

Chapter 12

Intersectionality Dis/ability Research: How Dis/ability Research in Education Engages Intersectionality to Uncover the Multidimensional Construction of Dis/abled Experiences

DAVID I. HERNÁNDEZ-SACA

University of Northern Iowa

LAURIE GUTMANN KAHN

Moravian College

MERCEDES A. CANNON

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

The purpose of this chapter is to systematically review the research within the field of education that explicitly examined how various social constructions of identity intersect with dis/ability to qualitatively affect young adults' experiences by asking the following question: What are the key findings in education research focusing on youth and young adults with disabilities who are multiply situated in terms of race, gender, social class, sexual orientation, or other social markers? Our conceptual framework included a sociohistorical approach that culled from intersectionality and disability studies in education that centered on the intersectional lived experiences of youth within K–16 educational contexts. In our research, we found 10 qualifying studies that illuminated how youth create meaning along the lines of their disabilities and their intersections, and we summarized these within the following three themes: (a) navigate intersectional disability discourses, (b) present their dis/ability oppression as intersectional, and (c) engage in their identity meaning making as a form of intersectional discourse. We conclude by situating these findings within the larger body of intersectionality disability studies in education research and provide future implications.

Review of Research in Education

March 2018, Vol. 42, pp. 286–311

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X18762439

© 2018 AERA. <http://rre.aera.net>

"Ain't nobody gonna get me down!" —Kiesha (Petersen, 2009, p. 434)

Critical special education and disabilities studies in education (DSE) scholars have called for an adoption of an intersectionality framework to better understand the political, emotional, sociocultural, and historical contexts of dis/ability¹ and its effect on lived experience within schools (Blanchett, Klingner & Harry, 2009; García & Ortiz, 2013). The formation of dis/abled, racialized, gendered, sexualized projects are mutually constituted and shape the education of youth and young adults with dis/abilities. We view the intersectionality framework as necessary to be fully inclusive of these identities. Intersectionality, a term Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) coined in her work examining how women of color, particularly Black women, experience employment discrimination and violence, explains how the experiences of individuals who occupy multiple marginalized identities can be silenced by intersectional forms of oppression.² Intersectionality theorists argue that locations of oppression and discrimination interact and shape the multiple dimensions of those experiencing them in a way that is not fully captured by separate examinations of each hegemonic system.

Despite the critical special education and DSE community's efforts toward understanding how disability is inextricably linked with ideologies of race, gender, sexual orientation, and other markers of difference, most theories of inequity within the educational landscape have ignored disability in its analysis (Artiles, 2013; Ferri, 2010). We situate the interlocking nature of disability and other markers of identity from a sociohistorical approach to draw attention to how these markers have influenced the education of students with dis/abilities. In other words, by a sociohistorical approach, we frame youth and young adults' intersectional identities as being socially constructed and positioned within historical, economic, political, and emotional contexts of their unique identities. These do not only involve the historical legacies of such identity groups but how they and others have made sense of such identities in the now—the latter of which influence how they phenomenologically make sense of who they are at their intersections. The purpose of this chapter is to systematically review empirical studies that examined how social constructions of identity intersect with dis/ability to qualitatively affect youths' and young adults' experiences in schools and classrooms *on the ground*.³ In this review, we ask: *What are the key findings in education research focusing on youth and young adults with disabilities who are multiply situated in terms of race, gender, social class, sexual orientation, or other social markers?*

After centering the significance of this work during the contemporary societal and political changes within the United States, we outline our conceptual framework and present our own positionalities. We then present our methods, followed by our findings, which we intertwine with the actual voices of multiply oppressed individuals with dis/abilities, and then discuss their implications. Finally, we end with our conclusions for theory, research, and praxis—the coupling of both critical reflection and action—for policy and practice on the ground.

To answer our review question, the synthesis of existing education research on youth and young adults with dis/abilities is of significance for several reasons. First,

students of color and their families live and are being educated in the most segregated settings since the 1970s, compared with their White and/or Asian and middle-class counterparts (Frankenberg, Hawley, Ee, & Orfield, 2017). Second, the neoliberal and capitalist logic of the U.S. political climate is jeopardizing the advances in civil rights that have resulted from the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Baglieri & Shapiro, 2012; Trent et al., 2014). This hegemony of neoliberalism threatens all students' opportunities to fair, appropriate, equitable, and accessible educations. For example, the U.S. Department of Education under Betsy DeVos has recently released a memo outlining its plans to limit the scope of civil rights investigations and has terminated more than 50 positions in the civil rights office of the U.S. Department of Education (Harris, 2017). That said, from our perspective, current civil rights laws do not sufficiently address the intersectional experiences of youth and young adults with dis/abilities (Crenshaw, 1991; see also Harris & Leonardo, 2018, this volume).⁴ We concur with Annamma's (2017) recent critique of DeVos and call for a disability justice that is intersectional:

We can work toward this intersectional approach to dismantling entrenched inequities by committing to disability justice. . . . Disability justice is not to replace other frameworks, but to be integrated in our fights against the systems of colonialism, White supremacy, cisgender heteropatriarchy, and capitalism as each of these contributes to a normative standard and punishes those that do not meet those standards. . . . (p. 1050)

Conceptual Framework

We begin by situating our conceptual framework that helped us make sense of the studies included in this review. Again, our conceptual framework is a sociohistorical approach. More specifically, by sociohistorical, we not only account for the history of disability at its intersections (Artiles, Dorn, & Bal, 2016) but also for the ways students with disabilities, who are multiply situated, recount their everyday experiences at their intersections in contemporary times. In other words, these youths' accounts of their intersectional identities are shaped by the deep histories of race, disability, and other social categories of difference in the United States. In addition, our framework has been influenced by past and present academic scholars' discourses and disciplinary discussion at the boundaries between special education and DSE. This is important since our conceptual framework is interdisciplinary in nature at the intersection of disability, influencing our understanding of disability justice as intersectional (Annamma, 2017). Specifically, we culled from critical theory, social constructivism, DSE, and intersectionality for our sociohistorical approach at the intersectionality of disability and race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and so on.

Disability Models

As a category and a label, disability is diverse, unclear, and open to interpretation, yet the presence of a disability label may lead to unequal outcomes in one's ability to

access education, housing, health care, transportation, and other aspects of independent functioning (Gold & Richards, 2012; Savaria, Underwood, & Sinclair, 2011). Our sociohistorical approach is founded on the idea that disability must be seen from a social model of disability that distinguishes between the impairment (biological and functional limitation) and the disability (the social oppression that results from the category). Although the social model of disability is widely recognized in the International Disability Rights movement, it has had minimal influence over U.S. institutions (including education, politics, etc.) and cultural ideas and practices that continue to view disability through the medical–psychological model, which emphasizes the individual’s pathology and interventions that attempt to normalize the individual (Connor, Gabel, Gallagher, & Morton, 2008). In contrast, the social model of disability focuses on the disabling consequences of social exclusion (Stevenson, 2010). This latter theoretical framework allows us to explore how the field of education research has examined the lived experiences of youth and young adults with disabilities who also identify with more than one marginalized identity. Nevertheless, it is important to explain how DSE has historically engaged with intersectionality due to the fact that we are coming from both a sociohistorical approach that culls from DSE and intersectionality frames, among others.

Disability studies in education and intersectionality. Again, despite the critical special education and DSE community’s efforts to shift toward understanding how students with disabilities experience intersectionality in schools, most theorists who speak to the production of inequity have ignored disability in their analyses (Ferri, 2010). DSE theorists and researchers argue that disability is a social construct that is reproduced by inequitable social structures and arrangements. They point out that definitions of what constitute a disability are unstable and shifting categories. In addition, similar to DSE, traditional special education has historically ignored issues of intersectionality (Artiles, 2013; Erevelles, 2000; Gill & Erevelles, 2017). In turn, those engaging with intersectionality have been guilty of ignoring the salience of disability (Erevelles & Minear, 2010). Failing to take into account the intersectionality of race *and* disability within both scholarly communities has intended and unintended epistemological, ontological, axiological, and etiological consequences for how we have come to know the nature of human experience within U.S. society and schooling (Ferri, 2010). Some of the consequences of the former include contribution to the reproduction of White Supremacy and institutionalized racism along the intersections of identity markers, given its own—special education—hegemonic and positivist underpinnings (Artiles, 1998; Heshusius, 2004; Patton, 1998).

Within our field of special education, one major example of the intersection of race and disability is the over 60-year-old problem of the disproportionate placement of minority students within more subjective and high-incidence categories of special education labels such as intellectual disabilities, learning disabilities (LD), and emotional behavioral disabilities (Artiles, 2011; Collins, 2000; Skiba, Artiles, Kozleski, Losen, & Harry, 2016). Artiles (2011) has pointed out that due to the lack of an

intersectional understanding of disability as racialized, special education and special education law have failed to recognize the hierarchical functions of these intersections. For example, civil rights efforts for students with disabilities through Individuals with Disabilities Education Act became a tool of inclusion for White students, but a tool of exclusion for historically marginalized students, with the same disability (Artiles, 2011). This is particularly so, if seen through an intersectionality lens that acknowledges the qualitatively different ways in which racial minority groups experience schooling contexts versus racial majority students at the intersection of disability and race. Hence, we can no longer ignore dis/ability intersectionality and its sociohistorical nature and contexts and must give explicit attention to power relations and the other side of the dialectic that is both discursive and material (Artiles, 2017; Erevelles & Minear, 2010; Ferri, 2010) given that racial disparities in special and general education continue to discursively and materially structure the experiences of some students qualitatively differently.

Sociohistorical approach of dis/ability intersectionality. When we view dis/ability at its intersections as a process within a sociohistorical context, wherein human bodies are represented and organized within social structures and everyday practices that are socially constructed, we can begin to understand how dis/ability is a fluid construct, concurrently a (re)presentation of what it signifies while its meaning is created and recreated over time and spaces (Artiles et al., 2016; Garland-Thomson, 2002). One of these spaces is schools. While primarily understood as a space for gaining academic knowledge, schools cannot ignore the social and emotional processes that also take place within educational contexts. For example, schools can be crucial environments for establishing a student's sense of self and community. However, schools can also be locations of violence and oppression. Within the social sciences, Wetherell (2012) has coined the term *affective intersectionality* to foreground how our intersectional identities are not only embedded with the cognitive ways in which they influence our self-concepts, but how the role of affect and emotionality is structured by our experiences of oppression at the intersections.

This systematic review of the literature will allow us to understand how these disability labels and identities are co-constructed through the lens of intersecting identity categories in schooling contexts. By doing so, we can come to a deeper understanding of how our construction of disability is shaped by intersecting systems of privilege and oppression at the personal, political, and structural levels in educational spaces. Applying a sociohistorical lens, therefore, allows us to view the duality of the labels we use in their appropriate contexts. In particular, in this review, how we understood the salience of a sociohistorical lens was by framing the experiences of the participants of the studies as windows into their intersectional realities. In other words, by exploring the experiences and voices of youth and young adults with disabilities who simultaneously identify with multiple marginalized identities in the disability research in education that engages intersectionality, we can better affect transformational change in school cultures as well as support individual students

(Hernández-Saca, 2017; Kozleski & Artiles, 2015). We start this exploration with our own critical reflexivity of our positionalities at our disability intersections.

Our Positionalities

We approach this review as a situated cultural practice, from conceptualization to feeling–meaning making (Lemke, 2013) of the knowledge and (re)presentations of the literature and the findings that are (co)produced (Arzubiaga, Artiles, King, & Harris-Murri, 2008). Conducting research as cultural work means that our personal assumptions, values, and biographies, as well as our social interactions between ourselves as scholars and the studies we analyze and our ideological frameworks are embodied in our work (Arzubiaga et al., 2008).

Author 1

I am a 35-year-old (author DIH) bilingual in Spanish and English, gay male of El Salvadoran and Palestinian descent labeled with an auditory LD. My family and I immigrated to the United States when I was 2 years old because of the civil war in El Salvador during the 1980s and for economic reasons. During that journey, I developed a fever of 105 degrees. As a result, I experienced seizures and convulsions throughout my childhood, which led to my diagnosis of an auditory LD and being tracked into special education from kindergarten through college. These early childhood experiences introduced me to the world of dis/ability at my intersections, and even though I experienced seizures and convulsions that took over my body with uncontrollable energy, I was always myself. Nevertheless, the trauma of these events were compounded by the symbolism and negative perceptions that our culture and educational system have inculcated into me about the meanings of “disability,” “LD,” and being in special education (e.g., “special needs kid,” “not smart,” “never learning to read and write”) and other self-deprecating false messages about myself (e.g., “not having long-term memory and not being able to quickly recall information”), that is, the labels of special education. Other dominant discourses perpetuate fears about people who are immigrants to the United States. For example, for me coming from a war-torn country and having to listen to negative messages about my home country of El Salvador, in addition to Palestine, within the U.S. context has been problematic to say the least. My identities of El Salvadoran and Palestinian have made me sensitive to the projections that others have placed on me. In other words, experiencing speech therapy for my auditory LD and being a dual language learner within K–12, and a person of color of El Salvadorean and Palestinian descent, I am sensitive to the dominant stereotypes about how I speak English and the microaggressions I receive from native speakers at their intersections. Nevertheless, my identities and the languages I speak represent pride in my communities as opposed to being predicaments that cause “special” treatment. Such intersectionalities are only causes of “trouble” within the hegemonic order in a society and schools of White-supremacist and assimilation, English-speaking, able-bodied norms, among others.

Author 2

As the second author, my background as a special education teacher provides me with the firsthand knowledge of special education environments, processes, and experiences described in this research. I am also an individual with a disability, having been diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and LD in adulthood. Although I never experienced the special education system as a student, I have navigated the process of identity, disclosure decision-making processes, and understanding accommodations as a person with a disability. I am afforded the power and privileges that come with privileged identities. As a heterosexual, cisgender, middle-class White Jewish woman with a graduate education who is not the parent of a student with a disability, I bring with me an awareness of a set of values and beliefs that have been shaped by these positions. As I strive to continuously develop as an ally with historically oppressed and marginalized identity groups, I try to deliberately work at understanding how White supremacy, heterosexuality, and classism manifest as a set of institutional practices that marginalize and subordinate others.

Author 3

As the third author, I too intersect several identity markers: Black, heterosexual, woman of faith in Christ, mother, and a person labeled with a speech and language disorder. At 4 years old, my mother's sudden death left me traumatized (Cannon, & Morton, 2015), and I did not speak for well over a year. Once I started school, I had to meet regularly with the school's speech pathologist. Throughout my adult life, this mental and emotional memory was suppressed and emerged during the last semester of my master's program when readings about the marginalized treatment of individuals with disabilities in schools and broader society. As I read, I consciously connected my thoughts to the historical treatment of Black folks and the pseudoscientific experiments conducted on them, such as the Antebellum Medical Experiment, the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, Eugenics/Reproduction Control, and Radiation Experiments With Plutonium, just to name a few (Washington, 2006). The purpose behind how I disclosed my positionality is twofold: (a) to provide the intersectional perspectives of a Black, woman, with a dis/ability label,⁵ which lacks (re)presentation in the educational literature (Cannon, 2016) and (b) to examine *othering* conversations about intersectionality that usually obscures Blacks and Black women's perspectives of how they view their dis/abilities.

METHOD

Below we detail how we identified the studies included in this review as well as our methods of analysis.

Data Collection

We conducted a systematic search for educational studies that utilized an intersectionality framework, centering on the lived experiences of youth and young adults

with disabilities focusing on youth with marginalized identities within K–16 educational contexts. By studies that use an intersectionality framework, we refer to research that analyzes the intersection of social identity markers of difference by examining intersecting systems of power (McCall, 2005). Using a collaborative online platform (Google Docs), we created a list of 71 keywords and descriptive terms that explored issues of young adults with disabilities at various intersections. We used the following six search engines: *SearchOne Portal* from the University of Northern Iowa, *Journal Storage (JSTOR)*, *PsychINFO*, *Google Scholar*, *EBSCO Academic Search Premier*, and *EBSCOhost*. We used the keywords and descriptive terms in various combinations with connectors such as “and” or “or” to yield potential studies. Some of these combinations included the following: *disability and disability*, *intersectionality*, *school(ing)*, *lived experience*, *education labels*, *gender*, *youth*, *learning disability*, *special education*, *qualitative research*, *ethnography*, *stories*, and *narratives*.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria included the following:

1. *Timeframe*: To critically examine and survey the most current disability and intersectionality published work in the field of education research we focused on studies published between 2000 and 2017.
2. *Type of Study*: We restricted our sample to studies that were qualitative, utilized a critical lens,⁶ were conducted in the United States and explored the lived experience of the student participants themselves. It was through content analysis of the studies’ design, theoretical, and conceptual framework that we were able to review if the study came from a critical lens. Our sample included the following research designs and data collection methods: ethnographies, in-depth interviews, case studies, including multiple case study, and narrative poem co-construction. We excluded quantitative and mixed-methods studies because they do not necessarily capture the voices of the students or represent the youths’ lived realities on the ground, and they foreground the etic perspectives of researchers as opposed to the emic voices of youth with dis/abilities at their intersections.
3. *Source of Publication*: We focused on peer-reviewed journal articles to ensure the quality of the research studies because peer-reviewed studies are vetted by scholars who are experts in the field.
4. *Population and Focal Social Identity Markers*: Our sample of studies were focused on youth and young adults—students aged 14 to 26 years—who have a disability and have other social identity markers of difference with analysis that specifically analyzes that intersection. Ages 14 to 26 was chosen because it spans adolescence to emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000). In addition, we wanted to explore this formative time for this group given their in-depth identity exploration as individuals and as part of social groups.

We conducted a total of 50 searches, which produced 153,245 articles. Collectively, we skimmed these articles’ titles and/or abstracts to determine whether or not they met our inclusion and exclusion criteria. As many of the titles made it clear that they would not meet our criteria, there were fewer abstracts to read. If the titles and/or

abstracts did not provide us with the evidence necessary to include or exclude the study, we reviewed the relevant sections of the published article that would provide us with the evidence.

Individually, we identified the articles that we felt met the criteria listed above. After omitting duplicates, we had 32 potentially eligible articles. We reviewed these 32 articles and together decided an article's inclusion or exclusion in the final sample. This provided the opportunity for cross-examination of the 32 articles and a reexamination of the ones we each gathered to ensure they met all four of the inclusionary and exclusionary criteria. After cross-reviewing the 32 articles, we identified and decided on 10 articles that met all of the above criteria.

Data Analysis

Our data analysis processes and procedures were systematic, critical, iterative, and recursive (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). First, we created a data matrix that served as a document to divide the data analysis processes and included the following columns that represented the research study elements that we wanted to code for each of the 10 studies: (a) coded by; (b) author and title; (c) confirmation that the selected study met the inclusionary and exclusionary criteria or not; (d) purpose and research questions; (e) methods of data collection; (f) images/tables/figures; (g) methods of data analysis; (h) discussion of findings, implications, and conclusions; (i) narratives or quotes by the researchers and youth and young adults that spoke to us; (j) our systematic literature review question; and last (k) space to memo and reflect as we coded the 10 studies. Second, each researcher input the content from the articles within the matrix. During this phase of the review process, we carefully read all of the studies in the database, which assisted in filling out the matrix. Third, we created separate online collaborative matrices to analyze, synthesize, and engage with the studies around our research question, allowing us to inductively and collaboratively analyze for themes that emerged from the research in our database. Finally, all of the authors collaboratively and iteratively discussed, reflected upon, and analyzed the findings of the review as well as the feeling–meaning making of the findings and the connections to existing research and theory.

Through this systematic, iterative, and recursive data analysis, we co-constructed the data in the spirit of “slow scholarship” (Mountz et al., 2015). Each author was acutely aware of the different positionalities and perspectives that we each brought to the review process(es) and were mindful in how we interacted with one another to co-construct our understandings, access, and participation within the cultural practice of completing this review. We now turn to the presentation of our findings.

FINDINGS

Our research question allows us to explore what knowledge has been created by on the ground experience of youth and young adults with dis/abilities at their intersections. In our research, we found that youth create meaning along the lines of their disabilities and we summarized these within the following three themes: (a) navigate intersectional disability discourses, (b) present their dis/ability oppression

as intersectional, and (c) engage in their identity meaning making as a form of intersectional discourse. The powerful quote at the beginning of this systematic review, “Ain’t nobody gonna get me down!” was from one of Petersen’s (2009) study participants, Kiesha, an African American woman who was labeled with ADHD and an anxiety disorder during her sophomore year of college. In it she centers her voice in the context of her experiences as an individual who is multiply oppressed. Therefore, we felt it exemplifies many of the sociohistorical dimensions of the youths’ disability discourses. For Kiesha, we specifically noticed that her use of “Ain’t” is not ahistorical due to the fact that “Ain’t” is reminiscent of “Ain’t I a Woman” from Sojourner Truth’s famous speech against her intersection of, at the time regarding racism, slavery, and patriarchy. Kiesha’s choice of “Ain’t” in contemporary times evokes the legacies that we argue connect her to past generations of Black women fighting for their freedom such as Sojourner Truth.

First, at the structural level, our analysis revealed dominant discourses—intersectional disability discourses—related to particular materialities (e.g., the special education classroom, the short bus, etc.) within and across time, space, and contexts that the youth and young adults with disabilities experienced at the intersections. The second finding was focused at the political level, and highlighted how youth and young adults experienced dis/ability oppression as intersectional. The third, at the personal level, revealed that youth and young adults’ discourses and narratives about their intersections are interconnected to the first two findings as the individuals engaged in questioning, resisting, and subverting dehumanizing internal and external structures and systems. We understood these as the studies’ participants understanding of disability identity as intersectional discourse because their discourses and narratives involved intersectional experiences.

Intersectional Disability Discourses

Findings from this review revealed key dimensions of the dominant discourses around the intersections of disability and race, gender, sexual orientation, class, and language and how the individual(s) navigated and made sense of these discourses. On a structural level, this synthesis showed the complex ways youth’s experiences within dominant dis/ability discourses and material reality is intersectional. These dominant discourses of disability identity expose *special education symbolism* (the myths that circulate within society and special education and general education) that have become rumors and half-truths about what it means to be a student with a special education category at their intersections (Hernández-Saca, 2017). In other words, as we unpacked what we know from education research, we came to the conclusion that youth and young adults with dis/abilities need to make sense of what it means to be labeled within special education categories and at their intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, and so on. The latter was part and parcel of the dominant discourses and the stories about what it meant to be—the symbolism—a student with a dis/ability at their intersections. To illustrate, Kiesha states, “if it’s not my race, it is other things,

like being a woman or my disability” (Petersen, 2009, p. 436). These dominant narratives about dis/ability at their intersections have structured how individuals experience the present—*history matters and influences the present lived experiences of students at their intersections* (Artiles, 2017; Artiles et al., 2016; Hernández-Saca, 2017; Munyi, 2012).

Three of the 10 studies collectively and individually conducted on the life experiences of Black females and males with dis/abilities were included in the database and illuminated insights about the intersectional nature of dis/ability (e.g., Annamma, 2014; Connor, 2006; Ferri & Connor, 2010). More specifically, Annamma, Connor, and Ferri’s body of work illuminated the power of intersectional disability discourses. For example, Annamma (2014) centered the experiences of 10 young girls and women of color with special education dis/ability categories within juvenile incarcerated facilities, illuminating the effects of institutional practices and processes of control and compliance related to how *deviant behavior* was understood and documented. The young girls and women’s “deviant behavior” was framed as an academic need within the institutional context of the juvenile justice system. This rationalizing in the name of their academic needs was unraveled by Annamma through the students’ voices as socializing practices. For example, Veronica was one of the 10 participants in Annamma’s (2014) study who together with the other females “had a variety of experiences with disability labels . . . and felt that [she was] in special education because [she] could not intellectually contend with [her] peers” (p. 317). Within the context of Annamma’s (2013) larger dissertation study, she described Veronica as “a self-identified lesbian female of color . . . [who] ‘never saw’ people like her in the curriculum. Nor did she see the practices exercised by this historically oppressed community taken up in schools” (p. 127). Within the context of Annamma’s (2014) study, Veronica stated the following:

I don’t care who says no or what, if I’m comfortable with it, I’m going to sit the way I want. And I’ll just do what I do and I never got in trouble for it. And when I did, I would just close them back and spread (my feet) again. (p. 314)

This quotation is representative of the youth and young adults who experience dis/ability socializing practices. As another example, Annamma (2014) illuminated this “subordination” from Veronica as gendered, given that she was violating the standards of “normative femininity.” For example, Veronica had “short spiky cut” hair, and she was described within an official school document as having “a mannish posture” (Annamma, 2014, p. 319), demonstrating how disability intersects with other dimensions of marginalized identities. We argue that not only the participants’ singular-dimensional experiences of race, disability, and/or gender were clearly informing the institutional actors in the reviewed research. But, in contrast, the participants experienced intersectional disability discourses that enacted violence and erased their voices. In addition, this finding fills a gap in the literature, illuminating the intersections of disability, race, and gender. In other words, intersectional disability discourses,

documented in Petersen (2009) and Annamma's (2014) studies, create a social construction of reality and identities that leads to the erasure of people's humanity.

From a sociohistorical perspective, we can see how the legacies of slavery, capitalism, eugenics, and patriarchy constrain the agency of youth due to their intersections within and across markers of difference (Erevelles, 2011). We do not suggest that educational literature ignores this complexity, but more studies need to illuminate the complexity that students experience due to race, gender, sexual orientation, dis/ability relations within U.S. educational contexts and society. For example, Veronica's voice attests to these structural, intersectional disability discourses, whose characteristics are embedded within individuals as ideologies or paradigms and institutions through social practices, routines, and hence cultures (Annamma, 2014). These structural, or negative intersectional disability discourses, can be understood as part and parcel of the deficit-oriented thinking that has a long history within U.S. society and schooling (Valencia, 2012). Ferri and Connor (2010) further highlight these intersectional disability discourses that youth experienced at the intersection of gender, dis/ability, and special education—what we call *special education symbolism*—that other historically marginalized youth with dis/abilities at their intersections must navigate. *Special education symbolism* refers to how students have negatively experienced and felt the meaning of special education on their psyches. Historically, the master narratives of special education (Hernández-Saca, 2016) have framed these negative feelings, emotions, and meanings as *subjective*, temporary, or irrational. Nothing could be further from the truth—the damage caused by special education symbolism has deleterious effects on students at their intersections. Moreover, we argue that *special education symbolism* is intersectional in nature because dis/ability and identity are not single-dimensional. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize then that this is a way that the intersectional lives of youth are shaped by such structural intersectional identities and in particular the unintended consequences of special education labels and placement have on students' conceptualizations of self.

Across the 10 studies reviewed here, 6 illuminated how youth with dis/abilities at their intersections needed to actively navigate presumptions about not only their dis/abilities but also about their other identity markers while experiencing special education across time and space (e.g., Annamma, 2014; Connor, 2006; Ferri & Connor, 2010; Kahn & Lindstrom, 2015⁷; Madigan, 2005; Petersen, 2009). In Petersen (2009), a couple of young adult Black women with disabilities were profoundly aware of the school personnel's assumptions about their disabilities. For example, Shana talked about her school counselor's view of her and the limitation of her ability: "He wouldn't let me go on college visits because he didn't think college was for me. He looked at me and saw just another young, single, poor, black woman. A woman going blind at that!" (Petersen, 2009, p. 433). Similarly, Courtney was aware of race, gender, and disability assumptions:

I thought sharing my visual chart with [my personal wellness professor] would fix things for me, but that wasn't the case. Now I was the pitied, disabled, black woman. If it wasn't one thing, it would be something else. I just couldn't win. (Petersen, 2009, pp. 435–436)

She continued, “At least I knew what I was up against” (p. 436).

Similarly, Ferri and Connor (2010) open their study by acknowledging the “youth crisis,” the dominant narrative that circulates within society and schooling about girls: “Like the phrase ‘failing schools,’ the terms ‘youth’ and ‘crisis’ have become so intertwined that it is difficult to think about one without the other” (p. 105). Ferri and Connor illustrated how dominant intersectional disability discourses, about the “youth crisis,” are often gendered and have created the social construction of the “girl problem.” Much of Ferri’s body of work has highlighted the issue of gender as it intersects with special education disability categories (Ferri, 1997; Ferri & Connor, 2010; Ferri & Gregg, 1998). For example, we know very little about what it means to be the “only girl of color in special education” (Ferri & Connor, 2010) given that there is not only a paucity of studies that focus on the experiences of females of color with dis/abilities or critically examine how being a girl shapes their experiences as students across time and space (Cortiella & Horowitz, 2014). This theme was also described by Madigan (2005), who explored the intersections of gender, ethnicity, disability, and a coed special education classroom versus a single-gender special education classroom. Our review found that females of color experienced disability as qualitatively different than males of color, but at the same time, there were overlaps across gender (e.g., individualized attention, modification, and accommodations along with shame and frustration about the myths and meanings of LD and special education within society). This finding points to the urgency of utilizing an intersectionality framework when understanding and creating knowledge concerning the experience of youth and young adults with dis/abilities at their intersections. Significantly, this first finding shows us that the dominant narratives and discourses at the structural dimensions of society shape the lived experiences of youth and young adults with disabilities on the ground in oppressive intersectional ways.

Most of the research in this review demonstrated a forceful method for rejecting dominant oppressive ideologies that involved participants developing critical consciousness around the intersections of their identities. For example, Petersen (2009) found that young Black women with dis/abilities who participated in her study actively sought liberation through developing (a) an awareness of how the discourses surrounding race, gender, or dis/ability may have led to limited or restricted opportunity; (b) an ability to reject the dominant ideologies and subsequent messages surrounding race, gender, or disability; and (c) an awareness of how race, gender, and dis/ability interconnect to limit opportunity. By developing an *intersectional critical consciousness* and rejecting dominant ideologies of “deficient,” “abnormal,” and “broken,” these youths and the communities they navigate are concurrently experiencing and redefining the dominant discourse of dis/ability at its intersections. In other words, by validating youths’ sociohistorical knowledge, researchers construct dis/

ability feeling—meaning making in a manner that rejects the negative messages about people at their intersections. This is critical to recognize and positively respond to the structural ways in which disability at its intersections shape youth's experiences in schools and future life trajectories.

Youth's Dis/ability Oppression as Intersectional

As we conducted the analysis of our 10 studies to answer our research question, our second finding focused on the interaction between the structural and the personal levels of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989). The synthesis of these studies revealed that the youth and young adults exposed how oppression was rooted in the social construction of the intersection of their identities that they experienced, witnessed, and made feeling—meaning of. From a DSE framework, we found that even impairment labels that the youth claimed or were given were not only biological but also socially, historically, emotionally, and politically constructed (Gallagher, Connor, & Ferri, 2014; Shakespeare, 2013).

For example, race, disability, and other intersections were significant to the well-being of students in some of the studies. Connor (2006) shares the voice of Michael, a Black, young adult male, labeled with an LD. Connor illuminated the intersections of Michael's identity at the dominant discourses of race, socioeconomic status, and LD. In Connor's (2006) study, Michael's voice and narratives highlight the intersectional nature of his experiences and feeling—meaning making of oppression and violence exposing the over 60-year-old problem of overrepresentation of students of color within special education settings (Artiles, Kozleski, Trent, Osher, & Ortiz, 2010). Michael described the disturbing phenomenon that many Black males get into so much "trouble just by walking" as they navigate U.S. communities and schools. Michael's comments evoke how Black girls, women, boys, and men are overrepresented in shootings at the hands, fears, and misunderstandings of police officers in the United States. Furthermore, this experience parallels how Black and Brown bodies with dis/abilities are disproportionately recipients of "zero-tolerance" and "discipline" policies within educational contexts (Losen, Ee, Hodson, & Martinez, 2015; Morris, 2016). Michael addresses these dominant discourses and stereotypes of Blacks as criminals when he wrote through poetry:

People suspect us.

They stereotype Black people as thieves, criminals and
all that—you're gonna steal.

So people really don't trust you.

They'll take your bag before you go into the store.

It makes you not wanna shop.

Being a Black person is hard because you get stopped by the police constantly.
(Connor, 2006, p. 157)

However, Michael's words above—that is, his *truth*—pushes back on these dominant discourses even as they try to colonize his mind and (re)present him as one of these “enemies.” Similar to Michael, Chanell, a Black, young woman, with an LD “positions herself among a legacy or genealogy of Black women who have survived positions of seeming powerlessness and the direst of consequences” (Ferri & Connor, 2010, p. 118) in her poem:

A Slave Woman's Voice:

Hear me and hear me good for Which I, the woman is speaking.

Take these shackles off my legs (!!)

Which you have installed upon me

Let me be free to talk, run and play with me

People for which I am human just like you.

If you cut me, don't I bleed?

If I am sad, don't I cry?

If I'm happy, don't I laugh?

Don't I have feelings just like you?

So take these shackles from my feet

Open up these doors

Show me some

R-E-S-P-E-C-T

For we the women

The creator of all of you,

And God's the creator of all.

So I say with my last breath

Take these shackles off my feet.

Open the gate and let me free. (Ferri & Connor, 2010, p. 118)

Both Michael and Chanell remind us that poetry is a way to convey one's knowledge of their experiences at our intersections, while shedding light on other ways of knowing, experiencing, and expressing that are not promoted by hegemonic discourses. The power of such hegemonic discourses—productive, oppressive, and capillary—is distributed within and across people and social institutions through language and emotion (Gannon & Davis, 2012). Both Michael and Chanell's poems are reflective of their sociohistorical contexts as they relate to how others have treated them at their multiple intersections. Hence, we argue students and human beings do not experience socially constructed ideologies of race, gender, class, and disability neutrally or as a *matter of fact*.

Within this second theme, *youth's dis/ability oppression as intersectional*, we also found that the majority of the youth and young adults described how the intersection of their identities affected the social, emotional, and spiritual aspects of their personhood. For example, Ferri and Connor (2006) found the following themes based on the experiences of their five participants: (a) issues around privacy and positionality within and across school spaces; (b) negotiating their multiple selves in relationships; (c) barriers to their education related to issues of power and control within special education and general education that affected their motivation and well-being in schools; (d) gendered experiences outside of school; and (e) being aware of the intersectionality of social reality due to their multiple identities within these structures. Regarding the lack of privacy, Ferri and Connor (2006) concluded:

Despite guarantees of privacy, schools regularly convey students' disability status in direct and indirect ways. The derogatory names given to accessible busses (i.e. "the short bus" or the "tard bus") illustrate how the stigma associated with special education spreads even to the physical structures of schools. Many of the young women in this study talked about how parts of the school building came to be associated with special education. This unofficial marking off of special education zones within schools underscores the level of segregation students who receive special education services experience on a daily basis. (pp. 107–108)

Therefore, dis/ability and gender intersectionality segregation was not only external but also internal (Hernández-Saca, 2016, 2017). Understanding the importance of how youth and young adults with dis/abilities make sense of their internal and external worlds is critical to creating new knowledge that contributes to educational equity reform movements and praxis on the ground. For school reform efforts, a focus on historically marginalized youth voices that take an intersectional lens of disability is warranted given the paucity of this research (see Gonzalez, Hernández-Saca, & Artiles, 2017, for a systematic literature review on student voice research).

Youth's Dis/Ability Identity as Intersectional Discourse

Our last finding was that the researchers of the studies included in this review overwhelmingly described the identity formation of dis/ability as mutually constitutive of intersectional identities. Kahn and Lindstrom (2015), for instance, reported that the young adults who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and/or intersex (LGBTQI) and as people with dis/ability labels described how the construction of disability and queer narratives mutually constituted each other within school contexts, concurrently influencing and being influenced by each other. Desi, a transgender student and a person of color in Miller's (2015) study, dealt with stigmas from dis/ability and other labels within school contexts.

Because depression and anxiety disorders are still really stigmatized, it's harder for me to bring that up in an academic context with my teachers, because they're less likely to understand and they're usually going to be in the mindset of, "You need to come to class anyway, because this is a grade. No matter what your feelings are, you need to come." I don't bring it up, because I often feel like they put the lazy label on me

or just the overly emotional label on me, which feels really terrible. It adds to feeling stigmatized. (Miller, 2015, p. 386)

Desi's identity discourse explicates his personal feeling and experiences with stigmas from teachers about identity categories. To further illustrate in another study, a gay man with a disability (i.e., Cerebral Palsy) who also has LD, and is a person of color, was not comfortable talking about his identity and experiences (Henry, Fuerth, & Figliozi, 2010). "If I would have had counseling all of my college career, I would be a different person" (p. 5). These experiences set a foundation for how the participants navigated normality within their own identities and within the school environment if he would have had the opportunity for identity development in an institution that supported him at the intersection of his identities. Instead, the institutions he was socialized within approached support as if his identities were additive and unidimensional, causing him difficulty and pain.

In Connor (2006, p. 155), Michael continues to shed light on his experience, illuminating how youth created intersectional meaning of dis/ability identity:

I write backwards . . .
 . . . I was born in Brooklyn.
 I'm nineteen going on twenty.
 Dyslexia . . . I still have it.
 I think it is natural
 Everyone is born with something, so it's not like a disability.
 People say, you have dyslexia, da-da-da-, but to me it
 Really didn't do anything.
 I just had to work harder.
 If people understood they wouldn't make fun of
 learning disabilities.
 People really won't know about what learning
 disabilit[ies] are.
 I think in this society, learning disability—
 It's like a downfall, it makes you look bad . . .
 "It's not like a disability."
 "It's natural."

Within Michael's poetry, we can see how dominant discourses, intersectional disability discourses, about what it means to be Black, LD—specifically, dyslexic—and poor create a "matrix of oppression" that students like Michael (and others in the included studies) needed to navigate internally and externally about their sense of self and

multiple selves, such as their academic identities (Cannon & Morton, 2015; Collins, 2000). These dominant discourses—beliefs and ideas or even tropes about who these particular students are—were persuasive, ideational, emotional, and, hence, sociohistorical and political realities in which youth were forced to be aware of, and could not just “ignore.” Michael’s poetry, and hence, voice, above demonstrates how he navigated these structural domains that tried to tell him who he was. In another example, in Kahn and Lindstrom (2015), Sarah, who is diagnosed with a specific learning disability, states,

‘Cause I just want to be what other people expect me to be. I just want to do . . . what I feel is good, what I feel is okay, just not, like, social norm. I don’t want to be like everybody else, I want to be different. (p. 367)

In other words, the youth’s oppressed positionality keeps them from full citizenship and belonging within U.S. society and schooling, due to the power of these dominant structures that are simultaneously being experienced and (re)produced by their experiences. Given that Sarah clearly asserts her embrace of difference, this understanding helps us counter deficit-oriented ideologies structured within U.S. society and schooling about historically marginalized youth and their communities. Connor (2006) and Kahn and Lindstrom (2015) help us humanize historically marginalized youth like Michael and Sarah and call for a dismantling of these violent structures within educational contexts.

In another example, Lambert’s (2015) research on young Latina/o’s experiences in the mathematics classroom explores how disability and ability are constructed within school settings. Lambert presents tensions that exist between professional pathologizing and the lived experiences of the individual with the lived intersectional experience. With a system steeped in systematic oppression, this discourse is highly racialized and gendered. This scenario brings to light the importance of valuing the students’ articulation of their sociohistorical narratives. This research also explores how dis/ability is constructed by the gendering of the students’ feeling–meaning making. For example, consider Ana, bilingual in Spanish and English, “Dominican and American . . . [and was] identified by the school as learning disabled . . . [and] approached mathematics learning differently” (Lambert, 2015, p. 2).

Ana’s self understanding frames her as different from the boys in interests, not intelligence. Her narrative echoes those of high-achieving girls in other studies who downplay their own ability in mathematics, actively constructing identities that exclude mathematics despite their success. (Lambert, 2015, p. 13)

This quote exemplifies how the researcher constructs the narrative around dis/ability and gender identity and how the experiences of her participants were intertwined. For example, although Ana frames her lack of interest in math as different from boys and having nothing to do with intelligence, the researcher points to the larger gender pattern of girls having to downplay their intelligence in fields that are

traditionally dominated by stereotypes of who is smart and who is not. Within the field of math, the question of who is smart at math and who is not happens to be along gender lines. In addition, from a sociohistorical intersectional disability discourse analysis, Ana's self-understanding is indeed intersectional in nature since she is experiencing doing math along the structural identities of gender, ethnicity, and being a student with a disability. This points to the salience of dominant discourses defined earlier within this section but also within this review in the theme *intersectional disability discourse*.

DISCUSSION

The findings described above contribute to a critical understanding of the experience of dis/ability at its intersections for historically marginalized youth within educational contexts. The findings demonstrate how disability is intersectional, constructed within dominant sociohistorical *discourses and material realities* within U.S. society and schooling that stem from legacies of oppression and injustice that fall along intersectional lines. Our findings lead us to argue that disability experience and identity can no longer be considered separate from youths' other socially constructed intersectional identities because they have real material consequences for their lived experiences within everyday cultural practices (Erevelles, 2011). Historically, theory, research, and policy have ignored complexity, which we argue students are already experiencing within educational contexts, including special education (Artiles et al., 2016; Erevelles, 2011; Hernández-Saca, 2017). From our findings, we contend that academic (e.g., learning and literacy) and educational spaces and contexts are not devoid of social, emotional, and spiritual identification processes related to race, dis/ability, gender, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, masculinity, and other differences that intersect and interlock with the experiences of students at their intersections (Baker, Andriessen, & Järvelä, 2013; Lemke, 2013; Nasir, 2011).

Across the 10 studies reviewed, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks grounding these topics and the feeling–meaning making of the participants were framed within their intersectional identities. The usual *identity badges* of disability, race, gender, sexual orientation, among other differences, do not only encompass the experiences of youth with disabilities at their intersections. Therefore, the role of culture and learning needs to be taken into account since culture mediates human development and all human activity (Artiles, 2015; Rogoff, 2003). Furthermore, the focus on disability at its intersections is similar to the framing of dis/ability critical race studies theory (Annamma et al., 2013), which foreground the false and oppressive ideology of Whiteness and heteronormativity with that of normalcy and ableism. Similarly, our research aligns with theories of how oppressive ideologies structures the experiences of Black, Brown, and disabled females and males—Black or Brown Disabled bodies—at the macro level within U.S. society. Therefore, educational contexts undergird who and how one counts as a person and who has symbolic, cultural, social, and economic capital or legitimacy (Bourdieu, 1986). As we incorporate our

findings from this review into the epistemological work of intersectionality, Kiesha's voice (Petersen, 2009), "Ain't nobody gonna get me down!" deeply resonates and represents the other youth and young adults included in this research, serving as a powerful representation of the strength, emancipation, and resistance that intersectionality as a framework provides as it centers the experiences of those who are at the fringes of societal imaginaries within U.S. society and schooling.

IMPLICATIONS

Our review has demonstrated that as education researchers, advocates, and professionals continue to construct disability as unidimensional, they continue to contribute to the master narrative of disability that shames and marginalizes. As Henry, Fuerth, and Figliozzi (2010) noted, "Contemporary diversity advocates are challenged to reexamine disability within a precise and interwoven context that can also account oppressive experiences of the disabled based on sexual orientation, gender, race, and class" (p. 378). By centering our analysis on qualitative studies that focus on youths' voices to illuminate the intersection of ableism with racism, sexism, cissexism, ethnocentricity, and other forms of systematic oppression, this research explored the divide that often manifests between *the professional and the lived experience*. For the implications, we will focus on ways to operationalize an intersecting lens that incorporates students' articulation of their sociohistorical narratives.

Personal

Fostering critical consciousness (the ability to understand and actively challenge oppressive social and political hegemonic powers) also has the potential to support the development of resilience, empowerment, and full integration of all aspects of personal and group identities for youth with dis/abilities who experience intersectional systematic oppressions (Freire, 2008). By engaging in an ongoing examination of their experiences to determine how disability and race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and so on interact on micro, meso, and macro levels in society, teachers and education researchers have the opportunity to support youth as they come to understand the interaction of these characteristics within multiple ecological contexts. Hence, this is why student voice research is of paradigmatic importance to lead to individual and societal transformation through systems change (Gonzalez et al., 2017). The latter acknowledges the psychological contributing to sociohistorical frameworks, not just purely framing individual identity as pathological and psychological (Kozleski & Artiles, 2014).

How the researchers operationalized the construction of intersectional dis/ability communicated the loss of social, cultural, and economic capital that manifests in the denial of educational opportunity. This supports Bourdieu's (1986) description of capital as the symbolic and concrete resources acquired by the individual's connections, communities, and relationships that was repetitively described by researchers who discussed the deletion of capital due to intersecting of dis/ability and other

marginalized identities. This review's finding of the stigmatizing and overincarceration of Black and Brown youth and its systematic intersection with gender is both a result of and contributing to the diminished social capital of the described intersectional identities. This key finding of the connection between the personal and the structural ecological level had major on the ground implications for the participants' lives in these studies, yet the concept of cultural and social capital is not used commonly in discussions around dis/ability and education (Trainor, 2008, 2017).

Structural

The knowledge and voices from this research support the argument that we must go beyond *identity badges* to move toward justice for all. We consider students as human beings. We recognize that students' identities matter and are not identity-less or culture-less (Artiles, 2015).⁸ This helps us counter deficit-oriented ideologies structured within U.S. society and schooling. We argue that traditional theory, research, and practice and the canon of special education has failed to take advantage of the intersectionality framework given that they do not recognize social identity markers or culturally responsive or sustaining pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Paris & Alim, 2017) as relevant to teaching, literacy, and learning and to the nature of dis/ability (Artiles, 2015; Artiles, 2011; Waitoller & King-Thorius, 2016).

Again, our review approached our research question from a sociohistorical lens by centering the voices of the youth and young adults along disability, race, and gender and other markers of difference to reveal the complex ways dis/ability is experienced intersectionally. In particular, we explored the youth and young adults' voices at the structural, political, and personal levels of society and schooling. We found that education research focusing on youth and young adults with dis/abilities who are multiply situated in terms of race, gender, social class, sexual orientation, or other social markers understood disability in terms of (a) intersectional disability discourses, (b) dis/ability oppression as intersectional, and (c) engage in their identity meaning making as a form of intersectional discourse. In sum, our review highlights the importance of using an intersectional framework to better understand how multidimensional identities affect our students and our research. Our review also reminds us to rely on the voices of the marginalized and oppressed to see how schools, policy, and labels can inflict harm on the individuals that are supposed to be provided with a fair and appropriate education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All three authors are thankful and greatly appreciative for the professional copyediting by Dr. Stephanie McBride-Schreiner. The authors are mindful and grateful of the peer-reviews that they received before and during the 2016 annual American Educational Research Association conference on an earlier draft of the current project and preliminary findings presentation. The authors are extremely thankful to Drs. Jeanne M. Powers, Gustavo E. Fischman, and Adai A. Tefera for their review of our proposal and feedback as it greatly influenced the focus of this systematic literature review. Last, the authors are mindful of the mentor-text they used to model this review off of: Waitoller and Artiles (2016).

NOTES

¹Throughout the chapter, we use *dis/ability* to define disability as being a social construction and constructed by its political, historical, social, emotional, and economic contexts regarding ability and disability at the same time. We use *disability*, without the dash (/) between *dis* and *ability*, to denote and acknowledge the existence of disability as impairment or being a real predicament (Shakespeare, 2013).

²A foundational force for the framework of intersectionality, Black feminism examined how the interlocking systems of power, social inequities, socially constructed identities, and social problems and their solutions are constructed through the intersection of race and gender (Collins, 2000).

³By on the ground, we mean how youth and young adults experience their intersectional identities in their everyday lives within tangible, situated contexts, such as inside of schools.

⁴For example, critical theorist researchers face conflict when using labels and social categories because, on the one hand, these labels and social categories are necessary to participate in the political and civil rights conversations that are built on hegemonic structures. On the other hand, critical researchers feel these terms harm the individual since they also may be used to sort and segregate individuals. Using an intersectionality framework allows the researcher to first understand, and then question, how social groups are defined and constructed and how those groups are understood (Penrose, 1999) and how intersectionality is used. Furthermore, McCall (2005) acknowledges the contradictory relationships that identity categories can create.

⁵As a critical scholar, I (author MAC) am aware of the sociohistorical construction of the terms, such as Black, female, and disability. I chose to list a few of my identity markers the way that I did to bring attention to the concept that my identities are all separate in essence but intersectional in function. To illustrate my view, I use the words of a participant in Petersen's (2009) study name Kiesha, here is her words, "If it's not my race, it is other things, like being a woman or my disability" (Petersen, 2009, p. 436).

⁶By *critical lens*, we mean having a critical theory (Freire, 2005) approach at the analysis of disability at its intersections that foreground issues of power relations. This was important to ensure that the studies did not take a medical-psychological model of disability and foregrounded the importance of power relations in social identities in the lives of their student participants. This, in turn, indexes our own conceptual framework that we brought to the review and the importance of a sociohistorical intersectional analysis.

⁷It is important to note that this included study was conducted by the second author of this literature review.

⁸We choose to use *identity-less* and *cultureless* as opposed to *colorblindness* given that the term *colorblindness* reproduces an ablest assumption about those who are blind as deficit.

REFERENCES

References marked with an asterisk were studies included in the analysis and database of this systematic literature review.

Annamma, S. A. (2013). *Resistance and resilience: The education trajectories of young women of color with disabilities through the school to prison pipeline* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado Boulder). Retrieved from https://scholar.colorado.edu/educ_gradetds/33/

*Annamma, S. A. (2014). Disabling juvenile justice: Engaging the stories of incarcerated young women of color with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 35, 313–324.

Annamma, S. A. (2017). Not enough: Critiques of Devos and expansive notions of justice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 30, 1047–1052.

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(1), 1–31.

- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469–480.
- Artiles, A. J. (1998). The dilemma of difference: Enriching the disproportionality discourse with theory and context. *The Journal of Special Education*, 32, 32–36.
- Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an interdisciplinary understanding of educational equity and difference: The case of the racialization of ability. *Educational Researcher*, 40, 431–445.
- Artiles, A. J. (2013). Untangling the racialization of disabilities: An intersectionality critique across disability models. *DuBois Review*, 10, 329–347.
- Artiles, A. J. (2015). Beyond responsiveness to identity badges: Future research on culture in disability and implications for RTI. *Educational Review*, 67(1), 1–22.
- Artiles, A. J. (2017, October 19). *Re-envisioning equity research: Disability identification disparities as a case in point*. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual AERA Brown Lecture in Education Research. Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/Events-Meetings/Annual-Brown-Lecture-in-Education-Research>
- Artiles, A. J., Dorn, S., & Bal, A. (2016). Objects of protection, enduring nodes of difference: Disability intersections with “other” differences, 1916–2016. *Review of Research in Education*, 40, 777–820.
- Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Trent, S., Osher, D., & Ortiz, A. (2010). Justifying and explaining disproportionality, 1968–2008: A critique of underlying views of culture. *Exceptional Children*, 76, 279–299.
- Arzubiaga, A., Artiles, A. J., King, K., & Harris-Murri, N. (2008). Beyond research on cultural minorities: Challenges and implications of research as situated cultural practice. *Exceptional Children*, 74, 309–327.
- Baglieri, S., & Shapiro, A. (2012). *Disability studies and the inclusive classroom: Critical practices for creating least restrictive attitudes*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Baker, M., Andriessen, J., & Järvelä, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Affective learning together: Social and emotional dimensions of collaborative learning*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Blanchett, W. J., Klingner, J. K., & Harry, B. (2009). The intersection of race, culture, language, and disability: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education*, 44, 389–409.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2011). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Cannon, M. A. (2016). From homeless to hopeful: Overcoming tragedy to preserver. In Y. D. Ford, L. J. Davis, M. T. Scott, & Y. Sealey-Ruz (Eds.), *Gumbo for the soul: Liberating memoirs and stories to inspire females of color* (pp. 51–57). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Cannon, M. A., & Morton, C. H. (2015). God consciousness enacted: Living, moving, and having my being in him. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 39, 147–156.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- *Connor, D. J. (2006). Michael’s story: “I get into so much trouble just by walking: Narrative knowing and life at the intersections of learning disability, race and class. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 39, 154–165.
- Connor, D. J., Gabel, S. L., Gallagher, D. J., & Morton, M. (2008). Disability studies and inclusive education: Implications for theory, research and practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12, 441–457.
- Cortiella, C., & Horowitz, S. H. (2014). *The state of learning disabilities: Facts, trends and emerging issues*. New York, NY: National Center for Learning Disabilities.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of*

- Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1): 139–167. Retrieved from <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8/>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.
- Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational Theory*, 50(1), 25–47.
- Erevelles, N. (2011). *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Erevelles, N., & Minear, A. (2010). Unspeakable offenses: Untangling race and disability in discourses of intersectionality. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 4, 127–145.
- Ferri, B. A. (1997). *The construction of identity among women with learning disabilities: The many faces of the self* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens.
- Ferri, B. A. (2010). A dialogue we've yet to have: Race and disability studies. In C. Dudley-Marling & A. Gurn (Eds.), *The myth of the normal curve* (Vol. 11, pp. 139–150). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Ferri, B. A. & Connor, D. J. (2006). *Reading resistance: Discourses of exclusion in desegregation and inclusion debates* (Disability Studies in Education). New York, NY: Peter Yang.
- *Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2010). "I was the special ed. girl": Urban working-class young women of colour. *Gender and Education*, 22, 105–121.
- Ferri, B. A., & Gregg, N. (1998). Women with disabilities: Missing voices. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21, 429–439.
- Frankenberg, E., Hawley, G. S., Ee, J., & Orfield, G. (2017). *Southern schools: More than half-century after the civil rights revolution*. Retrieved from <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/southern-schools-brown-83-report>
- Freire, P. (2008). *Education for critical consciousness* (Continuum impacts). London, England: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2005). *The pedagogy of the oppressed* (Continuum impacts). London, England: Continuum.
- Gallagher, D. J., Connor, D. J., & Ferri, B. A. (2014). Beyond the far too incessant schism: Special education and the social model of disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18, 1120–1142.
- Gannon, S., & Davis, B. (2012). *Postmodern, post-structural, and critical theories*. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *The handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (2nd ed., pp. 65–91). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- García, S. B., & Ortiz, A. A. (2013). Intersectionality as a framework for transformative research in special education. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 13(2), 32–47.
- Garland-Thomson, R. (2002). Integrating disability, transforming feminist theory. *NWSA Journal*, 14(3), 1–32.
- Gill, M., & Erevelles, N. (2017). The absent presence of Elsie Lacks: Hauntings at the intersection of race, class, gender, and disability. *African American Review*, 50, 123–137.
- Gold, M. E., & Richards, H. (2012). To label or not to label: The special education question for African Americans. *Educational Foundation*, 26, 143–156.
- Gonzalez, T., Hernández-Saca, D. I., & Artiles, A. J. (2017). In search of voice: Theory and methods in K–12 student voice research in the US, 1990–2010. *Educational Review*, 69, 451–473. doi:10.1080/00131911.2016.1231661
- *Haight, W., Kayama, M., & Gibson, P. (2016). Out-of-school suspensions of Black youths: Culture, ability, disability, gender, and perspective. *Social Work*, 61, 235–243.

- Harris, A. (2017, June 15). Memo outlines education dept. plans to scale back civil-rights efforts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/memo-outlines-education-dept-plans-to-scale-back-civil-rights-efforts/118937>
- Harris, A., & Leonardo, Z. (2018). Intersectionality, race-gender subordination, and education. *Review of Research in Education, 42*, 1–27.
- *Henry, W., Fuerth, K., & Figliozi, J. (2010). Gay with a disability: A college student's multiple cultural journey. *College Student Journal, 44*, 377–388.
- Hernández-Saca, D. I. (2016). *Re-framing the master narratives of dis/ability through an emotion lens: Voices of Latino students with learning disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Hernández-Saca, D. I. (2017). Re-framing the master narratives of dis/ability at my intersections: An outline of a research agenda. *Critical Disability Discourses/Discours critiques dans le champ du handicap, 8*, 1–30. Retrieved from <https://cdd.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cdd/article/view/39723>
- Heshusius, L. (2004). From creative discontent toward epistemological freedom in special education: Reflections on a 25-year journey. In D. J. Gallagher, L. Heshusius, R. P. Iano, & T. M. Skrtic (Eds.), *Challenging orthodoxy in special education: Dissenting voices* (pp. 169–230). Denver, CO: Love.
- *Kahn, L. G., & Lindstrom, L. (2015). “I just want to be myself”: Adolescents with disabilities who identify as a sexual or gender minority. *Educational Forum, 79*, 362–376.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Artiles, A. J. (2014). Beyond psychological views of student learning in systemic reform agendas. In E. B. Kozleski & K. King-Thorius (Eds.), *Ability, equity, and culture: Sustaining inclusive urban education reform* (pp. 63–79). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Artiles, A. J. (2015). Mediating systemic change in educational systems through socio-cultural methods. In P. Smeyers, D. Bridges, N. Burbules, & M. Griffiths (Eds.), *International handbook of interpretation in educational research* (pp. 805–822). New York, NY: Springer.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- *Lambert, R. (2015). Constructing and resisting disability in mathematics classrooms: A case study exploring the impact of different pedagogies. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 89*(1), 1–18.
- Lemke, J. L. (2013). Thinking about feeling: Affect across literacies and lives. In O. Erstad & J. Sefton-Green (Eds.), *Learning lives: Transactions, technologies, and learner identity* (pp. 57–69). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Losen, D., Ee, J., Hodson, C., & Martinez, T. (2015). Disturbing inequities: Exploring the relationship between racial disparities in special education identification and discipline. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 89–117). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- *Madigan, J. (2005). The intersection of gender, race, and disability: Latina students in special education. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners, 8*(1), 45–60.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs, 30*, 1771–1800.
- *Miller, R. (2015). “Sometimes you feel invisible”: Performing queer/disabled in the university classroom. *Educational Forum, 79*, 377–393.
- Morris, M. (2016). *Pushout: The criminalization of Black girls in schools*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., . . . Curran, W. (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 14*, 1235–1259.
- Munyi, C. W. (2012). Past and present perceptions towards disability: A historical perspective. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 32*(2). doi:10.18061/dsq.v32i2.3197

- Nasir, N. I. (2011). *Racialized identities: Race and achievement among African American youth*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Paris, D., & Alim, S. H. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Patton, J. M. (1998). The disproportionate representation of African-Americans in special education: Looking behind the curtain for understanding and solutions. *Journal of Special Education*, 32(1), 25–31.
- Penrose, J. (1999). Using personal research to teach the significance of socially constructed categories. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 23, 227–239.
- *Petersen, J. A. (2009). “Ain’t nobody gonna get me down”: An examination of the educational experiences of four African American women labeled with disabilities. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 42, 428–442.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Savaria, E., Underwood, K., & Sinclair, D. (2011). If only I had known . . . : Young people’s participation in the construction of their learning disability labels. *International Journal of Special Education*, 26(3), 92–105.
- Shakespeare, T. (2013). *Disability rights and wrongs revisited*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Skiba, R., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Losen, D., & Harry, B. (2016). Risks and consequences of over simplifying educational inequities: A response to Morgan et al. (2015). *Educational Researcher*, 45, 221–225.
- Stevenson, M. (2010). Flexible and responsive research: Developing rights-based emancipatory disability research methodology in collaboration with young adults with Down syndrome. *Australian Social Work*, 63(1), 35–50.
- Trainor, A. A. (2008). Using cultural and social capital to improve postsecondary outcomes and expand transition models for youth with disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 42(3), 148–162.
- Trainor, A. A. (2017). *Transition by design: Improving equity and outcomes for adolescents with disabilities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Trent, S. C., Driver, M. K., Rodriguez, D., Oh, K., Stewart, S., Kea, C., & Artiles, A. J. (2014). Beyond Brown: Empirical research on diverse learners with or at-risk for specific learning disabilities from 1994–2012. *Multiple Voices*, 14(2), 12–29.
- Valencia, R. R. (Ed.). (2012). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Waitoller, F. R., & King-Thorius, K. A. (2016). Cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for dis/ability. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86, 366–389.
- Washington, A. H. (2006). *Medical apartheid: The dark history of medical experimentation on black Americans from colonial times to the present*. New York, NY: Harlem Moon.
- Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotion: A new social science understanding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.