

This copy is made for your private study or for your research.

The Copyright Act 1994 prohibits the sale, letting for hire or copying of this copy.

Criminal Behavior

- ▶ [Deviance](#)

Criminal Behavior in Families

- ▶ [Family Features and Violent Behavior](#)

Criminologies of Everyday Life

- ▶ [Impact of Housing Design on Crime](#)

Criteria for Selecting Indicators

- ▶ [Indicator Selection Criteria](#)

Criteria to Classify People as Poor or Nonpoor

- ▶ [Poverty Lines](#)

Criterion Validity

Ralph L. Piedmont
Pastoral Counseling Department, Loyola
University Maryland, Columbia, MD, USA

Definition

Criterion validity is a method of test validation that examines the extent to which scores on an inventory or scale correlate with external, non-test criteria (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2005).

Description

The ultimate aim of criterion validity is to demonstrate that test scores are predictive of real-life outcomes. The basic paradigm for this approach is to give the instrument to a group of individuals and to collect measures of some criterion of interest (e.g., health status, responsiveness to psychotherapy, work performance). There are two variants to this paradigm. The first is called ▶ *concurrent validity*, where both the test scores and criterion measure are collected at the same time. The second is called ▶ *predictive validity* where criterion ratings are obtained at some point after the test scores were obtained. Concurrent paradigms tend to generate higher validity coefficients than predictive paradigms because the passage of time will tend to attenuate correlations between the two sets of scores.

References

Cohen, R. J., & Swerdlik, M. E. (2005). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Critical Difference

- ▶ [Reliable Change Index](#)

Critical Disability Theory

Jennifer Gillies
Alzheimer Societies of Kitchener-Waterloo
and Cambridge, ON, Canada

Synonyms

[Disability](#); [Equality](#); [Equity](#); [Human rights](#)

Definition

Critical disability theory is rooted in a critique of traditional discourses and assumptions of ► **disability** which serve to oppress persons with disabilities and infringe on their ► **human rights**. The theory is built upon the argument that “disability is not fundamentally a question of medicine or health, nor is it just an issue of sensitivity and compassion; rather, it is a question of politics and power(lessness), power over, and power to” (Devlin & Pothier, 2006, p. 2). This perspective challenges able-bodied supremacy and the oppression that arises from restricting economic and social benefits to persons with disabilities which are then redistributed as privileges to be negotiated (Oliver & Barnes, 1993; Rioux & Frazee, 1999; Rioux & Prince, 2002). Critical disability theory moves away from the individual pathology of disability (based on the biomedical model), and beyond liberalism and a social model of disability, toward a human rights approach that argues for equal access to all aspects of social life including transportation, housing, economic entitlements, health, education, and employment (Oliver & Barnes, 1993) as well as “key sites of power and privilege” (Hughes & Paterson, 1997, p. 325). As Williams (2001) states, “If disability is seen as a personal tragedy, disabled people are treated as the victims of circumstance. If disability is defined as social oppression, disabled people can be seen as the collective victims of an uncaring discriminatory society” (p. 134; also see Hughes & Paterson, 1997; Oliver, 1993). From this perspective, the challenges experienced by persons with disability can only be addressed once the human rights of persons with disabilities are formally enshrined in law and resources are appropriately and fairly allocated to citizens (Hughes & Paterson, 1997; Oliver, 1993; Williams, 2001).

Description

Critical disability theory is based on a human rights approach to disability (Bichenbach, 2001;

Rioux, 1997, 2003; Rioux & Prince, 2002) and the oppression theory of disability (Oliver, 1993; Williams, 2001). The oppression theory of disability originated in the United States during the early 1960s from members of the disability movement (Bichenbach, 2001) who were inspired by critical theory and ► **feminism** (Devlin & Pothier, 2006). The movement was driven by people with disabilities seeking to emancipate themselves from oppressive social policies, practices, stereotypes, and research (Kaufman, 2003) which patronized, medicalized, and rationalized oppression (Neath & Schriener, 1998). The application of the theory is most dominant in the discipline of disability and legal studies (see work by Bagenstos, 2003, 2004a, b; Blanck, Wilichowski & Schmeling, 2004; Kanter, 2003). The goal is to secure rights “based on humanity rather than economic contribution and rights are equated with those of all others in society” (Rioux, 2003, p. 296). Devlin and Pothier (2006) assert that “the biggest challenge comes from mainstream society’s unwillingness to adapt, transform, and even abandon its ‘normal’ way of doing things” (p. 27). This approach holds society responsible for providing economic and social supports to enable “social and economic integration, self-determination, legal and social rights” (Rioux, 2003, p. 296). This perspective challenges dominant ideologies that disability is solely a medicalized condition inherent to the individual in need of treatment by doctors and therapists. Alternatively, disability is accepted as an inherent part of society; thus, “treatment” lies in the reformation of economic, social, and political policies and the redistribution of power, control, and autonomy to persons with disabilities.

Critical disability theory is “a self-consciously politicized theory. Its goal is not theory for the joy of theorization, or even improved understanding and explanation; it is theorization in the pursuit of empowerment and substantive, not just formal, ► **equality**” (Devlin & Pothier, 2006, p. 8). The application of a critical approach to exploring and understanding disability directly relates to quality of life. The ways in which disability is conceived have ramifications that

extend beyond academia to the lives of persons with disabilities. How disability is conceived ultimately affects the rights of persons with disabilities and the way they are treated (Rioux, 1997, 2003; Williams, 2001). Rioux (2003) asserts that “how disability is perceived, diagnosed, and treated, scientifically and socially, is reflected in assumptions about the social responsibility towards people with disabilities as a group” (p. 289). The impact that constructions of disability have on the lives of persons with disabilities (and society as a whole) cannot be understated, especially when such conceptions have historically been offensive to persons with disabilities and have led to oppression and exclusion from critical aspects of civic life. Critical disability serves as a lens through which to examine how resources and power are allocated within society. The ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of life of persons with disabilities since:

...not all share equally in the good life, or feel adequately included. Among those who face recurring coercion, marginalization, and social exclusion are persons with disabilities. . . The consequence, we suggest, is a system of deep structural economic, social, political, legal, and cultural inequality in which persons with disabilities experience unequal citizenship, a regime of dis-citizenship (Devlin & Pothier, 2006, p. 1).

Cross-References

- ▶ Disability
- ▶ Equality
- ▶ Equity
- ▶ Feminism
- ▶ Human Rights

References

- Bagenstos, S. (2003). “Rational discrimination,” accommodation, and the politics of (disability) civil rights. *Virginia Law Review*, 89(5), 825–923.
- Bagenstos, S. (2004a). The future of disability law. *Yale Law Journal*, 114(1), 1–84.
- Bagenstos, S. (2004b). Justice Ginsburg and the judicial role in expanding “we the people”: The disability rights cases. *Columbia Law Review*, 104(1), 49–59.
- Bichenbach, J. (2001). Disability human rights, law, and policy. In G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, & M. Bury (Eds.), *Handbook of disability studies* (pp. 565–584). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blanck, P., Willichowski, A., & Schmeling, J. (2004). Disability civil rights law and policy: Accessible courtroom technology. *The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 12(3), 825–842.
- Devlin, R., & Pothier, D. (2006). Introduction: Toward a critical theory of dis-citizenship. In D. Pothier & R. Devlin (Eds.), *Critical disability theory: Essays in philosophy, politics, policy, and law*. Toronto, ON: UBC Press.
- Hughes, B., & Paterson, K. (1997). The social model of disability and the disappearing body: Towards a sociology of impairment. *Disability and Society*, 12(3), 325–340.
- Kanter, A. (2003). The globalization of disability rights law. *Syracuse Journal of International Law and Commerce*, 30(2), 241–269.
- Kaufman, C. (2003). *Ideas for action: Relevant theory for radical change*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Neath, J., & Schriener, K. (1998). Power to people with disabilities: Empowerment issues in employment programming. *Disability & Society*, 13(2), 217–228.
- Oliver, M. (1993). Re-defining disability: A challenge to research. In J. Swain, V. Finkelstein, S. French & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Disabling barriers—enabling environments* (pp. 61–68). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Oliver, M., & Barnes, C. (1993). Discrimination, disability and welfare: From needs to rights. In J. Swain, V. Finkelstein, S. French, & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Disabling barriers—enabling environments* (pp. 267–277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rioux, M. (1997). Disability: The place of judgment in a world of fact. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 41(2), 102–111.
- Rioux, M. (2003). On second thought: Constructing knowledge, law, disability, and inequality. In S. Herr, L. Gostin, & H. Koh (Eds.), *The human rights of persons with intellectual disabilities: Different but equal* (pp. 287–317). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Rioux, M., & Frazee, C. (1999). The Canadian framework for disability equality rights. In M. Jones & L. A. Basser (Eds.), *Disability, divers-ability and legal change* (pp. 171–182). The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Rioux, M., & Prince, M. (2002). The Canadian political landscape of disability: Policy perspectives, social status, interest groups and the rights movement. In A. Puttee (Ed.), *Federalism, democracy and disability policy in Canada* (pp. 1–10). Montreal & Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Williams, G. (2001). Theorizing disability. In G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, & M. Bury (Eds.), *Handbook of disability studies* (pp. 123–144). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.