 53–5  
     creative approaches, 55  
     cross-sensory translation, 55  
     curb cut model, 54  
     taken-for-granted approach, 54  
 Riddell, S., 31  
 Riley, C., 17, 61, 67  
 Rizzo, C., 99  
 Roberts, P., 100  
 Robertson, J., 12  
 Rodan, D., 10, 17, 81  
     *Disability, Obesity and Ageing*, 17  
*Rolling with Zach*, 121  
 Ross, K., 59, 82  
 Roulstone, A., 16, 20  
*Routledge Handbook of Disability Studies*, 20  
 Rowe, D., 70  
 Rubin, L. C., 84  
 Ruiz-Mezcua, B. E., 48  
 Ryan, F., 92, 99
- Saito, S., 79  
 Sanchez, J., 50  
 Sancho, J., 27  
 Sandahl, C., 34  
 Sanson, K., 78  
 Sapey, B., 103  
 Sassen, S., 59  
 satire, 59, 73, 84  
 Scannell, P., 37  
 Schantz, O. J., 72  
 Schauder, D., 42  
 Schiavo, Terry, 106–8  
*Schlag Den Raab*, 11  
 Schlesinger, P., 46  
 Schmidt, Kristian, 99  
 Schuster, Will, 84  
 Schweik, S., 55  
 Scorsese, M., 14

- Screen Actors Guild (SAG), 98
- Scrubs*, 84
- Second Life, 103
- sensory impairments, 6, 8
- Sepinwall, A., 88–9
- sexism, 11
- sexual cultures of disability, 34
- sexuality, 14, 32, 40, 56–7, 114
- Shakespeare, T., 14, 23–4, 30–1, 73
- Shaw, M., 122
- Sherer, T., 91, 94
- Sherry, M., 34
- Shildrick, M., 31
- Shultz, D., 90
- Siebers, T., 23, 32–3
- Disability Theory*, 33
- sign language, 1, 37, 44–6, 48, 53, 74, 109
- blogging, 109
- deaf consumers, 37
- Silence*, 87
- Silent Worker*, 45
- Silva, C. F., 74
- Silvers, A., 23
- Silverstone, R., 21, 59
- Sinclair, S., 119
- Sinfield, A., 24
- Six Million Dollar Woman*, 61
- Skouge, J., 102
- Smart, G., 12
- smartphones, 39
- Smith, A., 28, 71
- Smith, C. R., 28
- Snyder, S. L., 30, 32, 83, 92–3
- soap opera, 82–3, 122
- social (disability) media, 6–9
- social and cultural underpinnings, 20
- social approaches, 21
- social depreciation, 114
- social disablement, 81
- social identity, 6
- social imaginary, 34, 86
- social inclusion, 18, 49–51, 108–9, 118
- social marginalization, 82
- social media, 109–10
- social model, 7–8, 21–3, 95
- criticized, 23
- debate about the, 23
- social networking site, 109–10
- social participation, 120–3
- social work, 15, 21
- societal listening, 107
- socio-cultural dynamics, 20
- socio-digital, 39
- Sony Music Awards, 12
- Sopranos, The*, 88, 92
- Sparks, R., 87
- special education, 15
- Special Olympics, *see* Paralympics
- Specials, The*, 122
- speech impediment, 36–7
- speech synthesis programs, 43
- Spence, E. H., 21
- St Elsewhere*, 89
- Star Trek*, 86
- State Journal*, 57
- Steadward, R., 73
- Steele, N., 96
- Sterne, J., 39
- Stevens, J., 97
- stigma, 6, 15, 24, 80, 105–6
- Straus, J., 33
- super-offensive material, 11
- supercrip model, 64
- Swain, J., 23
- Switched at Birth*, 87
- Sydney Morning Herald, The*, 64–5
- tablets, 10
- talking books, 41
- Taub-Pervizpour, L., 102
- Taylor, A., 71
- Taylor, M., 9
- Taylor, S., 102
- television
- characteristics of, 88
- community television, 101

## 156 Index

- television – *continued*  
 crime drama, 87  
 developments, 79  
 digital television, 18, 38, 40, 48–50,  
 55, 118  
 disability representation, 80  
 internet-enabled television, 40  
 investigation of disability, 80  
 novelization of, 78  
 online TV, 78  
 prime time television, 100  
 programmes for hearing  
 impairment, 46  
 programming, innovative forms  
 of, 92  
 quantitative and qualitative  
 study, 80  
 reality television, 80–1  
 representation of disability, 79, 81  
 season passes on subscription, 78  
 subgenres of, 122  
 symbolic power of, 82  
 transmedia television, 78  
 under-representation of actors, 77
- Tester, K., 21  
*The Glee Project Wiki*, 99  
 The Goldfish, 105  
 Thomas, C., 16, 20  
 Thomas, N., 71  
 Thompson, E., 59  
 Thoreau, E., 103–5  
 Titchkosky, T., 54  
 Tomlinson, A., 71  
 Townsend, P., 24  
 Towse, Beachcroft, 43  
 train station accessibility, 119  
 training and employment,  
 95–6  
 translocal, 59  
 Tremain, S., 31  
*True Blood*, 88  
 Turner, G., 37, 59, 80  
 TV apps, 40  
*Twin Peaks*, 89, 92  
 Twitter, 10, 12, 92, 109, 111–12, 121  
 accessibility rating, 111  
 audiences, 10  
 Tzanelli, R., 71  
 UK Disability Discrimination Act, 52  
 UN Convention on the Rights of  
 Persons with Disabilities, 117  
 United Nations, 7, 20, 38, 67  
 Universal Declaration of Human  
 Rights, 51, 73  
 US Americans with Disabilities Act, 52  
 user-generated content, 121, 123  
 user-generated online communities,  
 104  
 Utray, F., 48–9  
 Van Zoonen, L., 80–1  
 video-sharing platforms, 40  
 Vimeo, 40  
 Visentin, L., 9  
 vision impairment, 41–3, 48–50,  
 110, 119  
 visual instrument and sensory organ  
 replacement (VISOR), 86  
 vocalization programs, 43  
 Wajcman, J., 39  
 Walker, A., 24  
 Wark, K., 71  
 Warren, N., 60  
 Wass, V., 98  
 Wasserman, D., 23  
 Watson, N., 16, 20, 31  
*Way Ahead, The*, 2  
 Weber, I., 48  
*Weeds*, 84  
 Weissmann, E., 78  
*West Wing, The*, 87  
 wheelchair basketball, 34  
 wheelchair-marathon champion, *see*  
 Fearnley, Kurt  
*When Billy Broke His Head*, 113  
 Whyte, S. R., 31  
 Wilde, A., 83

- Wildman, S., 50  
Williams, M., 58  
Williamson, K., 42  
Wilson, J. C., 69  
Winfrey, Oprah, 121  
Wiser, D., 57  
*Wizard of Oz, The*, 50  
Wodak, R., 59  
*Wolf of Wall Street, The*, 14  
Wolford, J., 50  
Wollheim, P., 110  
Wood, L., 95  
workplace discrimination, 98  
World Health Organization (WHO),  
    3–4, 5–7, 21  
*World Report on Disability*, 4–5, 7, 21  
World Summit on the Information  
    Society, 52  
World Wide Web, 43, 115  
Young, C., 71  
Young, S., 63  
YouTube, 10, 40, 109–13, 121  
    AbilityNet's rating, 110  
    accessibility, 110  
    audiences, 10  
    recognition, 110  
Zajicek, M., 104  
Zhang, L., 60–1, 64  
Zola, I. K., 25  
    *Images of the Disabled, Disabling  
    Image*, 25