

Breaking Down the Disability Digital Divide

Candidate Number: 1003123

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MSc. IN SOCIAL SCIENCE OF THE INTERNET at the Oxford Internet Institute at the University of Oxford.

Word Count: 15,000

August 2016

Abstract

Scholarly work on digital inclusion and popular discourse commonly refer to a so-called "disability digital divide" – persons with disability, compared to the rest of the population, are less likely to use the Internet and generally engage in certain Internet activities at lower rates. However, there is little granularity in that understanding. I evaluate the validity of prior findings in the British context and challenge the prevalent frame of the "digital disability divide" with a mixed methods approach.

I use Oxford Internet Survey (OxIS) data to show that disability affects the likelihood of Internet use in 2007-2011, controlling for various demographics and socioeconomic status, but this finding does not extend to 2013. Among current Internet users, I find that those who report a disability do not engage less online than the rest of the population. This finding controls for demographics and persists along three dimensions: amount, variety, and types of Internet use. However, the OxIS data treats disability as a binary. I analyze how this is over-simplistic. To supplement these findings, I use data from a web platform that helps persons with disability find work to show that different types of disability are associated with particular flavors of online engagement. Compared with the rest of the users, those with mental health conditions are more likely to have digital contact with staff. Those with long-standing illness or health conditions are less likely to complete an online workshop.

Statistical findings are backed up with semi-structured interviews with people with a range of disabilities in two U.K. cities in the East and West Midlands. I find diverse levels of agency over technology use. At the same time, there are accounts of Internet technologies being both enabling and further disabling as well. Researchers should not cast technology in a blanket of empowerment or persons with disability in a blanket of disadvantage. The "disability digital divide" narrative reinforces a bifurcation that ignores the idiosyncrasies and nuances in how a diverse population interacts with technology. It is fruitful to move away from that frame.

Keywords: disability, internet, Oxford Internet Survey

Acknowledgements

I thank the 15 interview participants who agreed to help inform my research for no compensation. I am grateful to Remploy staff for facilitating these interviews. They are Mark Burrett, Gerry Skipper-Byer, Krishna Morar, Louise Davey, and Samantha Sharpe. I acknowledge funding from the Mansfield College graduate award. Finally, to a range of people at the Oxford Internet Institute who made me feel welcome and contributed to this essay and my intellectual growth, thank you.

Contents

List of Figures and Tables

1	Intr	oduction	1
	$1.1 \\ 1.2$	Rethinking the disability digital divide frame	$\frac{1}{2}$
2	Lite	rature Review	4
_	2.1	The main discourses on disability	$\overline{4}$
	2.2	Enabling and disabling narratives	5
	2.3	Existing empirical findings	14
		2.3.1 Disability and status of Internet use	14
		2.3.2 Disability and other dimensions (e.g. types) of Internet use	15
		2.3.3 Disability and social exclusion	17
	2.4	Research Questions	18
3	Met	hodology	19
	3.1	Quantitative data	19
		3.1.1 Dataset I: Oxford Internet Survey (OxIS)	19
		3.1.2 Dataset II: Remploy Online	20
		3.1.3 Selection of datasets	21
	3.2	Qualitative interviews	22
	3.3	Ethical considerations	23
4	Fine	dings	25
	4.1	Disability and Internet use	25
	4.2	Disability and social exclusion	28
	4.3	Type of disability and method of online engagement	29
	4.4	Complicated enabling-disabling tensions	30
5	Disc	cussion	33
	5.1	RQ_1 : Some evidence of a divide in Internet use, but not among those online	33
	5.2	RQ_2 : Varied and complicated relationships between persons with disability and technology	26
	5.3	technology	36 39
6	Con	clusion	42
A_1	open	IIX	44

List of Figures

1	Directed network graph of all Remploy Online users with at least one reported	
0	disability	54
$\frac{2}{3}$	Undirected network graph of disability coexistence ties	55
9	Samantha Sharpe)	56
4	Remploy Platform: Progress tracker (13 tasks listed under the 5 categories) on the website. (Credit: Samantha Sharpe)	56
5	Activeness is measured by completing at least 3 profile tasks and logging in at least 4 times over 1 year. 20.7% (N=444) are active users	57
6	The constructed activeness indicator does not heavily bias any particular type of disability	57
7	ROC curves for logistic regression models 2 and 4 in Table 13. Area under curve is 0.903 and 0.804 respectively, indicating decent predictions.	58
8	Outliers check for logistic regression models 2 and 4 in Table 13. Largest Cook's	
	Distance is 0.08 and 0.03 respectively, indicating no damaging outliers	58
\mathbf{List}	of Tables	
1	Enabling and disabling narratives: Application to disability	8
$\frac{1}{2}$	Enabling and disabilities: Application to disability	8 20
2	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20
2 3	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20
2 3 4	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21
2 3 4 5	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23
2 3 4 5 6	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online Type(s) of disabilities that Remploy Online users report having Treating disability and ICT use as binaries: Some examples	20 20 21 23 45
2 3 4 5 6 7	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47 48
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47 48
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of reported disabilities among users on Remploy Online	20 20 21 23 45 46 47 48 49 50