An Ecological Model of Rhetorical Fatigue

Examining the Relational Nature of Accommodation Negotiations

in Disability Resource Centers

by

Courtney Caputo

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2024

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes how Arizona State University's disability resource center, Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services (SAILS), impacts access fatigue among students with disabilities. Access fatigue is rhetorical fatigue borne from the continuous need for people with disabilities to perform accommodation negotiations, or requests for practices that will grant them access to certain spaces. This study theorizes access fatigue as an intersection between scholarship about embodied rhetorical fatigue and interactional rhetorical phenomena that occur during accommodation negotiations.

This research is guided by user experience (UX) methodologies, including a textual heuristic analysis of two SAILS documents; stakeholder interviews with students, teachers, and a SAILS representative; and a comparative analysis situating SAILS in relation to other disability resource centers. This thesis frames accommodation negotiations and access fatigue through the lens of institutional relationality and identifies four key dimensions of institutional relationality that affected participants' experiences with access fatigue, including: burden sharing between students and SAILS, misfitting between students and SAILS, institutional culture shaping facilitated by relationships between non-registered stakeholders and SAILS, and institutional access fatigue resulting from design inconsistencies between SAILS and other disability resource centers. To relate this theorization to design practices, this thesis includes UX-informed guidelines for designing disability resource centers that promote fatigue relief through the integration of theories of institutional relationality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a long history of ableism and exclusionary practices toward students with disabilities in the university setting (see: Dolmage, 2017). In an attempt to address this from a legal standpoint, the Americans with Disabilities Act (§12189) required that educational courses be made accessible to students with disabilities, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 mandated that "no otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States [...] shall, solely by reason of his or her disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance," including educational institutions (§504). These laws do not require the establishment of a department dedicated to providing accommodations to students with disabilities. Yet, disability resource centers (DRCs) have become ubiquitous in the university setting. This thesis examines how the institutional presence of DRCs mediates the experiences of students with disabilities.

For the purposes of this study, a DRC is a department within an institution that is responsible for facilitating accommodations for students with disabilities. Although DRCs were historically established as responses to the aforementioned accessibility laws (Madaus, 2011), many universities do not frame their DRCs as solely tools for legal compliance. Some universities claim that their DRCs are services intended to "empower" students with disabilities (OSU Disability Services) or "create a culture of access" in the university community (ASU Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services). These statements broaden a DRC's scope far beyond baseline compliance with

accessibility laws. The existence of departments purportedly intended to empower students with disabilities invites certain questions: do these DRCs address the social and emotional dimensions of life with disability, rather than only the legal dimension? What kinds of empowerment do DRCs currently enable? What additional kinds of empowerment could they potentially enable? This study examines one DRC, Arizona State University's (ASU's) Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services (SAILS), to begin addressing these broad questions from a rhetorical perspective.

This thesis builds upon disability rhetoric theory to analyze the extent to which SAILS addresses access fatigue, a rhetorical phenomenon that mediates lived experiences with disability. Konrad (2021) describes access fatigue as a concept that "outlines the specific demands placed on disabled people to teach others how to participate in access while at the same time confronting their thoughts and feelings about disability" (183). This thesis will outline further definitions of access fatigue and the factors that contribute to it, but a brief summary is as follows: access fatigue occurs because individuals with disabilities are often expected to advocate for their own access, which is a rhetorically arduous and therefore fatiguing endeavor. This rhetorical barrier to access prevents some people from engaging in conversations about accommodations (i.e., accommodation negotiations), which limits their inclusion in certain spaces. In theory, a DRC like SAILS that seeks to empower and include students with disabilities should address this problem.

This is a rhetorically-informed user experience (UX) study that examines SAILS as a service intended to improve disabled students' experiences at ASU. This study examines how a critical understanding of access fatigue can be used to improve DRC

design and how stakeholders' relationships with DRCs complicate the existing model of access fatigue. This inquiry was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do students' interactions with SAILS impact their experiences with access fatigue?

    1. Do interactions with SAILS alleviate access fatigue, and if so, how?

    2. Do interactions with SAILS cause access fatigue, and if so, how?

2. How can SAILS and other DRCs be designed to address access fatigue more effectively?

By exploring these questions, this thesis finds that the relationships between DRCs and various campus stakeholders fundamentally shape the rhetorical ecology in which accommodation negotiations occur. DRCs both alleviate fatigue and introduce institutional contexts that contribute to fatigue. The lens of institutional relationality ultimately provides a framework for design recommendations that address DRCs' affordances and limitations in ways that can promote fatigue relief.

As a note about language, I use both the terms "person with (a) disability/disabilities" and "disabled person" in this text. Person-first language has been championed by scholars from numerous disciplines as a humanizing rhetorical move (Dunn & Andrews, 2015). Meanwhile, Cherney (2019) argues that person-first language "risks reifying negative connotations of disability because it implicitly accepts the ableist idea that disability lessens value" and suggests "that something is wrong with being disabled" (24) (see also: Gernsbacher, 2017). Both language choices are accepted in disability justice work (see: Oswal, 2019), and I use both terms to minimize the harms associated with using only one.

Furthermore, I use the term "accommodation negotiations" throughout this study to refer to the interactional process of requesting and discussing accommodations that will permit or enhance one's inclusion in a particular space. Other scholars have applied different names to this phenomenon, such as "accommodation communication" (Rocco & Ghiaciuc, 2017). However, based on Konrad's (2021) findings, the process of seeking accommodations is negotiative in quality because disabled individuals must reconcile their goals for inclusion with their audience's understanding of disability and access. Accommodation negotiations may be viewed as a precursor to access fatigue because access fatigue is the result of engaging in and deciding whether to engage in accommodation negotiations.

Theoretical Framework: Justice Work Through UX Methodologies

This section outlines the frameworks and assumptions that underlie this work, including the social model of disability, theories of justice work, and the UX methodological approach.

This work is informed by disability theory, and accordingly, I adopt the assumptions and logics of the social model of disability. As opposed to the medical model of disability, which asserts that disability is purely physical, the social model argues that disability is socially constructed (see: Davis, 2013; Cherney, 2019). This does not presume that all physical differences are socially constructed, but rather that the categorization of some differences as 'disabled' and others as 'non-disabled' is socially constructed. Because disability is socially constructed, accessibility is determined by which bodies and minds designers choose to accommodate. Thus, inaccessibility—and therefore, access fatigue, which results from negotiating inaccessibility—is the result of

4

design choices.[1] This means that researchers and designers can engage in justice work by advocating for and implementing design choices that foster accessibility and fatigue alleviation. For the purposes of this study, I adopt Jones and Walton's (2018) model of justice work:

> Social justice research in technical communication investigates how communication broadly defined can amplify the agency of oppressed people—those who are materially, socially, politically, and/or economically under-resourced. Key to this definition is a collaborative, respectful approach that moves past description and exploration of social justice issues to taking action to redress inequities. (242)

While numerous approaches may enable this kind of justice work, I have found UX to be a valuable framework for enacting Jones and Walton's definition of justice because it emphasizes participants' humanity and agency and because it inherently involves a solutions-oriented mindset. To explain these affordances, I begin by defining UX as "a theory and practice that emphasizes the need for functional products that integrate the users' needs and experiences" (Crane, 2022, 10). UX moves beyond whether participants can technically use a product (i.e., usability) and toward "how the user feels as they prepare and actively interact with a product" (Crane, 2022, 10). UX can ultimately be summarized by its methodological value for foregrounding participants' interactions and relationships with a product.

---

[1] In the context of DRCs, I define design choices as decisions made by authorities within DRCs and higher campus departments that affect a DRC's operations, services, language choices, and so on. For instance, DRC design choices include the language used on a DRC's website, the range of services a DRC offers, how the DRC allocates responsibilities to staff members, the methods used to inform teachers about students' accommodation needs, etc.

UX upholds participants' humanity and agency by encouraging designers to "value the experience of users as integral to the design process without negating the users' capability to contribute by assuming that the designer knows best" (Jones, 2016, 474). Jones's work demonstrates that UX is humanizing because it recognizes the value of users' knowledge and lived experiences, and it promotes users' agency by empowering them to contribute to design decisions that directly impact their lives. Jones advocates for narrative inquiry as a design method, noting that "narrative is powerful because it allows all individuals a unique voice" (480). Valuing users' voices is particularly important for underrepresented users because it can lead to designs that recognize their lived experiences and address the difficulties they face. For example, Oswal (2019) argues that UX work involving users with disabilities can honor "multiple ways of knowing," promote holistically accessible design practices that nondisabled designers may overlook, and foster nuanced discussions that challenge inaccessibility and ableism (5). I use UX methodologies in this project because these affordances of UX make it an excellent method for researchers who want to "amplify the agency of oppressed people" through a "collaborative, respectful approach" (Jones and Walton, 2018, 242).

Furthermore, a UX approach is valuable for justice work because it emphasizes turning research findings into action and solutions. As Rohrer (2014) explains, qualitative UX research asks "why and how to fix" a problem (4). This is a more solutions-oriented approach than standard qualitative research, which may be summarized as "an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem" (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, 4). While standard qualitative research can involve a focus on solutions, such a focus is not a prerequisite, as it is for UX research.

Essentially, UX work does not merely attempt to describe individuals' relationships with a particular artifact. Rather, it aims to understand these relationships in order to improve designs. As Oswal (2019) notes, improving designs that impact underrepresented users can challenge "designs that take into consideration only those users who are viewed as normal in the common parlance and whose needs are deemed normative" (6). I have adopted a UX framework for this study because UX's inherent emphasis on solutions embodies Jones and Walton's (2018) call for justice research "that moves past description and exploration of social justice issues to taking action to redress inequities" (242).

Through these justice affordances, UX provides a framework for analyzing rhetorical ecologies in ways that center justice. Edbauer's (2005) model of rhetorical ecologies asks rhetoric scholars to move beyond the fixed concept of a rhetorical situation and see that "public rhetorics do not only exist in the elements of their situations, but also in the radius of their neighboring events" (238). UX shares this value, as it foregrounds the complexity of interactions and relationships between users and products, valuing the prior experiences that users bring with them to a product and the ways that a product shapes users' experiences (see: Still, 2011; Golightly et al., 2011; Hassenzahl, 2018). This becomes particularly clear when considering UX in relation to usability, which attempt to isolate users' interactions with artifacts and do not consider the emotional or relational dimensions of user-product interactions. UX offers methods and principles that can be used to study these ecologies, which guided the methodological and analytic approaches and in this thesis. Overall, by framing this project through a UX lens, I embrace the complexities of rhetorical ecologies while prioritizing users'

perspectives and working to address challenges users' encounter within the ecological context of DRCs.

Statement of Positionality

To orient my own positionality, I am an ASU student with hearing loss. I have never registered with SAILS, although I have considered doing so. My decision not to register for institutional accommodations was partially driven by the belief that it would not be worth the required labor. While I could have registered for accommodations such as preferential seating, I opted instead to arrive at my classrooms early to select an accessible seat, thus avoiding conversations with my teachers and SAILS. In this sense, my decision not to register with SAILS was influenced by a desire to reduce the number of accommodation negotiations I engaged in and to prevent myself from feeling fatigued.

As a student with a disability, I have experienced misfitting, reverse accommodation, retrofits, disclosure, and access fatigue in the university setting. A more detailed description of these concepts can be found in the literature review. However, as a student with a non-visible disability who does not always need accommodations to access a space, I exercise some agency over the decisions to disclose my disability and engage in accommodation negotiations (see: Wood, 2017). In this sense, I recognize that my experiences with access fatigue may be different from the experiences of students who have a visible disability or who could not participate in classroom activities without registering with SAILS. The use of interviews in this project is intended to bring these perspectives to this thesis's discussion of access fatigue in DRCs.

Finally, I address this project's relationship with SAILS. This study valued input from and collaboration with a representative from SAILS in alignment with UX

stakeholder analysis methods. However, this project was completed independently from SAILS, and these findings were not predetermined or suggested by SAILS.

Site of Study: A Brief Profile of SAILS[2]

SAILS is a department within ASU's Educational Outreach and Student Services Department that serves about 10,000 students per academic year across all ASU campuses. Originally named Special Services for Disabled Students, SAILS was established in the 1970s to satisfy legal accessibility requirements. The name was later changed to the Disability Resource Center before finally becoming Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services in 2020 (McCune, 2020). In addition to modifying SAILS's name to center inclusion, ASU has increasingly emphasized SAILS as a symbol of ASU's inclusivity charter (McCune, 2020), and the SAILS homepage indicates that the department works to "create a culture of access and inclusion" on campus. In this sense, ASU currently positions SAILS not as a tool for legal accommodation fulfillment but rather as a tool for the broader inclusion of students with disabilities.

The design choice to center language that promotes access beyond legal requirements makes SAILS a valuable site for this inquiry. In an analysis of fatigue alleviation, it is crucial to study a DRC that operates with a justice or inclusion framework rather than only legal mandates because students do not have a legal entitlement to fatigue relief. By examining the potential for access fatigue alleviation in DRCs, this project argues that DRCs could be tools for addressing some social and

---

[2] Unless otherwise cited, the information in this section was provided by the SAILS representative referenced in this study.

rhetorical difficulties of life with disability. It is therefore important to study a DRC such as SAILS that also recognizes the potential for DRCs to promote access in a broad sense.

SAILS provides the following services: alternative format (e.g., teachers must use formats that are accessible for screen reading software), alternative testing (e.g., extra time on tests), communication access (e.g., a SAILS transcriber will provide real-time captioning), flexible attendance (i.e., excused absences for disability-related reasons), flexible deadlines (i.e., permission to turn in assignments for full credit after the due date), campus transportation services (e.g., a vehicle drives students to their classes), peer notetaking (i.e., accessible notes provided by an assigned classmate), and other accommodations as needed.

SAILS employs about 35 professional staff members and 80 student staff members. The professional staff members have a master's degree or equivalent, typically in social work or disability studies. Both students and professional staff engage in administrative work, convert media into alternative formats, add captions to media, drive transportation carts, and more. Only professional staff members serve as access consultants, or liaisons between students and teachers who answer students' and teachers' questions, oversee students' registration appointments, attend student-teacher meetings as needed, and more. Each access consultant serves about 600 students.

To begin SAILS's accommodation process, students submit a registration form through SAILS's website. The form asks about students' disabilities, accommodations they have received in the past, and accommodations they think they may need in the future. Students are not required to submit documentation of their disabilities with the registration form. SAILS does not always require medical documentation for students

with visible disabilities, such as a blind student who has a guide dog. Students with less

visible disabilities, such as a student with a learning disability, must present medical

documentation before accommodations can be implemented.

After submitting the form, students meet with an access consultant for about one

hour to discuss their accommodation needs. Then, the access consultant sets students up

in the SAILS portal. Each semester, students use the portal to select which classes they

would like to receive accommodations in. SAILS then sends a faculty notification

document to teachers to inform them of students' accommodation needs. This document

addresses common faculty questions about accommodations and provides instructions for

ensuring students can access class materials. Faculty may need to perform certain tasks

after receiving the notification, such as setting students up with more testing time. After

that, SAILS's goal is that faculty and students need to put in minimal work for a smooth

accommodation process. This thesis analyzes the emergence and mitigation of access

fatigue during these stages in SAILS's processes.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Access fatigue exists in a broader ecology of rhetorical fatigues, which may be defined as mental, emotional, and sometimes physical fatigue resulting from the repeated interaction with a rhetorical practice. It is important to emphasize the role of repetition in inducing fatigue, as an argument that is not initially fatiguing can become fatiguing after its circulation or repetition[3] (Rice, 2018). This general concept dates back to classical rhetorical studies, as even the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* argues that "repeat[ing] the same thing precisely [...] would weary the hearers" (IV.XLII.54, as cited in Bradshaw, 2020).

Research about rhetorical fatigue is limited; however, rhetoric scholars have conceptualized fatigue in a few insightful ways. The following section includes a discussion of the factors that may cause fatigue and theorization about how rhetorical fatigue can be addressed or alleviated. Then, to develop a clearer understanding of how accommodation negotiations align with these theories of fatigue, the literature review maps several rhetorical factors that make accommodation negotiations uniquely difficult and fatiguing. This chapter ends by analyzing how theories of fatigue and accommodation negotiations converge into the concept of access fatigue.

---

[3] While circulation is not the same as repetition, the cycle of reengaging with a particular artifact or argument holds true for both. Circulation focuses on rhetorical movement across audiences and contexts, which inherently involves the repetition of an argument (see: Gries & Brooke, 2018). For many disabled individuals, accommodation negotiations are both repeated and circulated, as these negotiations occur in many areas of an individual's life yet require repeated rhetorical moves across various contexts (see: Konrad, 2021).

Causes of Fatigue

Rice (2018) and Bradshaw (2020) attend to the fatigue felt among audiences of exhausting arguments, such as repetitive discussions of gun control and misinformation. This can be characterized as audience fatigue, or fatigue caused by repeatedly hearing, reading, or otherwise engaging with an argument. Both authors ascribe an inevitability to fatigue. For example, Rice applies a bodily metaphor to rhetorical circulation, suggesting that "movement exhausts. Circulation involves bodies that get exhausted. [...] A body inevitably exhausts to the point of death" (283). She argues that argument producers, audiences, and even arguments themselves are subject to this exhaustion. This theorization suggests that rhetorical circulation or repetition is inherently fatiguing. Bradshaw agrees with this assertion, and he indicates that fatigue is a natural response to repeated engagement with an argument. Audience fatigue occurs because engaging with repeated or circulated rhetoric requires labor. An audience must respond to fatiguing rhetoric, such as by producing counter-rhetorical practices or by experiencing an affective response. Performing this labor repeatedly can be frustrating, tedious, and exhausting.

Other scholars have focused on the fatigue that results from repeatedly producing the same argument. This can be characterized as production fatigue. Wiederhold (2008) argues that this fatigue occurs for several reasons, including: the expectation that one will make a certain argument when the context for that argument arises, the insufficiency of language for capturing particular sentiments, and the reality that many instances of fatiguing communication are difficult embodied performances. Wiederhold's theorization suggests that fatigue can result not only from the repetition of arguments but also from the enactment of difficult rhetorical practices. Thus, we can see both repetition and

13

difficulty as causes of fatigue. Wiederhold focuses on how embodied performances present difficult rhetorical demands that induce fatigue, and other scholars' work supports this theory. Thus, I now turn to a discussion of the uniquely fatiguing nature of certain embodied rhetorical acts.

The Fatigue of Performative and Embodied Rhetorical Acts

Butler (1988) notes that "gender is in no way a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts proceed; rather, it is [...] an identity instituted through a *stylized repetition of acts*" (519). Butler's focus is not on fatigue, yet she identifies a critical point for this area of focus: embodied identities (including gender, race, and disability[4]) are built upon repeated patterns. If, as previously outlined, rhetorical fatigue is caused by repetition, then the very act of performing an embodied identity can create the conditions for fatigue. This is particularly evident if one adopts Rice's (2018) view that fatigue is an inevitable result of repetition.

It is important to note that rhetorical moves from individuals whose bodies deviate from the white, masculine, abled norm have a higher performance burden, whereas rhetorical moves from individuals with more normative bodies are seen as professing "universal" rhetorics and experiences (Knoblauch, 2012). This places greater expectations on disabled identity performances, particularly when a disabled identity overlaps with a marginalized racial or gender identity. Cedillo (2018) finds that bodies that contest the white, abled norm incur additional rhetorical labor because rhetorical acts from marginalized bodies are treated with a deficit model. Essentially, while Butler's

---

[4] The social model of disability, as noted in the introduction, demonstrates that disabled identities are embodied performances (see Davis, 2013).

insight about repetitive identity performances demonstrates that all identities involve a degree of performative labor, Knoblauch and Cedillo demonstrate that this labor is particularly difficult for underrepresented rhetors.

Furthermore, while performance is typically seen as an act of rhetorical production, rhetors are also typically exposed to audience reactions to their embodied practices, thus also relating performance to audience fatigue. Novotny (2023) outlines the concept of misconception fatigue, arguing that there is a fatigue associated with repeatedly encountering audiences who are confused about an embodied experience, such as infertility. She notes that "enduring fatigue [in a marginalized body] can be exhausting but also risky, leaving one feeling exposed and vulnerable to verdicts outside of one's control" (200). In this sense, embodied fatigue can result from the lack of agency underrepresented rhetors exert over conversations and cultural logics about their bodies.

Fatigue Alleviation

UX work is concerned with understanding users' challenges to address and perhaps resolve them. Accordingly, to situate fatigue in relation to the UX methodology of this study, I turn to an examination of how scholars suggest rhetorical fatigue can be addressed. A synthesis of various scholars' work reveals two primary models of rhetorical fatigue alleviation; however, there is a need for further research into how these models translate to embodied rhetorical fatigue.

Rice (2018) notes that fatigued publics can become energized by calling attention to the fatigue they feel and seeing the fatigue others feel. She asks, "what might it mean, then, to imagine publics activated by attunement to a widespread exhaustion, felt across bodies all at once? Could we conceive of amplification through exhaustion?" (286). I

15

refer to this concept as the naming model of fatigue relief because it calls for the explicit naming of fatigue. Rice argues that naming fatigue helps contextualize certain fatigues as systemic problems, which helps exhausted individuals see themselves within a similarly fatigued community. This can "activate" these publics to push back against fatiguing rhetorical demands (Rice, 2018, 286).

Duong et al. (2023) discuss the fatigue-alleviating strategy of "venting," which also aligns with the naming model of fatigue relief. The authors find that strategy is valuable because it creates space for community building, aligning with Rice's theory of naming fatigue as a way of organizing energized publics. Duong et al. discuss the affordances of venting as follows:

> Individuals may engage in venting to seek social support (for example, through expressions of empathy from the communication partner), but they may also seek to validate their feelings. This validation is a form of uncertainty reduction in that it seeks information regarding whether their emotions are seen as being appropriate and valid. (269)

Thus, naming fatigue not only connects fatigued individuals to others, but it also helps them see their fatigue as a legitimate problem and not a personal shortcoming. This naming strategy offers an avenue for critical reflection on ableism and the enactment of justice work. For example, Flower (2013) finds that disabled communities can counter ableist logics by organizing together and calling attention to their struggles. Though Flower does not focus on fatigue, her work shows that fatigued audiences can become rhetorical producers who collectively name their fatigue to critically disrupt fatiguing logics and promote a more equitable society.

16

While the naming model of fatigue alleviation is valuable, Duong et al. (2023) identify this model as an "emotion-focused" response that addresses short-term distress rather than a "problem-focused" response that addresses the cause of the distress or fatigue (267-268). Bradshaw (2020) argues that the naming model can exist alongside problem-focused options to disengage with certain fatiguing rhetorical practices. For example, he notes that social media sites can reduce digital users' rhetorical exhaustion from repeated rhetoric by displaying "you're up to date" end-points after a period of scrolling (11). He argues that it is important for users to recognize moments to disengage, thereby reducing their future fatigue. Whereas the naming model of fatigue alleviation is characterized by further action from fatigued individuals (i.e., naming requires communicating about fatiguing problems), the disengagement model calls for fatigued rhetors to remove themselves from situations that require fatiguing action.

Yet, both the naming and disengagement models of fatigue alleviation may not align perfectly with discussions of embodied fatigue. Encouraging underrepresented rhetors to adopt the naming model imposes the expectation that underrepresented groups are responsible for going public about their own marginalization if they want to reduce their fatigue. This may cause additional fatigue, as Lorde (1984) argues that the socially-imposed need for underrepresented groups to represent themselves in public discussions is a "drain of energy" (109).

Furthermore, while Bradshaw (2020) frames disengagement with fatiguing rhetoric as self-care, this strategy may actually harm underrepresented rhetors. As Konrad (2021) notes, people with disabilities sometimes choose to disengage from accommodation negotiations due to fatigue, but this results in their exclusion from certain

spaces. Furthermore, Novotny (2023) argues that when underrepresented rhetors disengage with fatiguing rhetoric about their embodied experiences, it creates opportunities for harmful narratives about their bodies to circulate. This leads to greater fatigue in the long term, as embodied rhetorical practices become even more difficult when audiences have greater misconceptions about underrepresented rhetors. Thus, a practice that works for fatigues not borne from marginalization (e.g., Bradshaw's focus on digital rhetors' fatigue) may have negative outcomes when applied to fatigues borne from marginalization (e.g., access fatigue or misconception fatigue).

The existing models of rhetorical fatigue alleviation primarily focus on actions individuals can take to feel less fatigued rather than ways to disrupt systemic fatigue. This project expands upon this scholarship to understand the role that institutional tools could play in systemic fatigue alleviation. The next section outlines rhetorical difficulties students may experience as they engage in accommodation negotiations, enabling a richer understanding of the kinds of issues DRCs need to address to alleviate embodied fatigue.

Accommodation Negotiations as Fatiguing Embodied Performances

When considered through the lens of fatigue theory, accommodation negotiations become clear instances of fatiguing rhetoric. First, as Konrad (2021) outlines, individuals with disabilities must engage in accommodation negotiations across numerous contexts and audiences, thus making them both a repeated and circulated act. Furthermore, because accommodation negotiations relate strongly to one's identity as a disabled person (Jung, 2007), accommodation negotiations can be considered repeated identity performances. Asking for accommodations implies a bodily difference, which results in a

more complex negotiation process for underrepresented rhetors, according to the aforementioned embodied fatigue scholarship.

This section of the literature review develops an expanded understanding of rhetorical fatigue as it relates to embodied communication about disability. I draw upon disability rhetoric scholarship to identify specific interactions that occur during accommodation negotiations and discuss why these interactions create the conditions for fatigue. While the rhetorical phenomena described here are not the only interactions involved in accommodation negotiations, they offer critical insight into why accommodation negotiations are so fatiguing.

To put it succinctly, accommodation negotiations are difficult and fatiguing because they operate within ableist culture.[5] Advocating for access in ableist culture generally involves repeatedly misfitting, reverse accommodating, retrofitting, and disclosing. In this section, I elaborate on each of these concepts in greater detail.

Misfitting and Reverse Accommodating[6]

Misfitting occurs when an individual tries to fit into the ableist norms of society, but they find that their body and/or mind simply does not align with those norms (Garland-Thomson, 2011). Garland-Thomson emphasizes that a misfit is not an inherent quality of a person with disabilities but rather a description of a relationship, as she

---

[5] Cherney (2019) defines ableism as "ways of knowing, valuing, and seeing the so-called 'abnormal' body as inferior. By extension, ableist discrimination places the 'normal' body at the top of an ideological hierarchy" (8). Engaging in accommodation negotiations relates to the inherently embodied nature of rhetoric, and the rhetor encounters difficulty because their embodied needs and goals are seen as inferior.

[6] I discuss these concepts together because Obermark uses the concept of misfitting to frame reverse accommodation, so her analysis links these concepts. Misfitting and reverse accommodation may be seen as interconnected rhetorical phenomena related to one's internal reactions to inaccessibility.

writes, "the problem with a misfit, then, inheres not in either of the two things but rather in their juxtaposition, the awkward attempt to fit them together" (593). Obermark (2019) directly extends Garland-Thomson's work to the university setting. By highlighting ways that disabled students might misfit in activities common to graduate-level English classes, such as discussions and essays, Obermark illustrates how misfitting impacts students with disabilities. For example, she notes that "a misfit with discussion renders students unfit, unable to 'survive' graduate school," which impacts students' ability to achieve academic and career goals.

Through a theorization of misfitting, Obermark considers the concept of reverse accommodation, in which students with disabilities believe that it is their responsibility to adapt to different instructors' inaccessible course activities. In essence, students with disabilities believe they must correct their misfit. Yet, she finds that reverse accommodation is often ineffective because inaccessibility cannot be overcome by individual willpower, leaving students frustrated and excluded from academic spaces.

Taken together, misfitting and reverse accommodation reflect the difficult internal experiences that precede accommodation negotiations in the university setting. Students misfit in their classes, but they feel they are expected to adapt and fix their misfit. However, many students, such as Obermark herself, continue to misfit. Thus, they need to perform accommodation negotiations to secure access. In other words, they ask the other party involved in a relational misfit to change their practices to correct the misfit. When students ask for accommodations in this way, they may experience shame or frustration because they have failed to reverse accommodate in the way they may be expected to. Essentially, individuals with disabilities go through a series of difficult

internal experiences and negotiations before they even begin negotiating with others about access, meaning they may approach accommodation negotiations with a degree of preexisting fatigue related to their misfitting embodied identity.

Retrofits

Retrofits, as theorized by Dolmage (2017), occur when someone adapts a space or practice on a case-by-case basis to accommodate a person with disabilities, often in response to an accommodation negotiation. Whereas reverse accommodations place the burden of correcting a misfit on the disabled individual, retrofits place this burden on other stakeholders involved in the interaction.

Dolmage frames retrofits with a spatial metaphor. In response to inaccessible steep steps leading to an entrance (which cause a misfit for individuals with mobility challenges), a retrofit might be a ramp at the back entrance. The building is not designed with access in mind, but people with disabilities are not required to reverse accommodate if they want to access the building. By contrast, universal design would involve removing the steps so individuals with mobility challenges can use the front entrance. Dolmage elaborates on the difficulties retrofits pose as they materialize in the classroom setting:

> when the accommodations that students with disabilities have access to, over and
>
> over again, are intended to simply temporarily even the playing field for them in a
>
> single class or activity, it is clear that these retrofits are not designed for people to
>
> live and thrive with a disability, but rather to temporarily make the disability go
>
> away. The aspiration here is not to empower students to achieve with disability,
>
> but to achieve around disability or against it, or in spite of it. (71)

Essentially, retrofitted accommodations cast one's embodied identity as a negative characteristic. As the previous section on the fatigue of embodied performance demonstrated, navigating conversations in which one's identity is marginalized can lead to fatigue. Additionally, as Dolmage outlines, individuals with disabilities must be retrofitted into inaccessible spaces "over and over again" because retrofitting one space or practice does not necessarily affect another inaccessible space or practice (71). This means that students must frequently engage in accommodation negotiations to obtain retrofits, and this repeated rhetorical demand can cause fatigue.

Discussions of retrofits are central to accommodation negotiations because retrofits are inherent elements of the DRC structure. Accommodations are add-ons rather than fully ingrained elements of the course. Furthermore, as Dolmage outlines, retrofits are framed as redesigns which may obscure from teachers' intended 'true' design. Teachers may focus on the 'loss' resulting from the retrofit while failing to see how their class resigns disabled students to an inferior course experience. In general, students seeking accommodations exist in this difficult, retrofitted rhetorical situation, and navigating how to mediate their desire to have the 'full' class experience with their need to use accommodations creates the potential for fatigue.

Essentially, while retrofits can be beneficial responses to misfits because they reduce students' need to reverse accommodate, they also create complex, potentially fatiguing contexts that students must navigate during accommodation negotiations.

Disclosure

Disclosure relates to both identifying as having a particular disability (e.g., disclosing as being deaf) and identifying as a disabled person in general. While not all

accommodation negotiations involve the former kind of disclosure, asking for retrofits involves exposing a misfit, which inherently involves disclosing that one is disabled. Thus, almost all accommodation negotiations involve the latter kind of disclosure.

Though scholarship in this area does not directly address fatigue, research related to disclosure highlights how disclosure aligns closely with theories of fatigue. First, scholars have increasingly theorized disclosure not as a single instance but rather as a repeated, embodied practice. Kerschbaum (2014) writes, "disability self disclosures can be understood as *the culmination of recurring processes* in which past experiences are brought to bear on a present moment" (63, emphasis added). Price et al. (2017) write, "disability disclosure is better understood as *an ongoing rhetorical process* in which faculty members *repeatedly need to address their disability* for various audiences, across many different contexts" (emphasis added). According to Rice's (2018) argument that circulation as inevitably fatiguing, the repeated identity performances involved in disclosure create the conditions for fatigue.

Moreover, certain aspects of disclosure render it a particularly vulnerable and frustrating process. Kerschbaum (2014) illustrates that the process of disclosure involves being read and labeled, potentially in ways which the rhetor does not want. Moe (2012) notes that concealing one's disability is often necessary in maintaining one's credibility and being rhetorically effective. He argues that "being able-bodied, strong-voiced, and handsome" are key factors in being perceived as rhetorically effective (446). Moe shows that this embodied definition of rhetorical effectiveness existed in ancient Rome and has persisted to the modern day. Disclosure, therefore, opens one up to the risk of being seen as rhetorically weak according to deeply ingrained ableist cultural logics. Meanwhile, not

23

disclosing and therefore "maintaining the able-bodied public persona requires copious amounts of energy" (Valeras, 2010). Thus, both disclosing and choosing not to disclose create difficult rhetorical situations that can lead to fatigue.

Ultimately, this scholarship demonstrates that the decision of whether to disclose is difficult, as individuals must decide whether exposure to stigma is worth a retrofit. When individuals choose to disclose their disabilities, they experience embodied vulnerability. Given that disclosure of a general disabled identity is required to expose a misfit and receive accommodations, the repeated need to face stigmas and judgments about one's body during accommodation negotiations creates the conditions for fatigue.

Access Fatigue

As the previous sections have demonstrated, there are clear intersections between theories of fatigue and scholars' work in disability rhetoric. Few disability rhetoric scholars explicitly incorporate fatigue as a lens in their work, but such a lens offers an insightful reading of their work. Konrad (2021) does offer direct attention toward the fatigue of disabled life. She constructs a definition of access fatigue that aligns strongly with work in rhetorical fatigue and accommodation negotiations, defining it as "the everyday pattern of constantly needing to help others participate in access, a demand so taxing and so relentless that, at times, it makes access simply not worth the effort" (180). This indicates that access fatigue is a product of the repeated experience of performing access work (i.e., accommodation negotiations).

Although Konrad's findings synthesize work in the areas of fatigue and accommodation negotiations, her work is not grounded in these areas. She turns to multiple disciplines to develop an understanding of several key rhetorical phenomena that

explain access fatigue, including microaggressions, parallels between Burrows's (2016) concept of "the Black tax" and disabled life, the feminist theory of hammering (Ahmed, 2016), and power imbalances in relationships between accommodation recipients and accommodation providers (Mingus, 2017). In addition to these interdisciplinary lenses, this thesis suggests that rhetorical fatigue and the aforementioned disability rhetoric concepts are useful for understanding access fatigue and its potential alleviation.

For example, the interactional disability rhetoric concepts discussed in this literature review provide nuance to Konrad's central framework in which she identifies four elements of accommodation negotiations that make them particularly fatiguing:

> Access requires (1) inventing a disabled self that is suitable for public engagement, an activity that can involve (2) confronting audience reactions to disability, which can re-inform a disabled person's own sense of self and be so taxing that they need to preserve their own energy by (3) weighing the value of each exchange and (4) teaching others how to participate in access. (Konrad, 2021, 182).

While Konrad does not directly discuss misfits, reverse accommodation, retrofits, or disclosure, these concepts may be considered building blocks for the components of access fatigue in her framework. In other words, a performance of a disabled self is not necessarily a rhetorical act on its own. Rather, this performance involves interactions, such as negotiating whether one can reverse accommodate, disclosing one's identity as disabled, categorizing the misfit one experiences, and so on. Konrad's framework provides analytic themes that summarize interactional patterns during accommodation negotiations, but these themes can also be viewed according to the specific actions and

experiences implicated in each accommodation negotiation. Konrad's work enables solutions-focused UX researchers to ask questions such as: how can designers reduce fatigue that results from confronting audience reactions to disability? Meanwhile, recognizing the rhetorical building blocks of her framework enables UX researchers to ask: how can designers reduce fatigue that results from encountering stigmas after disclosing a disability, reacting to beliefs that retrofits detract from 'true' designs, and so on? Both questions are valuable, yet the latter question delineates more specific scenarios that designers can target in their efforts to reduce fatigue. Therefore, this thesis explores accommodation negotiations by considering both Konrad's analytic framework and the interactional phenomena implicated in accommodation negotiations.

Fatigue theory may also provide practical approaches for research about access fatigue alleviation. Konrad argues that understanding the aforementioned four-part framework can cultivate habits for access-oriented audience behaviors, such as "inviting engagement with difference" and promoting "uptake and transfer of access-oriented practices from one situation to another" (196). Adopting these habits is an important end goal, but Konrad does not offer specific means by which we can work toward this goal. While initial descriptive work on access fatigue may not require identifying actionable paths forward, scholars who want to view access fatigue through Jones and Walton's (2018) view of justice should move "past description and exploration of social justice issues to taking action to redress inequities" (242). Fatigue theory introduces models of fatigue alleviation that are currently imperfect but offer actionable starting points that share the goals of Konrad's habits of mind.

For example, a goal of "inviting engagement with difference" is to shape a culture that is more receptive to narratives of different struggles. Similarly, through an integration of Flower's (2013) work, the naming model of fatigue advocates for going public about fatigue as a way of shaping a culture that recognizes others' experiences of fatigue. Further, Konrad's goal of transferring practices across contexts seeks to minimize the need for individual accommodation negotiation interactions (i.e., make access more universal), which aligns with the disengagement model of fatigue by valuing a reduction in overall access labor. As previously noted, these models apply imperfectly to embodied fatigue relief, thus warranting further study. However, these models enable researchers who value Konrad's habits of mind to see more actionable starting places for cultivating these habits among communities. For example, rather than asking "how can designers help communities develop habits for promoting the 'uptake and transfer of access-oriented practices from one situation to another?'" we can ask, "how can designers help rhetors disengage with fatiguing accommodation negotiations without forfeiting access?" Answering the latter question can help researchers address the big ideas reflected in the former question. Yet, the latter question focuses on immediate desired results rather than overall goals, so it may be a more helpful place for designers and researchers to begin.

Overall, Konrad's approach to access fatigue is valuable because she performs important descriptive and analytical work. I argue that seeing access fatigue at the intersection of fatigue theory and accommodation negotiations is also a valuable way to understand this concept, especially in the context of UX design research because it enables designers to ask more targeted and actionable questions. This thesis builds upon

Konrad's descriptive work in access fatigue by recognizing both Konrad's framework and the theories discussed in this literature review as ways of integrating the concept of access fatigue into practical design choices.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Approaches

This study consists of three approaches: textual analysis, interviews, and comparative analysis. The textual analysis is a heuristic evaluation used to understand how SAILS's design may affect certain aspects of accommodation negotiations. This evaluation was followed by interviews with stakeholders to collect data about their experiences interacting with SAILS. Finally, the comparative analysis maps several DRCs' language and features to understand how the textual analysis and interview findings may relate to other DRCs, which facilitates a series of recommendations for how DRCs can more effectively alleviate students' access fatigue.

Textual Analysis

First, I performed a textual analysis of two documents involved in SAILS's accommodation process: the student registration document and the faculty notification document (FND). The first page of each of these documents can be found in Appendices B and C, respectively. The registration document is an online form students complete as the first step in the process of determining their eligibility for accommodations. Because this document involves students asking SAILS for help securing access, this document is an instance of students performing accommodation negotiations with SAILS. Therefore, I analyzed this document as a site in which students might experience fatigue.

The FND is an informational letter SAILS sends to a teacher at the beginning of a semester. The document informs the teacher of the accommodations a student should receive and how to implement those accommodations. Each teacher receives a separate

document for each student in their class who needs accommodations. Because the document asks the teacher to take actions that will promote access, the FND is an example of SAILS performing accommodation negotiations on behalf of the student. I analyzed this document as a tool that could be used to replace some students' accommodation negotiations and relieve access fatigue.

The textual analyses were guided by the UX method of heuristic evaluation, wherein a researcher holistically walks through a process users undergo and takes evaluative notes (Buley & Anderson, 2013). Konrad's (2021) four-part access fatigue framework served as the theoretical framework for the heuristic evaluation. Essentially, because these documents are instances of accommodation negotiations, I analyzed the documents' specific rhetorical practices to understand where access fatigue may occur or be alleviated. The specific coding processes involved in this analysis are described later in the data analysis section.

Interviews

While there are numerous UX methods that can be used to understand participants' experiences as they use an artifact, I selected the interview method, as it has multiple affordances recognized in UX and rhetorical research. Interviews help researchers attain "grounding in an understanding of user goals" (Buley & Anderson, 2013, 127) and collect data about experiences that cannot be readily observed (Wilson, 2013), such as accommodation negotiations and internal experiences of fatigue. Additionally, in alignment with the justice framework of this project, interviews allow researchers to put underrepresented participants' voices at the forefront of research (Wood, 2017; Jones, 2016).

This thesis includes ten 30-minute interviews with various stakeholders (seven students, two teachers, and one SAILS representative). The interviews were informed by UX stakeholder analysis methods, wherein researchers collect narrative data from multiple perspectives to understand how a diverse range of users and designers interact with an artifact (Buley & Anderson, 2013). The interview participants are the primary individuals who typically interact with the SAILS documents in the textual analysis. SAILS designs both documents, students fill out the registration document, and teachers receive the FND.

The student interviews provided narratives about students' interactions and relationships with SAILS. This data was used to evaluate whether and how access fatigue materializes in students' academic experiences. While the teachers could not decisively comment on whether their students experienced fatigue, they described the kinds of interactions they had with students about accommodations. I sought to learn about teachers' general experiences with SAILS because they are users of this institutional tool, and any challenges they face in providing accommodations could lead to ineffective accommodation practices and access fatigue. Finally, interviewing a SAILS representative clarified SAILS's goals, challenges, and approaches. This provided context for the design choices made in the registration document and FND.

The interviews were semi-structured, derived from both traditional semi-structured UX interview methods (Wilson, 2013) and co-constructive rhetorical interview methods that view participants as contributors rather than subjects (Selfe & Hawisher, 2012). As an example of this approach, I asked students a series of prewritten questions and unscripted follow-up questions that fostered the construction of narratives about their

experiences registering with SAILS, communicating with SAILS, and performing accommodation negotiations with their teachers. To promote the co-construction of knowledge, I defined access fatigue near the end of the interviews and asked participants to reflect on whether they identified as fatigued. By introducing fatigue at the end of the interviews, I ensured that students were not primed to focus on fatigue. However, discussing fatigue with students enabled them to share their perspectives and reflect on whether access fatigue accurately described their experiences. Furthermore, I gave each participant the opportunity to offer insight into how they believe SAILS could be designed to address their needs more effectively, thereby recognizing them as collaborators in the UX process.

Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis was informed by the UX method of comparative or competitive assessment, which involves identifying artifacts similar to the one being analyzed, identifying categories or frameworks through which to compare the artifacts, analyzing each artifact according to the categories, and condensing this information into a usable map or summary (Buley & Anderson, 2013, 140-143). University DRCs served as the artifacts of analysis in this approach. Importantly, this comparative analysis is not intended to critique these DRCs but rather to map commonalities and divergences in their language and practices. The objective of this analysis is to better understand the landscape of American DRCs and inform this project's DRC design recommendations.

This analysis includes DRCs from eight universities: Arizona State University, Florida State University, Ohio State University, the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Minnesota, the University of California Los Angeles, the University of

Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and Michigan State University. These schools were chosen because they are public, R1 universities with large student populations, and therefore, they are somewhat similar to ASU. The primary categories of analysis were language (e.g., what names do DRCs give their departments?), explicit values (e.g., do DRCs identify values like equality or inclusivity as central to their operations?), and process design (e.g., how do students register with the DRC?).

This analysis drew upon two sources of information available on DRCs' websites: the description of the registration and faculty notification process and the introductory or mission statement. The analysis of DRCs' process fostered an understanding of how SAILS's operations compare to other DRCs' operations. For example, this analysis sheds light on what accommodations various DRCs offer and what kinds of labor inputs are required during the registration process (e.g., attending meetings). This provides context for how this thesis's discussion of access fatigue in SAILS's processes may translate to practices at other DRCs. The introductory statement, usually visible on the DRC's homepage, allows for an understanding of how SAILS's treatment of access and disability differs from other DRCs. The text also provides insight into a DRC's perceived role within a university. For instance, citing a desire to spread awareness about access issues implies that a DRC seeks to go beyond individualized classroom retrofits. Although the DRCs often contained descriptive text beyond the initial introductory statement (e.g., in FAQs), I only analyzed the introductory statement because it indicated what the DRC sees as most central to its operations.

The comparative analysis addresses a key problem in UX work that Crane (2022) notes, which is the lack of generalizability in a UX study. By situating SAILS in relation

to other DRCs, I allow for a more informed understanding of how the values and practices of SAILS identified in the textual analysis and interviews relate to the values and practices of other DRCs. This enables me to present a list of recommendations for DRCs with an understanding of how their purposes and processes compare to SAILS. Essentially, although this study is not inherently generalizable, the comparative analysis allows my SAILS-specific findings to be more useful for other DRCs.

Participant Recruitment and Demographics

The teachers and SAILS representative were recruited via email. I identified teacher participants by randomly selecting a sample of teachers from the ASU faculty list. I reached out to three teachers and conducted interviews with the two who responded. I contacted SAILS via email, and I was connected with a high-ranking representative who agreed to an interview.

Ideally, UX participants would be randomly selected; however, due to the private nature of SAILS registration, I was not able to randomly select student participants. Students were primarily recruited through ASU's new participant recruitment tool, Research + Me. This tool connects student participants and researchers in an online platform with the goal of increasing community engagement with research. I posted a brief description of my study to the site with language focusing on improving DRCs rather than fatigue to avoid priming my participants with discussions of fatigue. 33 students signed up for this study on Research + Me, and I randomly selected 12 to contact. Five of these students agreed to participate in an interview. In addition, two students were recruited through a Department of English promotional email. A total of seven students participated in this study.

In general, the teacher and student participants represent diverse backgrounds. Both teachers have been teaching at ASU for over ten years, so they have extensive experience with SAILS. Teacher A primarily teaches a business behavioral class that focuses on group work and class presentations. The primary accommodations students use in her class are flexible attendance and flexible deadlines. She teaches about 35-50 students per class, with about five students registered with SAILS in each class. Because her classes are upper division, most of her students have been at ASU for over one year.

Teacher B teaches several mandatory freshman classes in the School of Arts, Media, and Engineering. Her classes are large lecture halls with about 300 students in each class. She said that about a dozen students in each class are usually registered with SAILS. Whereas Teacher A mostly interacts with students who have used SAILS before, Teacher B interacts with many students are using accommodations for the first time. Thus, the teachers were able to provide insight about their communications with numerous students in different fields and with different levels of familiarity with SAILS.

The student participants identified as having various physical and mental disabilities, including mobility disabilities, autism, bipolar, diabetes, and anxiety. The following SAILS services were used by students represented in this sample: flexible attendance, flexible deadlines, optional Zoom attendance, DART transportation assistance, permission to have full-time enrollment status with fewer credits, notetaking, alternative format, extra time on tests, and permission to record class sessions. Some students had been registered with SAILS for years, some had been registered for only a semester or two, and one was actively going through the registration process.

This sample included students who identified as Hispanic, White, Native American, and Asian. The majority of student participants took ASU courses in person, but two took classes online. The sample included two early academic career students, three upper division students, and two graduate students. Five students identified as female, and two identified as male.

Data Analysis

Most of the data analysis in this thesis involved a coding scheme based on Konrad's (2021) four components of accommodation negotiations that contribute to access fatigue, as discussed in the literature review. To briefly summarize and name the components, access fatigue consists of: (1) a performance of a disabled self, (2) exposure to audience reactions or expectations, (3) weighing the value of each exchange, and (4) pedagogical work. I used this framework to identify and classify elements of accommodation negotiations, which offers a consistent way of tracking experiences of access fatigue in the documents and student interviews. The following section outlines the application of this framework to the data and other methods used in the data analysis.

Textual Analysis

As is consistent with both the heuristic evaluation method (Buley & Anderson, 2013) and traditional qualitative data analysis methods (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015), I coded the textual analysis documents based on a coding scheme that categorized content according to Konrad's (2021) framework. Coding chunks consisted of about one sentence, and I conducted a separate pass of each document for each code. The following section outlines the coding definitions for each document.

Registration Document. I coded this document for instances in which students

performed components of accommodation negotiations. The coding definitions can be

found in the table below.

Table 1

Registration Document Coding Definitions

Code	Definition
Performance of a disabled self	Instances in which this text asks students to construct a disabled identity within the expectations of the document (e.g., instances in which students were expected to construct histories of their experiences with disability).
Exposure to audience reactions	Instances in which SAILS confronts the student with their expectations about access and/or disability (e.g., by defining which disabilities are considered eligible for institutional accommodations).
Weighing the value of each exchange	All rhetorical moves that require labor on the part of the student (e.g., instances in which students were asked to call their medical providers as part of the registration process).
Pedagogical work	Rhetorical moves that require students to educate SAILS or another entity about how their practices can be modified to be more accessible.

As a note about the third component, I recognize that not all labor is overly

burdensome for students, and thus, not all labor will induce access fatigue. However, the

labor expected in this document is work that students need to engage in to secure access,

thus requiring students to weigh the value of each interaction. I coded every instance of

labor demands because each instance could create the conditions for access fatigue in

individuals with varying degrees of tolerance for access-related labor.

Although this document contains numerous rhetorical moves, I broke the moves

into two categories: language/wording choices and modal/design choices. Language

coding chunks consisted of about one sentence. Modal elements were defined as any shift

in modality. For example, the shift from written text to a multiple-choice selection represents a modal shift. For each of the components of accommodation negotiations, I conducted a pass of the document to identify language choices that fit into the category and a pass to identify modal choices that fit into the category.

Faculty Notification Document. I coded this text for instances in which the document performed the components of accommodation negotiations, thereby potentially reducing a student's need to engage in those conversations and creating opportunities for access fatigue alleviation. Codes were assigned according to the following definitions:

Table 2

Faculty Notification Document Coding Definitions

Code	Definition
Performance of a disabled self	Instances in which SAILS constructs a disabled identity for the student (e.g., by defining a student as "unable" to complete certain tasks and therefore disabled).
Exposure to audience reactions	Instances in which SAILS predicts teachers' responses and defends students' need for access (e.g., by addressing potential concerns teachers may have about implementing flexible attendance in their classrooms).
Weighing the value of each exchange	Instances in which the document enables SAILS staff, teachers, or the document itself to engage in labor or exchanges that the student would otherwise need to engage in to ensure access (e.g., by asking teachers to contact SAILS rather than students with general questions). This code generally reflects outcomes that would have otherwise needed to come from student negotiations, which supplants students' need to weigh the value of accommodation negotiations.
Pedagogical work	Instances in which SAILS educates faculty about disability, access behavior, how to provide accommodations, and what SAILS is (e.g., by informing teachers about how to adapt documents to accessible formats).

There were fewer modal shifts and interactive elements in this form than in the SAILS registration document; therefore, this form was only coded for textual and language elements.

Interviews

For all interviews, I chunked content based on statements that encapsulated a specific idea. When a participant expressed the same idea repeatedly in one dialogue exchange, it counted as only one code. Coding chunks that encapsulated an idea were usually 1-4 sentences, depending on an individual's speech patterns. I conducted a separate pass of each transcript for each code.

Student Interviews. For the student interviews, each component of accommodation negotiations was further coded as demonstrating either alleviation or fatigue. An alleviation code represents students' access fatigue being reduced by SAILS, and a fatigue code represents students experiencing access fatigue at ASU. The coding definitions were as follows:

Table 3

Student Interviews (Alleviation) Coding Definitions

Code	Definition
Performance of a disabled self	Instances in which students expressed that SAILS made it easier for them to present as disabled (e.g., when students did not need to disclose their specific disabilities to teachers to receive accommodations).
Exposure to audience reactions	Instances in which students expressed that SAILS made it easier to encounter expectations and cultural logics on campus (e.g., when students said that the FND made their teachers more receptive to accommodation negotiations).
Weighing the value of each exchange	Instances in which students expressed that SAILS reduced the labor required for access so they did not need to weigh the value of

	engaging in accommodation negotiations (e.g., when students were given accommodations without needing to talk to their teachers).
Pedagogical work	Instances in which students expressed that SAILS educated others about accommodations so students did not need to (e.g., when SAILS educated teachers about how to implement specific accommodations).

Table 4

Student Interviews (Fatigue) Coding Definitions

Code	Definition
Performance of a disabled self	Instances in which students struggled with their embodied identity presentation (e.g., when students felt uncomfortable identifying as disabled by registering with SAILS).
Exposure to audience reactions	Instances in which students encountered or prepared to encounter members of the campus community expressing ableist ideas (e.g., when students' teachers told them that accommodations may be unfair).
Weighing the value of each exchange	Instances in which students were required to consider whether access labor was worth the result (e.g., when students needed to talk to their teachers to successfully implement accommodations).
Pedagogical work	Instances in which students educated their teachers about access (e.g., when students explained how to make flexible attendance work in a particular class).

Although the students discussed experiences of access fatigue outside the university setting, I only coded instances of alleviation and fatigue in the university setting. When students expressed comparisons between SAILS and outside settings, I included those ideas in the coding because the ideas related to SAILS (e.g., when a student said that the accommodation registration process at her workplace required less effort than the SAILS registration process).

Teacher Interviews. The teacher interviews were initially coded according to Konrad's (2021) framework; however, this was a limited way to analyze the teacher

interviews because access fatigue involves a student's "internal rhetorical experience" that teachers cannot describe (Konrad, 2021, 186). In a second round of coding, teachers' statements were coded according to their FND-aligned and misaligned reactions toward students' accommodation negotiations and their successes and challenges while accommodating students. Understanding teachers' alignment and misalignment with the FND helps clarify the degree to which the FND's theoretical persuasive capacities materialize in real teachers' beliefs about disability. Further, quantifying teachers' successes and challenges with accommodations contextualized their perspectives during accommodation negotiations. The coding definitions are listed below.

Table 5

Teacher Interviews Coding Definitions

Code	Definition
Successes	Instances in which teachers expressed that SAILS made it easier for them to implement accommodations into their classes (e.g., when conversations with an access consultant helped the teacher understand what accommodations a student needed).
Challenges	Instances in which teachers struggled during communications with SAILS or students (e.g., when teachers had difficulty contacting access consultants after encountering a question about accommodations).
SAILS-Aligned	Instances in which teachers expressed ideas that reflected a specific argument in the FND (e.g., when teachers expressed that it was reasonable to change their typical grading practices to accommodate a student).
SAILS-Misaligned	Instances in which teachers expressed ideas that diverged from a specific argument in the FND (e.g., when teachers suggested that it was solely the student's responsibility to ensure their own access).

Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis began with a thorough exploration of each DRC website while taking notes to identify notable language choices, value statements, and

practices on each website. After collecting this general data, the information was

condensed into discrete categories for mapping (Buley & Anderson, 2013). Essentially,

the categories summarized my observations from the website exploitation. Each DRC

was evaluated as fulfilling or not fulfilling a criterion. For example, for the criterion of

using the term "disability" in the DRC's name, DRCs who use the term received a light

blue "yes" code and DRCs who did not received a red "no" code. These colors were

chosen because their high contrast is generally considered favorable for viewers with

visual impairments. The following sections outline the criteria selected for this analysis.

  Registration and Faculty Notification Process. To analyze the DRCs'

operational practices, I coded for the following criteria, which were selected based on an

understanding of the features present in SAILS's registration and faculty notification

process and observations from the website exploration.

- use of a registration form at any point in the process

- use of a registration form as the first step in the registration process

- use of a meeting in the registration process

- whether DRC representatives were given an institutional name (e.g., access consultants)

- whether the DRC representative's title includes the term "disability"

- whether testing, captioning, interpreting, and physical access were included as services (categories grouped together because these are legally required services)

- whether flexible attendance was included as a service offered

- whether flexible deadlines were included as a service offered

- whether the DRC sent a FND to teachers.

42

Introductory/Mission Statement. I coded the introductory statement by noting whether the following features were present in the text. These criteria were chosen because they reflected rhetorical moves observed on SAILS's page or notable moves present on other DRCs' pages. They also provided insight into DRCs' roles within the university (e.g., the "stated goal of spreading awareness" criterion indicates that a DRC seeks to go beyond individual accommodations).

- a mention of equality

- a mention of access and/or inclusion

- a stated goal of spreading awareness about inclusivity and accessibility issues to the broader campus community

- a stated goal of changing campus culture to be more inclusive or promoting holistic accessibility changes

- a mention of improving accessibility for all parts of campus, rather than only academic spaces

- the term "disability" used in the DRC's name

- the term "access/accessibility" used in the DRC's name

- a qualification or modifier in the term "students with disabilities" or equivalent phrase (e.g., *eligible* students with disabilities or students with *documented* disabilities)

After assigning yes (blue) and no (red) codes, I quantified DRCs' alignment with SAILS in each category. Finally, I considered how the textual analysis and interview data relates to these findings, leading to an understanding of what other DRCs can learn about ASU students' experiences with accommodation negotiations and access fatigue.

43

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Table 6

Textual Analysis and Student Interview Coding Results

	Performance of Disabled Self	Exposure to Audience Expectations	Weighing the Value of Each Exchange	Pedagogical Work	Total
Registration Doc: Textual	17	5	8	0	30
Registration Doc: Modal	3	5	3	0	11
Registration Doc: Total	20	10	11	0	41
Faculty Notification Document	11	24	12	24	71
Student Interviews: Alleviation	15	12	37	4	68
Student Interviews: Fatigue	29	14	47	6	96

Figure 1

Comparative Analysis Map: Registration and Faculty Notification Processes

	ASU	FSU	OSU	UT Austin	UMN	UCLA	UIUC	MSU	
Registration form?									8 yes (including SAILS) 0 no
Registration form as first step?									7 yes (including SAILS) 1 no
Meeting?									7 yes (including SAILS) 1 no
Specific DRC representative named? (e.g., access consultant)									7 yes (including SAILS) 1 no
"Disability" in representative name?							x		2 yes (including SAILS) 5 no 1 N/A (no DRC representative named)
Testing, captioning, interpreting, physical access?									8 yes (including SAILS 0 no
Flexible Deadlines?									3 yes (including SAILS) 5 no
Flexible Attendance?									4 yes (including SAILS 4 no
Services listed beyond the above?									5 yes 3 no (including SAILS)
Use of Faculty Notification Document?									8 yes (including SAILS) 0 no

Figure 2

Comparative Analysis Map: Introductory/Mission Statements

	ASU	FSU	OSU	UT Austin	UMN	UCLA	UIUC	MSU	
Name of DRC	Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services	Office of Accessibility Services	Disability services	Disability and Access	Disability Resource Center	Center for Accessible Education	Disability Resources and Educational Services	Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities	
Goal of spreading awareness for university community?									5 yes (including SAILS) 3 no
Mention of equality?									4 yes 4 no (including SAILS)
Mention of access/inclusivity?									4 yes (including SAILS) 4 no
Discussion of changing campus?									4 yes (including SAILS) 4 no
Mention of access for all parts of campus? (As opposed to academic spaces only)									6 yes 2 no (including SAILS)
"Disability" in name of DRC?									5 yes 3 no (including SAILS)
"Access" in the name of DRC?									4 yes (including SAILS) 4 no
Qualification/modifier before "students (with disabilities)"?									3 yes 5 no (including SAILS)

Discussion

I analyze students' experiences with fatigue through the frame of institutional relationality, which highlights how the interactions between students, DRCs, teachers, and other stakeholders shape and are shaped by individuals' relationships with the DRC. This discussion makes visible the ways that DRCs affect the rhetorical ecologies of institutional accommodation negotiations and impact students' experiences with access

fatigue. Ultimately, I argue that we should view accommodation negotiations within DRCs through the lens of institutional relationality because it helps us see the complexities of how fatigue operates in DRC settings.

First, I define institutional relationality. Through the lens of rhetorical ecologies, we can see that relationships are "sustained by the amalgam of processes, which can be described in ecological terms of varying intensities of encounters and interactions" (Edbauer, 2005, 231). Thus, individual interactions build to trans-situational relationships. While relationships are often thought of as connections between people, UX research highlights how users and products have complex relationships formed through user-product interactions (Hassenzahl, 2018). For example, a student who interacts with SAILS via the registration document develops a relationship with SAILS. This relationship is refined through further interactions with SAILS, interactions with others about SAILS, and so on. For the purposes of this study, "institutional relationality" refers to the pattern of these trans-situational connections that exist in the rhetorical ecology of DRCs. In sum, we can see relationality through a series of building blocks: a relationship is an aggregate of individual interactions, and institutional relationality is an aggregate of relationships with a DRC.

While Konrad's (2021) work in access fatigue offers a valuable framework for identifying and classifying accommodation negotiations, her work is limited in institutional contexts because it primarily views access as an exchange between a person with disabilities and a person who can perform a retrofit. This thesis argues that institutional relationality significantly complicates accommodation negotiations and access fatigue, which invites us to see these concepts as tied to and shaped by

relationships within institutions. This discussion recognizes the value of Konrad's framework by signaling which components of her framework are primarily implicated in certain dimensions of relationality; however, this discussion also notes areas in which Konrad's framework is incomplete without considering the relational dimensions involved in institutional accommodation negotiations.

The following sections discuss four key dimensions of institutional relationality that affected participants' experiences with access fatigue, including: burden sharing between students and SAILS, misfitting between students and SAILS, institutional culture shaping facilitated by relationships between non-registered stakeholders and SAILS, and institutional access fatigue resulting from design inconsistencies between SAILS and other DRCs. These themes reflect ways that institutional relationality both caused and alleviated fatigue. Rhetorical ecologies are inherently messy; therefore, although each discussion section attempts to isolate particular interactions and relationships within SAILS's ecology, it should be noted that these dimensions of relationality overlap. Each section header and introduction include framing language as an attempt to articulate the divergences and interactions between these sections. Each section also includes a recommendation, offered as a UX-informed guideline for designing DRCs that promote fatigue relief through the integration of theories of institutional relationality.

Burden Sharing: Fatigue-Alleviating Relationality Between Students and DRCs

This section analyzes how the relationships between students and SAILS affect the labor input required from students during accommodation negotiations. Konrad's (2021) model of access fatigue places the burden of labor solely upon the disabled

individual, who must perform all four fatiguing elements of her accommodation negotiation framework. However, participants in this study shared the labor of accommodation negotiations with SAILS. Specifically, the FND and access consultants performed the general rhetorical work of access on behalf of students, which exemplifies fatigue-alleviating burden sharing through institutional relationality. In particular, this relational affordance of DRCs alleviates fatigue in the audience expectation, weighing the value of each exchange, and pedagogical work components of the coding framework.

The textual analysis offers clear examples of how burden sharing is enacted. While the exact code counts are slightly variable, it is notable that the FND was coded for total accommodation negotiation performances 30 times more than the registration document. Ostensibly, this suggests that SAILS performs significant rhetorical work for students while requiring less total work from them. Yet, there is minimal overlap between the kinds of accommodation negotiations that these documents engage in. For example, after multiple passes of the registration document, I coded zero instances of pedagogical work required of students, while pedagogical work was the most common negotiation act in the FND. Meanwhile, the registration document had about twice the number of rhetorical moves that constructed a disabled identity for the student than the FND.

This data supports the notion that students and SAILS both perform rhetorical work for access, albeit in different ways (i.e., they share labor). For example, the heuristic evaluation tracks the circulation of arguments about misfitting from a student's identity performance in the registration document to SAILS's pedagogical work in the FND. The registration document asks students to discuss their personal misfit or how their disability "impacts [them] in an educational environment." Constructing a narrative about one's

misfit is an act of disabled self-performance on the students' part because it asks the student to situate their embodied identity in relation to a societal norm. The FND also includes themes of misfitting, but these discussions of misfitting support other kinds of rhetorical work. For instance, in the FND, SAILS situates notetaking in relation to a misfit by stating that this accommodation is for "a student who is unable to take their own notes, has a disability that impacts their ability to take full/comprehensive notes, or other challenges with securing notes in the same format as their peers." After describing the misfit, the FND provides instructions on how teachers can recruit student notetakers in their class by posting an announcement, thereby implementing accommodations to address the misfit. By discussing the student's misfit in this way, the FND builds on students' rhetorical work in the registration document to address the pedagogical demands of access without requiring students to engage in this rhetorical labor. This shifts the burden of certain fatiguing elements of accommodation negotiations from the student to SAILS.

Ultimately, some components of accommodation negotiations may require labor from an individual seeking access, such as an individual's performance of a disabled self. Without the student describing their misfit or history with disability, SAILS would not know they need accommodation assistance. However, other components primarily address an audience's needs, and they are not necessarily dependent on being performed by the individual seeking access. For example, this category includes pedagogical work to teach an audience member how to recruit notetakers. The registration document primarily asks students for the former kind of rhetorical work, while SAILS primarily

performs the latter kind of rhetorical work in the FND. This suggests that students and SAILS play different roles in undertaking the labor of accommodation negotiations.

Konrad (2021) indicates that rhetorical labor is necessary for access, as she states that "access *requires*" the four components of accommodation negotiations (182, emphasis added). The presence of each code in the overall textual analysis indicates that retrofitted access may indeed require these components. However, the distribution of these components across both the registration document and the FND suggests that students and DRCs can share the rhetorical burden of access. That is, in settings mediated by a DRC (i.e., settings involving institutional relationality), students are not necessarily the only negotiator during accommodation negotiations. Student A noted that SAILS takes on audience-related rhetorical burdens, which alleviates fatigue. She described how the FND allows her to approach accommodation negotiations with her teachers: "I'm not having to justify literally every little thing. It's already justified for me. [...] It makes life a lot easier." Konrad focuses on the repeated, fatiguing process of having to "justify every little thing." However, the lens of institutional relationality shows how institutional rhetors can participate in justification work to make access less rhetorically fatiguing for individual rhetors (i.e., how DRCs "make life easier").

Students' and teachers' narratives further illustrate how institutional burden sharing occurs in stakeholders' lived experiences. For example, access consultants were noted as significant contributors to fatigue relief through burden sharing. Student A recounted an instance at her previous school in which "there was an issue with my accommodations, and there was no one to back me up" because the school did not have access consultants. She added that at ASU, "having someone there to help either guide

50

me or actually do it for me is really helpful." Here, Student A is describing both a supportive institutional relationship ("backing up") and burden offloading ("actually doing it for her"). These layered affordances of an institutional relationship played a significant role in reducing the fatigue involved in her accommodation negotiations.

The teacher interviews further illuminate how access consultants can reduce the number of accommodation negotiations students engage in. For example, Teacher A did not know how to accommodate a student, and she was worried about "putting him on the spot," which may be seen as concern about making him engage in rhetorical work to secure access. The teacher met "extensively" with an access consultant who understood the student's needs and who provided strategies that the teacher could implement to ensure the student could participate in class. This ultimately led to a smooth accommodation process that the student did not need to participate in. In this sense, the student did not need to encounter audience expectations, educate his teacher about accommodations, or weigh the value of speaking with his teacher. Rather, the access consultant performed much of this rhetorical work for him, leaving him to "focus on [his] education and mental health," as Teacher A framed it.

This burden shifting relationality between students and SAILS is important because it can enable the disengagement model of fatigue relief without limiting students' access to their education. When disabled individuals bear the sole responsibility of accommodation negotiations, as in Konrad's (2021) model, disengagement with fatiguing rhetoric involves forfeiting access. However, Student A's and Teacher A's examples indicate that SAILS performed rhetorical work for students, enabling them to secure access while also disengaging from certain accommodation negotiations.

51

As another example of fatigue alleviation through burden sharing, students'

relationships with SAILS also led them to share the burden of representational

vulnerability with SAILS. In some cases, this fostered the naming model of fatigue.

Consider this quote from Student D:

> When I'm mentioning [accommodations] to my friends, I'm kind of advocating for
>
> the resource [SAILS], not so much saying my personal experience with it because
>
> I don't like to share my issues. And I don't, but I do see them, and I hear some of
>
> them are struggling. I tell them there is this resource and I use it, and it helps me
>
> stay on track.

In this instance, the student used SAILS as a tool to name and validate her peers'

struggles (i.e., the naming model of fatigue alleviation) with less emphasis on going

public with her own personal experiences. Rather than foregrounding her own identity as

a symbol for disability-related struggles, as Flower (2013) identifies as a limitation of

going public, Student D shifted the burden of representing the disability community to

SAILS. Thus, through burden sharing, DRCs can enable both models of fatigue

alleviation discussed in the literature review without the noted limitations. This invites

future research engagement with institutional dimensions to fatigue relief, and it further

challenges viewing access fatigue in institutional settings through the individual model.

***Recommendation: Allow students to opt out of general accommodation negotiations,
thereby enabling more agentive burden sharing.***

When possible, DRCs should allow students to choose if they would like their

teachers to initially contact them or an access consultant if teachers have questions. For

example, in the portal where students designate which teachers should receive FNDs,

DRCs can also let students assign a primary point-of-contact for their teachers' accommodation questions. This design recommendation aligns with the UX value for designs that recognize differences in individuals' relationships with a particular tool and let users agentively use a tool for various purposes (see: Getto & Flanagan, 2022).

Some participants did not mind having long conversations with their teachers about their accommodation needs. For example, Student B valued being "very open and honest to tell my instructors about my difficulties" because she found that it fostered positive relationships between her and her teachers. Others found these conversations frustrating and burdensome. Student D reported that she engaged in accommodation negotiations that were highly impersonal. She said that these conversations consisted of merely referring to a prewritten student-teacher accommodation agreement, encountering a teacher's concerns that accommodations were unfair to other students, and explaining what flexible attendance accommodations entailed at the definitional level. She expressed frustration over having these conversations, stating "I wish we didn't have to educate the professors because that's not our job." Thus, if given the option, she would prefer that her teachers speak to an access consultant, which shifts her labor burden to SAILS.

The differing perspectives among students indicate that DRCs do not necessarily need to take on all the accommodation negotiation labor from all students, as students like Student B find value in performing that labor. However, some students, like Student D, would prefer that DRCs take on more work. I argue that students should be able to designate whether teachers should contact them or an access consultant first because this would let students with varying interactional preferences offload varying degrees of rhetorical labor through institutional burden sharing.

53

This recommendation does not suggest that students who ask their teachers to primarily communicate with a DRC will never need to discuss accommodations with their teachers. Rather, this recommendation reflects a move toward granting students more agency over how often they engage in accommodation negotiations and encounter the possibility of access fatigue.

Student Misfitting: Fatiguing Relationality Between Students and DRCs

The previous section indicated that registering with a DRC may require a degree of labor input from students in the self-performance component of accommodation negotiations, such as the disclosure of an academic misfit to alert SAILS to the fact that they need accommodations. However, this does not mean that each self-performance code is a necessary instance of fatiguing rhetorical labor. This section delves deeper into this code to analyze misfitting as one of the potentially avoidable challenges students encountered while trying to engage in self performances in the registration document.

Hassenzahl (2018) offers a UX lens for seeing misfitting as an outcome of interactions with a product. He writes, "a product designer 'fabricates' a character by choosing and combining specific product features" (303). When users interact with a product, "the fit of the apparent character and the current situation will lead to consequences, such as a judgment about the momentary appealingness of the product, and emotional or behavioural consequences" (303). In essence, DRCs construct a character (also referred to as a norm or an ideal user), and students must negotiate their fit with this character during their interactions with the DRC.

SAILS constructs an ideal user as inherently a disabled student, which results in fatiguing misfits for some students. The registration document defines all applicants as

disabled through questions such as "how might your disability affect you in a college environment?" While reflecting on this language, Student C said, "I guess when you see it on paper, you know, 'your disability,' it's kind of discouraging, like I lack something." He added, "I don't want to be considered disabled," but he eventually acknowledged that receiving SAILS accommodations played a role in making him "understand that [he has] a disability." This experience illustrates how misfits emerge from interactions. SAILS's language implies that all students who face barriers to access are disabled, which constructs an ideal user as a disabled student. While Student C faced barriers to access, he did not initially identify as disabled. In his interactions with SAILS, Student C was confronted with SAILS's construction of an ideal user, and he evaluated his misfit with their norm. Student C eventually performed a reverse accommodation for SAILS by identifying as disabled to align with SAILS's normative user. Student C's relationship with SAILS informed his embodied performance, as he directed his identity toward relational fits with SAILS. In this sense, it would be erroneous to consider students' self-performances in institutional contexts as inherently separate from their relationship with a DRC. This adds nuance to Konrad's (2021) description of how a disabled self-performance is fatiguing, but it also illustrates her larger point that individuals are expected to adhere to audience norms and expectations to secure access.

Other student participants declined to perform reverse accommodations for their identities and continued to identify as nondisabled despite being registered with SAILS. However, this also resulted in fatigue by causing students to repeatedly negotiate their misfit with SAILS. For example, Student G, who has autism and diabetes, repeatedly emphasized that he is "not as disabled" as "someone in a wheelchair," which was his

55

envisioned model of a normative disabled student. Although he is registered with SAILS,

he argued that it "doesn't make sense for [him] to be in SAILS" and that he would feel

more "morally justified" registering with SAILS if he used a wheelchair. Student G's

belief that he does not belong in SAILS indicates that he is continuing to grapple with a

misfit in his identity performance in relation to SAILS. His strong language illustrates the

confusing and fatiguing experiences that both he and Student C described. Ultimately,

they experienced a misfit with their academic environments, rendering them "disabled"

by ASU's norms, in which the definition of disability is the nonconformance of a mind or

body to a particular norm (see: Dolmage, 2014). This led them to register with SAILS.

Yet, these students felt that their identities were not sufficiently disabled to conform to

SAILS's norms either, leading them to experience another misfit. This left them in an

institutional limbo, as their identities did not seem to fit anywhere.

My study only included students who had registered with SAILS, indicating that

participants who did not identify as disabled either performed reverse accommodations or

continuously suffered misfits to ultimately receive accommodations. However, Teacher

A noted that some of her students did not want to register with SAILS because "they're

apprehensive about being marked as a student with a disability." This suggests that some

students might not receive accommodations at all because they are uncomfortable with

the requirement to perform a disabled identity to register with SAILS.

Teacher A's concept of a student being "marked" by their relationship with

SAILS may be a useful framework for understanding why misfitting is such a fatiguing

aspect of a relationship with a DRC.[7] Konrad (2021) discusses the theme of marking through the example of a woman with a visual impairment who uses a white cane to navigate. Konrad reflects on how access technologies can call attention to (i.e., mark) one's disability, which can create a sense of fatigue due to embodied vulnerability. In a world in which stakeholders equate DRC registration with being disabled, DRC registration can be seen as a more abstract version of Konrad's participant's white cane. Disclosing one's registration with a DRC (e.g., by having SAILS send the FND to one's teacher) marks someone as disabled. This may expose a student to stigma and negative attitudes from their teachers, as the literature on disclosure outlines. Yet, it also causes some students to engage in repeated internal reflections over what this mark means for their identity. For example, Students C and G struggled to reconcile their identities as nondisabled with the mark of disability that they believed SAILS gave them. Seeing students' relationships with DRCs through the lens of marking demonstrates that the misfitting involved in a student-DRC relationship is not a single interaction in the registration document but rather an ongoing process in which students carry the DRC's relational mark—and their corresponding misfit with that mark—through various external and internal negotiations.

Essentially, by framing students' reason for needing accommodations as a "disability," SAILS caused some students to experience a misfit and marked them with

---

[7] The notion of being "marked" has negative connotations, so I caution the application of this word in other contexts. However, I use the term "marked" here for two primary reasons: 1) it centers a participant's language, thus enabling her knowledge to contribute to this theorization and 2) Student C and the students described by Teacher A do seem to view their DRC-related identity as negative, so this word centers their perspectives. For future discussions of how relationships with a DRC affects one's identity as disabled/nondisabled, it may be better to suggest that DRCs "associate" students with disability.

an identity that caused them discomfort. These students' experiences indicate that DRCs can impose the fatigue of embodied performance onto students. That is, students' interactions with a DRC can involve complex and fatiguing identity construction inputs in the context of DRC-imposed norms. I argue that some of this fatigue is not a necessary component of the DRC registration process, and the following recommendation outlines how DRCs can reduce misfits by expanding their definition of an ideal user.

Recommendation: Do not require students to identify as disabled to access official accommodations, thereby promoting linguistic inclusivity and reducing opportunities for misfitting.

In UX, Postel's law asks designers to "be empathetic to, flexible about, and tolerant of any of the various actions the user could take or any input they might provide" (Yablonski, 2024). As the previous section outlined, SAILS does not flexibly incorporate identity inputs from students who do not identify as disabled, which causes fatiguing misfits. The following recommendation outlines how DRCs can use language that is more inclusive for all students who need to register with a DRC. This can reduce the misfitting-related fatigue students experience during the registration process and foster easier relationships between some students and the DRC.

There are several ways that DRCs can reduce the misfitting involved in institutional relationality, including strategies SAILS does well. For one, DRCs may adopt departmental names that focus more on access and inclusion than on disability, such as ASU's Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services or UCLA's Center for Accessible Education. Five of the eight DRCs in this analysis use the term "disability" in the departmental name, which rhetorically constructs an institutional tool

that exclusively serves students with disabilities. SAILS only includes the term "disability" within the registration form, yet even this caused some students to misfit, as previously described. The name of a DRC is important for several reasons. For one, seeing the name of the DRC is often the first interaction students have with a DRC, and thus, it is the beginning of their relationship with a DRC. Immediate misfits with a DRC may set an unhelpful tone for this relationship. Furthermore, naming is important because the DRC name can become synonymous with the "mark" of the DRC. For example, Teacher A referred to students in her class who are registered with SAILS as "SAILS students." When DRCs use the term disability in their name, this can more pronouncedly mark students as disabled by explicitly adding the word "disability" to stakeholders' descriptions of students. Thus, changing DRCs' names to emphasize access rather than disability can be an important step toward reducing fatigue caused by misfitting during an embodied identity performance for the DRC.

Additionally, DRCs can use language in the registration process that is inclusive for both people who proudly identify as disabled and people who are uncomfortable doing so. For example, SAILS uses phrases such as "barriers you are facing to accessing your education" in certain parts of the registration document. Using this language consistently throughout the registration process can be more inclusive for students with a variety of disabled/nondisabled identities. For example, SAILS could shift the language in the registration document from the current question of "how does your disability affect you in a college environment" to "what barriers to access do you face in a college environment?" This leaves room for students who identify as disabled to discuss their disabled identity. Meanwhile, students who do not identify as disabled can focus on what

kinds of access assistance they need. In other words, this language allows for more identity inputs. Other DRCs can analyze their own rhetorical practices to see where they signal their expectations of normative users, and they can consider whether they could use language that fits with more identities, which can lead to fewer misfitting opportunities and less fatigue.

The intent of this recommendation is not to erase the word disability from academic spaces. Indeed, a key linguistic choice in this thesis was to use the term "disabled" because Cherney (2019) argues that using the term disrupts the idea that disability is a problem. Entirely erasing language about disability may have the effect of causing a misfit among students who identify as disabled. These students should not be required to disregard their disabled identity to receive institutional accommodations, nor should they be led to believe that DRCs consider their disabled identity a problem. Thus, while DRCs should not require students to identify as disabled to receive accommodations, they can encourage students who identify as disabled to embrace their identity. When students express that they identify as disabled, DRC representatives can use the terms "disability" and "disabled" during their initial appointments and follow-up meetings with students. To learn whether students identify as disabled, DRCs may directly ask students this question in the registration document. Alternatively, I gave students the option to share their "disability or condition" in the interviews as a move toward linguistic inclusivity. Students who identified as disabled, such as Students F and E, responded with phrases such as "my disability is," while students who did not identify as disabled, such as Students C and G, tended to simply say "I have autism" or otherwise

state their diagnosis without labeling it as a disability. The initial meeting and registration process may involve asking questions like this to understand how students identify.

Overall, this recommendation offers ways that DRCs can be more useful for students with a variety of embodied identities. Just as the burden sharing recommendation asked DRCs to let students exert agency in terms of their labor sharing with the DRC, the goal of this recommendation is to let students set the terms of their identity in relation to the DRC.

Institutional Culture Shaping: Fatigue-Alleviating Relationality Between Non-Registered Stakeholders and DRCs

While this discussion has focused on the relationships between registered students and SAILS, there is also a degree of relationality between SAILS and other campus stakeholders, such as non-registered students and teachers (hereafter referred to as non-registered stakeholders). SAILS's relationship with a non-registered stakeholder may be built upon a series of direct interactions with SAILS (e.g., a teacher reading the FND) and indirect interactions with SAILS (e.g., a student hearing their friend talk about SAILS). Ultimately, some registered student participants had easier, less fatiguing interactions with individuals who had a relationship with SAILS. This enabled both the disengagement and naming models of fatigue alleviation, primarily through the audience expectation category of the coding scheme. This section begins by discussing how SAILS may affect non-registered stakeholders' responses to access-related interactions[8] (i.e.,

---

[8] While most of this thesis focuses on interactions that can be clearly classified as accommodation negotiations, this section discusses some conversations between stakeholders that relate more to general themes of access or disability, such as stakeholders' responses to seeing someone use assistive technology. I use the term "access-related interactions" to describe these situations.

how the relationship between SAILS and non-registered stakeholders works). Then, I outline the fatigue-alleviating affordances of the rhetorical ecology SAILS helps shape through its relationships with non-registered stakeholders.

One key way that SAILS shapes the rhetorical ecology of on-campus accommodation negotiations is by signaling cues about institutional values. Student A said, "I think [SAILS] has a very underlying presence in the way, like ASU's attitudes influence student attitudes [...]. Because ASU was accommodating, then the students will hopefully pick up on that from those cues and be more accommodating." This observation suggests that individuals receive cues during their interactions with institutions, and these cues map onto other interactions.

While it can be difficult to pinpoint exactly which interactions with SAILS influence stakeholders' attitudes, SAILS clearly signals several access-oriented cues to non-registered stakeholders. For example, SAILS hosts the Access Zone, an optional training for faculty, staff, and students that educates stakeholders about the importance of universal design and access. The SAILS Representative clarified that this training is intended to provide access-oriented cues, as he said that this training should "help people see things differently and increase their awareness so that they can do something to improve access and inclusion." Further, the FND includes a cue for shaping access culture, as it ends by telling teachers, "we look forward to working with you in support of the University's ongoing effort to create an accessible and inclusive campus community." Given its location in the emphatic position, this statement can be read as essentially an implication statement for the entire FND. This text signals to teachers that the purpose of implementing the accommodations outlined in the FND is to foster a more accessible and

62

inclusive institutional culture. This provides an access-oriented framework through which teachers can view their accommodation practices. Thus, while it would be erroneous to say that design choices like the training and FND language necessarily cause stakeholders to place a greater value on access and inclusion, it is evident that SAILS intentionally promotes this cultural value during interactions with stakeholders. Based on the understanding that interactions build up to relationships and cultural ecologies (Edbauer, 2005), it is reasonable to believe that SAILS's repeated access-oriented cues during interactions with non-registered stakeholders may contribute to an overall more accepting ecology of campus-based accommodation negotiations. This does not mean that relationships with SAILS are the only factors contributing to this rhetorical ecology but rather that these relationships circulate across individual interactions in meaningful ways.

Whereas the previous section on burden sharing primarily discussed ways that SAILS took on rhetorical labor students could otherwise perform (e.g., educating teachers on how to implement notetaking accommodations), this section demonstrates how institutions can perform culture-shaping labor that is extremely difficult or impossible for students. Konrad (2021) argues that accommodation negotiations between individuals are fatiguing because these interactions yield very little cultural change toward access and require "re-entering situations where [rhetors have] not made much progress" in shifting their audiences' views of access (195). However, the FND is sent to thousands of ASU teachers each semester, and SAILS hosts trainings intended to serve the entire ASU community, meaning the reach of SAILS's arguments and pedagogy is far greater than the reach of an individual student talking to a handful of teachers. In other words, each SAILS interaction can have greater "progress" in exchange for less total labor input than

63

individual interactions (Konrad, 2021, 195). Student A noted this progress as she reflected on how access-related interactions differed between ASU and off-campus settings, such as stores. She said that these interactions outside ASU are "just harder because I think people outside of the university setting don't have the same views of what disability is and what it means to have it." Some participants repeatedly noted that campus culture seemed different from off-campus culture regarding access, which they generally attributed to SAILS's cultural impact. Overall, this illustrates the unique role institutions play in affecting the ecology of accommodation negotiations.

Student A expressed that the relative ease of accommodation negotiations in the university setting was a source of fatigue relief through the disengagement model because she did not need to worry as much about "having to justify [her] existence" to non-registered stakeholders. It is important to emphasize the *relative* ease of campus-based interactions, as Student A still recounted her challenges with identifying as disabled in campus settings. Nevertheless, she argued that these issues were heightened outside campus. For example, she said that she felt vulnerable while entering a classroom with a cane, but she found this vulnerability more "weird and interesting" than outright harmful because of SAILS's underlying effects on non-registered stakeholders' beliefs. While this was not necessarily an easy situation for her, she said it was easier than a time when she used a motorized shopping cart at a grocery store, and someone asked her "how dare you use the chair [cart]?" because Student A did not appear disabled. Ultimately, Student A argued that audiences who had relationships with SAILS (i.e., campus audiences) provided easier access-related interactions because they adopted more positive cultural

logics about access and inclusion, so she felt that she needed to perform less audience-related labor. This reflects fatigue relief through the disengagement model.

In addition to making access-related interactions seem generally easier, ASU's campus culture also influenced whether students engaged in access-related interactions at all. For example, Student D noted that her audience's relationship with SAILS had a significant impact on whether she disclosed her condition to them. She said, "with school friends [i.e., audiences with SAILS relationships], I do mention SAILS, but when they're family friends and stuff, I don't mention SAILS because I don't want them to know I have a disability." She attributed this disclosure choice to the sense that SAILS gives her disability more "legitimacy." Essentially, she believed that SAILS's presence and cues primed her audience to be more receptive to her discussion of access issues, so she felt more comfortable discussing these issues. Thus, Student D's decisions to engage in access-related interactions were significantly influenced by her audience's relationships with SAILS, wherein audiences within SAILS's institutional scope offered less fatigue-inducing contexts for these interactions.

As a result of a rhetorical ecology in which she felt more comfortable disclosing her condition, Student D was able to adopt the naming model of fatigue relief. Student D said that she avoided discussing her condition with her family and family friends to avoid exposure to stigma, leaving her mental health struggles and any potential shared fatigue within her off-campus community as an unaddressed secret. However, she was more open about her experiences during conversations with her friends at ASU. She said, "I'd hear some of them [her friends] are struggling. I tell them there is this resource [SAILS], and I use it and it helps me stay on track." In this sense, Student D attuned her friends to

the fact that their challenges with inaccessibility were shared. The previous section on burden offloading outlined how Student D's naming of fatigue was made easier by her ability to offload the burden of representing the disability community; however, it is evident that her actions were also motivated by her perception that a SAILS-related audience would be more open to discussions of mental health struggles.

Student D's description of her conversations with her friends at ASU further emphasizes the importance viewing access-related interactions as relational and ecological. Student D believed SAILS positively impacted interactions even in situations that did not involve a FND, an access consultant, or any explicit rhetorical production from SAILS. Student D's discussions with her friends are technically exchanges between individuals; however, they were significantly influenced by the institutional context of SAILS because Student D indicated that she would not have engaged in these interactions with audiences who did not have a relationship with SAILS. In addition to illustrating the theory that rhetorical practices are situated within ecologies of context rather than isolated instances (Edbauer, 2005), this discussion encourages fatigue-conscious DRC designers to consider a broad definition of who uses and interacts with DRCs. While registered students (and teachers, to a degree) may be considered the primary users of a DRC, this analysis indicates that non-registered stakeholders also have relationships with DRCs that are relevant to discussions of fatigue.

Recommendation: Seek out interactions with non-registered stakeholders that offer institutional value cues, thereby improving the rhetorical ecology in which accommodation negotiations occur.

66

Still (2011) advocates for UX designers to imagine a broad range of potential users and complex contexts that could affect experiences with a product. Aligning with this call, this recommendation asks DRCs to recognize non-registered stakeholders as part of DRCs' user ecology in order to ultimately improve registered users' experiences. As a general design principle, I argue that DRCs should increase the number of interactions they have with non-registered stakeholders. It is also important for the DRC to use these increased interactions to promote institutional cues that can improve access-related interactions between non-registered stakeholders and registered students.

SAILS identifies building "awareness in the university community" as a central part of its role, essentially taking a direct approach to engaging with non-registered stakeholders. Design choices that reflect this approach can be seen through SAILS's access trainings, informational webinars, SAILS representatives' participation in diversity conferences hosted by the ASU Staff Council, and more. While I previously noted that it can be difficult to directly tie these design choices to cultural shifts, engaging with faculty and community members in this way increases SAILS's interactions with community members, which increases the overall institutional relationality on campus. Four other universities in the comparative analysis share SAILS's language about engaging with the university community, while the other three focus more on implementing retrofits and do not mention community engagement as part of their mission. I urge all DRCs to see interactions with non-registered stakeholders as a central part of their role in alleviating fatigue.

Seeing DRCs as a relational tool for the campus community could involve DRC attendance at campus events, visits to classrooms, networking with campus clubs and

67

stakeholders to ensure that activities are accessible, and other ways of building a strong

campus presence. These kinds of interactions can strengthen the DRC's relationships

with non-registered stakeholders, potentially leading to greater awareness of access

issues, more responsive audiences for accommodation negotiations, and ultimately

reduced fatigue among registered students.

In addition to simply increasing the number of interactions between non-

registered stakeholders and a DRC, DRCs should leverage their increased presence to

offer cues that disrupt fatiguing cultural logics. Student D recounted an instance in which

her teacher responded to her accommodation negotiation by saying "I do want to be fair

to the other students." Student D expressed that she felt fatigued while responding to this

argument. This exemplifies a cultural logic that accommodations give students an unfair

advantage. This logic arose several times in my interviews with stakeholders. The FND

does not directly address this logic, meaning there is not necessarily a clear institutional

cue for campus community members to follow regarding the theme of fairness. Thus, the

SAILS FND may benefit from including more direct cues about fairness to disrupt this

fatiguing logic, such as by adding text that states, "accommodations afford students a fair

chance to access their education rather than giving them an unfair advantage."

Prominent cultural logics at ASU may not be the same as prominent cultural

logics at other schools; therefore, this recommendation should not be viewed solely as a

suggestion that DRCs discuss fairness in their FNDs. Rather, this recommendation asks

DRCs to pay attention to the fatigue-inducing cultural logics that may be circulating in

their campus's community. DRCs can identify cultural logics through formal interviews

with stakeholders, ethnographic observations at campus events, surveys sent to teachers,

and other relevant methods. After identifying prominent cultural logics, they can work to disrupt the logics, such as by addressing the logics in the FND, developing trainings designed to challenge the logics, distributing informational materials about the logics, and so on. Essentially, this recommendation asks DRCs to tailor their interactions with non-registered stakeholders to the localized contexts of campus culture, as this will allow them to offer institutional cues that, if adopted, will lead to the most fatigue alleviation.

Institutional Access Fatigue: Fatiguing Relationality Between Students, SAILS, and Other DRCs

The previous sections have focused on the rhetorical ecology of accommodation negotiations within ASU. However, rhetorical ecologies expand beyond the scope of one institution. In comparison to the previous sections, this section takes a more global approach to understanding participants' interactions with SAILS during the registration process by seeing these interactions as contextualized by students' relationships with other DRCs. Almost every student participant in this study had a relationship with another DRC: at least two had been registered with DRCs at another college, at least two had received accommodations through their high school, and at least four had received workplace accommodations. The following section describes how inconsistent practices across these DRCs resulted in fatigue caused by engaging in difficult and repeated institutional accommodation negotiations across a highly varying ecology of DRCs. I refer to this as institutional access fatigue. This may be considered a distinct, institutionally-situated manifestation of the fatiguing need to weigh the value of each exchange, as seen in the coding scheme.

69

I frame this section through the UX principle of Jakob's Law, which states that "people leverage previous experience [mental models] to help them in understanding new experiences," and the need to learn how to use an artifact can distract the user from using the artifact to achieve their goals (Yablonski, 2024). As a general guideline, Yablonski encourages designers to model their products based on industry standards that users are familiar with to ensure that users can transition smoothly between products. However, when the comparative analysis maps are evaluated through the lens of this principle, a problem arises: the DRCs in this analysis are sufficiently similar to be considered an "industry" with certain standards, but many design choices are highly variable, meaning that there is no industry standard for DRC designers to follow in these areas.

Figure 1 of the comparative analysis map essentially describes the industry standards of R1 university DRCs. That is, the similarities in certain categories across the horizontal rows in figure 1 show that registration meetings, testing accommodations, faculty notification documents, and other elements are part of the standards of R1 university DRCs. These standards allow us to distinguish DRCs from other university departments and see DRCs as a unique "industry" or category across universities. Recognizing this standard is a central assumption of this thesis, as this project's general recommendations for DRCs would be meaningless if DRCs were not part of an institutional genre.

Although the categories in figure 1 are relatively uniform, figure 2 looks like a patchwork of different design decisions regarding the DRC's role and rhetorical practices. Most rows in figure 2 have a fairly even number of yes/no codes, indicating that there is not a strong DRC consensus over the standard design choice in each

category. Through the patchwork nature of this map, we can see that DRCs are far from monolithic institutions. For example, some DRCs center disability in their titles, others center access, and some center both. Additionally, some DRCs take on an active role as institutional culture shapers, while others limit their impact to classroom retrofits. These differences are not surface-level inconsistencies. As the section on misfitting discussed, the name of a DRC plays a role in shaping students' relational fits with a DRC, which can significantly impact fatigue. Further, as the section on institutional culture shaping discussed, a DRC's interactions with the campus community can play an important role in shaping a fatigue-alleviating campus culture. Thus, these differing design decisions may have significant consequences on students' experiences with fatigue.

The comparative analysis was initially intended to highlight standards that SAILS adheres to or deviates from, which would provide context for how this thesis's findings might transfer to other DRCs. However, one of the most notable results of the comparative analysis is that few categories have sufficient consensus to determine whether SAILS's practices reflect standard DRC practices. Yet, this comparative analysis only includes DRCs that theoretically should be somewhat similar, as they are all DRCs at public R1 universities with large student populations. This map does not account for the potential patchwork variation across workplace DRCs, DRCs at two-year colleges, governmental access tools, and more. The comparative analysis helps us see that even the theoretically narrow category of public R1 DRCs consists of localized entities with highly varying expectations, roles, rhetorical practices, etc.

Students' narratives give voice to the fatiguing experience of navigating this patchwork map as they seek access in various areas of their lives. For example, Student F

expressed frustration over the sense that "every organization's expectations are different." She repeatedly emphasized the fatigue she experienced while trying to determine what documentation she needed to verify her disability for SAILS. She said, "I didn't get a special achievement letter that says 'hello, you have hypermobility Ehlers Danlos' [...] so it can be harder to know exactly what each group or whatever wants because what my work wants may not be what SAILS wants." In this sense, she understood documentation as a standard feature of DRCs, but she was frustrated by the lack of consistency in practices and expectations within this standard. As another example, Student A, who is also an ASU employee, experienced fatigue as she navigated the various requirements for receiving employment accommodations. ASU employment accommodations are overseen by ASU's Human Resources office rather than SAILS, and Student A noted that going through both these accommodation systems was "difficult and confusing." She gave the examples of being able to find information about SAILS's registration process but not the ASU HR department's process, struggling with major differences in the accessibility of the DRCs' separate websites, and needing to figure out a different form submission process for each DRC. In essence, she was confronted by a lack of industry standards even within ASU's DRCs. These students describe an experience of fatigue borne from the repeated need to relearn access expectations and practices during interactions with every DRC before they can even begin experiencing the access benefits of DRCs. In this sense, access fatigue in DRC settings may include the cognitive labor of learning and processing new mental models during initial interactions with DRCs.

Ultimately, the inconsistent nature of providing institutional accommodations requires labor from students as they attempt to learn each DRC's requirements rather than transferring mental models across contexts. As participants indicated, this labor is repetitive and difficult, and therefore, it is fatiguing. As designers work to shape positive interactions between students and DRCs, they should see their choices as part of the ecological patchwork of DRC industry standards, or the lack thereof.

Recommendation: Network with other campus-affiliated accommodation providers to ensure consistency and interdepartmental familiarity, thereby reducing students' need to learn new access systems individually.

Institutional access fatigue is not a problem stemming from a single DRC's practices but rather from the pattern of difference in the ecology of DRCs. Thus, there may not be an easy solution for individual DRCs who wish to address this issue. Nevertheless, the following recommendation helps DRCs see how they can improve experiences of institutional access fatigue within contexts they can control.

As previously indicated, Student A experienced institutional access fatigue as she attempted to navigate the differences in SAILS's and ASU HR's registration processes. However, she said that her fatigue was slightly alleviated because her SAILS access consultant was familiar with the HR department's policies and answered her questions. This points to the potential for DRCs to share the burden of institutional navigation in addition to the aforementioned burden sharing during accommodation negotiations. That is, DRCs and their representatives can perform some of the exploratory work involved in developing relationships with a new DRC and make this process easier for students.

73

When possible, DRCs can network with campus accommodation institutions to make websites and required forms parallel in structure, train their employees to be able to answer questions about other departments' accessibility practices, and more. Depending on the DRC's local context, they can also network with major student employers or other local accommodation services so that access consultants can answer questions about off-campus DRCs students frequently interact with. This would let students offload the burden of understanding multiple accommodation institutions to the DRC. In all these scenarios, the ultimate design goal is to reduce the fatiguing labor burden students take on as they navigate institutional access systems alone.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis gives DRCs a way of conceptualizing their relationships with student

users as a rhetorical support system. The recommendations in this discussion give DRCs

a way of integrating theories of institutional relationality into design practices that

intentionally work toward fatigue relief.

Ultimately, engaging with students' experiences of fatigue through the framework

of institutional relationality uncovers the complex interactions involved in the daily

navigation of DRCs. Participants' experiences with institutional relationality paint DRCs

as complicated, rhetorically messy sites. For example, DRCs are institutions designed in

response to misfitting, yet they construct norms that cause other forms of misfitting. For

another, DRCs have burden shifting and culture shaping capabilities that can reduce

students' access fatigue, but to benefit from these affordances, students must first engage

in potentially fatiguing embodied performances and navigate the inconsistent ecologies of

DRCs. Essentially, the fatigue-related affordances and limitations discussed in this study

overlap at times; however, this is not a limitation of the framework of institutional

relationality but rather a reflection of a messy, under-researched site of rhetorical

engagement.

I argue that this messiness is a rich area of rhetorical inquiry because engaging

with DRCs gives us frameworks and language to understand the messiness students

encounter daily. Further, by recognizing the centrality of stakeholders' experiential

knowledge to this research, scholars and designers can continue foregrounding

stakeholders' capacity to influence the institutional designs that impact their lives. By

engaging with students and continuing to analyze the rhetorical phenomena implicated in

DRCs, we can ultimately develop more actionable, justice-oriented frameworks for

addressing the rhetorical messiness of institutional access.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2016). An affinity of hammers. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, *3*(1-2), 22-34. https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334151

Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12189 (1990). https://www.ada.gov/law-and-regs/ada/#subchapter-ii---public-services-title-ii

Bradshaw, J. (2020). Rhetorical exhaustion and the ethics of amplification. *Computers and Composition, 56*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102568

Buley, L. & Anderson, S. (2013). *The user experience team of one: A research and survival guide.* Rosenfeld Media.

Burrows, C. (2016). Writing while Black: The Black tax on African American graduate writers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, *14*(1). 15-20. praxisuwc.com/burrows-141

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal, 40*(4), 519-531. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3207893

Cedillo, C. (2018). What does it mean to move?: Race, disability, and critical embodiment pedagogy. *Composition Forum, 39.* compositionforum.com/issue/39/to-move.php

Center for accessible education. University of California at Los Angeles. https://cae.ucla.edu/

Cherney, J. (2019). *Ableist rhetoric: How we know, value, and see disability*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Crane, K. (2022). Out of industry, into the classroom: UX as proactive academic practice. In K. Crane and K. C. Cook (Eds.) *User Experience as Innovative Academic Practice* (pp. 3-23). University Press of Colorado.

Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, D. J. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.

Davis, L. J. (2013). Introduction: Normality, power, and culture. In L. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (4th ed., pp. 1-16). Routledge.

Disability and access. University of Texas at Austin. https://community.utexas.edu/disability/

Disability resource center. University of Minnesota. https://disability.umn.edu/

Disability resources and educational services. University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. https://dres.illinois.edu/

Disability services. Michigan State University. https://www.rcpd.msu.edu/services

Disability services. Ohio State University. https://slds.osu.edu/

Dolmage, J. T.. (2017). *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education*. University of Michigan Press.

Dolmage, J. T. (2014). *Disability Studies of Rhetoric*. Syracuse University Press.

Dunn, D. S & Andrews, E. E. (2015). Person-first and identity-first language: Developing psychologists' cultural competence using disability language. *American Psychologist, 70*(3), 255–264. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038636

Duong, B., Lee, J., Van Slyke, C., & Ellis, T. S. (2023). Distress coping responses among teleworkers. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *66*(3), 259-283. 10.1109/TPC.2023.3290927

Edbauer, J. (2005). Unframing models of public distribution: From rhetorical situation to rhetorical ecologies. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 35*(4), 5-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/02773940509391320

Flower, L. (2013). Going public—in a disabling discourse. In J. M. Ackerman, D. J. Coogan, & G. A. Hauser (Eds.) *The public work of rhetoric,* (pp. 127-156). University of South Carolina Press.

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

Gernsbacher, M. A. (2017). Editorial perspective: The use of person-first language in scholarly writing may accentuate stigma. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 58*(7), 859-861. 10.1111/jcpp.12706

Getto, G. & Flanagan, S. (2022). Localizing UX advocacy and accountability: Using personas to amplify user agency. *Technical Communication, 69*(4), 97-113. https://doi.org/10.55177/tc914783

Golightly, D., D'Cruz, M., Patel, H., Pettitt, M., Sharples, S., Stedmon, A., & Wilson, J. (2011). Novel interaction styles, complex working contexts, and the role of usability. In M. Albers & B. Still (Eds.), *Usability of complex information systems: Evaluation of user interaction* (pp. 281–304). Taylor and Francis Group.

Gries, L. & Brooke, C. G. (2018). *Circulation, writing, and rhetoric*, Utah State University Press.

Hassenzahl, M. (2018). The thing and I: Understanding the relationship between user and product. In M. Blythe & A. Monk (Eds.), *Funology 2: From usability to enjoyment* (2nd ed., 301-313). Springer.

Jones, N.N. (2016). Narrative inquiry in human-centered design: Examining silence and voice to promote social justice in design scenarios. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 46*(4), 471-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616653489

Jones, N. N. & Walton, R. (2018). Using narratives to foster critical thinking about diversity and social justice. In M. Eble & A. Haas (Eds.), *Key theoretical frameworks for teaching technical communication in the 21st century* (pp. 241–267). Utah State University Press.

Jung, J. (2007). Textual mainstreaming and rhetorics of accommodation. *Rhetoric Review, 26*(2), 160-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350190709336707

Kerschbaum, S. (2014). On rhetorical agency and disclosing disability in academic writing. *Rhetoric Review, 33*(1), 55-71. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43940400

Knoblauch, A. A. (2012). Bodies of knowledge: Definitions, delineations, and implications of embodied writing in the academy." *Composition Studies*, *40*(2), 50-65. https://www.jstor.org/stable/compstud.40.2.0050

Konrad, A. (2021). Access fatigue: The rhetorical work of disability in everyday life. *College Composition and Communication, 83*(3), 179-199. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2495035943?fromopenview=true&pq-origsite=gscholar&sourcetype=Scholarly%20Journals

Lorde, A. G. (1984). Age, race, class, and sex: Women redefining difference. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches* (pp. 109-119). The Crossing Press.

Madaus, J. (2011). The history of disability services in higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2011*(154), 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.429

McCune, C. (2020). ASU's newly named accessibility center is primed to serve students. *ASU News.* https://news.asu.edu/20200817-asus-newly-named-accessibility-center-primed-serve-students

Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Mingus, M. (2017) Forced intimacy: An ableist norm. *Leaving Evidence*. leavingevidence. wordpress.com/2017/08/

Moe, P. W. (2012). Revealing rather than concealing disability: The rhetoric of Parkinson's advocate Michael J. Fox. *Rhetoric Review, 31*(4), 443-460. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41697864

Novotny, M. (2023). Misconception fatigue: Towards an embodied rhetoric for infertility advocacy, *Rhetoric Review, (42)*3, 184-215. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2023.2219494

Obermark, L. E. (2019). Making space for the misfit: Disability and access in graduate education in English. *College English, 82*(2), 173-203. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2329717207?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=t rue

Office of accessibility services. Florida State University. https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas

Oswal, S K. (2019). Breaking the exclusionary boundary between user experience and access: Steps toward making UX inclusive of users with disabilities. *SIGDOC '19.* https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3328020.3353957

Price, M., Salzer, M. S., O'Shea, A., & Kerschbaum, S. (2017). Disclosure of mental disability by college and university faculty: The negotiation of accommodations, supports, and barriers. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *37*(2). dsq-sds.org/article/view/5487

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C § 504 (1973). https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasam/centers-offices/civil-rights-center/statutes/section-504-rehabilitation-act-of-1973

Rice, J. (2018). Circulation exhaustion. In L. Gries & C. G. Brooke (Eds.) *Circulation, writing, and rhetoric* (pp. 281-288). Utah State University Press.

Rocco, T S. & Ghiaciuc, S. (2017). An initial model for accommodation communication between students with disabilities and faculty. In S. L. Kerschbaum, L. T. Eisenman, and J. M. Jones (Eds.), *Negotiating disability: Disclosure and higher education*, (pp. 327-344). University of Michigan Press.

Rohrer, C. (2014). When to use which user experience methods. *Nielsen Norman Group, 12*.

Selfe, C. & Hawisher, G. E. (2012). Exceeding the bounds of the interview: Feminism, mediation, narrative, and conversations about digital literacy. In L. Nickoson and M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies,* (pp. 36-50). Southern Illinois University Press.

Still, B. (2011). Mapping usability: An ecological framework for analyzing user experience. In M. J. Albers and B. Still (Eds.) *Usability of complex information systems: Evaluation of user interaction,* (pp. 90-107). CRC Press.

Student accessibility and inclusive learning services. Arizona State University Educational Outreach and Student Services. https://eoss.asu.edu/accessibility

Valeras, A. B. (2010). "We don't have a box": Understanding hidden disability identity utilizing narrative research methodology. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 30*(3/4). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v30i3/4.1267

Wiederhold, E. (2008). Feminist rhetoric and representational fatigue. *JAC*, *28*(1/2), 123-149. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20866829

Wilson, C. (2013). *Interview techniques for UX practitioners: A user-centered design method*. Newnes.

Wood, T. (2017). Rhetorical disclosures: The stakes of disability identity in higher education. In S. L. Kerschbaum, L. T. Eisenman, & J. M. Jones (Eds.) *Negotiating disability and higher education* (pp. 75-92). University of Michigan Press.

Yablonski, J. (2024). *Laws of UX: Using psychology to design better products and services* (2nd ed.). O'Reilly Media Inc.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

ASU Knowledge Enterprise Development

APPROVAL: MODIFICATION

Mark Hannah
CLAS-H: English
-
Mark.Hannah@asu.edu

Dear Mark Hannah:

On 8/29/2023 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Modification / Update
Title:	Analyzing Access Fatigue in University Disability Resource Centers
Investigator:	Mark Hannah
IRB ID:	STUDY00018373
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Analyzing Access Fatigue in DRCs Protocol, Category: IRB Protocol; • Consent Form for SAILS Representative.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Consent Form for Students.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Consent Form for Teachers.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • recruitment_materials_researchplusme, Category: Recruitment Materials; • recruitment_materials_socialmedia_82823.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • recruitment_methods_email_15_07_2023.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • recruitment_methods_flyer_15_07_2023.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • supporting_documents_15_07_2023.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);

The IRB approved the modification.

When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Courtney Caputo
        Courtney Caputo
        Elenore Long
        Claire Lauer

APPENDIX B

SAILS STUDENT REGISTRATION DOCUMENT (FIRST PAGE)

Important Note: To save the progress of your application, be sure to select the form submission button at the bottom of each page.

INTRODUCTION

Type: **Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services Application**.

Welcome to Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Service's new student registration form. This form is intended for any current ASU student who has never received accommodations or worked with ASU's Student Accessibility office. If you are unsure if you need accommodations or if you will use accommodations, we still recommend completing this form as soon as possible to ensure a timely provision of accommodations as needed.

WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THIS FORM?
If you have received accommodations at ASU or have completed this form previously, please DO NOT continue. This includes any returning ASU student who is providing updated documentation, and current ASU students receiving accommodations. This form is strictly for NEW Student Accessibility students. In order to expedite services for returning students, please contact our office by emailing your Accessibility Consultant, calling 480-965-1234 or emailing the office at Student.Accessibility@asu.edu.

If you are needing on campus transportation, please access information about DART services here: DART

INFORMATION FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS
If you are a **parent** accessing this form, you are welcome to review the information and assist your student with completing the form, however parents should not submit this form on their student's behalf. It is important that your student lead the accommodation process as they are responsible for their accommodations in higher education. Additionally, if you are accessing this form through your MyASU Guest access, you will need to log out and have your student log in, otherwise the form will be inaccurate and may result in a delay in connecting with your student. Please see the username, ID number, and e-mail address that was automatically generated below. If it is not your student's information, please have your student sign in so they can complete the form.

Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services works with students to ensure they have access to their courses/course curriculum. These accommodations may be different than those received during a student's K-12 experience. The initial intake appointment will ensure students have the opportunity to discuss these differences with a staff member in our office.

ACCOMMODATION PROCESS AND FIRST APPOINTMENT

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Primary Campus :

[Select One ⌄]

Start Term :

[2024 - Spring ⌄]

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Preferred Name :

[ ]

Legal Name:

[ ]

Middle Name:

[ ]

Last Name :

[ ]

ASU ID # :

Hint: Enter 10 alpha numeric characters

[■■■■■■]

Birth Date:

APPENDIX C

SAILS FACULTY NOTIFICATION DOCUMENT (FIRST PAGE)

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Fall 2023 - DRC 101.1001 - TEST - TESTING (CRN: 99998-DEV)

Professor Chad Price,

Sparky Sun Devil (Not Specified) is registered with Student Accessibility and Inclusive Learning Services. This student is eligible for accommodations per SSM 701–03: Accommodations for Students with Disabilities for the duration of this course. This student has established eligibility with our office and the accommodations applicable to this student are included below. Accommodations are determined on a course-by-course basis and should you feel that your course requires alternative accommodations to ensure access, please contact the Accessibility consultant listed below to engage in that process as soon as possible. In addition to the cited policies, ASU's Charter emphasizes the University's commitment to ensuring accessibility and inclusion for all students. Student Accessibility is one of the resources to help fulfill that commitment. We request your assistance in support of these efforts.

You may have additional questions about accommodations. Here is an additional resource to provide more general information about accommodations. If you have specific questions about implementing any of the accommodations for this student, please contact the Access Consultant listed below.

The accommodation(s) most appropriate as it relates to your class is/are the following:

1. **Alternative Formats**

   ○ *PDF with Recognized Text*
   This accommodation is approved for a student who needs to have text based materials in an accessible PDF format.

   This is a PDF file where text on the page is readable by some screen readers including Adobe Reader which is a free download from Adobe.com. If files are in a Word document or similar type file, you do not need to change the file to PDF.

   More information on creating accessible PDF's can be found on the ASU Accessibility webpage.

   If you are using Canvas for your course, please find more information here about Ally, a tool that will assist in ensuring this accommodation is in place: https://lms.asu.edu/ally

   Typically, PDF's are already in an accessible format but you may receive additional communication from the Student Accessibility Alternative Format team should we require additional information from you such as your text book information or access to specific readings.

   If you have questions about your textbooks and have not already heard from our alternative format team, please review this document for more information.

2. **Alternative Testing**

   Testing Accommodations for in class and online timed assessments.

   ○ *Extra Time 1.50x*

STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING SERVICES

(480) 965-1234	Fax: (480) 965-0441	Student.Accessibility@asu.edu	https://eoss.asu.edu/accessibility

Downtown	**Polytechnic**	**Tempe**	**West**
522 N. Central Ave., Suite 201	6073 S. Backus Mall	PO Box 873202	PO Box 37100, MC 1050
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1194	Mesa, AZ 85212	Tempe, AZ 85287-3202	Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100

APPENDIX D

TEACHER INTERVIEW CODING RESULTS

	Success with SAILS	Challenges with SAILS	Alignment with SAILS	Misalignment with SAILS
Teacher Interviews	21	21	7	4