

**Lived Experiences of Faculty with Disabilities in Higher Education: A
Hermeneutic Phenomenological Method**

Mahendra Kumar Budhathoki, PhD

Bishwa Bhasa Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

E-mail: mahendratunp@gmail.com

Abstract

The number of faculty members with disabilities has increased nowadays in the university because of the inclusive recruitment policy. The faculties with disabilities still struggle with the disable-unfriendly environments in universities, and they are excluded from the research fields in Nepal although there are some research done on school children with disabilities and people with disabilities in family and society. University faculty members with disabilities need to be studied in order to truly address the real-life problems. This study explores the lived experiences of faculty members with disabilities perceived at Tribhuvan University, Nepal. A hermeneutic phenomenological research method within qualitative approach was exploited. Purposive sampling technique was used to select five teachers with disabilities in the study. Disability studies theory was used as a theoretical tool. The major findings are that the disabled faculty encountered mainly infrastructure/physical structure barriers, university policy and practice barriers, the university executives' (un)conscious/ (un)intentional ignorance and attitude barriers in the campuses. The teachers with vision impairment and motor impairment endured through difficulty of disable-unfriendly physical structures, university policy and practices. The findings mean the university environments were unfriendly, hostile and adverse to the disabled faculty. This study may motivate the executives to modify the policy, practices and attitudes to the disabled ones at the university which may impact the quality of the university.

Keywords: environment, disability studies, disabled faculty, executives' attitude, lived experience



Introduction

The number of the faculty members with disabilities in higher education is increasing nowadays because of the provisions of legislations and policy for the inclusive recruitment of people with disability. “As the number of teachers with disabilities increases, education will benefit from the wisdom imparted by their historically disqualified knowledges” (Anderson, 2006, p.373). The faculty with disabilities grapple and suffer more due to partly the conditions of their bodies and partly the structures and attitudes of executives, other teachers and students at the university. “Conversations about disabled faculty and staff on university campuses are rare” (Evans et al., 2017, p.198) and “the experience of academics with disabilities is an underresearched topic in the literature, and it was felt that there was a potentially widespread exclusion in universities that was poorly understood and infrequently recognized” (Barton & Hayhoe, 2022, p. 21). The experiences and values of the teachers with disabilities in universities of Nepal need to be explored for the true implementation of social justice. “The experience of disability is relevant to all marginalized groups – for all groups have people with disabilities in them” (Anderson, 2006, p.367). Studies on students with disabilities have been done, and disabled people have been researched for years. But the issue of the disabled teachers at university has been left to study.

Even the university faculty with disability have been struggling for the justice; they “still fight for a place at the table in academe” (Anderson, 2006, p.367). The universities deploy a great influence on social justice and academic achievements. The universities would be models of having disabled-friendly environments. But it lacks. The experiences of disabled faculties is inattentive for the discourse at the university. The university can truly implement social justice and reduce the struggles of the disabled teachers due to the consequences of the structures and negative attitudes in the universities. The university and campus practices can impact the lives of the teachers with disabilities. “The focus on experience is not arbitrary to the ruling but required” (Siebers, 2011, p.121). Therefore it is important to consider the real voices of the faculty members with disabilities regarding the lived experiences acquired within the university. What are the lived experiences of faculty with disabilities in the university? Why are the structural phenomena as they are? How do the teachers with disabilities adjudge the campus phenomena? Do the lived experiences of faculty members with disabilities expose the exclusion and ableism

in the Tribhuvan University? Their lived experiences cross-examine the executers' attitudes, university policy and educational practices at the university; the findings of this study assist the university executives to overcome the problems and difficulties encountered by the faculty members with disabilities.

The study explores the lived experiences of faculty with disabilities within Tribhuvan University. It attempts to discuss the entire college experiences of the faculty with disabilities.

Disability Studies: Theoretical Underpinning

Disability theory mainly illustrates the issue of disability with social meaning in the societies and communities, but here the reviews of pertinent literature briefly encapsulate disability theory substantially in the context of education.

Disability studies discusses the conditions, consequences and meanings of disability in social contexts. "Disability theory emanates from the perspective that disability is a sociological, economic and cultural thing" (Goodley, 2014, p.3). Disability studies examines the real experiences of people with disability in particular contexts. Juárez-Almendros (2017) mentions, "disability studies is an area of intellectual inquiry that originated in the social sciences and in political movements from the 1970s and that has since been adopted by the humanities" (p.1). Disability generally refers to the disabled bodies that hinder to perform the activities as the abled-bodies do in the society. "Disability is neither a fossilized, neutral thing nor an inherent flaw" (Iannacci, 2018, p.19). The concept of disability is constructed by socio-cultural environments. "Disability studies does not treat disease or disability, hoping to cure or avoid them; it studies the social meanings, symbols, and stigmas attached to disability identity and asks how they relate to enforced systems of exclusion and oppression, attacking the widespread belief that having an able body and mind determines whether one is a quality human being" (Siebears, 2011, pp. 3-4). The human made structures and attitudes make more difficulties and complexities in the society for disabled people. "Disability is now regarded in policy circles as not simply a medical issue but also a human rights concern. A major catalyst for this development has been the social model emphasis on the material and structural causes of disabled people's disadvantages" (Watson & Vehmas, 2020, p.26). Faculty and students with disabilities are contrary to the ableist paradigms in the university.

The university is also a public place constructed by people. The executives with able-body play significant roles to establish the university, and they ignore the necessities of disabled people in the university. “Ableism’s psychological, social, economic, cultural character normatively privileges able-bodiedness; promotes smooth forms of personhood and smooth health; creates space fit for normative citizens; encourages an institutional bias towards autonomous, independent bodies; and lends support to economic and material dependence on neoliberal and hyper-capitalist forms of production” (Goodley, 2014, p.21). University teachers, staffs and students with disabilities struggle with ableism. ”A social justice approach explicitly recognizes and challenges the ableism present in individuals, institutions, and society” (Evans et al., 2017, p.1). Able-bodied people discriminate even in institutions of higher education.

We examine institutional structures, programs, and policies as these are the institutional manifestations of ableism. Additionally, we argue for approaches to disability on campus that recognize the ways in which all members of the higher education community, those with and without disability, have been socialized to view disability and the ways that socialization is reflected in the organizational systems, norms, and assumptions that shape higher education. (Evans et al., 2017, pp. 2-3).

Disabled people have limitations due to their bodies in the university. “Disabled staff and faculty face multiple challenges on campus; they also have the ability to provide counternarratives about the place of people with disabilities in the world” (p.199). They suffer more because of the man-made structures in the campuses. According to Anderson (2006), university teachers with disabilities “engage the political by living with inaccessible buildings, attitudes, and policies... Teachers with disabilities live out a highly personal and embodied politics of resistance while serving as a guide to students in the classroom” (p.375). The faculty with disability face hostile environments in the campuses. They hesitate to return to workplaces due to the structural and attitudinal barriers of the campuses.

Loisel and Côté (2013) argued that the ability and willingness to return to work is the result of an interaction of multiple factors: (a) employees’ psychosocial traits (e.g., self-efficacy, coping strategies, social support); (b) attitudinal, organizational, and physical aspects of the workplace; (c) health care–related factors (e.g., the impairment itself, medical practitioners’

attitudes about the impairment and return to work); and (d) laws, policies, and regulations regarding insurance (both medical and disability) and disability documentation. (cited in Evans, et al, 2017, p.200).

Faculty members with disabilities encounters the organizational, attitudinal and policy impediment. “Academics with disabilities were being put at a severe disadvantage compared to able-bodied academics” (Barton & Hayhoe, 2022, p.21). Brown and Leigh say, “Academics with chronic illness, disabilities or neurodiversity are practically unseen and starkly under-represented in comparison to students with disabilities or disabled people in the general public (cited in Brown & Leigh, 2020, p. 5). Teachers and students with disabilities are taken as a problem in educational institutions by the ableists. “Disability itself has come to mean “unable to work”” (Finkelstein, 1991, p. 8) and Oliver (1999) argues that ‘exclusion from the world of work is the most important factor in what happens to us and the way we are treated by society” (p. 7). Neupane and Niure (2023) “explored the knowledge and awareness of the teachers of special schools regarding the inclusive education policy of Nepal” (p. 83). Lamichhane (2013) discussed barriers encountered by Nepalis with disabilities for school education. The infrastructures and academic environments and activities are not disable-friendly even in Nepali universities. The Nepali university executives do not hear the voices of the disabled faculty members. Although they know the disable-unfriendly environments in the universities, they ignore the issues while making infrastructures and policy in the universities. This study explores the real-life situations that the faculty members with disabilities have experienced at the university. This study examines what and how faculty members with disabilities perceive the university environments, executives’ attitudes and policy.

Methods

The study utilized interpretative qualitative approach; hermeneutic phenomenological method was exploited as the philosophical methodology. It is necessary to explore the lived experiences of the faculty with disabilities in the campuses and university. Disability studies was adopted as a theoretical tool to analyze the lived experiences of faculty with disabilities in the university.

The primary sources for data collection were the faculty with disabilities from the different constituent campuses of Tribhuvan University. The discourse of disability is found in societies, literary texts and public places like university. Here,

the real-life experiences of the teachers with disabilities were taken as the primary data. The secondary sources were books and journals related to disability studies.

The faculty with disabilities from the constituent campuses of Tribhuvan University were the population for this research. Five teachers with disabilities (two vision impaired, two motor impaired and one one-hand impaired) were sampled through purposive sampling from the constituent campuses of Tribhuvan University. The researcher did not find other serious types of faculty members with disabilities in Tribhuvan university. Among the selected teachers with disabilities, two were from outside the Kathmandu valley, and three were from the Kathmandu valley; one teacher was a female and four were males. The required data saturation was reached with the five participants.

A semi-structured interview as a data collection tool was used to direct the conversations with the informants. The interviews took place in the surroundings of the campuses; the probing questions were asked until the required data obtained.

Assent and consent from the campus administration and the participants are adopted for the interviews. The research strictly conveyed the principles of autonomy, privacy and data confidentiality.

The collected data/lived experiences were presented and interpreted with the nature of disabilities of the faculty members. The themes and interpretations of the lived experiences of the disabled faculties were connected with the structures, attitudes and policies of the university moving back and forth. The data were interpreted connecting with disability theory.

Results

Exposition of Real-Life Experiences of Faculty with Disabilities

The objective of the study was to explore the lived experiences of faculty with disabilities in Tribhuvan University; to achieve this objective, five teachers from the constituent campuses of the University were selected with purposive sampling. The University has the inclusive policy in the recruiting process. The researcher found mainly three types of faculty with disability: teachers with visual impairment, teachers with motor impairment and teachers with a hand-impairment. Many faculty who were recruited as the persons with disability have minor disability. Among the faculty with disability, two teachers with visual impairment, two teachers with motor impairment and one teacher with a hand impairment were individually interviewed

for the collection of data. Among those five faculty, two faculty were from outside the Kathmandu Valley and three were from Kathmandu valley.

The teacher 1 and 2 with visual impairment were Assistant Professors of Nepali Education and Nepali at Tribhuvan University. Both the teachers 1 and 2 with visual impairment agreed that Tribhuvan University has passed over the unsighted teachers; the University has recruited some disabled faculty due to the governmental inclusive policy, but neglected the needs of the unsighted teachers in teaching learning contexts in the University (Interviews, December 2021). The unsighted teacher 1 stated that he had to depend upon either other faculty co-workers or students to read the textbooks and reference books for the preparation of the classes; he took notes in braille lipi and lectured in the classes. The teacher 2 with visual impairment expressed that he took help for reading from family members like brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews and students for the class preparation. The unsighted teachers 1 and 2 asserted that they cannot see themselves what new books and new research papers are published in the market and academic areas, they have to depend on other faculty members of the colleges. They expected that at least textbooks could be transformed into audio forms, so that teachers and students with visual impairment could study. They questioned why the University executives have neglected such works for blind teachers and students; the executives' attitudes and behaviours were the (un)intentional discrimination to the teachers with disability as well as the unsighted students.

The teacher 1 with visual impairment stated that while he entered the class, the students felt very odd and doubted about his subject knowledge and teaching skills in the classrooms at the first day. The teacher 2 with blindness confessed that he could not write on the board, and students felt difficulty to note down the lectures at the beginning, and later they have become habituated to take notes from his lectures. Both the teachers 1 and 2 with blindness said that they spoke a bit slow so that the students were able to write some major points of the lessons in the classrooms. Both the teachers expressed their satisfaction to their students that the students showed their behaviours and respects to the teachers; they assisted by reading textbooks in the classrooms and by bringing necessary reading materials from the campus library and other places. The teacher 2 with unsighted said that his some students read some texts at home and told summary to him, and then he explained what the texts have given messages. Such activities enhanced the knowledge and skills of both students

and teachers. The teacher 1 recounted that in a class, two students silently went outside without taking permission, and wanted to come back into the class at the same manner. But he did not allow them getting into the classroom: they assumed that the teacher could not see their activities. The next day the same students asked him how he did know they were going out. The teacher 1 said, “I have lost visual perception but no other sensory perceptions.” It shows general people’s prejudice and misconceptions about the capabilities of blind people in order to know what is happening at the surroundings.

The teacher 2 complained that some employers were reluctant to hire him knowing that he was blind, and he affirmed that Tribhuvan University also compelled to give him teaching job due to the government inclusive policy and his qualifications. Both the teachers 1 and 2 with blindness claimed that they were capable teachers at the University. They expressed their satisfaction that sometimes the campus administrations have assisted them in the context of teaching learning activities; the campus general library was no useful for them.

Both the teachers 1 and 2 with blindness agreed that the buildings of the campus were unfriendly to persons with disability; even new buildings were hostile for the disabled people. The teacher 1 complained denounced that the recently built classroom building had three stairs but no one is disability friendly; such activities were disgusting and discouraging for the teachers and students with disability. He added that the office of the Campus Chief was on the third floor, and he had to meet the Campus Chief on the ground. The teacher 2 complained about the narrow passages in the buildings, and bumpy and stony grounds through which he had to move from one building to another. He added that students assisted him moving from office to the classrooms. The teacher 1 said that students and office helpers assisted him going into the classes. The teacher 2 also complained the even the recently constructed buildings of the offices of the Vice-Chancellor, the Rector, Deans were unfriendly to disabled people. The teacher 2 also connected the difficulty experienced at the building of University Grants Commission, Sanothimi.

Regarding the professional development, the teachers 1 and 2 showed their dissatisfaction to the University; the visual-impaired teachers could be prioritised in professional development. This would not provide benefits only to the concerned teachers but also to the students with disability of the University. The teacher 1 shared that he registered a research proposal for Doctor of Philosophy at Tribhuvan

University, but relinquished his PhD study because he could not manage an assistant to collect the necessary books, journal articles and related materials, and read aloud the collected materials for him; he could not pay for the assistant. He added that he had no extra income besides the regular income of the post lecturer; such circumstances discouraged him to complete his PhD study and do other research publications. The teacher 2 with visual impairment received a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Nepali entitled “*Pragatibadi Khandakabyaka Prabritti*”. He complained that the University Grants Commission did not provide scholarship for PhD study although he was selected. He said it discouraged him to go to UGC, Nepal. Although there were many obstacles to do research works, he shared, he has been publishing some research papers in journals. The visual-impaired teachers 1 and 2 expected some extra facilities like an audio library to promote their profession. The teacher 1 stated that the Evaluation of Committee of Tribhuvan University Service Commission underjudged and underrated him in promotion due to their deep-rooted perceptions on persons with disability; such biases come under intentional discriminations. The teacher 2 seemed more hopeful in promotion than the teacher 1. Both teachers stated that there were no visual-impaired teacher in decision making bodies of the University, and other normal persons had ignored the needs of the teachers and students with disabilities at the University.

The vision-impaired teacher 2 said that he advocated the rights of vision impaired people through writing along with his teaching and other activities. He informed that he has started an Audio Library for persons with vision impairment; his commitment to establish the audio library stemmed from his personal bitter experiences. He said that he made some recorded books and other documents for the blind readers, and he accepted he could not do enough recorded materials due to lacking budgets and volunteers. He expressed that he had submitted many proposals to different governmental and non-governmental organizations; they appreciated the proposals but had not sponsored for the audio library. He said that he proposed to establish the audio library in the Tribhuvan University Central Library, Kiritipur, but it did not start. Instead, the TU Central Library asked him for the recorded materials, but it did not work anything about the project. He charged that physically abled persons never realized the significant necessity of an audio library. This is also a discrimination to the teachers with disabilities in the sense of human rights and human value in the twenty-first century.

The unsighted teachers 1 and 2 affirmed that they had to repeatedly prove high performance expectations from students and other faculty in the campuses; the teacher 2 said that he rebuked a teacher for underrating his performance in the class. From the interviews, it can be concluded that the teachers 1 and 2 needed human support for library or field study and taking notes, transports, social security, and technical aids like laptops.

The second serious disability is motor impairment that impedes people's movement or sensation within specific areas: the people with motor impairment have loss or limited functions in their movement or muscle control. In this study, the researcher met a teacher 3 with spinal cord injury who could not move even a single step on feet, and next teacher 4 with loss of limbs who hardly moved fifty meter on flat and smooth path but could not walk on stepped stairs. The teacher 3 communicated that his spinal cord was damaged due to a fall from the roof of a building at the time of completing his master's degree. The spinal cord injury stopped him feel sensations and move his body, and resulted in paraplegia. The teacher 4 had very limited functions in his movement since birth. Both the selected teachers 3 and 4 have used wheelchairs to move from one place to another place.

Both the motor impaired teachers 3 and 4 expressed that they could not get into a building with stepped access. They stated that they could not go up to second or higher floor of the campus buildings. The teacher 3 with paraplegia could move only into the ground floors of the administration building and a recently built building; there were no stair disable friendly in the campus. He added that the entrance passage of the campus was stony, uneven, sloppy way to reach the administrative building: that caused obstacles for his wheelchair. The teacher 4 recounted his bitter experience at the campus, "my wheelchair slipped and turned over on the muddy ground in the rainy season, and next time a tier was punctured when I was getting down from the stepped way in the campus." He was infuriated with the campus administration that the campus could construct flat and smooth passages to the classrooms. The behaviours of the physically normal campus chiefs and teachers agitated him extremely. The teacher 4 said that the campus administrators did not have a feeling of humanity. Both the teachers 3 and 4 spoke that the buildings were unfriendly to disable teachers and students; the structures of buildings and passages on the ground irritated and frustrated the teachers and students with disabilities. They called such irresponsible behaviours as unintentional discrimination, and educated people indirectly did such unintentional discrimination.

The teachers 3 and 4 stated that they could not use the campus library because the library has been managed on either the ground floor with many stepped structure or second floor with stepped stairs. They said that such structures demotivated them to use the campus library. The teacher 4 shared his pain that he could not reach at the mid area of the board to write on the board: the teacher 3 also expressed his irritation to the campus administration regarding the placement of the boards in the classrooms. Both teachers 3 and 4 complained that the arrangements of the desk and benches obstructed them to move around in the classrooms. The faculty 3 showed his satisfaction with the students for their helping him inside and outside the classrooms. He added that there were no proper toilet in the campus for the person with paralysis of legs; he has to return to own home for toilet. He again recounted his resentful experience of visiting the Dean's office of the Faculty of Education, TU; he reached on the third floor with the help of people. He stated that he can open and shut the doors of his home, can go into toilet alone at his home, and he himself can move to the second floor at home. An individual can build disability friendly structures; he questioned why the University did not construct disabled-friendly stairs although there were two stairs and enough space. He affirmed that the university executives have conscious disability bias and intentional negligence to the needs of the teachers and students with disabilities. The researcher also observed the newly constructed buildings like Deans' offices, Vice-Chancellor and Rector were having stepped stairs, but not disabled-friendly infrastructures in the University. He questioned where the humanity is in the University.

The teachers 3 and 4 with motor impairment felt guilty regarding the professional development in the University; their motor-impaired body discouraged and limited them to participate in different academic programmes and research works. They said that they could not do research works and professional enhancement compared with their abled faculty, but still they have been doing reading and writing activities. The teacher 3 informed that he was doing Master of Philosophy in English Education from Nepal Open University, and the teacher 4 completed a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Economics from Open University, India.

They stated that the University research centres, Deans' offices, and even UGC call various research proposals and ask to submit hard copy forms and proposals, and determine physical presence for research defences. The teachers 3

and 4 said that it is difficult to visit the concerned offices and manage the assistants many times – first to submit proposal, second for proposal defence, third to submit progress reports, fourth to submit final copy for viva voice and fifth final viva voice (research defence); these provisions demotivated them to participate in different research activities. They interrogated to the UGC, universities’ research centres, deans’ offices and the university executives why they did not allow the technology (email for submissions and virtual/online meeting for viva voice/interviews) for these processes; the use of technology makes easier not only for the disabled but also the physically abled people. The teacher 3 said that the executives know the national disability-inclusive policy, disability rights, social justice, etc., but they coconsciously neglect and exclude the disabled teachers and students from the academic activities. He questioned that why they made rules only for physically abled people friendly; the rules and practices can be modified but the executives are unwilling to change them. The teachers 3 and 4 stated that thus the university as well as UGC segregated the disabled.

The teacher 3 catechized UGC about the rejections of online and distance learning programmes for further studies like MPhil and PhD degrees; in the name of ensuring quality education, UGC has become hostile not only to Open University but also the disabled teachers and students. He asserted that the UGC’ executives consciously made the policy, rules and regulations to segregate and exclude the disabled teachers and students from academic, intellectual and professional development. He hoped that after this research the UGC will rethink about its provision of acceptance/rejection and equivalent of MPhil and PhD degrees completed from open distance learning programmes of the universities and from Open University. Both the teachers 3 and 4 stated that educated people like university executives, faculty, staff and students did not overtly show their biases and discriminations but performed (un)intentional biases to the students and teachers with disabilities in the University.

The third informant was a faculty without a hand in the study, and it was caused by an accident, but not by birth. The teacher 5 without a hand affirmed that she did not feel bad of having disability in the context of reading and teaching activities although she experienced some difficulty while doing other household works. The teacher 5 with a shoulder disarticulation stated that she could walk, speak, listen, read and write well as the general people. She asserted that the co-

workers and students behaved her as the physically abled persons; but sometimes few people have obliquely made fun of her hand. She shared in the interview that other general teachers and students showed their unconscious bias to her gender role and disability. The teacher 5 without a hand revealed that a few girls assumed her as an inspirational idol for their lives. She said

I became aware of having disability when I was doing something heavy works and I had to do all works with a hand; the increased workload for the hand sometimes had minor aches and pains; and doctors suggested to avoid the heavy workload to save the remaining hand and shoulder problem.

But she did not disclose any problem of overuses of the remaining hand in teaching learning activities in the campus. During the interview, she expressed that when she had to copy few lines from books or lecture notes on the board, she put them on a table, and she had to repeatedly move to the table and the board. As the teachers 1, 2, 3 and 4, she (teacher 5) had full self-confidence in her professional skills- “I can”, and they considered themselves as successful professionals in the University.

Discussion of the Lived Experiences of Faculty Members with Disabilities

The issue of disability is concerned with the value of humanity, human thoughts and social justice. “Humans make in interpreting and expressing the meanings of their lived-in experiences” (Kundu & Nayar, 2009, p.2). The interviewees presented the human conditions of the University teachers with disabilities through their subjective experiences. From the viewpoints of the informants (five teachers with disabilities), the educated people have worked and studied in the University and they knew that it is unfair to discriminate and segregate with disability biases. But still the general students, teachers and staff did (un)conscious disability biases to the disabled teachers. All the interviewees affirmed that general persons’ (un)intentional and automatic mental biases stem from the unconscious assimilation with traditions, cultures, values and experience in their surroundings. Discrimination and conscious disability bias in the campuses mainly hindered to inclusive education and professional development of the teachers with disabilities in the University. The respondents stated that inherent disability bias in recruitment and promotion was a major problem in the University; the teachers

with disabilities adjust themselves with the university inaccessible structures and unfriendly policies and attitudes.

The respondents suggested that the University executives and the campus administrators can take steps to counteract disability biases and other biases in the University. Infrastructures, practices and invisible attitude barriers in the University held the students and teachers with disabilities back, rather than their physical impairments: despite having a little progress on disability equality and justice, the faculty with disabilities have been still held back by the University practices, infrastructures that were bias toward the disabled teachers. The teachers with disabilities mentioned that inherent disability bias in the mindsets of the University administrators prevented to make disabled-friendly environments and to achieve the key positions in the University. The teachers with disabilities expressed that the process of performance evaluation of the teachers with disabilities are the same as for general teachers in the university practices and systems; the abled-friendly criteria constructed for the performance evaluation in the University make the disabled teachers worse, and covertly impede them reaching at opportunities.

The University mechanisms usually provide more decision-making assignments, training, research works to the general faculty rather than the disabled teachers; it may be happened due to (un)conscious bias and stereotypes inherited by the administrators. The teachers with disabilities complained that the University's performance management policy and procedure place the disabled persons worse. The general faculty and the disabled faculty rarely have equal access to participation in different activities in the University. Such university policy and norms hinder the teachers' professional development. The informants suggested that the University needs to review the institutional practices and procedures for the teachers with disabilities.

The teachers with disabilities recommended that the University can make the well-planned infrastructures, buildings, libraries, stairs, toilets, etc. that will be easier for both general and disabled students and teachers. The campus administrations and the offices of the Campus Chiefs should be on the ground floor, so that the disabled persons can easily access and take services. The linking paths between buildings inside the campuses should be flat and smooth for the persons with vision and

motor impairment. For vision impaired teachers, and also students, the University can manage audio books, proper electronic support and technological access at the University.

The administrators should be positive to provide various opportunities available in the University. Regarding the facilities that the University has provided to the disabled teachers, the administrators can make easier. The teachers with disabilities do not entertain the general executives' and faculty's complimenting on their academic and professional achievements in the university- "*yasto saaririk kathinaika baabajut ...*": the university executives attempted to show their empathy/sympathy but ignored the needs inside the university. They affirmed that the University must eliminate the (un)conscious and (un)intentional disability bias and stereotypes and prejudices about the teachers with disabilities in the university; then only it will uplift the standard of Tribhuvan University.

Conclusion

The faculty members with disabilities unmask their negative experiences and understanding at the campuses and university. They lived through various obstructing factors like inaccessible infrastructures, unfriendly teaching learning environment, educational materials and pedagogy, limited institutional support, limited cooperative friends, etc. at the university. The discussion of the lived experiences of the teachers with disabilities of Tribhuvan University deduced that they suffer mainly infrastructure barriers, university policy and practice barriers and attitude barriers for their academic performance in the campuses. The faculty have suffered more due to the university structures and executives' attitudes rather than their body conditions; disability studies interprets the people with disabilities agonize more because of institutional and societal unfriendly behaviors. These barriers and negative experiences sometimes frustrated and obstructed their intellectual, academic and social integration at the university. They interrogated the university executives why the infrastructures and practices are as they are, why even the recently constructed structures and practices have been disabled-unfriendly in the university. They responded themselves that the major causes are conscious negligence and ignorance of the executives. Neglecting the teachers with disabilities in the university gives adverse effects on the performance of the university, national goal (disability education and justice) and society. A few modifications on the structures, practices

and executive's thoughts can improve the performances of the teachers with disabilities as well as the university itself.

Although this study provide significant insight into the lived experiences of teachers with disability at the university, there are also limitations in this study. This study has included only five teachers having blindness, leg-impairments (wheel chair users) and one hand disabilities; it lacks other serious types of disabilities like intellectual disability, hearing disability, dwarfism because there were no other types of teachers with disabilities except those three types in the university. These three types of disabilities do not reflect the diversity of the lived experiences of teachers with disabilities at the university. The study included the lived experiences of the teachers with disabilities inside the constituent colleges of Tribhuvan University but not in other colleges and other universities, families and societies. Therefore, the findings of the study are not generalizable to the lived experiences of all people with all types' disabilities.

The lived experiences of the selected faculty with disabilities expose the complexities encountered by the disabled teachers at the university. Ordinary environments at the university vituperate the professors with disabilities. More researches on the voices of disabilities and other minorities must be conducted inside the university to enhance the academia. The lived experiences and stories happened within the university help to create disable-friendly environments and praxis in the universities in Nepal. The inquiry on the voices of the teachers with disability help revamp the policies, attitudes, buildings and other structures at the university. There is a saying- nothing for us without us. Therefore, the universities should involve the disabled teachers in decision-making processes. This study will have a great effect on the university executives in terms of thinking about teachers with disabilities.

Acknowledgements

I sincerely appreciate the faculty with disabilities for participation in this study. I thank to the concerned campuses for their consent in this study. I would like to thank to UGC, Nepal for providing me a research grants for this study.

Funding

This article was financially supported by University Grants Commission, Nepal.

References

- Anderson, R. C. (2006). Teaching (with) disability: Pedagogies of lived experience. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 28(3-4), 367-379.
- Barton, J., & Hayhoe, S. (2022). *Emancipatory and participatory research for emerging educational researchers: Theory and case studies of research in disabled communities*. Routledge.
- Brown, N., & Leigh, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Ableism in academia: Theorising experiences of disabilities and chronic illnesses in higher education*. UCL Press.
- Goodley, D. (2014). *Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism*. Routledge.
- Evans, Nancy J., Broido, E. M., Brown, K. R., & Wilke, A. K. (Eds.). (2017). *Disability in higher education: A social justice approach*. Jossey-Bass a Willy Brand.
- Finkelstein, V. (1991). Disability: An administrative challenge? In M. Oliver (Ed.), *Social work: Disabling people and disabling environments* (pp. 1-15). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Iannacci, L. (2018). *Reconceptualizing disability in education*. Lexington Books.
- Juárez-Almendros, E. (2017). *Disabled bodies in early modern Spanish literature: Prostitutes, aging women and saints*. Liverpool University Press.
- Kumdu, A., & Nayar, P. K. (2009). *The humanities: Methodology and perspectives*. Pearson.
- Lamichhane, K. (2013). Disability and barriers to education: Evidence from Nepal. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 15(4). 311-324.
- Oliver, M. J. (1999). Capitalism, disability and ideology: A materialist critique of the normalization principle. In R. J. Flynn & R.A. Lemay (Eds.), *A quarter-century of normalization and social role valorization: Evolution and impact* (pp. 163-174). University of Ottawa Press. www.independen tliving.org/docs3/oliver99
- Neupane, N.R., & Niure, D.P. (2023). Special education teachers' knowledge on inclusive education provision in Nepal. *Ilam*, 19(1), 83-98.
- Siebers, T. (2011). *Disability theory*. University of Michigan Press.
- Watson, N., & Vehmas, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Routledge handbook of disability studies*. Routledge.