The Version of Record of the manuscript has been published and is available in *Higher Education Research & Development* 26 October, 2022
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07294360.2022.2138277

Accepted version

Ableism in higher education: the negation of crip temporalities within the neoliberal academy

Jess Rodgers[a]*, Ryan Thorneycroft [b], Peta S. Cook[c], Elizabeth Humphrys[d], Nicole L. Asquith[a], Sally Anne Yaghi[e], Ashleigh Foulstone[e]

[a] Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia; [b]School of Social Sciences, Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia; [c] School of Social Sciences, University of Tasmania; [d] The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia; [e]Private practice, Sydney, Australia

*Jess Rodgers
jess.rodgers@utas.edu.au

Abstract

Within Australian universities, neoliberalism has transformed education into a marketplace and product, where academic employees are regulated and controlled through metrics, productivity, and pressure to maintain and increase 'value'. In this environment, disabled academics face increasing barriers to workplace participation and meaningful inclusion. To explore the lived experiences of disabled academics, this article draws upon qualitative survey and interview data collected from disabled academics to consider the ways that the academy excludes and disables them. Specifically, we argue that the way time is regulated and managed within the neoliberal university is ableist, and fails to account for the crip temporalities by which disabled academics live their lives. The concept of crip and cripping time in relation to disabled academics opens up new ways of thinking, doing, and being that

are not constrained by normative (clock) time that marginalises disabled subjects. While we focus on an Australian context, the near-universalising 'logics' of normative time and neoliberal-ableism inherent to universities and societies more generally has implications for everyone. We argue that it is incumbent upon universities to rethink prevailing notions of time that currently elide the experiences and capacities of disabled academics.

Keywords: ableism; academia; Australia; crip time; neoliberal-ableism

Introduction

Academic lives are constituted in and through neoliberal, ableist, and chronopolitical times, and this demands a repertoire of expectations and practices predicated on individual performance, productivity, excellence, responsibility, and usefulness (Brown & Leigh, 2018; Davies & Bansel, 2005; Isaacs, 2020). Consequently, the neoliberal university demands abled (or non-disabled) bodyminds (Price, 2015). In this article, we draw on qualitative interview and survey results from Australian disabled academics to consider the ways in which the academy excludes, marginalises, and disables them. Noting the ways in which 'academic ecosystems seek to normalise and homogenise ways of working and of being a scholar' (Brown, 2020, p. 5), we argue that the neoliberal academy fails to account for the crip temporalities *necessarily* deployed by disabled academics. These academics sit, in Garland-Thomson's (2011) description, as square pegs in round holes. The exclusion and marginalisation of disabled academics within the academy is tantamount to the exclusion they face in broader society. We argue that it is incumbent upon universities to rethink prevailing notions of time that currently elide the experiences, capacities, and needs of disabled scholars.

Academia has traditionally been seen as an ivory tower that exemplifies elitism, privilege, excellence, and intelligence (Brown, 2020). Constituted in such exclusive and exclusionary terms, 'ableism in academia is endemic' (Brown, 2020, p. 3). In this century, however, various 'reasonable' accommodations have been slowly implemented for disabled

people within the academy (Lipka et al., 2020; Mclean et al., 2003). This has mostly focussed on student's needs largely driven by legislative change, but disabled academics continue to face significant individual, social, cultural, and institutional barriers to their equitable participation within their higher education workplaces (Brown & Leigh, 2018). Definition of 'reasonable' adjustments and 'inherent' requirements to the work of scholars are not demarcated in ways that facilitate participation; rather, they are benchmarks set by employers to identify and problematise those who are unable to meet the requirements of scholarship under the relentless pace of the neoliberal university.

Examination of disabled academics and their experiences within the academy is an emergent research topic (such as work undertaken in the UK, Brown & Leigh, 2018, 2020; Merchant et al., 2020; US, Horton & Tucker, 2014; Kerschbaum et al., 2017; Scandinavia, Olsen et al. 2020; and Canada, Waterfield et al., 2015), yet Australian experiences continue to be sparse and opaque (Mellifont et al., 2019). The troubling experiences of international colleagues, as well as anecdotal examples within an Australian context (including some of the authors of this article), demonstrates the importance of this research. To address this lacuna, several disabled and abled scholars from nine universities across Australia assembled to launch a pilot study to investigate the experiences of disabled academics in negotiating and traversing workplace expectations and demands at one Australian university.

In this article we start by situating our analysis within the context of neoliberal-ableism and the attendant negation of crip temporalities. 'Crip' is a reclaimed word that resignifies the pathology of disability and works to resist and subvert dominant and normative approaches to dis/abled positionalities, identities, and practices (McRuer, 2006), including 'time' in the context of this article. It is our contention that modes and technologies of neoliberalism work to constitute and perpetuate ableist practices, ideologies, and discourses, and in so doing, work to disavow the crip temporalities by which disabled people live. Crip

time challenges normative assumptions about pace and scheduling. The disavowal of crip temporalities within the academy further 'others' already marginalised disabled subjects. To explore this, we discuss the ways in which disabled academics are excluded from the academy including the individual and institutional negation of their crip temporalities. We conclude by problematising the nature of normative 'clock' time, suggesting that (crip) temporalities need to be accommodated to attenuate the exclusion of academics, both abled and disabled.

Contextualising our current moment

Neoliberal-ableism

Over several decades, neoliberalism has fundamentally changed the nature of the academy and academic life (Davies & Bansel, 2005). Bansel and colleagues (2020, p. 118) convey some of these changes:

> [h]igher education becomes a market, universities become enterprises, knowledge becomes a product, students become consumers and academics become service providers with responsibilities to students-as-consumers on the one hand and government and managerialist corporate interests on the other.

The neoliberal university is one of rampant managerialism, ranking, marketisation, metricisation, and profit (Andrew, 2020). The modern-day academic subject is regulated, controlled, and monitored through technologies of (self-)management and the distribution of working hours across research, teaching, administration, and governance (Davies & Bansel, 2005). Each category is measured through arbitrarily-defined metrics (teaching evaluations, publications, citations, grants,), and each academic's achievement of these is measured for 'success', 'performance', and 'impact' judged in relation to others (Davies & Bansel, 2005). Each academic needs to work 'harder' and 'better' to ensure their productivity and value is

maintained. Rather than focus on damaging neoliberal workplace practices, the institutional gaze instead frames these expectations as individual problems that are solved through individual performance (Davies & Bansel, 2005). Time is counted finitely, measured selectively through minutes, hours, days, and weeks, and academics are constantly trying to outsmart the metricised workload models that have Taylorised each available minute (Davies & Bansel, 2005; Walker, 2009). In a system where every moment must create a demonstrable outcome for the employer, academics are caught up in a linear understanding of time (Davies & Bansel, 2005). These demands normalise the experience of being 'burnt out', thus compounding—and simultaneously erasing—the harms experienced by dis/abled academics (Nishida, 2016). The reification of the abled norm in academia limits time for everyone, and especially disabled academics. As such, disabled academics 'stick out' due to their non-normativity and crip temporality.

The current moment within the academy can be conceptualised through the lens of neoliberal-ableism (Goodley, 2014; Goodley & Lawthom, 2019;). Neoliberal-ableism signifies the centrality of abledness within capitalist neoliberal societies (Goodley & Lawthom, 2019). Universities frame students and academics as earners or costers, and disabled academics are costers who require investment to enable their inclusion (Olsen et al., 2020). The expectation of productivity requires a 'fully able and abled being' (Brown, 2020, p. 3). Ableism refers to the un/conscious belief that the abled/non-disabled body is the ideal and proper body (Thorneycroft, 2020); a standardised, normalised body. Disabled subjects do not 'fit' within neoliberal-ableist ideals (Goodley & Lawthom, 2019; Goodley et al., 2014). The neoliberalisation of academia further entrenches its ableist nature (Nishida, 2016), and fails to adequately support diversity and difference. Disabled people who are seen as valuable to society are utilised by neoliberal capitalism as 'supercrips' shown to 'overcome' their

disability to be productive, which further designates other disabled people as not useful (Snyder & Mitchell, 2010).

No (crip) time

Crip time denotes the different temporalities by which (disabled) people live their lives (Kafer, 2013). Distinct from normative linear (clock) time, crip time moves beyond traditional markers that instantiate the social organisation of societies (Kafer, 2013). Crip time may involve slower time, where it may take longer to do something (walking, talking, and so on), or having less available hours to do something (such as a person with chronic illness who may have a limited number of 'functional' hours) (Samuels & Freeman, 2021). Crip time may involve faster time, such as neurodiverse people who may often be 'on-the-go' with quick thought processes. Crip time can be non-linear; for example, healing and progress for people with mental or chronic illness can mediate between wellness and unwellness in different times and places. People's sense of time can also be fluid, such as for those living with dementia or acquired memory loss. Crip time may involve 'time travel', whereby a body may age faster or a person may be infantilised no matter their age (Liddiard & Slater, 2018). Crip time can be asynchronous and disorientating; Samuels (2017, np) notes, 'I look 25, feel 85, and just want to live like the other 40-somethings I know'. Distinct from normative paradigmatic markers such as morning, day, and night; or birth, life, and death; or even school, work, and retirement; crip time opens up alternative temporalities and differently imagined pasts, presents, and futures (Kafer, 2013). In short, crip time is about flexible time.

Crip time is useful in the context of this article as it explains the ways in which the temporalities of disabled academics are disavowed and negated in an increasingly metricised, neoliberal scholarly life. Crip time reveals the ableism inherent to normative constructions of time (Ljuslinder, Ellis, & Vikström, 2020). Disabled academics experience pain, frustration, slowing down, speeding up, and other *reorientations to time* (Kafer, 2013) that are otherwise

erased and denied by the neoliberal-ableist academy. According to neoliberal-ableism, crip time is seen as extra time and thus wasted time (Kafer, 2013). Yet such 'wasted' or 'extra' time is not the product of the individual body; for example, Kafer (2013, p. 26) provides an example of a disabled person running late, and points to the myriad instances in which their temporality is impacted by (ableist) others:

> [there may be] a dependency on attendants (who might themselves be running late), malfunctioning equipment (from wheelchairs to hearing aids), a bus driver who refuses to stop for a disabled passenger, or an ableist encounter with a stranger that throws one off schedule.

Given the many ableist instances in which the temporalities of disabled people are impacted by others, time needs to be cripped. *Cripping* time involves rethinking and reorientating attitudes and approaches to time; 'break[ing] in our bodies and minds to new rhythms, new patterns of thinking and feeling and moving through the world' (Samuels, 2017, np). Part of our approach in this article is exposing ableist and taken-for-granted attitudes towards time, revealing the ways in which crip time is negated by neoliberal-ableist academies, then considering cripping time to better accommodate disabled academics within the academy.

Scholarship Disabled

Against the backdrop of years of personal experiences of ableism in the academy, and a purported 'inability' to manage time, in 2019 several colleagues across Australia formalised a research project—'Scholarship Disabled: An exploration of the experiences of staff with disability in higher education in Australia'—with the intention of turning anecdotal experiences into research data. This research team includes disabled and non-disabled academics from nine Australian universities. Between February and September 2019, we conducted a pilot study at one Australian university, aiming to obtain a sense of complex experiences before undertaking a national study. The study examined ableism experienced by

academic and professional staff in higher education through surveys and guided interviews and, in this article, we focus on the experiences of academic staff. The study was approved by the university's Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number H13272).

Deploying purposive sampling to gather the experiences of disabled academics, recruitment advertisements were placed around multiple campus locations, including staff rooms and bathrooms, and shared across social media platforms and university networks. Recruitment information provided a link to a survey about experiences of ableism within the university. Survey questions examined the nature of the person's disability, university work expectations and experiences meeting them, the impact of these expectations on disability and wellbeing, and experiences of university disability support policies and practices. At the end of the survey, respondents could opt-in to an interview. From 16 survey completions, seven participated in interviews. Interviews broadly examined participants' experiences in performing their role, recruitment, disclosure, adjustments for disabilities, promotion, exclusion and discrimination. The semi-structured interviews varied between 30 and 90 minutes. Interviews were transcribed by an automatic transcription program, Otter, and then reviewed to ensure their accuracy. The interviews, review of transcripts, and initial analysis of interview data were undertaken by two Psychology Honours students as part of their degree (who are also co-authors of this article). Due to limited numbers, the quantitative survey data is not generalisable, but we utilise the qualitative responses. These responses and the interviews form the basis for this paper. These experiences come from individuals but 'any single account of experience is always an account of other times, places, subjects and practices' (Bansel, 2012, p. 7). Each account exists through multiple constitutive relations, becoming an assemblage of many accounts (Bansel 2012). The source of responses is indicated using the following: interviews [I]; survey [S].

Qualitative data from the surveys and interviews were loaded into NVivo for manual thematic coding. Thematic analysis involved identifying themes from the data, with a focus on the experiences of disabled academics and notions of ableism. Data were read in an 'active way' (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 87), searching for meanings and patterns in and across the data. The initial themes were discussed by the research team, and the interviews were coded further. Informed by initial themes and in combination with our research questions and theoretical interest in ableism and crip time, two themes were identified that form the basis of the following discussion: exclusionary practices and their effects.

Findings and analysis

Exclusionary practices

There were many experiences that demonstrated how disabled academics fail to be accommodated in the academy. Termed 'exclusionary practices', they signify the barriers that block academics' paths. Three types of exclusionary practices were identified: practices that impinge role exclusion, career progression, and space exclusion.

Role exclusion

As with many higher education institutions in Australia and elsewhere, the site of our pilot study was reliant on a significant level of workforce casualisation. In the wake of COVID-19, this casualised workforce proved instantly disposable. Casual work is central to many disabled academics' career paths, though not necessarily by choice—often because it enables them to manage ableist norms shaping academic work or because of what university management may frame as being the disabled academic's 'issues'. Many disabled academics undertake casual work not because they want insecure and unreliable work, but because the ableist neoliberal institution presents too many barriers to permit tenured full-time labour.

As noted by one of our survey participants:

> I'm a casual, and so my hours are set afresh each semester, and I have to discuss my needs with a different supervisor or unit coordinator each time. Some have been great; many have not and have tried to pressure me into accepting work and hours that are unviable. … this semester, for example, I am teaching two 2-hour tutorials, with an hour's break in between. This 5-hour stint is much more difficult than a 4-hour stint would be, but policy dictates that I cannot teach for four hours without a break (even though this is physically easier for me). (S10)

While casually contracted scholars most obviously feel role exclusion, perceived 'incapacities' and 'issues' can also shape the roles they are offered as tenured full-time scholars. Teaching time is created and structured with the abled subject in mind, and this limits opportunities for promotion and the ability to demonstrate disabled academics' contributions to the university's successes:

> Job opportunities for promotion that are strictly for full-time workers only—even though a suitable job-share option may be a good fit. Due to my disability full-time work is not possible, however I otherwise meet all the requirements to be considered for promotion. (S19)

This participant exposes how the university frames some roles as requiring activities that can only be addressed by being full-time. As noted by interviewee 7, prior to the changes to work practices in academia due to COVID-19, the university framed all service work as requiring face-to-face contact:

> … I could have performed the job completely from home. I had Zoom facilities for meetings. I had email access to process all the student inquiries, but there was one or two I wasn't able to process because students would just get it in their mind that the problem will be solved if I see this [person] face to face. It was the only thing I wasn't able to do. So [my line manager] thought I wasn't doing the job … It could have been

> an excuse. … I didn't know his exact reasoning, but he basically pushed me out of that role. (I7)

Disabled people often experience issues when seeking accommodations (Titchkosky, 2011). There is an inability to accommodate individual differences when they clash with wider systemic and institutional rules and timeframes, which are enforced as inflexible and non-negotiable. They are then left with the predicament of refusing work altogether or accepting something less than ideal. The perceived necessity of face-to-face engagement discussed by interviewee 7 demonstrates the absurdity of refusing working from home accommodations given the speed and ease with which online work was enabled for most university staff in a COVID-19 environment. A failure to accommodate even the most basic provisions seemingly disappeared overnight. No longer were these accommodations considered costly; rather, they were *innovations* that enabled the academy's survival.

Career progression

Multiple participants raised the issue of career progression, which was blocked in many ways:

> [University] workload that compromises my capacity to use my self-care strategies (ie., an equivalent 150% FT load on a PT fraction). (S18)
>
> Main issues have been about career progression. When you live with a chronic health condition, it can be difficult to know when things are a problem. You become used to feeling unwell to a degree and therefore, work through exacerbation periods, when in fact it would be better to be on leave. When people suggest to take time off, they don't realise that this could be for weeks, rather than a day or two. (S5)

Overwork is often the norm in academia (Hemer, 2014), and while many abled people can engage in this behaviour, for disabled people the effects can be debilitating. A full-time academic workload at this university is 100% and divided into different work roles for

'balanced' academic staff—such as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. This presumes a stable and autonomous neoliberal subject who can perform certain roles within a specified timeframe, and when they cannot, they must work beyond the allotted time, often exacerbating their disabilities and deepening the exploitation of unpaid (in)voluntary labour. Disabled academics risk becoming problematic for being 'unproductive', and (their) time becomes a fragile commodity that must be negotiated in particular ways.

These quotes point to the internalisation of neoliberal-ableism, where productivity and career progression are held up as ideals that academics must strive towards. In effect, the neoliberal university promotes, rewards, and compensates abled scholars, whilst simultaneously using these hyperbolic metrics as benchmarks and standards to assess others. As with Taylor and his factory workers punished under the then newly developed Scientific Management (Taylor, 2003 [1903, 1911, 1912]), the early 21st century neoliberal university takes its most productive worker as 'the norm' to which all other scholars are expected to match or exceed to create the 'new norm'.

Exploiting 'the calling' to scholarly work is central to the ableist and dangerous scholarly culture. This vocational culture has no limits to the time it takes to complete the job, and as such, reproduces neoliberal-ableism. In workplaces where overwork is the norm, and where disabled subjects may not be able to engage in such practises, they become excluded from career progression, opportunities, stable careers, livelihoods, and personal wellbeing. Overwork impacts everyone's time but has particular and deleterious impacts on disabled scholars.

Space exclusion

The enactment of the Australian *Disability Discrimination Act* (DDA) in 1992 meant that all public institutions and government agencies across the country were required to make buildings accessible for those requiring assistive devices such as wheelchairs, walking frames,

and crutches. Thirty years from the DDA, this continues to be a barrier. There may be accessibility ramps, but these accommodations may not be at the main or most convenient access point to a university facility. Thus, ramps do little to assist access for disabled people whom the additional distance required to access ramps is problematic. Not long after making the front door more accessible, universities turned their attention to sensory hurdles such as those experienced by people with sight and hearing needs. Raised dots on the ground and hearing loops in lecture theatres facilitated increased access to higher education for some disabled people, but these accommodations were limited. As noted by survey participant 5, such accommodations can be a double-edged sword; while they make the university more accessible, using ramps and (chair) lifts automatically reveals the user as disabled, which some may prefer not to disclose.

Participants discussed how space exclusion continues to be problematic for staff who are disabled in other ways:

> [They] have denied my assistance dog access … [and there is a] lack of lift access and being denied permission to use the lifts that are available. (S10)
>
> But there just isn't any office space that is appropriate. The lack of appropriate office space evidences a university that is not designed with inclusion for people with ADHD. (S1)
>
> There are also a lot of spaces that I can't work in because the University is more concerned about the cost of its buildings than the wellness or productivity of its staff. (S20)

In the case of interviewee 8, while assigned a practical assistant to negotiate the campus, they were not provided with any advice in cases of emergencies and, because of a single incident,

they were not relocated with the rest of their academic team to a newly built high-rise campus that had no provisions for evacuating disabled staff in emergencies:

> … the able-bodied students were directed [to evacuate] by the smoke alarm [which] went off because of a welding accident … And I didn't know what to do. … I found a way out. But the thing is, the ramp wasn't built to code. It was very steep going downhill. … I'm the only one within the school that's still here [old campus] … I can't get to that [new] campus. And I can't get out in the case of emergency either. (I8)

As documented by many scholars who examine responses to emergencies and disasters (see, for example, Kelman & Stough 2015), equal access to safety is often forgotten. Further, as we have seen during the COVID-19 pandemic, disabled people are often perceived as acceptable collateral damage (Thorneycroft & Asquith, 2021).

When disabled staff are excluded from specific spaces, they can also be excluded from specific roles or opportunities. For example, the inherent design of teaching and travel commitments between and within campuses is predicated on an ableist linear notion of time that effaces the needs of disabled/different bodies and their own temporalities:

> … within our program we have teaching here, but it didn't suit the other cohort or the other academic members [to be based at this campus]. And I didn't really talk about the, you know, my challenges to driving two hours, sometimes two and a half, to get to a far away campus for a 9am lecture … And then to get parking. So it takes me even longer. … I said, look, I can't do this. (I1)

> Whilst I can teach satisfactorily, I can't take tutorials on back-to-back days because I have to rest the following day, and this is made worse by having to walk long

> distances from the parking spaces [to teaching spaces]. This means I can't take more work. (S12)

This adds additional professional and personal burdens for disabled scholars and fails to account for the crip time required to conduct academic work. The range of participants' exclusionary experiences culminate amounting to exclusion from roles and career progression. These exclusionary practices not only impact the roles available to disabled academics but also have significant vicarious and impactful effects.

Negative effects

The exclusionary practices discussed impact on the capacity and roles our participants had access to, but they also created iatrogenic harm and trauma. All individual responses to disability in the workplace are dependent on a process of disclosure, evidencing, and regulation of disabled academics. Accommodation plans (APs) at the pilot university require, at a minimum, the disclosure of the disability to the staff at the Equity and Diversity Unit, which is then used to draft an accommodation plan to be approved by the staff member's direct line manager. Many of our participants noted that despite policies around confidentiality and discretion, the nature of the implementation of these plans often required disclosure to a wide range of staff across the university; a direct consequence of neoliberal-ableism.

Gatekeepers at every point often ignore, reject, or forget about the conditions required under the AP, often because they are framed as 'too complex' to action. Individual subjects are responsibilised by a collective institution that under-resources and over-burdens its workers. Gatekeepers are often unable to alter structural barriers or institutional cultural norms (let alone ignore their own workload key performance indicators), resulting in the university exploiting and neglecting *both* disabled and abled scholars. As noted by our

participants, these practices led to disabled scholars being responsible for negotiating the accommodations mandated in their AP. For interviewee 6, on their return to work:

> I had spoken to the Equity and Diversity department to try and get help... [before my return to work], and my direct line manager to get help beforehand. … Being autistic, I struggle a lot with sensory input, so I had asked for any adjustments they could give me for that, I had asked for, uh with teaching … And it was too much for me. It was such a long day and I was literally just walking around the campus having panic attack after panic attack in between the classes trying to stay there all day. So I highlighted that this was going to be an issue yet again and asked them to allocate a tutor and I would pick up some additional marking instead but they were just like yeah, yeah we will do that and at the last minute they said 'oh sorry we didn't get around to it, you're just going to have to take the classes'. (I6)

During the process of disclosure, the few disabled academics who do engage in this process (approximately 25% according to our survey) accumulate significant levels of stress and anxiety about their position, especially as these accommodations relate to the 'inherent requirements' of the job. Where time is constrained and distorted for everybody, both abled and disabled scholars alike, lengthy processes that are easily dismissed are thrown into the 'too hard' basket.

The expectations of academic roles mean that it is not enough to do one thing well; to be recognised, rewarded, and promoted, academics must exceed expectations in teaching, research, and service. The viability of an academic career depends on the capacity to excel in all three areas. Research is especially important as this drives the income of the university, and unproductive researchers are 'costers' not 'earners':

> I am getting fairly close to the line since I'm not able to do any research. … I don't fit into that category of helping the university increase their research profile … It has

> been bought up in most years in my performance review … I would dearly love to be able to do research. I would be a Level E [Professor] like the other people who started 22 years ago, I'm currently a Level B [Lecturer]. If I was to become a Level E, I would double the value of my superannuation as it's based on the last 3 years. … So I do feel always under pressure, that one day someone is going to say to me, 'you're not researching, you're not fulfilling your inherent requirements, you're out of here'. … And that I feel it is going to get worse after I turn 60. I fear the worst. (I7)

The stress and anxiety about employment security noted by interviewee 7 has long-term consequences. This was heightened for casual academics who noted that if they raise their concerns about accessibility and accommodations, they fear they will not be awarded ongoing or future work.

Despite formal APs, participants experienced several negative effects from the ableist institutional environment. These included feeling obliged to work harder and longer to achieve the same outputs as their non-disabled colleagues, exacerbation of disability, physiological impacts, and leaving roles:

> I have to stay late and work weekends to try and make up the time lost to working in an open plan office that is incredibly distracting. (S1)
>
> My health declined so dramatically that I had to resign from that role. (S20)
>
> Most nights I leave here at nine or 10. Particularly when I'm [at a remote campus]. So I have to put in the extra hours in the office. (I7)

APs often take months to negotiate and even longer to implement; consequently, it is not a process that many casual academics undertake during their semester contract (which lasts approximately 14 weeks).

While income insecurity was a driving factor in casual disabled academics' willingness or capacity to disclose and seek accommodations, ongoing tenured staff were also

disadvantaged by the process. Interviewees 6 and 7 noted the significant financial effects of managing their own adjustment plans and accommodations in the workplace and the difficult decisions many disabled academics must make about their careers:

> I am still employed by the university. I am on leave without pay, because I was in a tenured position and I am getting [a] temporary incapacity benefit from [superannuation scheme] that will run out soon. … I don't feel like it is an environment that is going to support me to return. (I6)

For some disabled academics, the convoluted, intrusive, and ableist processes created to allow their access to an academic career, or limited or poorly implemented accommodations, compels their self-selection out of academia. Once gone, the issues they raise disappear along with them, and the systemic problems remain unresolved.

Implications for crip temporalities in academia

The relationship between the exclusion from and effects of the neoliberal-ableist academy on our participants compounds day-to-day experiences of disabled bodyminds in their efforts to 'fit'. Like in other studies, participants experienced role and space exclusion and the effects of these. Our study uniquely captures the impact of this ableism on casual employees and those with formal APs. Our participants—as with those in similar research internationally (Horton & Tucker, 2014; Kerschbaum et al., 2017; Merchant et al., 2020; Waterfield et al., 2015)—felt they had limited and difficult (sometimes, debilitating) options for remaining in the academy. For a few, being 'better' and 'faster' than their non-disabled colleagues meant they could avoid the ableist gaze and the punitive, patronising independent assessments of their capacity to meet the inherent requirements. But this approach was rare because it is unsustainable, given the costs of being a supercrip includes the labour required to be extraordinary (such as the costs of personal carers, assistive devices, and so on). Alternatively, disabled scholars can attempt to fly under the radar by being just enough, by

doing just enough, to avoid the assessment of capacity. For some of our participants, an uneasy vacillation between the two extremes was required to avoid the evaluation of being incapable of scholarship.

Many of our participants demonstrated many moves that sought to avoid the relentless nature of normative clock time and neoliberal-ableism. Moving between universities, departments, jobs, and priorities, the participants sought to move around or beyond the constraints that pin them down; however, normative clock time and neoliberal-ableism is pervasive throughout universities, domestically and internationally. In these contexts, it is necessary to query whether disabled scholars can ever meet the expanding remit and inherent requirements of scholarship, particularly given the shortfalls of formal accommodation plans. Time is stretched, distorted, and warped so much that the beginning and end of each workday is scarcely discernible even for abled scholars, as seen in arguments for 'slow academia' and 'slow scholarship' (for example, Berg & Seeber, 2018). With time constraints more than (or different from) their abled peers, disabled scholars are permanently teetering between supercrip (overperforming) and subcrip (underperforming), and never quite achieve the phantasmagorical perfection required to feel safe and inherently suitable to an ongoing academic career. Mitchell and colleagues (2014) suggest that hiding to be safe—closeting cripped bodyminds—and flying under the radar as just another less productive, non-disabled scholar may make the lives of disabled scholars a little easier, but '[i]f one can be included only by passing as non-disabled then much of the value of crip … experiences is lost' (299).

Crip temporalities destabilise academic ableism insofar as they provoke academic institutions, supervisors, and colleagues to question the taken-for-grantedness of excessive workloads and the thin stretching of time. Yet, changing the tempo marks disabled academics as out-of-place and unruly, and reinscribes their cripped bodyminds in a crisis/recovery temporality that 'prompts us to view our own potential "lack of fit" as a form of failure'

(Shahjahan, 2015, p. 491). Failing to meet the ideals of abledness was a constant in our participants' work lives, and the need for more time was perceived as both an imperative as well as sign of their inability to pass as abled; to fail as an academic within the neoliberal academy. The participants' stories suggest that individual resistance is not enough. Instead, collective forms of resistance are necessary. Baril (2016) suggests that embracing crip time can destabilise normative understandings that sick, rest, and recovery time is wasted, unproductive, and useless time. Crip time enables disabled scholars to provoke resistance to unrealistic neoliberal expectations and to model the possibilities for a different way of being, opening up new rhythms, patterns, modes, and modalities—not just for disabled scholars, but for all immersed in scholarship in neoliberal-ableist institutions. Failing to be 'inherently capable' of scholarship creates a discord that may be productive in changing academic work for everyone, including disabled students. As noted by Mitchell and colleagues (2014, 297), curricular cripistemologies—'the development of teaching pedagogies that foreground disability-based content, offering important social options for constructing alternative ethical frameworks for living'—may transform failed capacities into productive incapacities.

What we offer here is not new. Many have identified the ways in which neoliberalism has shaped the work lives of scholars (see, for example, Connell, 2019, Davies & Bansel, 2005; 2010). Disabled scholars are no different. Just as with their abled colleagues, they must meet—and preferably exceed—measured expectations. However, shared experiences of neoliberal quantification differ for disabled scholars in large part because their time is cripped, and this necessity of crip time is typically not respected, supported, or recognised. As such, participants' experiences exemplify academic ableism in practice. The experiences documented in this article (and the wider Scholarship Disabled study), epitomise the limits and possibilities of cripping time. The extra—or warped, distorted, flexible—time required by disabled scholars may mark them as inherently incapable but also offers an opportunity to crip

the unrealistic and unsustainable expectations of abledness. In cripping time, abled and disabled scholars have a common ground from which to resist the quantification of scholarship.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the study participants for your candid and thoughtful contributions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Western Sydney University Research Development Grant Fund.

ORCID

Jess Rodgers https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7825-8621

Ryan Thorneycroft https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2986-2694

Peta S. Cook https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5985-193X

Elizabeth Humphrys https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0192-0426

Nicole L Asquith https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2494-3391

References

Andrew, M. (2020). "Behind voluntary redundancy in universities: The stories behind the story." *Australian Universities Review* 62(2), 14-24. https://www.nteu.org.au/article/Behind-voluntary-redundancy-in-universities%3A-The-stories-behind-the-story-%28AUR-62-02%29-22296

Bansel, P. (2012). Resisting and re/counting the power of number: the one in the many and the many in the one. In M. Vicars, T. McKenna, & J. White (Eds), *Discourse, Power, and Resistance down Under* (pp.1-8), Sense Publishers.

Bansel, P., D. Perell, & S. Tang. (2020). What is this moment we are caught in? *Gender, Work & Organization* 27(1), 117-128. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12405

Baril, A. (2016). ‘Doctor, am I an Anglophone trapped in a Francophone body’: An intersextional analysis of ‘trans-crip-t time’ in ableist, cisnormative, anglonormative societies. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 10(2), 155-72. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2016.14

Berg, M., & B.K. Seeber. (2018). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in academy.* University of Toronto Press.

Braun, V., and V. Clarke. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2), 77-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brown, N. (2020). Introduction: Theorising ableism in academia. In N. Brown & J. Leigh (Eds.), *Ableism in academia: Theorising experiences of disabilities and chronic illnesses in higher education* (pp. 1-10). UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv13xprjr.6

Brown, N. and J. Leigh. (2018). Ableism in academia: Where are the disabled and ill academics? *Disability & Society* 33(6), 985-989. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1455627

Brown, N. & J. Leigh (eds) (2020). *Ableism in academia: Theorising experiences of disabilities and chronic illnesses in higher education*. UCL Press.

Connell, R.W. (2019). *The good university: What universities actually do and why it's time for radical change*. Monash University Press.

Davies, B. & P. Bansel. (2005). The time of their lives? Academic workers in neoliberal time(s). *Health Sociology Review* 14(1), 47-58. https://doi.org/10.5172/hesr.14.1.47

Davies, B., & P. Bansel. (2010). Governmentality and academic work: Shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 26(3). https://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/250

Garland-Thomson, R. (2011). Misfits: A feminist materialist disability concept. *Hypatia* 26(3), 591-609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01206.x

Goodley, D. (2014). *Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism*. Routledge.

Goodley, D. & R. Lawthom. (2019). Critical Disability Studies, Brexit and Trump: A time of neoliberal-ableism. *Rethinking History* 23(2), 233-251. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2019.1607476

Hemer S.R. (2014). Finding time for quality teaching: an ethnographic study of academic workloads in the social sciences and their impact on teaching practices. *Higher Education Research & Development* 33(3), 483-495. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841647

Horton, J. & F. Tucker. (2014). Disabilities in academic workplaces: Experiences of human and physical geographers. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39(1), 76-89. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12009

Isaacs, D. (2020). 'I don't have time for this': Stuttering and the politics of university time. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 22(1), 58-67. http://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.601

Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. Indiana University Press.

Kelman, I. & L.M. Stough (Eds.) (2015). *Disability and disaster*. Routledge.

Kerschbaum, S.L., A.M. O'Shea, M. Price, & M.S. Salzer. (2017). Accommodations and disclosure for faculty members with mental disability. In S.L Kerschbaum, L.T. Eisenman, & J.M. Jones (Eds.), *Negotiating Disability: Disclosure and Higher Education* (pp. 311-326). University of Michigan Press.

Liddiard, K. & J. Slater. (2018). 'Like, pissing yourself is not a particularly attractive quality, let's be honest': Learning to contain through youth, adulthood, disability and sexuality. *Sexualities* 21(3), 319-333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716688674

Lipka, O., Khouri, M., & Shecter-Lerner, M. (2020). University faculty attitudes and knowledge about learning disabilities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(5), 982-996. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1695750

Ljuslinder, K., K. Ellis & L. Vikström. (2020). Cripping time – understanding the life course through the lens of ableism. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 22(1), 35-38. http://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.710

McLean, P., Heagney, M., & Gardner, K. (2003). Going global: The implications for students with a disability. *Higher Education Research & Development* 22(2), 217-228. https:doi.org/10.1080/07294360304109

McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. New York University Press.

Mellifont, D., J. Smith-Merry, H. Dickinson, G. Llewellyn, S. Clifton, J. Ragen, M. Raffaele, & P. Williamson. (2019). The ableism elephant in the academy: A study examining academia as informed by Australian scholars with lived experience. *Disability & Society* 34(7), 1180-1199. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1602510

Merchant, W., S. Read, S. D'Evelyn, C. Miles, & V. Williams. (2020). The insider view: Tackling disabling practices in higher education institutions. *Higher Education* 80(2), 273-287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00479-0

Mitchell, D., S. Snyder & L. Ware. (2014). '[Every] child left behind': Curricular cripistemologies and the crip/queer art of failure. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 8(3), 295-313. https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/558369.

Nishida, A. (2016). Neoliberal academia and a critique from disability studies. In, P. Block, D. Kasnitz, A. Nishida, & N. Pollard, *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability* (pp.145-157). Springer.

Olsen, J., M. Griffiths, A. Soorenian & R. Porter. (2020). Reporting from the margins: Disabled academics reflections on higher education. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 22(1), 265-274. https://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.670

Price, M. (2015). The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain. *Hypatia* 30(1), 268-284. https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12127

Samuels, E. & E. Freeman. (2021). Introduction: Crip Temporalities. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 120(2), 245-254. https://browzine.com/articles/473096215

Samuels, E. (2017). Six ways of looking at crip time. *Disability Studies Quarterly* 37(3). https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/5824/4684

Shahjahan, R.A. (2015). Being 'lazy' and slowing down: Toward decolonizing time, our body, and pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 47(5), 488-501. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2014.880645

Snyder, S., & D. Mitchell. (2010). Introduction: Ablenationalism and the geo-politics of disability. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 4(2), 113-125, 216-217. http://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2010.10

Taylor, F.W. (2003). [1903, 1911, 1912]. *Scientific management*. Routledge.

Thorneycroft, R. (2020) *Reimagining disablist and ableist violence as abjection*. Routledge.

Thorneycroft, R., & Asquith N.L. (2021) Unexceptional violence in exceptional times: Disablist and ableist violence during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 10(2), 140-155. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.1743

Titchkosky, T. (2011) *The question of access: Disability, space, meaning*. University of Toronto Press.

Walker, J. (2009) "Time as the fourth dimension in the globalization of higher education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80(5), 483-509. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27750742

Waterfield, B., B.B. Beagan, & M. Weinberg. (2018) “Disabled academics: A case study in Canadian universities.” *Disability & Society* 33(3), 327-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2017.1411251