24

#DisabilityStudiesTooWhite

KRISTEN BOWEN, RACHEL KUO, AND MARA MILLS

Background: "Special Issues"

The title and impulse for this essay borrow from activist Vilissa Thompson, who created the hashtag #DisabilityTooWhite in 2016 to challenge the inadequate representation of disabled people of color in mainstream media and disability rights activism. The conversations sparked by #DisabilityTooWhite draw heavily on principles of disability justice, a term coined in 2005 by a group of queer disabled activists of color to levy intersectionality as a political challenge to whiteness in disability rights movements and ableism in racial justice movements (Sins Invalid 2019). In academic disability studies, which emerged in the United States in the 1980s–1990s (Garland-Thomson 2013), similar protests date at least to 2006, when Chris Bell published "Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal" in the second edition of *The Disability Studies Reader*, calling out the dramatic exclusions and false universalizing of the field in its founding decades. Bell's edited volume *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*, published posthumously in 2012, further opened the door for disability theory and activism centering race, such as disability critical race theory (DisCrit), crip-of-color critique, Black disability studies, Black feminist disability studies, decolonial disability studies, LatDisCrit (see Padilla, this volume), and more.[1]

Given the burgeoning critique of "white disability studies" since 2005–2006, we set out to assess the state of the field today, examining both authorship and content related to race in key journals and anthologies from 2010 to 2020. We wanted to know if the field had changed in meaningful ways: Are there more articles about race in disability studies journals and in canon-making anthologies? More citations of DisCrit or Black feminist disability studies authors? More scholars of color, regardless of specialization, editing or writing for disability studies journals? Or, as Moya Bailey and Izetta Mobley have recently argued, do "disability scholars pay homage to Bell" while "citations of his work have not led to the fundamental shift that he desired Disability Studies to make" (Bailey and Mobley 2019, 12)? Mel Y. Chen, Alison Kafer, Eunjung Kim, and Julie Avril Minich further note that field transformation has been obfuscated by "reductive and extractive citation practices" as well as increases in author representation

without "substantive engagement" in alternate theories and methods (Chen et al., 2023).

Authorship, citation, and representation matter in ways mundane and revolutionary. Beyond influencing the course of individual careers and livelihoods, they shape the historical record, laws and policies, and education. Publication and citation practices that continue to amplify white voices and present western work as the universal perspective demonstrate a "hierarchy of credibility" that devalues the intersectional experience of racial marginalization and disability (Becker 1967; Gibson, Bowen, and Hanson 2021). Our approach is informed by Rachel Kuo's previous work on "#CommunicationSoWhite," a 2018 study of authorship and citation in the field of communication, coauthored with Paula Chakravartty, Victoria Grubbs, and Charlton McIlwain. In that article, the authors depict the urgency of identifying and redressing racial disparities in academia:

> In the last decade we have seen the ongoing dismantling of affirmative action and other redistributive policies. Moreover, the growing "adjunctification of the professoriate" in the academic labor market (Sterne, 2011) has been disproportionately shouldered by women and people of color (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). These factors, in addition to institutionalized racism and academia's publish-or-perish mantra, perpetuate racial disparities (Gunning, 2000). New racial justice movements, from Black Lives Matter in the United States to Rhodes/Fees Must Fall in South Africa, have revived questions about representation within the academy and exposed ongoing inequities, including the prohibitive cost of higher education, insufficient attention to race and racial inequality in curricula, and racially hostile campus climates. (Chakravartty et al. 2018, 257)

In disability studies, racial disparities in authorship, content, citation, and editorship are particularly striking because people of color are disproportionately disabled (e.g., by substandard health care, environmental racism, or police violence) and tracked into special education (Minich 2016; Annamma 2018). Responding to these disparities requires not just "adding" elided perspectives into existing narratives but remaking disability studies models from different starting points. Scholars have mapped the complex historical and political relations between race and disability, which span coconstitution, analogy, intersectionality, shared social construction, and mutual exclusion (Erevelles and Minear 2010; Annamma, Connor, and Ferri 2013; Bailey and Mobley 2019; Tyler 2022). They have also argued for distinct social and historical sites, processes, and experiences of disablement (Puar 2017; Hinton 2021).

Although we borrow our method from "#CommunicationSoWhite," we acknowledge important differences between disability studies and communication, starting with institutional origins and power. Disability studies emerged out of disability activism, itself heavily influenced by feminist and civil rights

activism. Early disability rights activism was often led by white men (Hinton 2021), but the activist relationship to university spaces was largely one of exclusion. The first journal in the field, *Disability Studies Quarterly* (*DSQ*), was launched in 1980 as a newsletter for the medical sociology group of the American Sociological Association. Edited by Irving Zola from 1982 to 1994, the journal adopted its current name in 1985 and became the journal of the Society for Disability Studies after that group became an independent scholarly organization in 1986, having initially been founded in 1982 as a section of the Western Social Science Association for the Study of Chronic Illness, Impairment, and Disability. Over the years, *DSQ* has shifted its publishing focus to the humanities, while *Disability and Society*, founded in the United Kingdom in 1986, is primarily anchored in the social sciences. Both of these journals formerly included rehabilitation perspectives, and we note that this legacy may have deterred humanities authors trained in cultural studies and critical theory from publishing with them at an earlier moment.

Even today, when disability studies has proliferated as a subfield of literature, history, anthropology, sociology, and media studies, the Society for Disability Studies is a comparatively small scholarly society that has struggled with funding. Unlike communication, disability studies has remained a field or subfield rather than a discipline, with few university departments or majors worldwide, which has implications regarding the kinds of institutional power (or lack thereof) with which it is associated. For many critical disability studies scholars and activists, this interdisciplinarity and lack of "discipline" is a strength. In the words of Julie Avril Minich (2016), "disability studies as a methodology rather than a subject" keeps the field committed "to its origins in social justice work." On the other hand, much publishing in the field takes place in established journals in the humanities and social sciences (e.g., *PMLA*, *American Quarterly*) with higher "impact factors" than the disability studies journals we investigate here. Especially before tenure, scholars may be more likely to publish within their disciplines of training and employment or to focus on producing monographs, which are not captured in this study. Until recently, pivotal special issues and fora exploring the relationship between race and disability have tended to come out in ethnic studies or cultural studies journals such as *MELUS* ("Race, Ethnicity, Disability, and Literature: Intersections and Interventions" [James and Wu 2006]); *Amerasia Journal* ("The State of Illness and Disability in Asian America" [Ho and Lee 2013]); *Lateral* ("Forum: Emerging Critical Analytics for Alternative Humanities: Critical Disability Studies" [Minich 2016]); and *African American Review* ("Blackness and Disability" [Pickens 2017]).

As we assessed authorship trends over the past decade in self-proclaimed journals of disability studies, as well as edited collections that draw from a wider author pool, we kept in mind the denigration—in terms of ranking and funding—of publishing in disability studies. The observation by Subini Annamma, David

Connor, and Beth Ferri (2013, 9–10) of a "professionally enforced line between special education and general education journals," which they attribute to ableism, holds true in disability studies publishing more broadly. Following Anna Hinton, we also acknowledge "alternative genealogies" that don't appear in our journal count, such as the deep archive of writing about "trauma, non-apparent disabilities, violence, illness, and disease" in Black Feminist Studies (Hinton 2021, 13, 17, drawing on the work of Sami Schalk and Akemi Nishida).

With this in mind, we offer our study as an audit of disability studies circa 2020. We appreciate criticisms of the false objectivity of censuses, and the potential for tokenization or essentialism in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) "equity audits." We are also aware that we aren't coding for disability; a question mark hangs over the same decade regarding the inclusion of disabled authors in disability studies. But we believe even a rough tabulation of authorship and race-related content across a decade can reveal important trends—including stagnation—and spur accountability. We've witnessed the renewed, pragmatic and theoretical scholarly conversations that have followed similar studies in other fields. In addition to "#CommunicationSoWhite," we flag the Institute for Scientific Information report that revealed flat or decreased publishing rates for Black, Native American, and Hispanic authors in STEM fields between 2010 and 2020 (Beardsley and Halevi 2022). To move beyond counts and checklists, we point to Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha's *Disability Justice: An Audit Tool*, which asks organizations to assess the ways they are "centering disability justice politics, practices and leadership" (2022, 7).

Some of our findings, detailed shortly, are not unexpected: the diversification, if slow, of authorship in disability studies journals; the continuation of the issue, noted by Bell in 2006, of race often appearing in "special issues" of disability studies journals (and vice versa) rather than as a core analytic; and distinctions between the racial composition of authorship in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. Other findings took us by surprise: a stark underrepresentation of nonwhite authors (6.4 percent) and non-western sites of research (0.7 percent) in canon-making handbooks and anthologies, with the numbers being somewhat better in peer-reviewed journals (even though they rely on a smaller, submission-based pool); the fact that a third of the nonwhite scholars publishing in disability studies are non-western-based scholars; and a decrease in articles *about* race in certain journals (e.g., *Disability and Society*) over the past decade.

Methodology

Our methodology emerges from the 2018 study "#CommunicationSoWhite" (Chakravartty et al. 2018), which quantitatively assesses citational disparities in the study of communication by examining race and author names. In

the present study, rather than look at disparities in citation counts—how frequently an author is cited and their racial background—we focus on authors' racial identity and whether race is used as a central analytic in research content at the levels of theory, methodology, and discussion and findings. We take these two factors—authorship and content—to be distinct but interrelated aspects of the "white disability studies" argument. In addition to approximating the representation of scholars of color in disability studies, we offer a starting point for assessing *how* racial scholarship is more broadly employed by both white and nonwhite authors in the field. Beyond the mere inclusion of scholars of color, our approach emphasizes race as a deliberate analytic that goes beyond relegating racialized people into populations for scientific or social scientific study.

Following the rationale in "#CommunicationSoWhite," we approach coding in a binary "white/nonwhite" or "yes/no" format, given the ways an antagonistic social order of white dominance is embedded in much historical and contemporary racism and imperialism (Wynter 2003; Hesse 2016). While we understand that the lack of data disaggregation collapses unique variables, we chose to aggregate statistical analysis given (a) the argument about a *lack of nonwhite authors* in the secondary literature that prompted this study and (b) the complexities of racial interpretation, coding, and categorization. The general nature of this binary also allows us to investigate claims about white disability studies while engaging critically—as opposed to strictly—with categorization practices found in the US Census.

Our corpus of data includes 4,693 total entries from the years 2010–2020 in the following Anglophone, peer-reviewed humanities and social science journals of disability studies: *Disability and Society*, *DSQ*, the *Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal*, the *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*, and the *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies* (see table 24.1). We use Anglophone journals given the Euro-US-centricity in the field of study (Ng, White, and Saha 2020) and the longer-standing colonial legacies of western and English-speaking dominance in knowledge production. We excluded journals that simply have the word *disability* in the title—for instance, journals of nursing, education, rehabilitation, policy, and so on. We also excluded journals in Deaf Studies, which overlaps with but is not identical to disability studies. Lastly, although we acknowledge their field-building significance, we did not include journals that have been out of print for more than ten years (e.g., the *Disability Rag*); newsletters and "blog journals" (e.g., the Public Disability History blog, the Disability History Association newsletter); graduate student journals (e.g., *Critical Disability Discourses* at York University); recently launched journals (e.g., the *International Journal of Disability and Social Justice* and the *Indian Journal of Critical Disability Studies*, both founded in 2021); or book series.[2]

We additionally looked at edited collections—readers and handbooks—that curate what constitute "core" texts and themes in the field, including the

TABLE 24.1. Findings on disability studies journals and handbooks (2010–2020).

	Total entries	Content on race	Non-western site	Nonwhite authors
Disability Studies Quarterly	870	175 (20.1%)	73 (8.4%)	132 (15.2%)
Disability and Society	2,103	357 (17.0%)	179 (8.5%)	274 (13.0%)
Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal	552	156 (28.3%)	93 (16.8%)	146 (26.4%)
Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies	277	48 (17.3%)	7 (2.5%)	32 (11.6%)
Canadian Review	438	48 (11.0%)	12 (2.7%)	58 (13.2%)
Handbooks and anthologies	453	57 (12.6%)	3 (0.7%)	29 (6.4%)
Total	4,693	841 (17.9%)	367 (7.8%)	671 (14.3%)

Disability Studies Reader, first through fifth editions (1997, 2006, 2010, 2013, and 2016); *Keywords for Disability Studies* (2015); *Routledge Handbook of Disability*, first and second editions (2012 and 2020); *Disability Studies: A Student's Guide* (2013); and *SAGE Handbook of Disability Studies* (2001). These collections draw from humanities and social science publishing at large, beyond disability studies–focused journals, and as such might be expected to reflect either broader trends in authorship or gatekeeping in the field.

We treated each combination of author and article as an individual entry regardless of the contribution of multiple authors to a single article, repeat authorship, or duplication of pieces in handbooks over time. Our study focuses on original peer-reviewed research articles and book chapters and excludes creative or multimedia works and book reviews that may be included in journals and anthologies. Our intention with this list of publications is not to make an argument about what does or doesn't "count" as disability studies scholarship or to participate in defining a canon. Instead, our goal was to locate publications that self-identify as contributing to the field of "disability studies" or resources that are frequently sought out and shared both by individuals wanting to learn more about the field and by those who are teaching within it. For this reason, we also chose not to include more specialized edited collections (e.g., on disability and digital media).

The data-collection component of our study was completed between March 2021 and December 2021 with two human coders (coauthors Kristen Bowen and Rachel Kuo) who manually interpreted authors' racial identities and the race-related content of articles or chapters. Given that Anglophone disability studies journals and anthologies are primarily published in the United States and United Kingdom (with one journal in Canada), we adopted a coding schematic from US Census categories as a starting point: white, Black, Latinx, Asian, and Native and Indigenous. We then expanded from this schematic, given its

limitations, to account for Arab and Middle Eastern communities. In order to determine authors' racial identities, we primarily relied on publicly available material on the authors' faculty or staff pages hosted by their primary institution; personal websites; and social media accounts (e.g., LinkedIn, Twitter, and Facebook). Aware that studies like this can risk essentializing racial characteristics and traits, we examined a combination of headshots alongside biographical information, professional affiliations, and other published works. For example, authors may be visually misinterpreted as white by photo alone but may self-indicate racial, ethnic, or tribal backgrounds in their biographies or in position statements within scholarly articles.

This process surfaced many complicated questions about racial interpretation and, given the international dimensions of disability studies, many considerations about the geopolitics of race transnationally (Getsy and Gossett 2021). Again, our study is meant to provide baseline evidence for nearly two decades of qualitative claims about race and racial disparities in disability studies, rather than make objective claims about race per se. Following earlier studies and considerations of the racialization of geography (e.g., Chakravartty et al. 2018; Pulido 2002), we decided that both western and eastern European scholars would be counted as "white" unless they also identified as a person of color (e.g., being Black and German or South Asian and British). This slightly differs from other studies on geographic disparities in scholarship (e.g., Ekdale et al. 2022; Demeter 2020) that have taken a "Global North" and "Global South" distinction, where the Global North includes higher-income countries in Asia and Global South includes eastern Europe. Given our focus on Anglophone journals, we took into consideration historical and contemporary interpretations of whiteness, such as how East Asian scholars from Korea and Japan would be read as "nonwhite" within these sites of knowledge production. These are not easy distinctions. For example, we coded scholars from countries such as Portugal and Spain as "white" while scholars from Latin America were coded as nonwhite (which is an imperfect distinction given the ways that scholars from Latin America can also be white, depending on their relationship and positioning within historical systems of colonialism). Given the racialization of religion and global formations of Islamophobia, we coded Muslim scholars as nonwhite regardless of country of origin. Despite this, we could not adequately account for intragroup differences, such as caste and ethnic hierarchies (e.g., Han Chinese or Hindu Brahmins).

This process underscores the complexities of race, nation, and geography as a result of cross-cutting legacies of imperialism, empire, and migration. It requires attention to nuances and complexities in power relations that automated methods could not adequately account for. We emphasize these moments of tension and imperfect and messy decision-making to demonstrate the difficulties of categorizing mass quantities of data, even when only coding between two possible categories. The significant contributions of both critical race and disability

studies as method and theory have long emphasized the trouble with categorical assumptions. We also want to highlight the qualitative aspects of quantitative research as well as the necessity of any research, regardless of field or method, to treat race as an analytic rather than a fixed object of study.

We assessed whether articles and chapters feature race as a key analytic by reviewing abstracts and keywords, since these are strong indicators of how significantly the authors identify race as a core part of their research. We also searched for terms including *race*, *racial*, *racism*, *whiteness*, and *colonialism* throughout the entire article as supplementary information. While we are specifically looking at race as a distinct category, we also aim to challenge the ways that social difference has been compartmentalized into individualized categories of identity; thus we did not include articles or chapters that only briefly mention race as a component part of a list of intersecting identities or a list of demographics as data points. We also did not include articles that generically discuss "diversity and inclusion" or "social justice" without explicitly engaging an analysis of race and power. However, an article on militarism and imperialism that does not explicitly discuss "racism" might still be coded as being "about race" if the authors engage legacies of those systems as structuring racial orders.

When we started the coding process, we also noted the inclusion of scholarship about non-US and especially non-western sites that emphasized *populations* of difference by authors in both western and non-western institutions, such as case studies of disability rights activism or medical and health policies in different geographic contexts. At first, we decided *not* to count these articles as scholarship about race, given the absence of an analysis of power as well as our own concerns about reproducing western-centric frameworks of "racial others" (e.g., treating case studies in Africa as peripheral or particular). However, we continued to observe that much of the disability studies scholarship that was not explicitly about white communities focused instead on non-western communities. Moreover, many of the authors of color represented were located in these same sites writing from the perspective of their current geolocation. Noticing this as a substantial pattern, we then went back to the beginning of our data set to recode, and we created an additional category for scholarship "about race" that was sited in non-western geographies. Here, similar to our note earlier about the slipperiness of Global North / Global South distinctions, we approach "non-western" primarily as referring to sites outside the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Europe while also considering different transnational dimensions of local sites (e.g., studies on refugee communities in France). While we do not want to conflate race and nation, nor reify national boundaries, we made some coding decisions along these lines as a result of interpretations of race and racialization in the Anglophone sites where research is published.

At certain times, data about authors were simply not available. Some community-engaged researchers or other nonacademic authors, such as health

and education practitioners, were harder to find and identify given factors such as searchability of public biographical material or transitions across organizations. For some social science articles with multiple authors, it was more difficult to find information about middle authors (e.g., the fourth, fifth, or sixth), such as coauthors who were graduate students at the time of publication but then did not remain in academia. While we did our best to locate all authors regardless of institutional and organizational affiliation, authors we could not identify—forty-three total—were left out of the final analysis.

Findings

We launched this empirical study to assess the widespread assumption that scholarship by people of color, as well as scholarship that explicitly addresses race, is underrepresented in disability studies. Not surprisingly, the numbers confirmed this intuition (table 24.1). More specifically, we wanted to understand the extent of these disparities after 2010, when the field was better established and the critique of "white disability studies" well known. In terms of author representation, we found that 14.3 percent of articles and chapters published between 2010 and 2020 in journals and handbooks combined were by nonwhite scholars. Here we would like to reemphasize that we treated each data entry as a unique individual entry, so this percentage may include the same nonwhite scholar more than once.

We found that 17.9 percent (841 out of 4,693) of total publications either used race as a deliberate analytic or centered scholarship beyond western contexts. Out of the total data set, 7.8 percent of entries focused on non-western sites of study, which means that nearly half (43.6 percent, or 367 out of 841) of the publications "about race" were actually sited within racialized, non-western geographies. Non-US and non-western scholars publishing articles from or about their specific location make up approximately one-third (32.9 percent) of the total number of nonwhite authors publishing in disability studies journals and anthologies. Notably, 8.5 percent of the total number of entries (400 out of 4,693) are articles by nonwhite scholars that also focus on race. This means two things. One, in the majority of cases (59.6 percent) of nonwhite authorship, race is a critical part of the work. Specifically, a majority of first authors who are scholars of color write about race; however, when scholars of color are included in multiauthored articles (but not as first authors), those articles are typically not about race.

Second, we observe that white and nonwhite authors contribute almost equally to the scant scholarship on race in the field; 50.6 percent of the articles about race are by white authors. While there are some similarities between our findings and the findings in "#CommunicationSoWhite" (Chakravartty et al. 2018), in the latter article the authors discovered that the inclusion of more nonwhite scholars does not necessarily improve disparities in scholarly recognition

or distribution as measured through citations. Within disability studies, on the other hand, critical articles about race by nonwhite authors are sometimes highly cited.[3] For example, using Google Scholar metrics, Chris Bell's 2006 article "Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal" has at least 307 citations as of November 2022; while not included in our data set, Subini Annamma, David Connor, and Beth Ferri's 2013 article "Dis/ability Critical Race Studies (DisCrit)," published in the journal *Race Ethnicity and Education*, has over 730 citations. As Moya Bailey and Izetta Mobley (2019) point out, citation is not the main problem in disability studies, but rather representation in terms of content and overall authorship.

Within the data set, several special issues on feminism and movement politics are notable in their inclusion of racial scholarship, suggesting that an explicit emphasis on the *collective politics* of disability necessitates critical engagement with race. A 2012 issue of *DSQ* on "movement politics" guest edited by Michael Ralph featured eight nonwhite authors and eleven articles (out of twelve total within the issue) centering race as a critical analytic, and a 2013 special issue on feminist theory and disability in *DSQ* had six articles engaging with race. New and forthcoming special issues on race and indigeneity in disability studies journals, such as *DSQ*'s January 2022 issue on indigeneity and disability, may further support transformations of the field. The goal, as Bell argued, is broad structural change, but special issues such as these have the potential to call in new authors and amplify underrepresented themes in the field.

Although disability studies is interdisciplinary, it is worth noting the similarities and differences between journals that are primarily located in the humanities and those that are primarily in the social sciences. For example, *Disability and Society* makes up 44.8 percent of our entries (2,103 total entries), given the more common practice of coauthorship in the social sciences. *DSQ*, a more humanities-focused journal, has only 870 entries. *Disability and Society* had 13 percent representation by nonwhite authors and 17 percent of articles centering race, while *DSQ* had 15.2 percent representation by nonwhite authors and 20.1 percent of articles centering race. The difference in content may be due to the longer legacy of humanities-oriented scholarship engaging fields such as postcolonial and decolonial theory, ethnic studies, and feminist studies.

The difference between representation in journal publications and edited volumes is even more notable. Within the edited anthologies and handbooks, which purport to represent the entire field at a given point in time, there were only three total entries (0.7 percent) in the ten-year period (across all anthologies) that emphasized non-western sites of study, which has implications for what knowledge is deemed canonical and generalizable. Only 6.4 percent of authors represented in the handbooks were nonwhite and 12.6 percent of scholarship engaged race. In the case of *Keywords for Disability Studies* (2015), we coded more generously for the inclusion of race, racism, colonialism, or imperialism

given the brevity of each chapter. Additionally, aside from one chapter on feminist theory and disability studies and one chapter on Third World literatures, we observed no scholarship on race in the first edition of the *Disability Studies Reader* (published in the United States). After Bell's 2006 essay, which was subsequently included in later editions of the reader, there was a slight increase in scholarship on race. In both the 2013 and 2016 editions, there were eleven chapters that engaged substantively with race as an analytic and five nonwhite authors. However, neither edition included scholarship about non-western contexts. The *Routledge Handbook of Disability* (published in the United Kingdom) exhibited less change: two chapters on race and one nonwhite author in 2020, compared with one chapter on race and two nonwhite authors in 2012.

We also sought to see if there was any change over time across the entire data set. Using the two time periods of 2010–2015 and 2016–2020 as points of comparison, we found a slight increase in the inclusion of nonwhite scholars over time: 12.9 percent between 2010 and 2015 as compared with 16.1 percent between 2016 and 2020. There was also a minimal increase of scholarship about non-western sites, from 7.7 percent to 8.2 percent. However, we also noted a slight, but still surprising, *decrease* in scholarship *about* race between the two periods, from 18.7 percent to 17.9 percent. We looked more specifically at *DSQ* and *Disability and Society*, since these two journals make up the bulk of the data set and also represent one US-based publication and one UK-based publication. *DSQ* (based in the United States) saw a small increase in both nonwhite scholars (14 percent to 16.8 percent) and scholarship on race (19.4 percent to 20.8 percent), but a slight decrease in non-western-sited scholarship (8.5 percent to 7.5 percent). In comparison, *Disability and Society* (based in the United Kindom) saw an increase in nonwhite scholars (11.5 percent to 14.4 percent) but a decrease in both scholarship on race (18.5 percent to 15.5 percent) and non-western scholarship (8.8 percent to 8.3 percent). Because entries from *Disability and Society* make up almost half of the entire data set, their numbers influence the overall patterns in change over time. While the slight increase of nonwhite scholars publishing in disability studies journals can be heartening, the minimal scholarship in this area is still concerning.

Discussion

As noted, this study is offered as one way to assess the extent to which disability studies has shifted away from "white disability studies" over the past decade. We observe multiple reasons for the historical makeup of authorship in disability studies journals, from racial hierarchies in academia at large (disability studies scholars are mostly trained and employed in other fields), to the historical whiteness of the disability rights movement, to alternate genealogies that have not formally been recognized as "disability studies," to the impacts of interdisciplinarity

on publishing patterns and ableism on journal rankings (e.g., the publication of many disability studies articles in non–disability studies journals).

Our study also offers a data point for comparison with future directions the field might take. A number of factors have contributed to a current expansion in discourse about the intersections of disability and race: the anticipated impact of the "ADA generation" (those who have experienced their entire education following the 1990 passage of the key legislation of the Americans with Disabilities Act) moving into senior positions in their institutions; the Black Lives Matter movement; the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on conversations about care and accessibility in some academic contexts. The slowness of academic publishing in general and "crip time" in particular also means that scholarly disability studies work engaging race begun years ago may only just be coming out now (Samuels 2017). These factors, plus the small gains we documented regarding nonwhite authors and scholarship about race in humanities-based disability studies journals, and the growing presence of disability studies publishing in non–disability studies journals (including the excavation and creation of alternate genealogies), make us cautiously optimistic about more substantial changes in the coming years.

We urge social scientists working in disability studies to take up race as an analytic, given the surprising decrease in scholarship about race in disability studies journals in that subfield over the past decade. We also urge the field of disability studies as a whole to encourage more non-western scholarship in Anglophone journals, to incorporate decolonial and postcolonial perspectives across contributions, and to mark when understandings of disability have been developed from a US (or UK or Canadian) perspective so as not to falsely universalize. Following Bell, perhaps the time has come to note when a particular claim reflects "US disability studies" rather than a more global understanding of the field. As disability studies grows, we caution that non-western scholarship may be swamped by new research on the United States, United Kingdom, Europe, and Canada. Lastly, we point out the successes of certain peer-reviewed journals as compared with edited books in diversifying authorship, especially with regard to geographic region (e.g., the *Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal*). Publishers and book series editors should take into consideration the standpoints of editors for canon-making handbooks and encourage strategies like coeditorship and external review.

All of these factors contribute to the conversation about how we define a field, particularly one still as comparatively young as disability studies. "How might the who, the what, and the where of disability studies shift if the field searched for origin stories in unfamiliar places?" asks the call for papers for an upcoming special edition of *DSQ* titled "Origins, Objects, and Orientations: Towards a Racial History of Disability." These are vital questions for the ways we understand disability as inextricably intertwined with race. They are also vital to the

concrete ways we shape and reshape our field. In the absence of analysis of race and racism as a structuring analytic, whiteness is reified. The editors of *Crip Genealogies*, another collection forthcoming (2023) at the time of our writing, similarly work to "provincialize" white disability studies as a step toward "expand[ing] our notions of what counts as disability studies" (n p). And journals such as *Disability and the Global South*, publishing scholarship that spans global health, international development, psychology, and anthropology as well as disability studies, "critique and challenge the Westerncentrism in dominant disciplines and practices"[4] in part by decentering rather than simply diversifying disability studies.

Ensuring that disability studies work engages in conversations about disability and race across disciplines requires us to go beyond an audit. Institutional, financial, and other structural support is necessary for more scholars of color and non-western scholars to publish in the field. So is increasing funding and status for disability studies and special education journals. What methods, developed out of disability ways of interacting, working, and sharing information, can help us achieve these goals?

NOTES

1 We note, however, a relative lack of conversation between theories of race and disability in education (e.g. DisCrit) and the humanities (e.g. crip-of-color critique).

2 This dataset was selected by Rebecca Sanchez and Mara Mills.

3 A separate study would be required to compare citation rates for white scholars and scholars of color in disability studies, including books as well as articles in the data set.

4 *Disability and the Global South*. https://dgsjournal.org/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annamma, Subini. 2018. *The Pedagogy of Pathologization: Dis/abled Girls of Color in the School-Prison Nexus*. New York: Routledge.

Annamma, Subini, David Connor, and Beth Ferri. 2013. "Dis/ability Critical Race Studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the Intersections of Race and Dis/ability." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 16 (1): 1–31.

Bailey, Moya, and Izetta Autumn Mobley. 2019. "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework." *Gender and Society* 33 (1): 19–40.

Beardsley, Ryan, and Gali Halevi. 2022. *Insights: Ethnic Diversity in STEM in the United States*. Philadelphia: Institute for Scientific Information.

Becker, Howard S. 1967. "Whose Side Are We On?" *Social Problems* 14 (3): 239–247.

Bell, Chris. 2006. "Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal." In *The Disability Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., edited by Lennard Davis, 275–282. New York: Routledge.

Bell, Chris. 2012. *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Bolton, Sony Coráñez, Kelsey Henry, Leon J. Hilton, and Anna LaQuawn Hinton, editors. 2023. "Origins, Objects, and Orientations: Towards a Racial History of Disability." *Disability Studies Quarterly Special Issue*. https://networks.h-net.org/node/2606/discussions/7563116/disability-studies-quarterly-dsq-special-issue-cfp-towards-racial.

Chakravartty, Paula, Rachel Kuo, Victoria Grubbs, and Charlton McIlwain. 2018. "#CommunicationSoWhite." *Journal of Communication* 68 (2): 254–266.

Chen, Mel Y., Alison Kafer, Eunjung Kim, and Julie Avril Minich. 2023. *Crip Genealogies*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Demeter, Márton. 2020. *Academic Knowledge Production and the Global South: Questioning Inequality and Under-representation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ekdale, Brian, Abby Rinaldi, Mir Ashfaquzzaman, Mehrnaz Khanjani, Frankline Matanji, Ryan Stoldt, and Melissa Tully. 2022. "Geographic Disparities in Knowledge Production: A Big Data Analysis of Peer-Reviewed Communication Publications from 1990 to 2019." *International Journal of Communication* 16:2498–2525.

Eng, Chris A. and Amy K. King, eds. 2017. "Emergent Critical Analytics for Alternative Humanities." Forum, *Lateral: Journal of the Cultural Studies Association* 6 (1).

Erevelles, Nirmala, and Andrea Minear. 2010. "Unspeakable Offenses: Untangling Race and Disability in Discourses of Intersectionality." *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies* 4 (2): 127–145.

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. 2013. "Disability Studies: A Field Emerged." *American Quarterly* 65 (4): 915–926.

Getsy, David J., and Che Gossett. 2021. "A Syllabus on Transgender and Nonbinary Methods for Art and Art History." *Art Journal* 80 (4): 100–115.

Gibson, Amelia, Kristen Bowen, and Dana Hanson. 2021. "We Need to Talk about How We Talk about Disability: A Critical Quasi-systematic Review." *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, February 24, 2021. https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2021/disability/.

Hesse, Barnor. 2016. "Preface: Counter-racial Formation Theory." In *Conceptual Aphasia in Black: Displacing Racial Formation*, edited by P. Khalil Saucier and Tryon P. Woods, vii–x. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Hinton, Anna. 2021. "On Fits, Starts, and Entry Points: The Rise of Black Disability Studies." *CLA Journal* 64 (1): 11–21.

Ho, Jennifer, and James Kyung-Jin Lee, eds. 2013. "The State of Illness and Disability in Asian America." Special issue, *Amerasia Journal* 39 (1).

James, Jennifer C., and Cynthia Wu, eds. 2006. "Race, Ethnicity, Disability, and Literature." Special issue, *MELUS* 31 (3).

James, Jennifer C., and Cynthia Wu. 2006. "Editors' Introduction: Race, Ethnicity, Disability, and Literature: Intersections and Interventions." *MELUS* 31 (3): 3–13.

Larkin-Gilmore, Ella Callow and Susan Burch, eds. 2021. "Indigeneity and Disability." Special issue, *Disability Studies Quarterly* 41 (4).

Minich, Julie Avril. 2016. "Enabling Whom? Critical Disability Studies Now." *Lateral* 5 (1). https://csalateral.org/issue/5-1/forum-alt-humanities-critical-disability-studies-now-minich/.

Ng, Eve, Khadijah Costley White, and Anamik Saha Saha. 2020. "#CommunicationSoWhite: Race and Power in the Academy and Beyond." *Communication, Culture and Critique* 13 (2): 143–151.

Pickens, Therí A., ed. 2017. "Blackness & Disability." Special Issue, *African American Review* 50 (2).

Pickens, Therí. 2017. "Blue Blackness, Black Blueness: Making Sense of Blackness and Disability." *African American Review* 50 (2): 93–103.

Piepzna-Samarasinha, Leah Lakshmi. 2022. *Disability Justice: An Audit Tool*. Portland, OR: Northwest Health Foundation. https://www.northwesthealth.org/djaudittool.

Puar, Jasbir. 2017. *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pulido, L. 2002. "Reflections on a White Discipline." *Professional Geographer* 54 (1): 42–49.

Ralph, Michael, ed. 2012. "Movement Politics." Special Issue, *Disability Studies Quarterly* 32 (3).

Samuels, Ellen. 2017. "Six Ways of Looking at Crip Time." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 37 (3). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v37i3.5824.

Sins Invalid. 2019. *Skin, Tooth, and Bone: The Basis of Movement Is Our People*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: Sins Invalid.

Tyler, Dennis. 2022. *Disabilities of the Color Line: Redressing Antiblackness from Slavery to the Present*. New York: New York University Press.

Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—an Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (3): 257–337.