

**The geographies of disability: reflections on the development
of a sub-discipline**

by

Rob Imrie
Department of Geography
King's College London
Strand
London
WC2R 2LS

email: rob.imrie@kcl.ac.uk

and

Claire Edwards
Department of Applied Social Studies
University College Cork
Cork
Ireland

email: claire.edwards@ucc.ie

February 2007

Abstract

Geographers' interest in the subject of disability has traditionally been confined to particular parts of the discipline, and usually been of marginal interest to most academics. This has mirrored a broader antipathy to the study of disability in the social sciences although, in recent years, geographical scholarship about space, place, and disability has proliferated. In this review paper, we outline and assess the significance of this trend, and we comment on the importance of theoretical and methodological developments in the sub-discipline. In doing so, we anticipate the ways in which studies of geography and disability are likely to evolve.

(1). Introduction

This time of writing about disability and geography is appropriate, given that 2006 is the 30th anniversary of the declaration by the Union of Physically Impaired People Against Segregation (UPIAS, 1976). The UPIAS declaration was a pivotal moment in the disability movement in the UK, because, by rejecting medical and rehabilitative conceptions of disability and, instead, insisting on the understanding of disability as a social and political construct, it began to open up new ways of seeking to understand disablement in society. For UPIAS, the understanding of disability was not reducible to impairment or the medical condition, but was part of a complexity of social and political attitudes and relations that did not value disabled people. In this view, disabled people were conceived of as oppressed by society, in which their status was conditioned by structural, not personal, factors.

What was missing from the declaration and policy prognosis by UPIAS, and in subsequent developments in sociological and social policy research and writing about disability and society, was a geographical perspective or an understanding that social identity and process is not independent of spatial or geographical points of reference (also, see Shakespeare, 2006). Early work by behavioural geographers had made some inroads into showing the significance of physical barriers in influencing the movement of disabled people, and providing information and advice about practical ways of overcoming a barriered built environment (Golledge,

1991, Golledge and Timmermans, 1990). Much of this research was, however, highly descriptive of its subject matter, and tended to treat disability as a matter to be solved by recourse to technical solutions or outcomes (see, for example, Golledge, 1991, 1993).

This pioneering work nevertheless provided a context for the development of the sub-discipline now known as the geographies of disability, an area of study that has been inspired, not only by the sentiments of UPIAS, but also by theoretical developments and debates in geography. Foremost amongst these are marxism, social constructivism and materialist geographies and, latterly, those relating to post modernism and post structuralism (Butler and Parr, 1999, Chouinard, 1997, Gleeson, 1998, Valentine, 2003). In particular, research efforts in the early to mid 1990's sought to interlink, in helpful ways, the physical and technical approaches of behavioural geography to social and political contexts and issues, and, in doing so, to develop a materialist geographical focus for the study of disability and space. Since then, there has been a significant broadening of the subject matter to include studies across a range of spatial scales, subject matter, and the use of diverse methodological, theoretical, and conceptual frameworks.

However, despite the significant advances in the study of the geographies of disability, the subject area is still akin to Wolch and Philo's (2000: 138) description of geographers' research of learning disabilities, as a 'small corpus' of work (also, see

Hall, 2004). This corpus, while lively and important, is characterised by its marginality at international conferences, in geographical journals and text books, as well as a lack of influence on debates outside of geography. This is particularly so within public policy circles and the dominant disciplines, such as medicine, health studies, and social policy, that, collectively, drive forward both academic and popular conceptions of, and narratives about, disability (1). There are other significant silences or absences in the subject area too, most notably an ethnocentric bias, characterised by the relative absence of research conducted in places outside of Anglo-American, Australasian, and European contexts.

In seeking to comment on, and evaluate, the development of the geographies of disability, we divide the review into three. First, we provide a brief overview of some of the main developments in the sub-discipline. We outline some of the newer departures in the study of geography and disability, and the productive use of literature about the body in seeking to extend the understanding of disability beyond the confines of a medical-social conceptual binary. Second, we reflect on methodological developments, and comment on issues and problems relating to disabled people's calls for the development of emancipatory research. In doing so, we consider disability and public policy, in the light of observations from those seeking to relate geography to practical policy agendas and practices. We conclude the paper by outlining what we regard as a progressive research agenda for the

future, and anticipate ways in which studies of geography and disability are likely to evolve.

(2). The geographies of disability: recent developments

Some good reviews of research and writings about disability and geography have been produced over the last few years, and it is not the intention here to repeat them in any detail (for example, see Butler and Parr, 1999, Chouinard, 1997, Dorn, 2001, Gleeson, 1998, 1999, Imrie, 1996, Kitchin, 2000, Park et al, 1998, Pfeiffer, 2001). Rather, we seek to build on these by evaluating some of the important contributions to the geographies of disability over the last ten years or so, commenting on their contributions to the understanding of the interrelationships between space, disability and society. An opening observation is that what has emerged, since the mid 1990's, has been a broadening of the substantive focus of studies of space and disability, beyond some of the earlier foci of health, cognition and behaviour, welfare, design, and architecture. In particular, the study of disability is evident in most parts of human geography, and not just confined to a specialist or sub-part of the discipline.

However, up to the early 1990's, the study of geography and disability had been the preserve of specific niche areas of research activity, with some scholars, like Park et al (1998), suggesting that human geography had rarely engaged with studies of

disability. What engagement there was included important work derived from, in particular, medical or health geography, with a focus on planning for mental health, and also variants of behavioural geography concerned with mapping patterns of mobility and movement of disabled people (Dear, 1978, Dear, et al, 1980). The work of Golledge (1991, 1993) was especially important in seeking to explore 'spatial competence' and the interactions between vision-impairment, barriers in the built environment, and the importance of visual cues and/or technologies in facilitating way finding (also, see Golledge, et al, 1991). Much of this research was policy and practice-focused, and included, amongst other things, the production of tactile maps as navigational aids.

This formative research did not question the meaning of the term disability beyond a medicalised frame of reference. Disability was understood, primarily, as a function or outcome of disease or a malfunction of organic body parts that were, potentially, amenable to medical intervention and cure. The significance of socio-political and environmental contexts, in the production of disabling spatialities, was not part of the intellectual frames of reference until later interventions by those adopting a mixture of marxist and social constructivist understandings of disability (Butler, 1994, Butler and Parr, 1999, Gleeson, 1996, 1998, 1999, Imrie, 1996). Until then, a positivist paradigm dominated much of the study of geography and disability, with the onus on pattern description and mapping. Gleeson (1999: 23) refers to this early period as one whereby the study of geography and disability was

cast adrift in 'atheoretical currents', characterised by a mixture of methodological individualism and responding to the immediate practical needs of policy makers (2).

There were exceptions to this, most notably research about mental health care and the deinstitutionalisation of care facilities and support services, and later the work of Philo (1989, 1995), and others, on the geographies of madness and mental health (also, see Park and Radford, 1997, Parr, 1997, Parr, et al, 2004, 2005, Philo et al, 2005). What was emerging from these and related writings was the referencing to, and use of, aspects of Henri Lefebvre's understanding of geography as 'produced spaces', or spaces that were 'landscapes of power' (Lefebvre, 1991, Sibley, 1995). These landscapes, for authors such as Sibley (1995) and Laws (1994), were characterised by geographies of exclusion, in which institutionally unjust and socially oppressive practices, through the actions of actors and agents, were intertwined in the production of places marked by the exclusions of particular social groups, such as disabled people (also, see Young, 1990).

The focus on the geographies of exclusion has influenced subsequent research, including work on the development and design professions and their role in the production of disabling built environments (Butler and Bowlby, 1997, Gleeson, 1998, Imrie, 1996, 2003, 2006, Kitchin, 2000). Here, rather than view physical barriers as determinate and explanatory variables, research has explored the social,

institutional, and political processes that produce disabling spaces (Gleeson, 1998, Imrie and Hall, 2001). Access to places is seen as more than a physical or technical phenomenon; it is also embedded in cultural and aesthetic representations and political practices (Siebers, 2003). For instance, some interesting work by Hastings and Thomas (2006) considers how social constructions of the nation can privilege forms of embodied citizenship that exclude impaired bodies. Referring to the design and construction of the Welsh Parliamentary building, they note that architects' drawings and construction plans revolved around normalised bodies.

That such bodies are core to architects' conceptual schema is indicative of societal and aesthetic projections of moral and/or ethical spaces, characterised by places that are rarely sensitive to disability and the impaired body (see Imrie, 2003). This is a theme of much recent research influenced, in part, by observations that spatial practices are characterised by cultural oppression and the indignification of disabled people. Sieber (2003), for example, considers how cultural reproduction in art exhibitions and building design represses disability in aesthetic representations. Likewise, interesting work by Driedger et al (2004), on the self-identity and relationships of people with multiple sclerosis, documents the indignity of disability, in which the physical design of places prevents ease of mobility and movement. Gaete-Reyes (2006), in her study of women wheelchair users, shows how indignity is created by the absence of public toilets or places to perform natural bodily functions.

These types of geographical research point to the recursive relationship between identity and space, by documenting the different ways in which place is influential in how disabled people feel (about themselves). Other examples include research about disability, identity, and the meaning of the home (Allen et al, 2002, Burns, 2004, Imrie, 2004, Thomas, 2004). As these authors note, the home environment is, for most people, a place of privacy and refuge. However, the home, as both a material and discursive entity, interacts with the body and impairment to produce, for some disabled people, paradoxical and contradictory spaces. Thomas (2004) shows this with participants in her research. They illustrate how the home can be a source of comfort and entrapment, and a place that provides privacy, yet sometimes exposure to carers or others who disregard personal or private spaces (also, see Imrie, 2004).

Complementing this have been significant developments emerging in the work of scholars concerned with chronic illness and disease, pain, and the personal, even biographical, contexts of disability and impairment (Dyck, 1995, Moss and Dyck, 1996, Park, et al., 1994). The work was part of a broader shift in social and cultural geography towards an engagement with embodiment and place, and the study of corporeality and the micro-geographies of disability (Dyck, 1995). Much of this research was based on feminist interpretations of the impaired and gendered body, and, in particular, the study of disabled women's struggles to resist pejorative labels or cultural stereotypes. The propagation and use of such labelling has, for Moss and

Dyck (1999: 163), reinforced 'socially dominant definitions of deficiency and deviance, as a woman and a body'.

These themes underpin some instructive research in geography about bodily appearance, disability and space, which is challenging pre-conceptions about what impairment and disability is or how it ought to be defined (Hawkesworth, 2001, 2002). This focuses on people with visible skin conditions, such as acne, and the ways in which it can be understood in relation to geographical or spatial terms of reference. For instance, Hawkesworth's (2002: 259) study of facial acne in young people shows the active ways in which teenagers relieve their 'spatial anxiety or the threat of feeling less valid at certain moments' by avoiding some places, or by covering or making up the face. Referring to the work of Douglas (1966) and Goffman (1965), Hawkesworth (2001, 2002) usefully draws attention to the fluidity of identity in different settings, the potential of stigma to be present, and rituals and practices associated with seeking to blend in.

The spaces of disability referred to by Hawkesworth can be conceived of as, to use Holt's (2004: 220) expression, 'a set of discursive and performative practices', a theme that is increasingly to the fore in social and cultural geographies of disability (Davidson, 2003, Valentine, 2003). For instance, Holt's (2004) instructive research of school children shows how everyday attitudes, practices, and performances reproduce disability within the micro spaces of the classroom. Thus, while the

school she studied claimed to follow inclusive education practices, Holt's research shows that the use of the national curricula reinforced disabling values about normal stages of childhood mental development. For Holt (2004: 224), the effect of the school environment is to encourage 'children to regulate their mind bodies in conforming ways', although her research, like that of Allen et al (2002), suggests that disabled children are not 'cultural dopes' or passive victims but able to exercise active agency.

The focus on embodied narratives and discursive practices is evident in some newer developments in the study of disability and geography. One emerging topic is touch and tactility and the interrelationships between disability, body and the feel of a place (Hetherington, 2003). This continues the emphasis, in post-structuralist geographies of disability, of seeking to understand, what MacKain et al (2006: 2) term, 'the affective aspects of everyday spaces and performances'. For MacKain et al (2006), the priority is to move beyond the physical mapping of uneven tactility, to the study of personal experiences of tactile senses and spatial practices. This focus is indicative of geographers broadening the scope of studies of geography and disability, particularly in relation to the embodied narratives of subject groups such as children, elderly people, and people with learning difficulties (Allen et al, 2002, Hall, 2004, Valentine, 2003).

Geographers are also problematising the relationships between space, technology, and the (disabled) body, in which, for some authors, technology is not a thing in or of itself, reducible to an inanimate object, or a determinant of function. Rather, writers like Gaete-Reyes (2006) conceive of technologies, such as the wheelchair, not as a neutral artefact or thing, but rather as a 'limb-object' or a constitutive part of the body and spatial practices (also, see Le Corbusier, 1994). Gaete-Reyes (2006) recalls her time spent in a wheelchair in which its size dimensions, in combination with those of the kitchen, did not permit her to cook for herself. Then, when outside the house, she had to run the gauntlet of those who picked out the wheelchair as a sign of difference. She recalls, 'the reaction of the people in the street, in the mall, everywhere, staring at me and whispering behind my back or sometimes in front of me...it made me want to stay confined at home feeling very depressed' (Gaete-Reyes, 2006: 60).

In other contexts, though, the wheelchair is medium and means of enabling some independence of movement, and the importance of Gaete-Reyes' (2006) research is its challenge to a singular conception of the wheelchair as necessarily restrictive or restricting of mobility and movement. Driedger et al (2004) make a similar point in referring to mobility aids as a source of freedom. One of their survey respondents said that 'I call my scooter my legs. If you take away my scooter, you might as well chop my legs off' (Driedger, et al, 2004: 128). Likewise, research by Burns (2004) and Imrie (2004) documents the interrelationships between the wheelchair, spatial

practice, and patterns of movement and mobility. For Burns (2004), the wheelchair is a paradoxical object, simultaneously a means of facilitating access to space and signifier of bodily impairment and difference.

The rise of social and cultural geographies of disability has not, however, displaced materialist analysis, and some notable research in this genre is evident in the expanding subject area of disabling economic geographies (Hall, 2004, Wilton, 2004a). The works of Wilton (2004a) and Wilton and Schuer (2006) are important in examining the interrelationships between disabled people and labour market opportunities and barriers. As Wilton (2004a: 420) suggests, the changing geographies of work and employment have rarely been related to disability, and geographers 'have had little to say about the implications of these changes for disabled people'. Moving beyond a design or physical determinism, or the view that physical barriers, in and of themselves, determine access to the workplace, Wilton and Schuer's (2006: 186) focus on employers' conceptualisations of, and attitudes towards, disabled people, provides helpful insights into the determinants of 'non-accommodating workplaces.'

While this selective snap shot of specific areas of scholarship in geography and disability indicates the breadth and depth of study, a realistic view is that research has not progressed perhaps in the ways anticipated by Park et al (1998). An ongoing struggle is to convince geographers to incorporate disability dimensions into their

research, in the way that they are more likely to do so with categories such as gender, age, class, and ethnicity. This is not an absence peculiar to geography, but is evident across the social sciences. For instance, Sheller and Urry (2006), in proclaiming a new paradigm about mobilities, do not mention disability or disabled people who, by implication, are not incorporated into their new perspective about mobility and movement. In housing studies, discussions about the meaning of the home have, until recently, included every conceivable social category except that of disability and/or impairment. This is a familiar pattern, and one that cannot be dismissed lightly or ignored.

(3). The social relations of disability and geographical research

An evolving part of the sub-discipline is methodological, and has centred on the development of research methods responsive to debates about policy and user relevance. The study of disability, particularly within sociology, has been in the vanguard of seeking to make the academe work for the good of disabled people, and to develop the social sciences in ways that engage with practical life and politically relevant concepts and ideas. In this context, debates about the responsibilities of researchers in engaging with, and working through, disabled people have come to the fore. Oliver (1992) brought to attention issues about the exploitative nature of the relations of disability research, and said that academic research had done nothing to change the lives of disabled people. Stressing the need

to transform the social relations of research production through an emancipatory model of research, he called for a redress in power relations between the researcher and the researched, and a re-positioning of the researcher as committed to the causes of disabled people (3).

Oliver's (1992) exhortations have opened up discussion amongst those researching the geographies of disability, both in terms of how geographers position themselves politically in relation to disabled people and the disabled people's 'movement', as well as the practical implications of designing and carrying out research in this area (i.e. who or what is researched, which research methods are used) (Chouinard, 2000, Dyck, 2000). In a series of commentaries on 'Disability, Geography and Ethics', in the journal *Ethics, Place and Environment*, contributing authors make a commitment to what Gleeson (2000: 65) terms an 'enabling geography'. This seeks to contribute 'something positive to disabled people: for example, knowledges that can be used to empower disabled people and disempower ableist structures, practices and institutions' (Gleeson, 2000: 65). What it means to 'empower' or 'disempower' is, however, more complex, particularly when seen in the context of the practicalities of undertaking research.

The development of participatory and/or ethical strategies by geographers highlights the complexity of the process, in which the diverse contexts of both researchers and research participants - from organisational issues, through to

individual emotions - shape experiences (see Dyck, 2000, Hall, 2004, Kitchin, 2001, Laurier and Parr, 2000, Skelton and Valentine, 2003, Wilton, 2004b). Dyck (2000) notes that both researchers and disabled people occupy multiple, often contradictory, personal and/or institutional contexts that do not always permit inclusive and/or participatory research (also, see Humphrey, 2000). In referring to her previous research in an institution that subscribed to the medical model of disability, Dyck (2000) suggests that it conditioned, in part, how far she was able to convey to health care students social theoretical understandings of disablement.

Dyck's experiences are important in raising issues about how geographers negotiate their (privileged) position as producers of research in multiple contexts, and how geographical research can realistically play a role in contesting disabled people's oppression in society (also, see Chouinard, 1997, Humphrey, 2000, Kitchin, 2000). Gleeson (2000: 67) suggests, 'geographers must participate in the political struggle against the socio-spatial formations that oppress impaired people', a point echoed by others, including Valentine (2003: 379) who calls for 'research and activism to be united in a single political process'. Yet, debates within disability studies have sometimes led to confrontational disputes about the role of the academy and, indeed, a questioning of the legitimacy of, and contributions by, non-disabled researchers to the political goals of the disability movement (Humphrey, 2000, Oliver, 1992).

These (political) goals are seen, by some, as less likely to be achieved by the use of particular methodological approaches to geographical research, especially those based on scientific method and analysis. Reflecting an understanding of knowledge as context-specific and situated, advocates of emancipatory models of disability suggest that researchers need to be aware of diverse mental, bodily, and sensory experiences of place and environment in developing research strategies and methods. Hall and Kearns (2001: 243), for example, comment that 'traditional' research methods, such as questionnaires and interviews, 'can fail to represent the geographical lives of intellectually disabled people' (also, see Hall, 2004). Similarly, a project by Kitchin (2000), about the opinions of disabled people about social research, shows that most do not like the use of methods that fail to capture the complexities of disability. Such methods include pre-set questions that collect quantitative data and statistics.

These observations suggest that the use of particular qualitative or interpretative methods are a preferred way of giving voice to disabled people's experiences, and open up scope for inclusive research practices. In this respect, there have been some important methodological developments in geographical research that seek to articulate the different ways that disabled people know and experience the world. For example, in a research programme focusing on social inclusion for people with mental health problems, through gardening schemes and 'arts advocacy' projects, Parr (2006) has used collaborative film making with her participants. Likewise,

Kitchin's (2000) study of an access group in Newbridge, Northern Ireland, featured interactive and participative practices that provided scope for disabled people to influence the design and outcomes of the research.

An important aspect of methodological development is also evident in relation to the teaching of geography, and geographers have been in the vanguard of trying to create inclusive interactions between tutors and disabled students, particularly through the context of fieldwork (Fuller, et al, 2004, Hall, et al, 2002, Healey, 2003). The pioneering work by the Geography Discipline Network (GDN) provides good examples of interconnecting theory and practice, in using participative methods with disabled students to produce field experiences that have a high pedagogic value (4). Similar work is evident at the University of Reading in which a recently completed project on fieldwork in archaeology has sought to widen disabled people's access to higher education (5). The project brief states that the challenge is to overcome 'the stereotype of archaeology as a field discipline that may exclude disabled participants. It aims to effect a change of emphasis from 'disability' to ability, rather than excluding or categorising individuals' (Gilchrist, 2007: 1).

Despite the use of varied methods and approaches to research and teaching, geographers have highlighted issues and problems in breaking down the (hierarchical) social relations of the academe. Skelton and Valentine (2003) note the potential exclusion of the voices of deaf people, in a context whereby interviews

with them are often conducted through sign interpreters. They suggest that transcripts produced from such interviews are the interpretation of the interpreter that may obscure the 'embodied subjectivity' of deaf subjects (Skelton and Valentine, 2003: 460). Allen et al (2002) recount experiences of working with vision-impaired children whereby they felt obliged to filter the data through a social model of disability to satisfy the (institutional) sponsor. This was despite the children's testimonies and experiences suggesting that they did not feel oppressed or disadvantaged by the environment.

As the latter example demonstrates, geographers researching disability are caught up in broader institutional and political contexts shaping their research practice, raising questions about the role of research 'outside' the academy, and the relationship between research and policy processes. Much research about geography and disability has sought to explore practical experience and policy relevant relationships, perhaps as a consequence of the commitment amongst many of those working within the sub-discipline to challenging disabling attitudes and practices in society (Gaete-Reyes, 2006). Examples of policy research exist in the broadest sense of the term, and not just, as Pain (2006) suggests, in terms of doing commissioned work for, or working with, policymakers. Indeed, much research in the area might best be termed 'counter-policy research' (Pain, 2006: 251), which frequently involves critiquing policies in terms of their impact on disabled people's lives from 'outside' government and often within the context of the local scale.

Perhaps most prominent has been research about spatial planning and access in the built environment, although, as outlined earlier, geographers have also looked at changes in welfare services, including the impact of deinstitutionalisation, and disabled people's relationship to the labour market (Hall, 2004, Wilton and Schuer, 2006). Such studies look beyond particular initiatives to critique the broader concepts which underpin different policy interventions, as well as spatial contexts which inform them. Thus Wilton and Schuer (2006) note how a limited definition of social inclusion that equates participation in society with paid employment, underpins welfare-to-work programmes. They show how processes, operating at different spatial scales, impact on opportunities and barriers facing disabled people in the labour market. Likewise, Chouinard (2006) highlights the negative impact of changes in state income assistance policies in Ontario, Canada, on disabled women's relationship to housing.

That said, the contributions that might be made by geographers would appear to be absent from many applied evaluations of social policy interventions impacting on disabled people, which are frequently colonised by those working within the discipline of social policy. This may reflect perceptions about the subject matter of geography (both by geographers and policymakers), but perhaps also a suspicion amongst some geographers within the disability arena of working on 'applied' (as opposed to 'critical') policy research, in which they may be perceived as colluding

with, or seen as 'uncritical servants' of, the state (Pain, 2006: 253) (6). We would suggest, however, that critical contributions can be made by geographers in the context of applied disability research, and that applied and critical research need not be mutually exclusive.

For example, in terms of welfare entitlements and benefits in the UK, geographical variations in rates of incapacity benefit claimants are often referred to in government policy statements (see for example, Department of Work and Pensions, 2006), whilst initiatives which seek to engage disabled people in the labour market – such as the New Deal for Disabled People or Pathways to Work programmes – are frequently piloted on an area basis. However, many pieces of research commissioned by the government, which seek to explore 'claiming behaviour' and/or the effectiveness of these welfare-to-work programmes, treat geographical areas as little more than convenient containers within which to assess different initiatives, and are devoid of any context about particular locales (see Adam, et al., 2006, Sainsbury and Davidson, 2006).

Even in those evaluations which compare results from pilot areas against 'control' areas that did not have the intervention, there is rarely any discussion of how geographical processes at a range of spatial scales may impact on the initiative, including differentiation between labour markets, the local politics of disability, or processes of governance that operate at the level of the locale. There would, then,

appear to be certain disconnections in the relationships between geography and policy arenas that pertain to disability - including those areas that are often associated as being the 'domain' of geography (see Edwards, 2007). A recent call for papers in the journal *Local Environment* (Thomas and Imrie, 2006), for example, notes that disability and environmental issues are rarely connected to each other, and that more could be done to highlight the parallel concerns of both the disability and environmental movements, which stress notions of citizenship and the quest for 'democratic control'.

Edwards (2003, 2007) also highlights a lack of engagement with disabled people and disability in the context of urban regeneration policy, despite the fact that regeneration arguably covers a range of activities that impact on disabled people's lives. In this context, central government policymakers, administering an urban policy programme, expressed uncertainty as to how or why disabled people's needs should be seen as relevant to regeneration, partly because of a perception that disability was largely a medical issue which was the responsibility of health and social services. Such perceptions would seem to indicate a need to make greater connections between geography and disability policy research, including disciplines - such as social and welfare policy - which are not traditionally seen by policymakers as the preserve of geography, but could benefit from geographical forms of analysis.

(4). Conclusions.

The study of the spatialities of disability is characterised by important research that encompasses a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives. Geographers are at the forefront of debate about the social relations of research production, and are contributing, in positive ways, to empirical accounts of the specific contexts of disablement in society. These range from the ways in which disabled children seek to influence the micro-geographies of school classrooms, to disabled people's attempts to cope with poorly designed domestic environments. Geographers are also contributing to new ways of thinking about impairment and the body, and seeking to broaden understanding to incorporate dimensions of disability that stretch conventional definitions of disablement in society. Examples of this include the work of Hawkesworth on facial acne, and the continuing radical body politic research of people like Dyck and Moss.

Like all subject areas, there is still much to be done, and a noticeable absence in scholarship relates to historical geographies of disability, in which there is some need to develop understanding of time contrasts and continuities in the lives of disabled people (although, see Dorn, 1994, 1998, Gleeson, 1998). This thought was brought to mind by one of us reading a review of Jason Roberts' (2006) fascinating book about the retired 19th century navel officer James Holman, a blind person who travelled more than 250,000 miles on his own through five continents. Holman was part of a culture that did not value experience outside of visual faculties and, as Edmund Burke (1990: 203) said, 'no smells or tastes can produce a grand sensation,

except excessive bitters, and intolerable stenchés'. Burke's views reveal the depths of disabling attitudes towards vision impaired people at that time, and serve as a reminder of one of the tasks of contemporary social research, that is, to acknowledge temporality as part of the context of disability.

The lack of historical research and/or context in the study of disablement and geography is also compounded by an absence of studies of disability in a variety of socio-cultural contexts. As intimated earlier, too much of our understanding of disability and space is confined to parts of Europe, North America, and, to a lesser extent, Australia and New Zealand (although, for exceptions, see Dorn, 2001, Komardjaja, 2001). The study of geographies of disability is, in this respect, partial and likely to contribute to the dangers of what Pinch (1993) refers to as ethnocentrism and restricted conceptualisation. In addition, there are few comparative studies of disability, and therefore limited outputs of writings that are able to engage with, and reveal, the diversity and differences, the socio-cultural specificities, which underpin the interrelationships between disability and geography.

The significance of geographical research, however, beyond its mapping of the diverse and complex spatialities of disability, is the challenge it posits to the limited theorisations of disablement in society. There is some need to develop theory beyond the dualism of social and medical or individual and collective conceptions

of disability because they do not capture the complexities of disabled people's fluid identities and shifting socio-spatial locations and/or positions (see Edwards and Imrie, 2003). Shakespeare (2006) notes that the social model has taken disability studies into a theoretical cul de sac, because of its denial of the significance of the body, biology, and impairment in disabled people's lives (7). This is compounded by its neglect of geography or spatial perspectives, in which space, at best, is conceived of as a container or backdrop to the social processes and patterns of disability.

The challenge for geography (and geographers) is, we would argue, to extend and develop the theoretical insights of a Lefebvrian-inspired understanding of the production of space, and continue to combine it with the commitment to dialogical social inquiry. Such an inquiry, as we have previously intimated, is arguably not best served by the construction of static categories (i.e. social/medical, disabled/non-disabled, oppressor/oppressed) that have tended to characterise debates regarding the conduct of disability research and theory. Rather, it is one which ought to be intimately connected to space and place, that is, to the specific values and contexts of conduct, the diversity of lived encounters, and embodied experiences, of disability, and the temporal/spatial fluidity of (disabled people's) identities (also, see Flyvbjerg, 2006).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Nicky Burns, Mariela Gaete-Reyes, Marian Hawkesworth, Sarah Fielder, and two referees for useful and constructive comments about an earlier draft of the paper. Our thanks, in particular, to Jon May for encouraging us to write the paper.

Footnotes

(1). At the 2006 Royal Geographical Society annual conference, not a single session was organised about disability and geography. Similarly, the 2006 Disability and Society conference, organised by the Disability Studies Association, featured one paper by a geographer on a non-geographical theme, and few papers with a geographical or spatial focus. The last 8 issues of the journal 'Disability and Society' feature a single article (out of 44 articles published) by a geographer, and on a subject matter tangential to geography.

(2). In the UK, most funding about disability and space goes to organisations that do not really think of space beyond a container category, or as something that is the backdrop to social action and process. Thus, Reading University's Research Group for Inclusive Design broadly adopts a physical and technical approach to the study of disability, so too the other major research centre, SURFACE, the Inclusive Design Research Centre, based at the University of Salford.

(3). These pronouncements were part of a broader genre of work in the social sciences about the ethical roles and responsibilities of researchers (see Gouldner, 1971). While it provided some valuable insights, much of the debate propagated static and undifferentiated, oppositional, categories, such as researcher-researched, academic-non academic, expert-non expert, disabled person-non disabled person, etc. There was usually no identification of the complexity of subject positions, both within and between the categories. Relationships between the researcher and the researched were presented as one-way and detrimental to the research object and/or subject, such as disabled people. This was sometimes the case, although alternate stories began to emerge that, in a context of post-positivist study, emphasised the context-specific relations of disability, and the 'messiness' of the research process.

(4). For details about the Geography Discipline Network, visit the following website: www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/background.htm

(5). The project is called 'Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology'. It is a joint venture between the Universities of Reading and Bournemouth, and Professor Roberta Gilchrist directs it. For details of the project, visit, www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible/

(6). Fuller and Kitchin (2004) contrast critical and radical geographers with those that are non-critical and non-radical. The former are characterised by an ideological commitment to challenge socio-spatial inequalities, and the latter conduct applied research for government and business which, so Fuller and Kitchin (2004) argue, supports the status quo. However, we concur with Pain (2006) that such a

dichotomy is unhelpful. Engaging in applied research does not necessarily equate to being uncritical or failing to challenge the status quo (whatever that may be).

(7). It is commonplace in disability studies, and in the geographies of disability, for authors to state that the social model guides them without saying what they mean or understand by the term 'social'. Part of the task, in developing a more sophisticated theoretical foundation, is to require authors to be much more explicit about (their) social theorisations of disability, not just to state that they are subscribing to a social theory of disability per se, but to say what particular social theory it is that they are referring to and/or using.

References

Adam, S., Emmerson, C., Frayne, C. and Goodman, A., 2006, **Early quantitative evidence on the Pathways to Work pilots**, Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No. 354, Corporate Document Services, Leeds.

Allen, C., Milner, J., and Price, D., 2002, **Home is Where the Start is: The housing and urban experiences of visual impaired children**, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Burke, E., 1990, **A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of The Sublime and Beautiful**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Burns, N., 2004, Negotiating difference: disabled people's experiences of house builders, **Housing Studies**, **19**, 5, 765-780.

Butler, R., 1994, Geography and vision impaired and blind populations, **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**, **NS**, **19**, 366-368.

Butler, R. and Bowlby, S., 1997, Bodies and space: an exploration of disabled people's experiences of public space, **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, **15**, 411-433.

Butler, R. and Parr, H., (eds.), 1999, **Mind and Body Spaces**, Routledge, London.

Chouinard, V., 1997, Making space for disabling differences: challenging ableist geographies, **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, **15**, 379-387.

Chouinard, V., 2000, 'Getting ethical: for inclusive and engaged geographies of disability', **Ethics, Place and Environment**, **3**, **1**, 70-80.

Chouinard, V., 2006, 'On the dialectics of differencing: disabled women, the state and housing issues', **Gender, Place and Culture**, **13**, **4**, 401-417.

Davidson, J., 2003, **Phobic Geographies: The Phenomenology and Spatiality of Identity**, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dear, M. 1978: Planning for mental health care: a reconsideration of public facility location theory. **International Regional Science Review** **3**, 93-111.

Dear, M., Taylor, S., and Hall, G., 1980, External effects of mental health facilities, **Annals of the Association of American Geographers**, **70**, 342-352.

Department for Work and Pensions, 2006, **A new deal for welfare: empowering people to work**, HMSO, London.

Dorn, M., 1994, Disability as spatial dissidence: a cultural geography of the stigmatised body, **unpublished MA thesis**, Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University.

Dorn, M., 1998 'Beyond nomadism: The travel narratives of a "cripple",' in Nast, H. Pile, S., (eds.), **Places Through the Body**, Routledge: London & New York, 183-206.

Dorn, M., 2001, Symposium on Disability Geography: Commonalities in a World of Differences, **Disability Studies Quarterly**, **21**, 4, 2-5.

Douglas, M., 1966, **Purity and danger: an analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo**, Routledge, London.

Driedger, S., Crooks, V. and Bennett, D., 2004, Engaging in the disablement process over space and time: narratives of persons with multiple sclerosis in Ottawa, Canada, **The Canadian Geographer**, **48**, 2, 119-136.

Dyck, I. 1995, Hidden geographies: the changing life-worlds of women with multiple sclerosis. **Social Science and Medicine** **40**, 307-320.

Dyck, I., 2000, 'Putting ethical research into practice: issues of context', **Ethics, Place and Environment**, **3**, 1, 80-87.

Edwards, C., 2003, 'Disability and the discourses of the Single Regeneration Budget', in Imrie, R., and Raco, M., (eds), **Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy**, Policy Press, London, 163-180.

Edwards, C., 2007, 'Participative urban renewal? Disability, community and partnership in New Labour's urban policy', **Environment and Planning A** (forthcoming).

Edwards, C. and Imrie, R., 2003, Disability and bodies as bearers of value, **Sociology**, **37**, 2, 239-256.

Flyvbjerg, B., 2006, A Perestroikan straw man answers back: David Laitin and phronetic social science, in Schram, S. and Caterino, B., (eds.), **Making Political Science Matter**, New York University Press, New York, 56-85.

Fuller, M., Bradley, A. and Healey, M., 2004, Incorporating disabled students within an inclusive higher education environment, **Disability and Society**, **19**, 455-68.

Fuller, D. and Kitchin, R., 2004, 'Radical theory/critical praxis: academic geography beyond the academy?', D. Fuller and R. Kitchin, (eds) **Radical Geography/Critical Praxis: making a difference beyond the academy**, ACME Press, available online <http://www.praxis-epress.org/rtcp/contents.html>.

Gaete-Reyes, M., 2006, The mobility and movement of women wheelchair users, **PhD upgrading report**, Department of Geography, King's College London, Strand, WC2R 2LS.

Gilchrist, R., 2007, **Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology**, viewed at: http://www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible/
Site visited February 22, 2007.

Gleeson, B., 1996, A geography for disabled people? **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, NS**, 387-396.

Gleeson, B., 1998, Justice and the disabling city, in Fincher, R. and Jacobs, J., (eds.), **Cities of difference**, Guilford Press, New York, 89-119.

Gleeson, B., 1999, **Geographies of Disability**, Routledge, London.

Gleeson, B., 2000, Enabling geography: exploring a new political-ethical ideal, **Ethics, Place and Environment**, 3, 1, 65-69.

Goffman, E., 1963, **Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity**, Prentice-Hall Inc., New York.

Golledge, R.G. 1991, Tactual strip maps as navigational aids. **Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness** 85, 296-301.

Golledge, R.G. 1993, Geography and the disabled: a survey with special reference to vision impaired and blind populations. **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS** 18, 63-85.

Golledge, R., Loomis, J., Klatzy, R., Flury, R., and Yang, X., 1991, Designing a personal guidance system to aid navigation without sight: progress on the GIS component, **International Journal of Geographical Information Systems**, 5, 373-395.

Golledge, R. and Timmermans, H., 1990, Applications of behavioural research on spatial problems, **Progress in Human Geography**, 14, 57-99.

Gouldner, A., 1971, **The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology**, Heinemann, London.

Hall, E. and Kearns, R., 2001, Making space for the 'intellectual' in geographies of disability, **Health and Place**, 7, 237-246.

Hall, E., 2004, Social geographies of learning disability: narratives of exclusion and inclusion, **Area**, 36, 3, 298-306.

Hall, T., Healey, M. and Harrison, M., 2002, Disabled students and fieldwork: from exclusion to inclusion, **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**, 27, 213-231.

Hastings, J. and Thomas, H., 2006, Accessing the nation: disability, political inclusion and built form, **Urban Studies**, 42, 3, 527-544.

Hawkesworth, M., 2001, Disabling spatialities and the regulation of a visible secret, **Urban Studies**, 38, 2, 299-318.

Hawkesworth, M., 2002, The spatialities of facial disfigurement: the case of acne, **Unpublished Ph.D. thesis**, Department of Sociology, University of East Anglia.

Healey, M., 2003, Towards the inclusion of disabled students on fieldwork, **The Skill Journal**, 75, 11-16.

Hetherington, K., 2003, Spatial Textures: Making Place Through Touch, **Environment and Planning A**, 35, 11, 1933-1944.

Holt, L., 2004, Children with mind-body differences and performing (dis) ability in classroom micro-spaces, **Children's Geographies**, 2, 2, 219-236.

Humphrey, J., 2000, Researching disability projects, or, some problems with the social model in practice, **Disability and Society**, 15, 1, 63-86.

Imrie, R., 1996, **Disability and the City**, Paul Chapman Publishing, London and New York.

Imrie, R., 2003, Architects' conceptions of the human body, **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, 21, 1, 47-65.

Imrie, R., 2004, Disability, embodiment, and the meaning of the home, **Housing Studies**, 19, 5, 745-763.

Imrie, R., 2006, **Accessible housing: quality, disability, and design**, Routledge, London.

Imrie, R. and Hall, P., 2001, **Inclusive design**, Spon Press, London.

Kitchin, R., 2000, The researched opinions on research: disabled people and disability research, **Disability and Society**, **15**, **1**, 25-48.

Kitchin, R., 2001, Using participatory action research approaches in geographical studies of disability: some reflections, **Disability Studies Quarterly**, **21**, **4**, 61-69.

Komardjaja, I., 2001, New cultural geographies of disability: Asian values and the accessibility ideal, **Social and Cultural Geography** **2**, **1**, 77 - 86.

Laurier, E. and Parr, H., 2000, 'Emotions and interviewing in health and disability research', **Ethics, Place and Environment**, **3**, **1**, 98-102.

Laws, G., 1994, Oppression, knowledge and the built environment, **Political Geography**, **13**, 7-32.

Le Corbusier, 1994, **Towards a New Architecture**, Butterworth, Oxford.

Lefebvre, H., 1991, **The Production of Space**, Blackwell, Oxford.

MacKain, S., Perkins, C., and Dodge, M., 2006, **Touching Places/Placing Touch: Space, Culture, and Tactility**, call for papers, AAG 2007, San Francisco.

Moss, P. and Dyck, I., 1996, Inquiry into environment and body: women, work, and chronic illness, **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, **14**, 737-753.

Moss, P. and Dyck, I., 1999, Journeying through ME: Identity, body and women with chronic illness, in Teather, L. (ed.), **Embodied Geographies: Spaces, Bodies and Rites of Passage**, Routledge, London, 157-174.

Oliver, M., 1992, Changing the social relations of research production, **Disability, Handicap and Society**, **7**, 101-114.

Pain, R., 2006, Social geography: seven deadly myths in policy research, **Progress in Human Geography**, **30**, **2**, 250-259.

Park, D. and Radford, J., 1997, Space, place, and the asylum: an introduction, **Health and Place**, **3**, 71-72.

Park, D., Radford, J. and Vickers, M., 1998, Disability Studies in Human Geography, **Progress in Human Geography**, **22**, 3, 208-233.

Park, D., Simpson-Housley, P., and de Man, A., 1994, To the 'infinite spaces of creation': the interior landscape of a schizophrenic artist, **Annals of the Association of American Geographers**, **84**, 192-209.

Parr, H., 1997, Mental health, public space, and the city: questions of individual and collective access, **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, **15**, 435-454.

Parr, H., 2006, Mental health, the arts and belonging, **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**, **31**, 2, 150-166

Parr, H., Philo, C., and Burns, N., 2004, The house across the water: contested memories of Craig Dunain Asylum, **Scottish Geographical Journal** **119**, 341-360.

Parr, H., Philo, C., and Burns, N. 2005, 'Not a display of emotions': emotional geographies of the Scottish Highlands, in Davidson, J., Bondi, L. and Smith, M. (eds), **Emotional Geographies**. Ashgate, London, 87-102.

Pfeiffer, D., (ed.), 2001, Disability Geography: Commonalities in a World of Differences, theme issue, **Disability Studies Quarterly**, **21**, 4.

Philo, C., 1989, 'Enough to drive one mad': the organisation of space in 19th century lunatic asylums, in Wolch, J. and Dear, M., (eds.), **The power of geography: how territory shapes social life**, Unwin Hyman, Boston, 258-290.

Philo, C., 1995, Journey to asylum: a medical-geographical idea in historical context, **Journal of Historical Geography**, **21**, 148-168.

Philo, C., Parr, H., Burns, N., 2005, 'An oasis for us': 'in-between' spaces of training for people with mental health problems in the Scottish Highlands, **Geoforum**, **36**, 778-791.

Pinch, S., 1993, Social Polarisation: a comparison of evidence from Britain and the United States, **Environment and Planning A**, **25**, 779-795.

Roberts, J., 2006, **A sense of the world: how a blind man became history's greatest traveller**, Simon & Schuster, London,

Sainsbury, R. and Davidson, J., 2006, **Routes on to incapacity benefit: findings from qualitative research**, Department for Work and Pensions Research Report 350, Corporate Document Services, Leeds.

Shakespeare, T., 2006, **Looking back, moving forward**, accessed on January 3, 2007, at www.bbc.co.uk/ouch/columnists/tom/250906_index.shtml.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J., 2006, The new mobilities paradigm, **Environment and Planning A**, **38**, 2, 207-226.

Sibley, D., 1995, **Geographies of Exclusion**, Routledge, London.

Siebers, T., 2003, What can disability studies learn from the culture wars? **Cultural Critique**, **55**, 183-216.

Skelton, T. and Valentine, G., 2003, 'It feels like being Deaf is normal': an exploration into the complexities of defining D/deafness and young D/deaf people's identities, **The Canadian Geographer**, **47**, 4, 451-466.

Thomas, P., 2004, The experience of disabled people as customers in the owner occupied market, **Housing Studies**, **19**, 5, 781-794.

Thomas, H. and Imrie, R., 2006, The Environment and Disability: making the connections, **Call for Papers, Special Issue of Local Environment**, paper available from Huw Thomas, email: thomash1@Cardiff.ac.uk.

Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation, 1976, **Fundamental Principles of Disability**, UPIAS, London.

Valentine, G., 2003, Geography and ethics: in pursuit of social justice - ethics and emotions in geographies of health and disability, **Progress in Human Geography**, **27**, 3, 375-380

Wilton, R. and Schuer, S., 2006, Towards socio-spatial inclusion: disabled people, neoliberalism and the contemporary labour market, **Area**, **38**, 2, 186-195.

Wilton, R., 2004a, From flexibility to accommodation: disabled workers and the reinvention of paid work, **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS** **29**, 420-432.

Wilton, R., 2004b, Keeping your distance: balancing political engagement and scientific autonomy with a psychiatric consumer/survivor group, in Fuller, D. and Kitchin, R. (eds) **Radical Geography/Critical Praxis: making a difference beyond the academy**, ACME Press, available online <http://www.praxis-epress.org/rtcp/contents.html>.

Wolch, J. and Philo, C., 2000, From distributions of deviance to definitions of difference: past and future mental health geographies, **Health and Place**, 6, 137-157.

Young, I., 1990, **Justice and the politics of difference**, Princeton University Press, New York.