In the fall of 2013, I co-taught a one-credit seminar to a group of undergraduate students on productions and manifestations of ableism. As a core focus, my co-instructor and I outlined the ways in which disability is socially constructed, using education as a clear site to illuminate how systematic oppression shapes access and experiences. The course was housed within the Social Justice Education program on campus, which framed its courses on oppression through an interdisciplinary lens rooted in critical theory. In designing our seminar, we drew upon a diverse selection of scholarship to inform ourselves and our students. We utilized materials ranging from YouTube videos to depictions of individuals with disabilities on popular TV series and movies to spark dialogue. The course ended up being a powerful space to discuss an identity that 15% of the world’s population share (World Health Organization, 2011), which is too often relegated to the margins within higher education.

After reading Dan Goodley’s (2017) *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, I realized the ways in which our course focused on specific models of disability (e.g., social, minority) and geographical contexts (e.g., the Global North) shaped our conversation. Moreover, in developing our class to challenge banking models of education that see students as empty repositories to receive knowledge (Freire, 1970), our conversation was also reflective of our collective positionality within the topic of disability. Four years after my teaching experience, Goodley’s work helped me to further my own understandings of disability as an individual and an educator.

Over the course of 10 chapters, Goodley provides an interdisciplinary overview of critical disability studies as shaped by educational, psychological, sociological, and critical theory perspectives. Goodley is a professor of Disability Studies and Education at the University of Sheffield, and the volume focuses predominantly on Western positions with some reference to larger global culture. Goodley outlines the organization of the book by framing the subject matter (chapters one through three), developing central analyses (chapters four through nine), and offering new insights (chapter 10). Within each of the dominant perspectives presented, Goodley discusses prevalent models and approaches. For example, the sociologies of disability in chapter four span functionalism, interpretivism, radical humanism, and radical structuralism.

Overall, the book serves to synthesize the current field of disability studies and reposition the conversation more directly within critical theory and research. A key theme of the book explores the ways in which disability is constructed across different ideological and physical spaces. Disability is defined relationally, emphasizing the importance of context. The volume also distinguishes the concept of ableism from disablism, the latter of which is defined by Thomas (2007) as “a form of social oppression involving the social imposition of restrictions of activity on people with impairments and the socially engendered undermining of their psycho-emotional well-being” (p. 73). Goodley has a clear mastery of the field of study, integrating key ideas by disability studies scholars such as Simi Linton, Tom Shakespeare, Nick Watson, and Carol Thomas. The book is meticulously researched and expansive, affirming Goodley’s own status as a scholar in the field.

In the preface, Goodley acknowledges feedback from the first edition of the book that led to changes in the writing style of this newest volume. These concerns challenged “the overly academic nature of the writing, complained about the bias toward the critical disability studies and expressed anxieties about the potentially mystifying nature of social theory (p. xiii).” Goodley goes on to explain the ways in which the readability of the book was addressed in this revision through engaging chapter titles, discussion questions, and endnote citations. This volume was created “with undergraduates and postgraduates, academic, practitioners and activists in mind” (p. xi). However, a major pitfall of the volume is that the revisions do not go far enough in promoting readability. Instead, the synthesis of literature is likely to be too dense for new readers without prior grounding in the subject matter.

The issue of audience is compounded by the lack of anecdotes or examples across the volume, creating a disjuncture at times between the informative tone of the chapters and the more conversational discussion questions. The areas where Goodley’s voice is most engaging are often relegated to subsections of the text. One such section, chapter six, integrates individual narratives with academic content to illustrate how subjects are created. Another example occurs in chapter eight, which Goodley co-wrote with Rebecca.
This chapter demonstrates specific examples of the idea of DisHuman, an approach that unpacks hegemonic views of what it means to be human and coined by the author group as part of a DisHuman manifesto. Most prevalently, Goodley and colleagues share the example of Laughing Boy (LB), a moniker for Connor Sparrowhawk. LB, an individual with autism and epilepsy, drowned in a bath at the hospital to which he had been admitted. The authors share the subsequent activism that occurred in LB’s name, which brought together various community members and resulted in a neglect charge against the hospital. The story is engaging and illuminating, providing a clear context to which the reader can apply key ideas. Indeed, Goodley seems to concur and chooses to end the book with an update from the LB campaign for justice, using it as a tool to situate why disability studies is so critical. A third edition would be better suited by weaving in more such narratives to help a diverse readership engage with the breadth of content.

Regarding the other critiques of the first volume, Goodley holds fast to the value of critical theory in his argument by stating “complex times require complex theories” (p. xiii; emphasis by the author). This is an area of success as Goodley weaves the concept of disability artfully with other identities, discussing ideas of intersectionality and drawing upon key foundational theorists (e.g., Judith Butler, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Frantz Fanon, Michel Foucault). The interwoven nature and emphasis on theory would be better served by explicitly naming the focus as critical disability studies, perhaps even in the title. In fact, a major contribution of the book is the way that it challenges other forms of critical theory to incorporate a truly intersectional and interdisciplinary lens and examine how multiple marginalized identities can be co-constructed. Interestingly, despite this lens, Goodley does not cite the work of Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) in coining the word intersectionality.

In sum, the book is a valuable contribution of those seeking to understand critical disability studies. It offers a thorough, integrated foundation that promotes complex thinking. However, it is not a primer text. The volume would be most successfully directed towards graduate students or scholars well acquainted with disability studies and critical theory looking to deepen their knowledge and develop a more nuanced, integrated understanding.
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