DISABILITY MEDIA STUDIES

Elizabeth Ellcessor and Bill Kirkpatrick, editors.

New York: New York University Press, 2017.

Introduction

Toward a Disability Media Studies

ELIZABETH ELLCESSOR, MACK HAGOOD, AND
BILL KIRKPATRICK

In a crowded mall, a flash mob dances to the 1983 synth-pop hit "Safety Dance," led by a slightly nerdy guy in a red sweater-vest (fig. I.1). He kicks, he gyrates, and for the grand finale he strides through the air, held up by other dancers as crowds of shoppers cheer. Then the music stops, he is dropped unceremoniously back into his wheelchair, and Artie's dream of able-bodiedness ends in dejection at the reality of his disabled existence.

Figure I.1. A group of young men, with Artie front and center, doing a hip-hop-inspired dance in a shopping mall.

1

This scene from *Glee* (Fox, 2009–2015)[1] met with sweeping critical praise: the *A.V. Club*'s Todd VanDerWerff said it "might be THE best" episode of *Glee* ever, while *Time*'s James Poniewozik called it "entertaining, arresting and moving in an unqualified sense."[2] But the representation of disability is complicated. The admirable politics of visibility that led *Glee* to include a wheelchair user as a central character are undermined by the industrially convenient casting of an able-bodied actor (Kevin McHale) in the part. Mainstream critics praised McHale's supposedly realistic performance, but persons with disabilities[3] pointed out that, in fact, his acting was all wrong, his contorted posture an "inaccurate portrayal of the way an average paraplegic sits."[4] Even when the show had Artie dancing in his wheelchair, his moves were a pale imitation of the strength and artistry of dance troupes like AXIS that incorporate wheelchairs.[5] The storyline itself—in which Artie dreams (not for the last time) of a better existence as an able-bodied person—reinforced the dominant but problematic idea that people with disabilities are inevitably miserable and want nothing more than to be "fixed."[6] Clearly, many disagreed that the show's depictions were an "unqualified" success.

Not only is the representation of disability complicated, but the issue is becoming more urgent. As medical science achieves new breakthroughs in the "repair" of impairments, media representations of disability are proliferating as never before. In the early 21st century, television shows from *House* (Fox, 2004–2012) to *Breaking Bad* (AMC, 2008–2013) to *Switched at Birth* (ABC Family, 2011–2017) to *Friday Night Lights* (NBC, 2006–2011) prominently featured characters with disabilities. Major films like *Avatar* (James Cameron, 2009), *The King's Speech* (Tom Hooper, 2010), and *The Theory of Everything* (James Marsh, 2014), among countless others, make disability central. Indeed, the full gamut of popular culture—from athletes racing on carbon-fiber legs to viral videos of Deaf persons switching on their new cochlear implants—is awash in representations of disability. Beyond representation, disability is at the center of important technological innovations and political debates regarding a range of media technologies, such as the Digital Rights Management on e-books that ostensibly protects copyrights but has the side effect of preventing blind people from activating needed speech-to-text features.

Given all this, the question for researchers and students becomes: how do we make sense of the relationships between disability and media? We need perspectives and methodological tools to analyze how disability shapes media texts, technologies, and industries—and how our media, in turn, shape what it means to be "disabled" or "able-bodied" in contemporary society. We require ways of understanding disability and media in terms of political and economic forces; epistemology (how we come to know the world) and phenomenology (how we experience it); the stories we tell about it and the goals and constraints of the media industries that circulate those stories; material technologies and official policies; and audiences' understandings of themselves and the world. We need theories and strategies that help us grasp the interplay of disability and popular culture, account for the slippery constructedness of "disability" and "able-bodiedness," incorporate the knowledges and lived experiences of people marked as "disabled," and analyze struggles over meaning, inclusion, and power.

Two main academic disciplines currently offer many of the theories and methods we need: disability studies and critical-cultural media studies. The rich history of disability studies provides a wealth of insights into disability as narrative trope, cultural identity, lived experience, socioeconomic status, and political category. Media studies is a humanities-centered, mostly qualitative field that explores how the media work as cultural, political, and economic institutions, as sites of meaning-making and ideological contestation, and as resources for social and individual identity formation and expression.

Importantly, however, neither disability studies nor media studies, on its own, has adequately grappled with the complexities of disability and media *together*. Scholars in each field are generating useful insights and approaches, but they are far from integrating the insights or building on the approaches of the other. In fact, often they are not even talking to each other: each has its own conferences, journals, Facebook groups, etc., and still rare is the crossover scholar who feels equally at home in both fields. Our claim is that these fields need to learn from each other—have an interdisciplinary conversation, share insights and perspectives, and adapt the most useful theories and methodologies from each other—in order to advance our understanding of media and disability. This book stages one such conversation and begins to dem-

onstrate the power of *disability media studies* (DMS), a scholarly orientation and research agenda that reflects awareness of—and then builds on—the strengths of these two areas. There is excellent work being done on *both* sides, and our purpose in this anthology is to help each understand the value and contributions of the other so that, in concert, they may develop this emerging field.

What is the nature of this conversation? We get into details below, but three overarching hopes form our vision. First, through this dialog, we hope that more disability scholars will move beyond textual analysis of media representations to consider more fully the role of media within economic and ideological circuits of production and reception. Second, we hope that media scholars will become aware of a broader range of embodiments that shape and are shaped by our encounters with media. In other words, the field needs to recognize dis/ability as central to the study of media. Third, and above all, we hope that *all* scholars will recognize themselves in the critically oriented, humanities-centered concern with social, cultural, and economic justice that unites both disability studies and media studies, energizing their scholarship and helping develop disability media studies on theoretical, methodological, and political common ground.

This collection brings together these scholarly traditions in the belief that their proximity and cross-pollination will prove useful to readers and generative to scholars. We do not wish for this volume, and the interventions it offers, to constrain disability media studies by naming it: in staging a deliberately cross-disciplinary conversation between chapters, we leave open powerful possibilities for ongoing innovation and theoretical germination. In this introduction, then, we will outline the foundations and current state of disability studies and media studies before staking out the common ground upon which disability media studies can be built.

Disability Studies

Disability studies is a relatively new field whose scholarship has emerged within a range of traditions, primarily rhetoric, English, ethics, art history, gender and queer studies, and the social sciences (including education and developmental psychology). Although disability studies is

gaining a structural foothold in universities thanks to an ever-increasing number of dedicated programs, this interdisciplinary legacy—as well as its widespread, even fundamental orientation toward accessibility and activism beyond the academy—is responsible for many of the core strengths and achievements of disability studies scholarship.

By interrogating the social, physical, economic, and ideological conditions of disability and able-bodiedness, disability studies in both its scholarly and activist modes has challenged the subaltern status of persons with disabilities and opened new areas of inquiry across the political, cultural, and academic spectrum. It has given us new tools with which to study narrative and representation, led the study of embodiment in new directions, and been at the forefront of research on norms and normalization. For media scholars and students new to disability studies, we would highlight three core contributions as a way into the field: its articulation of *disability as socially constructed*, the *identification of and challenges to the "normate" subject position*, and the *emphasis upon lived experience as an epistemological basis* for making claims.

First, disability studies has challenged the medicalization and pathologization of disability, widely known as the *"medical model" of disability*. The medical model understands disability as an ontological "fact" in the world rather than a constructed social and political position. People with bodily differences "have something wrong with them" and are regarded as medical problems to be solved. This is still the dominant, "common sense" way of thinking about disability. But pathologization inevitably leads to social and political marginalization; for persons with disabilities, it can lead to existential threats, such as involuntary sterilization, selective abortion, or euthanasia, while leaving unaltered the structures and ideologies that privilege able-bodiedness and devalue alternative embodiments.

In the 1970s, disability activists in the UK challenged the medical model and argued instead for the "*social model" of disability*,[7] which has also been taken up by disability scholars. The social model draws a distinction between "impairment" and "disability"; it posits that while bodies may have *impairments*, those impairments become *disabilities* only in the context of specific physical and social environments. In that sense, disability is not (as in the medical model) a "fact" about a person, but a status imposed by society: needing a wheelchair, for example, only be-

comes a "disability" given the absence of ramps and elevators—or given the attitudes, beliefs, and power structures encountered in a discriminatory ableist society.

The social model has enormous political implications, since it suggests that disability is not a physical or mental "defect" that inevitably locates certain individuals outside the bounds of "normal" society, but a socially constructed, oppressed, minority identity imposed on certain individuals because of their *perceived* difference.[8] From this position, it becomes possible to advocate for rights and resources and to use the legal and justice systems to fight discrimination. So powerful is the social model in making civil-rights arguments that activists successfully used it to advocate for the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990), and its logic informs that act's language and provisions. While it can be problematic to lump together individuals with wildly varying experiences, identities, and challenges under the homogenizing category "disabled," there can be, depending on context, strategic advantage in constructing an essentialized "disabled" identity in organizing for social change.[9]

Aside from the social model's political utility, derived from its rejection of the ontology of disability, it helps to understand how the model has shaped the study of media within disability studies, which is through what Mack Hagood calls the "sociotextual approach": the pairing of the social model and textual analysis. This research has been heavily invested in critiquing stereotypical representations of persons with disabilities, arguing that these depictions contribute to ableist attitudes, which in turn inform and justify practices and policies that reproduce the social and material conditions of disability. For instance, Colin Barnes has argued that harmful "disabling stereotypes" abound in books, films, and television, while Martin Norden identifies and critiques problematic disability tropes such as "the innocent" and "the cyborg villain."[10] Some scholars have extended such analyses to consider representational patterns; an influential example referenced several times in this volume is Rosemarie Garland-Thomson's taxonomy of representational strategies for depicting persons with disabilities: the sentimental mode, the wondrous mode, and so forth.[11] Through such analyses, disability studies has demonstrated how people with impairments may be disabled by the prejudice and othering that is modeled, legitimated, and recirculated by media depictions.[12]

While the social model and sociotextual approach remain useful in destabilizing assumptions about disability and the stereotypes that support those assumptions, they have come under critique for oversimplifying the complex relationships among bodies, experiences, institutions, technologies, ideologies, and representations that constitute "disability" in any given society. For example, Robert McRuer acknowledges how generative Garland-Thomson's taxonomy has been, but he argues that it is less a universal framework than a reflection of contemporary ideas about disability.[13] Furthermore, media analyses informed by the sociotextual approach tend toward the moral evaluation of "positive" or "negative" depictions of disability, rather than considering representation in a broader context of media production, consumption, interpretation, and cultural impact.

The impairment/disability dichotomy at the heart of the social model has also been critiqued from a poststructuralist perspective, especially the work of philosopher Michel Foucault and feminist theorist Judith Butler, which says that impairment and disability *both* are socially constructed.[14] In other words, if the social model maintains that "disability" is not a "fact" about a person, then poststructuralists add that neither is "impairment" a fact, certainly no more so than race and gender are "facts" about people. In this view, discursive power informs our perception and valuation of bodily non-normativity, making "impairment" an unstable category that only has meaning when measured against ever-shifting and contextually dependent bodily norms.[15] For example, vision that would count as "impaired" in contemporary Western society, given automobiles, the centrality of literacy, and other vision-dependent phenomena, likely would often have been considered within the range of the "normal" in the agrarian contexts of earlier centuries.

This strong social constructionism has also influenced a second important contribution of disability studies: the identification of the "*normate*" *subject position* as constructed and reproduced via a range of material, social, and cultural institutions. In short, not only are the categories of "impaired" and "disabled" socially constructed, but so are the categories of "normal" and "able-bodied." Lennard Davis's foundational essay on "constructing normalcy" traces the transition from the social valorization of ideal (and thus unattainable) forms of embodiment to the moral ascendency of normal (and thus ostensibly possible)

bodies.[16] The pursuit of normalcy becomes an imperative: the supposed attainability and desirability of normalcy translate into a rejection of all that is outside the norm and encourage—even compel—individuals to mold themselves into a hegemonically dominant form of embodiment.[17] Davis traces the emergence of prescriptive "normality" in the nineteenth century, its creation of the disabled person as a "problem," and its subsequent destabilization by the proliferation of scientific and medical markers of abnormality (which have, in the meantime, become so numerous that "normal" may now be losing its meaning).[18]

Garland-Thomson extended the theorization of norms in her coinage of the term "normate" to refer to a privileged body, without stigma, that functions as a universal type in a given society.[19] The critical potential of the normate stems from its descriptive power, as the recognition of the normate subject position makes it possible to identify how such positions are upheld by built environments, social institutions, and cultural discourses including media texts. Furthermore, by naming the usually invisible or unmarked norm (as "cis" does in gender theory), the normate also enables theorization without recourse to a possibly essentialized category of "disability" that, as mentioned above, invites difficulties of definition and scope. Returning to the introductory example of *Glee*'s Artie, we can see how even an ostensibly "pro-disability" text reinforces the fundamental desirability of the normate and, in its ableist implication that non-able-bodied persons can never be truly happy, works to enforce bodily normalcy.

Given the emphasis on social construction in the social model and the normate, it is important to note that many disability scholars have argued that some embodied phenomena are, in fact, irreducible to social constructions. Susan Wendell, for instance, highlights the experience of pain as a component of many disabled people's lives that is inherently subjective, rather than social.[20] This leads to the third major contribution of disability studies (and disability activism): the insistence upon *lived experiences* as a basis for critique and analysis. Traced back to activists' calls for "nothing about us, without us," this is an epistemology that refutes the medical model of disability by treating the voices and marginalized perspectives of people with disabilities as valid sources of knowledge.[21]

This valuation of lived experience has two major implications. First, it means that people with disabilities are welcomed as creators of knowledge

in a range of scholarship. For instance, many scholars working within disability studies "claim disability"[22] or otherwise choose to articulate their "relationship to disability."[23] Additionally, academic works may include disabled voices through various forms of direct quotation and may offer credit to participants or collaborators beyond standard academic practice.[24] Second, this epistemological stance entails taking subjective forms of knowledge seriously, including experiences of pain, specific narratives of oppression, and phenomenologies of everyday life. Disability is never a single experience or a generalizable phenomenon; it is always multiple, always contains contradictions, and is, at best, a political category used to group shared experiences without erasing the differences that persist.

Several disability theorists attempt to bring together the above threads—the political and critical advantages of social constructionist perspectives, including the social model and the normate, and the significant insights offered by the valuation of subjective disability experiences—in new ways. For instance, Tobin Siebers critiques the poststructuralist perspective associated with Foucault and Butler for its inability to grapple with "the difficult physical realities faced by people with disabilities" and its tendency to present their bodies "in ways that are conventional, conformist, and unrecognizable" to people living with disability.[25] Siebers instead proposes the concept of "complex embodiment," which "raises awareness of the effects of disabling environments on people's lived experience of the body" (recalling the social model) but which also emphasizes that "some factors affecting disability, such as chronic pain, secondary health effects, and aging, derive from the body" (incorporating material contexts, phenomenology, and medicalization).[26] Similarly, Alison Kafer offers a "political/relational model" of disability in which disability arises from the variable relationships of bodies, minds, and social and physical environments.[27] In this model, neither disability, ability, nor impairment is self-evident. Kafer agrees that impairment and disability are both socially constructed in context but argues that the social model may ignore lived experiences of impairment and politically marginalize disabled people who are interested in medical interventions or cure.[28] In terming her model "political/relational," Kafer attends to the dynamics of power that shape particular relationships among people, institutions, culture, and material structures and that produce disability as a meaningful category of analysis.

Siebers and Kafer also suggest different ways of complicating the category of disability by situating it in relation to other identities. Siebers offers complex embodiment as an expansion of intersectionality,[29] a feminist theory by which analysis of social oppression must consider multiple axes of identity, including race, gender, class, and sexuality. Kafer draws upon Jasbir Puar's theory of "assemblage," which challenges the essentialism that can inhere in identity categories; disability (like race, gender, and sexuality) is thus considered "as events, actions, and encounters between bodies."[30] Such theoretical complications pave the way for more nuanced analyses of media and culture that go beyond the sociotextual and that invite more direct engagement with the subjective knowledges of persons with disabilities.

While calling attention to these specific contributions and scholars, we also recognize that there are too many important concepts and studies emerging from disability studies—including recent intersectional work on media—to highlight them all here, although many are referenced and explained in the chapters that follow.[31] Nonetheless, as a primer on core concepts for those new to disability studies, we hope that the above already begins to illustrate what disability studies can offer to other disciplines.

Media Studies

There are many varieties of media studies, with varying methods, underlying assumptions, and names. Schools and scholars dedicated to the study of media may be affiliated with journalism, mass communications, rhetoric, film, telecommunications, information science, or many other nomenclatures. This plethora of names sits atop a variety of approaches: some work, termed "communication science" or "media effects," draws upon psychological or other social scientific methods to study the effects of engagement with media on our thoughts and behaviors;[32] "mass communications" tends to focus on the economic and institutional aspects of media systems, content, and audiences, often with an emphasis on persuasion, public relations, and propaganda;[33] film studies is often indebted to art history and formal or aesthetic analysis of texts, to traditions of literary interpretation, or to a range of theories of reception from (most prominently Freudian and cognitive psychology

to analyze film-audience relationships);[34] and we're just scratching the surface. There is much excellent work in all of these traditions—some of it related to disability—yet they are not the focus of this volume.

Instead, this collection foregrounds—and posits as a productive foundation for DMS—a strand of media studies based in the critical humanities and in which media are analyzed first and foremost for their role in struggles over social, political, and economic *power*. In this approach, media texts, audiences, industries, and technologies are inseparable from their specific social contexts, i.e., their attendant political, material, and economic conditions, since it is within specific contexts that particular meanings have particular consequences for social relations and power. Since these struggles are often expressed in relationships between media and race, gender, class, sexuality, and other categories of difference, media studies is radically interdisciplinary at its core, borrowing from feminist theory and queer studies to analyze gender and the media, from Marxist traditions to study class and socioeconomic status and the media, and so on. Indeed, many within disability studies might draw on similar groundings in British cultural studies, poststructuralism, and feminist, queer, and critical race scholarship.

To help orient scholars coming from disability studies who wish to engage with new ways of studying media, we will highlight two key theoretical approaches and methods that set media studies apart from other humanities-based approaches: the valuation of *popular culture in everyday life* and an *integrated approach* to the study of media that uses diverse methodologies to consider the production, circulation, and reception of mediated culture in specific social and industrial contexts.

First, the study of *popular culture* means taking seriously the elements of everyday life, including the pleasures available in media texts. In contrast to aesthetic approaches that seek to separate "good/high" art from "bad/low" art, or effects-based approaches that try to identify causal relationships between media consumption and one's thoughts and behaviors, media studies is interested in how people actually make sense of media artifacts—even socially stigmatized media forms—and what they do with them as they go about their lives. Again, power is central: drawing on Michel de Certeau's conception of the practice of everyday life as a space in which individuals and social formations may exercise agency and "poach" at the margins of powerful social structures and ideologies,

media studies has sought to highlight the politics of commonplace activities, pleasures, and cultural artifacts.[35] A well-known example is Janice Radway's study of romance novels, a genre widely considered "trashy" but in which (mostly women) readers often find empowerment, not to mention valuable pleasures.[36] Popular culture, in this view, is a site of continual struggle, a space in which the relationships of power and oppression in a society can be exposed, challenged, reinforced, and rearticulated by those who find power and pleasure within cultural artifacts. It can also provide resources for identity formation, coalition and capacity building, and collective political action.[37]

Popular culture is not synonymous with "mass" or mainstream culture; instead, it is "popular" precisely because it is taken up by individuals who recognize in it something that enables them to make sense of their everyday lives and relationships, and that helps them navigate their social and material world.[38] Of course, often the texts that offer such opportunities are those mass-produced by corporate media industries, so it is easy to dismiss them as unimportant at best and nefarious at worst: we are all familiar with complaints that "tawdry" reality shows like *Jersey Shore* (MTV, 2009–2012) "dumb down" our society. But media studies instead analyzes how individuals and groups encounter and use such cultural products in a variety of ways through a process of *negotiation.*

Negotiation refers to how readers selectively attend to and interpret texts to form their own meanings from them.[39] As advanced by Stuart Hall, the theory of negotiation recognizes that every complex text contains a wealth of possible meanings, and which ones you privilege will depend on your ideological position, social location, cultural context, and beliefs and values. The text will "prefer" some of its possible meanings by making them more obvious, appealing, or commonsensical within a given context, but it can never fully shut down or erase alternatives. Audiences might resist the text's dominant meanings, attend more to those ineradicable alternatives for their own pleasure or empowerment, or make "perverse" sense of the text to fit their own context. As readers (viewers, listeners, etc.), we "negotiate" with the text, situationally adapting our reading to our specific contexts, needs, or pleasures. Unlike certain influential approaches in the field of English that privilege the meanings "within" the text as the ones of greatest interest to the analyst, media studies seeks to identify meanings that *could* be activated

Figure I.2. Artie, sitting in his wheelchair, alone and looking wistful in the shopping mall.

and subject positions that *could* be adopted when "reading" (making sense of) a given text in a given context.

For example, returning to *Glee* (fig. I.2), we may adopt the preferred reading of the text by endorsing the inclusion of Artie and enjoying the show's validation of his importance and humanity. In doing so, we would also accede to a dominant cultural ableism, taking for granted that someone with a mobility impairment would dream of, and aspire to, able-bodiedness. Alternatively, we may adopt a more negotiated or even oppositional reading that works against such ideologies. We might bristle as the text suggests that Artie is incomplete or unfulfilled because of his disability, and despite our pleasures in the text, we may never forget that, on an industrial level, the producers hired an able-bodied actor for the role. In other words, rather than simply adopting the meanings put before us (much less the messages that the creators may consciously *want* us to adopt), our response to *Glee* may be complicated and ambivalent, marked by both pleasure and aggravation, endorsement and

rejection. One task of the scholar, in this view, is to move beyond a text's "preferred" reading in order to discover how audiences are *actually* negotiating textual meanings in specific settings, or how those negotiations shift depending on the social context or audiences' own experiences.

There is controversy within media studies about how significant this struggle might be in any given case: in the face of pervasive and systemic inequality and discrimination, what are the potential political roles of a popular culture that (according to some critiques) functions primarily to reproduce dominant ideologies of consumer capitalism?[40] We cannot explore such questions at length here, but we do find extraordinary value in an approach that takes audience agency and popular culture—even "bad" culture—seriously, even in the face of structural oppression. Thus one of the contributions of media studies is to interrogate the politics of popular culture and the processes of negotiation.

A second contribution of media studies to a disability media studies is methodological; how, after all, can we possibly account for the diversity of meanings, interests, and contexts that are relevant to understanding the place of popular media in everyday life? Media studies approaches are less about interpreting texts than tracing the ideological struggles that surround media artifacts using mixed methodologies. In other words, while many scholars in English embrace the negotiated nature of meaning, they tend to limit themselves methodologically to textual analysis, thus missing out on a lot of contextual information offered by the study of text, audience, industry, social context, and technology together. While textual analysis remains important to media studies, it is just one part of an *integrated approach* to media.

Taking such an approach means studying media texts not in relative isolation, but together with their industrial conditions of production, the social, political, and material contexts of their reception, and the active participation of audiences in producing meanings—all as interrelated phenomena.[41] What makes this approach useful is its insistence on the circulation of artifacts, meanings, and power among various sites, texts, institutions, and individuals. In other words, an integrated approach to the study of media and culture rejects the limitations of a purely textual (or representational) analysis as well as the simplistic explanations of an industrial, top-down analysis that ascribes *too* much power to authors, cultural producers, or the economic system itself. Mediated culture is,

instead, the complicated result of interactions among industries, audiences, economics, and broader social and political contexts, none of which completely control the meaning-making process.

Media studies scholarship might be loosely grouped into studies of texts, audiences, industries, and social contexts, though scholars often articulate linkages among these domains. Methodologically, textual studies include aesthetic, discursive, and representational analyses.[42] Studies of audiences, often referred to as reception studies, incorporate ethnographic and interview methods, as well as theories of phenomenology and affect.[43] One strand of this scholarship, fan studies, has been particularly attentive to the ways in which audiences go "beyond" a text to create new cultural artifacts and practices out of existing cultural material and produce new ways of interacting with media.[44] Critical industry studies brings together cultural studies and political economy approaches, often using discursive analysis and interviews or other ethnographic methods to illuminate the dynamics of media production and distribution;[45] critical policy studies similarly unpack the meanings embedded in media regulations.[46] Studies that prioritize media's social context often employ critical historiography and ideological analyses, connecting media texts to larger sociohistorical struggles.[47] There are many media scholars who articulate texts, audiences, industries, and social contexts, particularly with respect to identity; a paradigmatic example is Julie D'Acci's *Defining Women*, which included detailed audience and industrial analysis and linked *Cagney and Lacey* (CBS, 1982–1988) to a larger context of U.S. televisual representations of women and gender politics in the 1980s.[48] More recently, *How to Watch Television*—a collection of many scholars' work—offers snapshots of many of these methodological approaches and demonstrates how they might inform one another and foster more complex understandings of media, their producers, their audiences, and their situatedness in time and space.[49]

A final point in this regard is that, although media studies is concerned with the production of meanings in these multiple interactions and contexts, such meanings do not remain at the level of ideas. Instead, they exist in the material sense of discursive and economic practices that involve physical bodies doing things, physical places that are constructed in particular ways, and subjective feeling or affect that is generated when audiences encounter texts.[50] In other words, meaning and

materiality are inseparable: ideas are embodied in and shaped by material conditions and human practice, made meaningful by the discourses that inform them and that they in turn inflect. Media technologies themselves raise further issues of materiality and embodiment: how we interact with buttons, dials, or gaming consoles; how we plug in earbuds or position ourselves to view screens; how manufacturers imagine the bodies that will engage with their creations; and in countless other ways.

As the above suggests, this approach to media studies makes media analysis exponentially more complex than textual analysis alone. This is why the methodologies and perspectives of media studies can be so powerful, and why we hope more disability scholars will embrace them: in the negotiation of culture, situated within large and small struggles over meaning and power, we see opportunities for agency and self-expression, for political change, and for reimaginings of the "common-sense" (hegemonic) ways of being in the world.

Toward a Disability Media Studies

From the preceding reviews of disability studies and media studies, it is apparent that there is common ground to be found in the goals, methods, and values of each. Disability studies' validation of the epistemology of lived experience, for instance, is complemented by media studies' valorization of everyday life. More basically, as both fields are invested in the identification of relations of power and oppression, and the transformation of those relations via critique and activism aimed at both representations and structures, we see a unity of purpose that indicates a powerful collaborative potential. In this section we identify the most notable benefits of a disability media studies fusion, then offer a brief summary of how each chapter speaks to this shared project of formulating a richly contextual and politically engaged field.

First, we believe that the theories and methods of media studies can expand and enhance the ways that disability scholars analyze media texts, technologies, and cultures. Due to the rich attention that media studies gives to the politics of popular culture, its pervasive interest in negotiation as foundational to the production and reception of media artifacts, and its integrated approach to the study of media, it can help disability studies not just move (even further) beyond the sociotextual

approach when studying mediated cultures, but also do a better job of meeting the specific theoretical and methodological challenges of studying electronic media in context and with appropriate complexity. Such an approach would consider more thoroughly how media representations are connected to systems of structure and agency, better accounting for economic and material institutions and forces, social and political contexts of media production and reception, technological limitations and affordances, and the ways that audiences negotiate meanings. In practice, this suggests the need for more ethnographic and reception research from disability scholars of media, a more thorough understanding and appreciation of the political economy of media production, and the industrial strategies, cultures, and practices that inform the creation and distribution of media representations.

Second, media studies could clearly benefit from more interaction with disability studies. Most urgently, media scholars need to elevate disability to greater significance among their categories of analysis. Despite emerging from an interest in social and cultural power, the field has been slow to address issues of disability on anything like the scale seen in analyses of race, class, gender, and sexuality. With questions of normativity and marginality so crucial to the discipline, it is not entirely clear why media studies is still far from incorporating disability into its working knowledges, standard curricula, and professional routines. Nonetheless, as the contributions to this volume demonstrate, disability is not just "another Other"[51] but in fact raises profound issues of theory, epistemology, and methodology that enrich the study of media and society.

Beyond that, we hope that more media scholars will engage with concepts such as the social model (and its successors) and the "normate." We suspect, following Gerard Goggin and Christopher Newell,[52] that many of our media studies colleagues, even though they have moved past essentialist understandings of race and gender, still have an implicit understanding of disability rooted in the medical model. This explanation, however, is no justification. An encounter with theories from disability studies will help more media scholars see the constructedness of disability and able-bodiedness, the ideological power of ableism and bodily normativity, and the role of media technologies, institutions, and representations in producing and upholding—as well as potentially challenging—these constructions and ideologies. Such insights would

align well with media studies work on hegemonic representation and the ways in which texts, audiences, and institutions interact.

Additionally, media studies would benefit from greater appreciation of an epistemology that trusts lived and physical experiences as a basis for critique and analysis. We recognize that this raises significant theoretical questions that we are not able to delve into here—such as how to think about the discursive construction of subjectivity—but we welcome scholarship that continues to explore such issues and believe the encounter will be productive. For example, media studies (with notable exceptions)[53] has tended to neglect the physical experiences and technological interactions that structure media use at a material level, often silently assuming normative forms of spectatorship or sensory engagement. As Mills and Sterne have shown, however, we need to understand the ways that media and information technologies are intertwined with the standardization and regulation of the human body.[54] This gap could be addressed in part through increased attention to the normate in conjunction with media studies methodologies for studying reception and its valuation of the practices of everyday life. By studying the lived experiences of people with disabilities—who often use media quite differently and, in doing so, reveal unnoticed limitations and unexpected possibilities of media technologies, structures, and texts—disability media studies can better address media's materiality and a wider range of practices of reception.

We also want to emphasize the many areas of overlap between disability studies and media studies. For example, both fields are radically open to useful ideas across the humanities and borrow freely from feminist cultural theory, critical race theory, queer studies, and others. Even at the level of specific theories, the stage for dialog is set; one example invoked by multiple authors in this book, coming from both disciplines, is Michel Foucault's notions of biopower and biopolitics.[55] These concern the ways that modern states use scientific discourses, techniques of normalization and standardization, and surveillance of their populations' health and biological functioning (from birth rates to body mass index to sexual behavior) to regulate conduct and manage society. Media studies has taken up these concepts in work on everything from makeover shows to data mining,[56] while disability studies has found biopolitics especially generative in analyzing how some bodily differences are set

apart as particularly threatening for the state.[57] By already sharing some theoretical vocabularies, then, the two fields are primed to meet on a disability media studies common ground.

Finally, we firmly believe that the political impulses of these fields are complimentary and would be strengthened through cross-pollination. In the words of Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, "The aim of much disability studies is to reimagine disability, to reveal how the storied quality of disability invents and reinvents the world we share."[58] In short, she calls for attention to discourse as a cultural and material force that structures our experiences, which clearly aligns with the political imperatives of media studies: the fundamental political commitments of both fields are tied to questions of normativity, marginality, unjust distributions of power, and the role of ideology in maintaining systems of inequality. By working in concert, a disability media studies might produce scholarship that radically rethinks received knowledges about the workings of culture, society, and identity. What we seek is not simply a sharing but a fundamental reorientation toward interdisciplinarity that results in new questions about how, where, and with what consequences media and bodies are co-constitutive within specific social contexts, material conditions, political realms, policy frameworks, and economic and historical landscapes.

We are encouraged that these fusions are beginning to occur in scholarship across several continents, within a variety of publications, and at a range of disciplinary locations. Ever more journals, special issues, monographs, and other collections of research focus on media and disability, bringing together work on accessibility, translation, representation, health, gender, race, and other thematics with studies of television, digital media, film, medical imaging, visual culture, and other forms of mediation.[59] Furthermore, in a demonstration of how vibrant and productive a disability media studies can be, scholars across the disciplines are bringing media studies and disability studies into fruitful dialog with queer theory, postcolonialism, fat studies, gender studies, and more.[60]

The present collection joins this work by providing an accessible collection of essays in which scholars grapple with the ways in which disability studies and media studies may inform and enrich one another. To help expand and deepen the scholarly interchange between these fields, we have brought together a wide range of scholarship that addresses disability in relation to texts, industries, technologies, and audiences. We

asked our authors to analyze their objects of study with an awareness of speaking beyond their normal disciplinary audience—in the sense of both making their work accessible beyond their disciplinary colleagues and striving to chip away at those disciplinary walls in the process. Each is addressing certain fundamental questions: How does your study engage and extend questions of media representations beyond the textual? How does it expand existing media scholarship by incorporating an appreciation of normalization, ableism, and alternative epistemologies? How does it contribute to the interdisciplinary dialog between disability studies and media studies?

The resulting essays do not represent a perfect synthesis of disability and media studies, whereby the scholars from each tradition have suddenly adopted the theories, methods, and perspectives of the other; we are not presenting a "third way" or demonstration of "how it should be done." Instead, we see this volume as part of an ongoing dialog about the interdisciplinary study of disability and media. We believe such conversation is the most productive way forward for better understanding the intersections of media and disability. No reader will find equal value in all chapters, but we believe all readers can find something of value in each.

Our aim is academic, to be sure, but it is also political: as representations of disability proliferate across an ever-wider range of media, and as new technologies give rise to new questions of access and open new possibilities for—but also new barriers to—cultural participation, it becomes an increasingly urgent social issue to understand the countless ways in which ability and disability drive our cultural narratives and frame our public discourse. The essays that follow begin to develop that understanding and, more importantly, point the way for other scholars, students, producers, and consumers of media to grapple productively with media, popular culture, and the meanings of disability.

How to Use this Book

In order to stage an interdisciplinary conversation and exchange of ideas, this book is organized thematically. Scholars are not grouped by background or approach, but are placed according to the themes and topics that they address (production, gender, technology, etc.). Such an arrangement may be particularly attractive in teaching this text, as students can

be guided through points of commonality and difference, extending these interdisciplinary conversations into the classroom. In less structured contexts, this arrangement may similarly prompt reflection and suggest means for further developing disability media studies in our readers' own scholarship, public engagement, or experiences of popular culture. As an alternative to the thematic organization, we have provided a table of contents that lists chapters by medium (see Chapters by Topic [Medium]). Such groupings may prove more resonant for particular teaching needs and may suggest a starting point for scholars coming to this text with a background specifically in film or television studies.

In addition, we have provided short abstracts at the beginning of each chapter, summarizing the topic and enabling readers to quickly recognize the tradition from which an author is coming to this conversation. Each abstract also highlights the chapter's primary contributions to those from outside of that field, indicating what it might offer to a larger DMS approach. Though we cannot predict or direct the cross-pollinations that this collection may inspire, we hope these abstracts will help readers understand the rationale for each chapter's inclusion and its value beyond its home discipline and core readership. These abstracts may also be useful in making decisions about teaching; often, those chapters stemming from the disciplinary home of the course or instructor might be more easily taught first, building on recognizable ideas, while those that offer less familiar approaches may require additional time or supplementary activities in the classroom.

In short, though readers are certainly invited to read this collection in its entirety, there is no expectation that they read linearly. Nomadic ventures across and among the chapters and afterwords are encouraged, and alternative imaginings of structure are welcome. In these different arrangements of chapters or sections, different issues may rise to the forefront of thought and discussion, and such diversity of use and interpretation will only foster the growth of disability media studies as a more robust and dynamic field.

Chapter Breakdown

The first thematic section focuses on Access and Media Production. It begins with "Kickstarting Community," in which Elizabeth

Ellcessor considers how crowdfunding and online community for the web series *My Gimpy Life* (2013–2014) illuminate what she calls "cultural accessibility"—the ability to access culturally relevant, collaborative, and inclusive media. Next, in "*After School Special* Education," Julie Passanante Elman shows how disability media studies can illuminate the workings of traditional media industries, demonstrating how ABC's *After School Specials* (1972–1995) consistently linked heterosexuality with able-bodiedness and represented adolescence as a process of "overcoming disability."

The second section focuses on Disability and Race. Alex Porco's chapter, "Throw Yo' Voice Out," exemplifies how disability media studies can reveal unexpected dimensions of texts by showing how non-normative voices (including lisps, slurs, and other markers of vocal disability) intersect with race to become signifiers of authenticity and originality in hip-hop. Lori Kido Lopez's chapter, "How to Stare at Your Television," considers how "freak shows" and their reality TV successors implicate viewers in the witnessing of racialized dynamics of ability.

In the next section, Disability and Gender, Ellen Samuels's "Prosthetic Heroes," situates *Iron Man 3* (Shane Black, 2013) in relation to the reintegration of disabled veterans and the broader War on Terror. Her focus on masculinity is complemented by a focus on femininity in D. Travers Scott and Meagan Bates's analysis of advertisements for anxiety medications. They argue that these commercials do not merely feminize mental impairments like anxiety and depression, but in fact produce them as constitutive of "normal" contemporary femininity.

The three chapters in the next section offer very different approaches to the study of Disability and Celebrity Culture. First, Krystal Cleary draws upon queer and disability theory, audience research, and celebrity studies to analyze Lady Gaga's performances of disability, arguing that the mainstreaming of disability culture that some see in Gaga's jewel-encrusted wheelchairs and neck braces may equally be read as an appropriation that minimizes lived experiences of disability. Next, Katie Ellis and Gerard Goggin use South African sprinter Oscar Pistorius's fatal shooting of girlfriend Reeva Steenkamp to explore how disability is implicated in the governing of race, gender, sexuality, and normalcy. Finally, Tasha Oren demonstrates how three films about engineer and well-known Autist Temple Grandin reveal changing understandings of

autism, as well as the possibilities inherent in film style to represent non-neurotypical individuals.

Reflections on Disability and Temporality ground the next two chapters. First, Shoshana Magnet and Amanda Watson investigate how comics and graphic novels allow for non-linear representations of time, making it possible to depict the ways that people with disabilities are made to suffer under modern temporalities. Then, Robert McRuer analyzes the film *Any Day Now* (Travis Fine, 2012), demonstrating how "homonormativity," or the mainstreaming of queer life narratives into dominant social frameworks such as marriage, fails to incorporate disability, leaving room for radical challenges to this social order.

The last section, Disability and Technology, explores contexts in which mediation may rely upon or produce disability. First, Toby Miller examines the physical, economic, and environmental consequences of media technologies on the people who assemble and disassemble them, showing how disablement is intrinsic to the social inequalities upon which we build our media systems. Mack Hagood's chapter, "Disability and Biomediation," uses the case of tinnitus—a condition marked by a ringing in the ears—and its attendant diagnostic and therapeutic media to propose a framework for the study of biotechnological mediation. Finally, Bill Kirkpatrick demonstrates how popular conceptions of disability, through the rhetorical figure of the disabled "shut-in," shaped media policy in the 1920s while, as part of the same process, the emergence of radio changed the social and cultural meanings of disability.

The book also includes two afterwords, by leading scholars in disability and media studies, staging an initial conversation of the sort this volume aims to provoke. First, disability scholar Rachel Adams uses the case of eighteenth-century artist Matthias Buchinger as a starting point for her reflections on disability media studies, appreciating the ways that the contributions to this volume offer multiple frameworks for analyzing the layers of mediation and the complexities of disability that Buchinger represents, but also calling for more historical and international work. Then, from a media studies perspective, Jonathan Sterne and Mara Mills propose "dismediation," a method by which we seek out the media in disability, and the disability in media. Critiquing media studies canons and looking forward to new questions and strategies, this afterword offers a provocative future for disability media studies.

NOTES

1 *Glee*, "Dream On," directed by Joss Whedon, written by Brad Falchuk, Fox, May 18, 2010.

2 Todd VanDerWerff, "Glee: 'Dream On,'" *A.V. Club*, May 18, 2010, www.avclub. com; James Poniewozik, "Glee Watch: Dream until Your Dream Comes True," *Time*, May 19, 2010, http://entertainment.time.com.

3 Appropriate terminology has been a long-standing debate among disability scholars and activists. Many prominent disability organizations and policies, particularly in North America, favor the term *people with disabilities* as "person-first" language that foregrounds the core humanity of the individual. The problem with *people with disabilities* is that it seems to imply that disability and impairment are innate rather than constructed. In other contexts, *disabled people* is preferred because it avoids conflating impairment with disability and communicates the ways that people are "disabled" by society rather than by the "impairment" that constitutes their difference. The question of terminology is further complicated by the issue of those who are widely regarded as "disabled" but who themselves reject that construction; the best example is Deaf persons who understand themselves as belonging to a linguistic and cultural minority group, not as "impaired" or "disabled."

These debates are far from settled, and one can raise valid theoretical and political objections to all of the currently acceptable labels. In this volume, we have tended to prefer *persons with disabilities* (which highlights the diversity and citizenship of individuals, rather than the flattening of "people") as the term most frequently endorsed by prominent disability activists at the time we are writing; however, several authors have used other formulations in their chapters, a choice that we have respected. Furthermore, where it is most important we have privileged more theoretically precise—if perhaps somewhat jargony—language such as "bodily non-normativity." We encourage readers to remember that *no* term would be neutral or value-free and that our choices of language in this volume—almost certain to appear dated all too soon—are driven by fundamental respect and a commitment to social justice for "persons with disabilities."

4 Bob Vogel, "Irony of the Best-Known Wheelchair User," *Roho*, January 4, 2012, https://roho.com.

5 Kociemba, "'This Isn't Something I Can Fake.'"

6 Or, if all else fails, killed: the 2016 film *Me before You* (Thea Sharrock), for example, features a quadriplegic—again played by an able-bodied actor (Sam Claflin)—who chooses euthanasia over being a "burden" to the woman he loves.

7 Union of the Physically Impaired against Segregation and the Disability Alliance, "Fundamental Principles of Disability," *Centre for Disability Studies*, November 22, 1975, http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk.

8 Shakespeare, "The Social Model of Disability," 214–15; Corker and Shakespeare, *Disability/Postmodernity*.

9 For more on strategic essentialism, see Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography," in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakra-vorty Spivak, eds., *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988): 197–221.

10 Barnes, "Disabling Imagery," 39; Norden, *The Cinema of Isolation*.

11 Garland-Thomson, "Seeing the Disabled."

12 Shakespeare, "Cultural Representation of Disabled People," 283.

13 McRuer, *Crip Theory*, 171–198.

14 Poststructuralism argues that what things are and what they mean are the result of discourse and discursive practices—from the language we use, to how we arrange ourselves in physical space, to how we imagine ourselves in relation to other people and the world. Because discourse is unstable and always changeable, that means that the world and our sense of it is also unstable: we might imagine some things to be natural and unalterable, but in fact they are the result of power struggles over meaning. French theorist Michel Foucault developed many of these ideas, while American philosopher Judith Butler has extended Foucault's theories to analyze, most influentially, gender and sexuality.

15 Tremain, "Foucault, Governmentality," 10–11.

16 Davis, "Constructing Normalcy."

17 See also work on "compulsory able-bodiedness," such as McRuer, "Compulsory Able-Bodiedness."

18 Lennard Davis, *The End of Normal: Identity in a Biocultural Era* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008).

19 Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*.

20 Susan Wendell, *The Rejected Body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

21 Charlton, *Nothing about Us without Us*.

22 Linton, *Claiming Disability*.

23 O'Toole, "Disclosing Our Relationships to Disabilities."

24 Kuppers, *Disability Culture*.

25 Siebers, *Disability Theory*, 57.

26 Ibid. "Complex embodiment" draws on and extends two important strands of feminist scholarship: standpoint theory (different social identities and experiences produce different knowledges) and intersectionality.

27 Kafer, *Feminist, Queer, Crip*.

28 Ibid., 7.

29 Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* 43 (1991): 1241–99.

30 "Q&A with Jasbir Puar" [interview], *Darkmatter Journal*, May 2, 2008, www.darkmatter101.org.

31 See, for example, Alaniz, *Death, Disability, and the Superhero*; Sarah Heiss. "Locating the Bodies of Women and Disability in Definitions of Beauty," *Disability Studies Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (2011), http://dsq-sds.org; Amy Holdsworth, "Something Special: Care, Pre-school Television and the Dis/abled Child," *Journal of Popular Television* 3, no. 2 (2015): 163–78; Sami Schalk, "Reevaluating the Supercrip," *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 10, no. 1 (2016): 71–86.

32 See, for example, Jennings Bryant and Mary Beth Oliver, *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* (New York: Routledge, 2009); Robin L. Nabi and Mary Beth Oliver, *The Sage Handbook of Media Processes and Effects* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009).

33 John Durham Peters and Peter Simonson, *Mass Communication and American Social Thought: Key Texts, 1919–1968* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004); Stanley J. Baran and Dennis K. Davis, *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future* (Boston: Cengage Learning, 2014); Bruce D. Williams and Michael X. Delli Carpini, *After Broadcast News: Media Regimes, Democracy, and the New Information Environment* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

34 Christian Metz, *The Imaginary Signifier: Psychoanalysis and the Cinema* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); David Bordwell, *Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

35 Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*.

36 Janice A. Radway, *Reading the Romance*: *Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

37 See, for example, Jenkins, *Textual Poachers*; Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2008).

38 For more on this approach to popular culture, see John Fiske, *Reading the Popular* (London: Routledge, 1989).

39 Hall, "Encoding/Decoding."

40 Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002).

41 D'Acci, "Cultural Studies, Television Studies"; du Gay et al., *Doing Cultural Studies*; Johnson, "What Is Cultural Studies Anyway?"

42 Gray, *Watching Race*; Gledhill, *Stardom*; Douglas, *Listening In*; Shawn VanCour, *Making Radio: Early Radio Production and the Rise of Modern Sound Culture, 1920–1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). See also Mack Hagood's chapter, this volume, on approaches to technologies that might fit within this set of analyses.

43 Morley, *Family Television*; Ien Ang, *Living Room Wars: Rethinking Media Audiences* (London: Routledge, 1995); Hollis Griffin, *Feeling Normal: Sexuality & Media Criticism in the Digital Age* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017).

44 Jenkins, *Textual Poachers* and *Convergence Culture*; Gray, Sandvoss, and Harrington, *Fandom*; Hills, *Fan Cultures*.

45 Caldwell, *Production Culture*; Havens, Lotz, and Tinic, "Critical Media Industry Studies"; Holt and Perren, *Media Industries*.

46 Lewis and Miller, *Critical Cultural Policy Studies*; Streeter, *Selling the Air*; Allison Perlman, *Public Interests*.

47 Hilmes, *Radio Voices*; Spigel, *Make Room for TV*; Allen, *Horrible Prettiness*, Bodroghkozy, *Groove Tube*.

48 D'Acci, *Defining Women*; See also du Gay et al., *Doing Cultural Studies*.

49 Ethan Thompson and Jason Mittell, *How to Watch Television* (New York: New York University Press, 2013). For an outstanding introduction to media studies methodologies, see also Michael Kackman and Mary Celeste Kearney, eds., *The Craft of Criticism: Critical Media Studies in Practice* (New York: Routledge, forthcoming).

50 D'Acci, "Cultural Studies, Television Studies," 436.

51 Kudlick, "Disability History."

52 Goggin and Newell, *Digital Disability*.

53 See, for example, Roger Silverstone, *Television and Everyday Life* (London: Routledge, 1994); Toby Miller and Alec McHoul, *Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (London: Sage: 1998); Anna McCarthy, *Ambient Television: Visual Culture and Public Space* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Jussi Parikka, "New Materialism as Media Theory: Medianatures and Dirty Matter," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 9, no. 1 (March 2012): 95–100.

Recent work on video games and the Internet has begun to lead more media scholars toward questions of materiality; we contend, however, that a disability perspective will both accelerate this necessary exploration and, more importantly, provide resources for questioning the bodily normativity that can all too easily inform such studies.

54 Mills, "Deafening"; Sterne, *MP3*.

55 Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*.

56 Ouellette and Hay, *Better Living through Reality TV*; Kenneth C. Werbin, "Spookipedia: Intelligence, Social Media and Biopolitics," *Media, Culture & Society* 33, no. 8 (November 2011): 1254–65.

57 Mitchell and Snyder, *The Biopolitics of Disability*.

58 Garland-Thomson, "Representing Disability," *PMLA* 120, no. 2 (March 2005): 523.

59 The recent collection *Different Bodies: Essays on Disability in Film and Television* is broadly international, and its authors use disability studies to perform accessible critical analyses of fictional representations, documentaries, and audience reception in relation to film and television texts (Mogk, *Different Bodies*).

Additional works that participate in an emerging disability media studies include: Alper, *Digital Youth with Disabilities*; Ellcessor, *Restricted Access*; Ellis and Goggin, *Disability and the Media*; Ellis and Kent, *Disability and New Media*; Katie Ellis and Mike Kent, eds., "Special Issue: Disability and the Internet," *First Monday* 20, no. 9 (September 2015), http://firstmonday.org; Julie Passanante Elman, *Chronic Youth: Disability, Sexuality, and U.S. Media Cultures*

of Rehabilitation (New York: New York University Press, 2014); Fuqua, *Prescription TV*; Haller, *Representing Disability*.

60 See, for example, Jasbir Puar, "The Cost of Getting Better: Ability and Debility," in Lennard Davis, ed., *The Disability Studies Reader*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2013): 177–84; Rebecca Wanzo, *The Suffering Will Not Be Televised: African American Women and Sentimental Political Storytelling* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009); McRuer, *Crip Theory*; Sami Schalk, "Coming to Claim Crip: Disidentification with/in Disability Studies," *Disability Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (2013), http://dsq-sds.org; Mel Y. Chen, *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).