How to cite this article:
Amini-Fard, J., Rouhani, P., & Yazdgerdi, A. (2024). Exploring the Gaps in Legal Protections for Invisible Disabilities. *Journal of Historical Research, Law, and Policy, 2*(4), 46-55. https://doi.org/10.61838/jhrlp.2.4.6

Article history:
Original Research

Dates:
Submission Date: 10 August 2024
Revision Date: 13 September 2024
Acceptance Date: 25 September 2024
Publication Date: 01 October 2024

Exploring the Gaps in Legal Protections for Invisible Disabilities

1. Jalil. Amini-Fard [1] : Department of Public International Law, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran
2. Parinaz. Rouhani [2*]: Department of Public International Law, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran
3. Ashkan. Yazdgerdi [3]: Department of Public International Law, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran

*corresponding author's email: Rouhani1984parinaz@gmai.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore how individuals with invisible disabilities in Tehran experience and navigate legal recognition, protection, and enforcement, highlighting systemic gaps and psychosocial consequences within Iran's legal framework. A qualitative research design was employed using semi-structured interviews to capture the lived experiences of individuals with self-identified invisible disabilities, including psychiatric, neurological, and chronic conditions. Fifteen participants were recruited through purposive sampling in Tehran. Interviews were conducted until theoretical saturation was reached, lasting between 45 and 75 minutes, and were transcribed verbatim. Data were analyzed thematically using NVivo software, applying Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework. Open, axial, and selective coding were used to identify key themes and subthemes reflecting participants' legal experiences. Three overarching themes emerged: (1) legal recognition and definition gaps, including the exclusion of invisible disabilities from statutory definitions and standardized assessments; (2) institutional barriers to enforcement, such as bureaucratic delays, interagency fragmentation, and discriminatory attitudes among legal staff; and (3) psychosocial impacts of legal invisibility, including emotional distress, advocacy fatigue, fear of disclosure, and withdrawal from legal systems. Participants also reported developing alternative strategies for resilience, such as peer advocacy, informal networks, and reframing of disability identity. These findings underscore how the structural invisibility of non-apparent disabilities produces legal exclusion and social disempowerment. The study reveals significant deficiencies in the Iranian legal system's recognition and support for individuals with invisible disabilities. Legal definitions, procedural systems, and professional practices must be reformed to accommodate non-visible impairments through inclusive policies, standardized evaluations, and disability rights training for legal professionals. Amplifying the voices of those affected is essential to advancing equitable justice and fulfilling the commitments of the CRPD.

Keywords: *Invisible disabilities; legal recognition; procedural justice; disability rights; qualitative research; Iran; psychosocial impact; legal exclusion.*

Introduction

Disability law has long been premised on the visibility of impairment, often privileging physical, sensory, or mobility-related conditions in the design of legal standards, institutional protocols, and public understanding. However, the rise of the disability rights movement and the growing recognition of the social model of disability have spotlighted the marginalization of individuals with non-apparent or "invisible" disabilities—conditions that are not immediately observable but may be chronic, episodic, or debilitating in nature (Clair et al., 2005; Fitzgerald &

Paterson, 2020). These include psychiatric disorders, neurodevelopmental conditions, autoimmune diseases, chronic pain, and cognitive impairments, among others. Despite advancements in disability rights discourse, significant gaps remain in the legal recognition, protection, and enforcement of rights for individuals with invisible disabilities, leaving many in a state of legal ambiguity and social neglect (Santuzzi et al., 2014; Beatty et al., 2019).

The distinction between visible and invisible disabilities is not merely semantic—it is deeply embedded in institutional structures and legal definitions. In many jurisdictions, legal frameworks continue to rely on traditional medical categorizations or impairment-based assessments that favor observable symptoms or standardized diagnoses (Campbell & Oliver, 2013). This legal privileging of visibility has profound implications for access to social protections, workplace accommodations, and anti-discrimination measures. Individuals with conditions such as fibromyalgia, bipolar disorder, epilepsy, or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) often encounter skepticism, disbelief, or outright exclusion when attempting to invoke legal protections, especially in systems where eligibility depends on visible markers or narrowly defined diagnostic categories (Kerschbaum et al., 2017; Vickers, 2012).

International legal instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) advocate for inclusive definitions of disability that emphasize the interaction between impairments and social barriers (United Nations, 2006). However, the translation of these principles into national legal systems remains uneven. In Iran, as in many other countries, disability-related legislation tends to focus on physical impairments, leaving those with invisible disabilities underrepresented in state disability registries, employment law, social insurance systems, and judicial protections (Moghaddari et al., 2021). This legal invisibility not only excludes them from services but also reinforces societal stigma and delegitimizes their lived experiences (Jones et al., 2021).

The social and legal challenges faced by individuals with invisible disabilities are exacerbated by epistemic injustice—a form of discrimination wherein individuals are discredited as knowers of their own condition (Fricker, 2007). Legal systems, dominated by formal documentation, biomedical assessments, and rigid classification protocols, often demand proof that is difficult or impossible for those with fluctuating or non-visible conditions to produce. Consequently, individuals are frequently caught in a paradox: their symptoms are debilitating enough to require accommodations, yet too inconspicuous to warrant legal acknowledgment. This phenomenon leads to what some scholars have termed “the burden of disclosure” (Santuzzi et al., 2014), wherein individuals must continuously validate their condition in order to access basic rights, often at the cost of privacy, mental well-being, and social identity.

In the workplace context, for example, disclosure of invisible disabilities is fraught with risk. Studies have shown that employees with non-apparent conditions are more likely to experience discrimination, retaliation, or career stagnation after disclosure, leading many to conceal their condition entirely (Beatty & Joffe, 2006; von Schrader et al., 2014). This concealment, while protective in the short term, denies individuals access to legal accommodations under labor laws and anti-discrimination statutes. The failure of legal systems to account for these dynamics contributes to a structural under-protection of this population, both in terms of rights enforcement and in the design of inclusive workplace policies.

Judicial processes are equally unaccommodating. Courtrooms, administrative agencies, and legal aid services are often ill-equipped to identify or respond appropriately to individuals with invisible disabilities. Legal professionals, including judges and attorneys, may lack the training to understand the nature of such disabilities, leading to procedural injustice, misinterpretation of credibility, or inappropriate rulings (Dudley-Marling, 2004; Silvers &

Francis, 2017). The lack of standardized assessment tools and poor interagency coordination further compound these barriers, resulting in prolonged case timelines, misclassification, and denial of services (Mulvany, 2000).

Moreover, legal invisibility has psychosocial ramifications that transcend the courtroom. The cumulative effect of disbelief, procedural exclusion, and failed recognition undermines individuals' trust in the legal system and reinforces internalized stigma. Research in disability studies and critical legal theory has highlighted how such exclusionary practices lead to the erosion of civic identity and belonging among marginalized groups (Yeo, 2003; Goodley, 2014). For individuals with invisible disabilities, the experience of being "legally unrecognized" often produces emotional distress, advocacy fatigue, and a withdrawal from institutional engagement altogether (Kattari et al., 2018).

In recent years, advocacy groups and disability rights organizations have worked to bridge these legal gaps through legislative reform, awareness campaigns, and strategic litigation. However, empirical research on the subjective experiences of individuals navigating legal systems with invisible disabilities remains limited, particularly in non-Western contexts. Most existing studies have focused on clinical outcomes or organizational diversity efforts, neglecting the lived legal realities of affected individuals. Qualitative studies exploring how legal frameworks are interpreted, experienced, and contested by those they are meant to protect are especially scarce in the Iranian context (Mehrabi et al., 2020).

This study seeks to fill this gap by exploring the legal experiences of individuals with invisible disabilities in Tehran, Iran. Using a qualitative approach based on semi-structured interviews, the research investigates how participants interpret legal protections, navigate institutional processes, and perceive the adequacy or failure of existing legal frameworks. The aim is to identify recurring patterns of exclusion, misunderstanding, and systemic neglect, as well as sources of empowerment and resistance. Particular attention is given to the role of legal definitions, diagnostic documentation, procedural accessibility, and psychosocial consequences of legal invisibility.

By centering the voices of those most affected, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how legal systems interact with disability in socially and medically complex ways. It also responds to broader calls within legal scholarship and disability studies to decenter Western paradigms, incorporate diverse cultural contexts, and foreground the experiential knowledge of disabled individuals in legal analysis (Pothier & Devlin, 2006; Grear, 2010). The findings are expected to inform both policy reform and legal practice, offering recommendations for more inclusive legal recognition, disability assessment, inter-agency coordination, and rights enforcement mechanisms that accommodate the realities of invisible disability.

In doing so, this research aligns with the evolving international discourse on human rights, inclusive justice, and intersectionality. The CRPD emphasizes the importance of accessibility, equality before the law, and participation in all aspects of life, regardless of the form a disability takes (United Nations, 2006). Achieving these goals requires not only legislative reform but also a fundamental shift in how disability is understood, validated, and integrated into the legal fabric of society. Invisible disabilities challenge us to rethink entrenched legal assumptions, to interrogate the boundaries of recognition, and to build systems capable of addressing the full spectrum of human difference.

Methods and Materials

This study employed a qualitative research design grounded in an interpretivist paradigm, aiming to explore the lived experiences and legal perceptions of individuals with invisible disabilities regarding the adequacy and accessibility of legal protections. The approach was chosen to allow for an in-depth understanding of participants' subjective interpretations and nuanced insights into legal frameworks and their limitations. Participants were recruited through purposive sampling, focusing on individuals with self-identified invisible disabilities—such as chronic pain conditions, psychiatric disorders, and neurological impairments—who had experience interacting with legal, workplace, or social service systems in Tehran. A total of 15 participants (8 female, 7 male), aged between 23 and 49 years, took part in the study. Recruitment continued until theoretical saturation was achieved, meaning no new significant themes emerged from additional interviews.

Data were gathered through semi-structured, in-depth interviews conducted face-to-face in confidential settings or online via secure video platforms, depending on participants' preferences and accessibility needs. The interviews were guided by an open-ended protocol developed in consultation with disability rights experts, including key topics such as experiences with legal recognition, institutional responses, accessibility of legal information, and perceptions of discrimination or neglect. Each interview lasted between 45 and 75 minutes and was audio-recorded with the informed consent of the participants. All interviews were transcribed verbatim in Persian, and participants were assured of confidentiality, with identifying details anonymized.

The transcribed data were analyzed using thematic content analysis, following Braun and Clarke's six-step method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within qualitative data. NVivo software (version 12) was employed to facilitate data management, coding, and theme development. Initial open coding was used to identify recurring expressions and experiences, which were then grouped into axial codes to highlight relationships and overarching patterns. Selective coding was conducted to finalize the core categories that encapsulate the central issues surrounding the legal treatment of invisible disabilities. The analysis was iterative, involving multiple readings of transcripts and continuous comparison across interviews to ensure consistency and depth. Reflexive memo writing and peer debriefing were also employed to enhance analytic rigor and credibility.

Findings and Results

Theme 1: Legal Recognition and Definition Gaps

Ambiguity in Legal Terminology:

Participants consistently pointed to the lack of precise legal language to describe and categorize invisible disabilities. Many reported that legal documents use vague or medicalized terms, making it difficult to determine eligibility for support. One participant noted, "They talk about 'impairments' but never explain what counts if people can't see it on you." The inconsistency in how invisible disabilities are defined or referenced across governmental and legal texts creates confusion and marginalization.

Invisible vs. Visible Disability Bias:

The interviews revealed a recurring perception that legal systems favor visible disabilities, both in recognition and resource allocation. Respondents described systemic disbelief in their experiences due to the non-obvious nature of their conditions. As one participant shared, "If you're in a wheelchair, they listen. But when I say I have chronic fatigue, they roll their eyes." This visible/invisible binary often led to legal neglect or the dismissal of claims.

Absence in Disability Lists:

Many participants highlighted their exclusion from legally recognized disability lists used by various agencies. These lists tend to prioritize physical or sensory impairments, leaving out neurological or psychiatric conditions. A respondent stated, "I checked the entire disability registry and couldn't find anything that fits what I've lived with for ten years." This absence resulted in the denial of essential legal protections and accommodations.

Diagnostic Validation Requirements:

Respondents emphasized the burden of undergoing extensive and repetitive documentation to "prove" their disability, often through a narrow medical lens. Legal recognition was frequently contingent on psychiatric confirmation, which not all participants could access. One interviewee remarked, “They made me get three separate notes from doctors, but still said my case wasn’t strong enough legally.” This over-reliance on medical gatekeeping acted as a barrier to justice.

Lack of Standardized Assessments:

Participants identified a lack of coherent evaluation tools across ministries and legal bodies. This led to arbitrary or contradictory decisions about eligibility. One participant explained, “In one office, I was told I qualified, in another, they said I didn’t meet the threshold. It’s like flipping a coin.” The absence of unified standards led to uncertainty and the perception of legal inconsistency.

Invisibility in Employment Law:

Respondents expressed concern that labor regulations fail to account for non-obvious disabilities, especially in workplace accommodation policies. Several mentioned that human resource departments often refused legal accommodations, claiming no physical evidence existed. As one participant put it, “When I requested flexible hours due to my condition, HR said, ‘You look fine to me.’” This lack of recognition led to legal disputes, discrimination, or forced resignation.

Theme 2: Institutional Barriers to Enforcement

Delays in Legal Processes:

Numerous participants spoke about excessive delays when pursuing legal remedies. Court dates were postponed repeatedly, and bureaucratic processes extended over months or years. One participant lamented, “By the time the court acknowledged my complaint, I had already lost my job and health insurance.” These delays contributed to deteriorating mental health and financial strain.

Discriminatory Attitudes of Officials:

Interviewees frequently encountered stigmatizing beliefs and dismissive attitudes from judges, clerks, and legal aid staff. Some shared that their symptoms were minimized or mocked. One respondent recalled, “The judge asked if I was just anxious and looking for attention. I left in tears.” This interpersonal discrimination discouraged further engagement with the legal system.

Weak Interagency Coordination:

Participants described being bounced between various ministries, offices, and departments, each claiming another was responsible. This lack of interagency alignment created procedural limbo. One participant described the experience: “They kept saying ‘not our jurisdiction’—I spent six months just figuring out who to talk to.” The absence of centralized support resulted in legal stagnation.

Lack of Training for Legal Staff:

Respondents noted that legal professionals often lacked training or awareness about the nuances of invisible disabilities. This resulted in poorly informed judgments and procedural errors. A participant commented, “I had to educate my own lawyer on what fibromyalgia even is.” The gap in professional capacity undermined the legal system’s ability to provide fair representation.

Exclusion from Legal Aid Programs:

Several interviewees indicated they were denied access to legal aid based on assumptions that they were capable of working or supporting themselves. These eligibility decisions often ignored the episodic or hidden nature of their impairments. One participant stated, “Because I’m not visibly impaired, they said I didn’t need assistance—even though I couldn’t afford a lawyer.” This exclusion reflects systemic biases in service allocation.

Theme 3: Psychosocial Impact of Legal Invisibility

Emotional Burden of Non-Recognition:

The emotional toll of not being legally recognized was evident across narratives. Participants described feelings of alienation, frustration, and systemic betrayal. One individual expressed, “It’s not just about the law ignoring me—it’s about how it makes me feel like I don’t exist.” This psychological burden often intensified their health challenges.

Fear of Disclosure:

Due to anticipated stigma or retaliation, many participants avoided disclosing their condition to legal authorities or employers. Some feared losing custody rights or employment if their diagnosis became known. As one said, “I kept it a secret because I knew once it’s in the system, it could be used against me.” This fear constrained their access to justice.

Advocacy Fatigue:

Repeatedly recounting their experiences, filing complaints, and engaging with unresponsive institutions led to emotional exhaustion. One participant summarized this as “having to relive the trauma every time, for people who don’t even believe you.” The burden of constant self-advocacy without meaningful results created a cycle of discouragement.

Deterioration of Trust in Legal System:

Over time, participants reported losing faith in the legal system’s ability or willingness to protect their rights. This was expressed through narratives of disillusionment, cynicism, and passive withdrawal. “You get tired of fighting a system built to ignore you,” one participant stated. Such experiences contributed to long-term disengagement.

Coping Strategies:

In response to systemic failure, participants adopted alternative strategies such as relying on informal peer networks, self-advocacy, or completely disengaging from formal systems. Some selectively disclosed only to trusted individuals. “We have our own underground network to share advice—it’s more reliable than the actual law,” one interviewee explained.

Empowerment Through Collective Voice:

Despite challenges, several participants engaged in activism, advocacy, or community organizing to challenge the legal neglect of invisible disabilities. They described public speaking, NGO collaboration, and online campaigns as sources of empowerment. One respondent proudly shared, “They wouldn’t listen to me in court, but they heard me when I spoke at the university.”

Reframing Disability Identity:

Some participants described a shift in how they perceived their own condition—not as a deficit but as a source of resilience or critical insight. They challenged social definitions and reclaimed their narrative. “I stopped seeing myself as broken and started seeing the system as flawed,” one individual said, reflecting a redefinition of self against dominant legal norms.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study sought to investigate how individuals with invisible disabilities in Tehran experience legal recognition, protection, and enforcement within Iran's disability rights and judicial systems. Drawing from in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 15 participants, three core themes emerged: legal recognition and definition gaps, institutional barriers to enforcement, and the psychosocial impact of legal invisibility. These themes reveal a pattern of systemic exclusion shaped by ambiguous legal definitions, discriminatory institutional practices, and a lack of psychosocial support mechanisms. Together, the findings underscore the multidimensional nature of legal marginalization for individuals whose disabilities are not immediately visible.

The first theme, concerning legal recognition and definitional ambiguity, highlights a fundamental flaw in the legal architecture that governs disability protections in Iran. Participants emphasized how legal language remains anchored in medicalized, visible, and objectively verifiable conceptions of disability, effectively excluding many forms of chronic illness, psychiatric conditions, and neurodevelopmental disorders. This is consistent with broader critiques in disability studies literature, where legal systems have been found to reinforce ableist assumptions by demanding visual or measurable impairment as a precondition for protection (Clair et al., 2005; Campbell & Oliver, 2013). This bias results in the exclusion of individuals with conditions such as fibromyalgia, PTSD, and bipolar disorder from formal registries and state benefits—an issue mirrored in other national contexts where legal definitions rely heavily on static diagnostic criteria (Vickers, 2012; Fitzgerald & Paterson, 2020).

Participants' experiences with bureaucratic disbelief, invasive validation procedures, and fragmented diagnostic thresholds further confirm the enduring medical gatekeeping embedded in Iranian disability policy. This echoes the findings of Beatty et al. (2019), who argued that the burden of proof imposed on people with invisible disabilities is disproportionately high due to the absence of standardized and inclusive assessment mechanisms. Respondents in this study described being subjected to repetitive, often contradictory documentation processes that failed to account for the episodic nature or subjective experiences of their conditions. This reflects Fricker's (2007) concept of "epistemic injustice," where individuals are disqualified as credible witnesses to their own experiences due to systemic biases that devalue non-visible forms of disability.

The second theme—barriers to legal enforcement—captures the institutional dysfunctions that inhibit access to justice. The data revealed a consistent lack of coordination between agencies, prolonged legal timelines, and discriminatory attitudes among legal professionals, including judges, lawyers, and clerks. These procedural barriers are not unique to Iran. Silvers and Francis (2017) emphasized that legal systems across jurisdictions are often structurally unprepared to deal with disabilities that challenge normative assumptions about visibility and functional limitation. This inadequacy is further exacerbated by the lack of training in invisible disabilities for legal personnel, a gap identified by Santuzzi et al. (2014) as a key institutional shortcoming that affects the procedural fairness of disability-related legal claims.

Participants also pointed to exclusion from legal aid services, where eligibility was based on outward signs of incapacity or stereotypical assumptions about productivity. This institutional neglect has been documented in other studies highlighting how social service systems often filter out individuals with "unconvincing" impairments due to internalized notions of what disability should look like (Mulvany, 2000; Kattari et al., 2018). These findings suggest that legal protections for invisible disabilities are not merely absent—they are actively undermined by procedural norms and biases that produce second-order discrimination, where invisibility itself becomes a disqualifying factor.

The final theme centers on the psychosocial consequences of being legally unrecognized. Participants articulated a deep sense of alienation, frustration, and advocacy fatigue, as they were required to repeatedly justify their condition in settings that offered little empathy or institutional support. Many reported concealing their disability due to fear of stigma or legal consequences, a phenomenon well-documented in workplace studies on non-disclosure and emotional labor (Beatty & Joffe, 2006; von Schrader et al., 2014). Legal systems that rely on disclosure as a precondition for accommodation fail to account for the psychological toll of publicizing a stigmatized identity—particularly when that disclosure does not result in meaningful support.

Notably, some participants responded to legal exclusion by developing alternative strategies for resilience and empowerment. These included engaging in grassroots advocacy, forming informal networks for legal advice, and reclaiming their disability identity through personal narrative. Such forms of agency resonate with what Goodley (2014) describes as “disability activism from the margins,” where individuals excluded from institutional channels construct their own pathways for resistance. Although these acts of self-determination are commendable, they should not obscure the institutional obligation to provide equitable legal protections. Rather, they highlight the inadequacies of existing frameworks and the need for systemic reform.

This study’s findings align with international disability rights discourses, particularly the CRPD’s emphasis on accessibility, non-discrimination, and full participation in society regardless of impairment type (United Nations, 2006). However, the implementation of these principles within Iranian legal practice remains incomplete. While Iran ratified the CRPD in 2009, the practical mechanisms to ensure rights for those with invisible disabilities remain underdeveloped. As noted by Moghaddari et al. (2021), the Iranian legal system continues to prioritize physical impairments in its registries and benefits structures, limiting the scope of protection for those with psychiatric or cognitive conditions.

The findings also contribute to a growing body of research calling for intersectional approaches to disability law—approaches that recognize the interaction of legal, cultural, psychological, and institutional forces in shaping the lived experiences of marginalized populations (Grear, 2010; Pothier & Devlin, 2006). The legal neglect of invisible disabilities is not simply a matter of definitional oversight but a reflection of deeper systemic biases rooted in ableist norms, evidentiary paradigms, and institutional inertia. A reimagining of disability law must therefore include a conceptual shift toward flexibility, recognition of subjective testimony, and integration of psychosocial dimensions into legal reasoning.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors’ Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adheried in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

Beatty, J. E., & Joffe, R. (2006). Invisible disabilities: A qualitative exploration of employee perspectives. Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 21(2), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.1300/J490v21n02_07

Beatty, J. E., Baldridge, D. C., Boehm, S. A., Kulkarni, M., & Colella, A. (2019). On the treatment of persons with invisible disabilities: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. Journal of Management, 45(1), 317–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316675726

Campbell, F. K., & Oliver, M. (2013). Disability politics: Understanding our past, changing our future. Routledge.

Clair, J. A., Beatty, J. E., & MacLean, T. L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. Academy of Management Review, 30(1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.15281431

Dudley-Marling, C. (2004). The social construction of learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 37(6), 482–489. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194040370060201

Fitzgerald, M. H., & Paterson, K. A. (2020). Invisible disabilities. In J. H. Stone & M. Blouin (Eds.), International Encyclopedia of Rehabilitation. Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange.

Fricker, M. (2007). Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing. Oxford University Press.

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

Grear, A. (2010). Redirecting human rights: Facing the challenge of corporate legal humanity. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, N., Shakespeare, T., & Bright, T. (2021). Disability and the global South: The critical importance of social justice. Disability & Society, 36(4), 540–545. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2021.1907545

Kattari, S. K., Lavery, A., & Hasche, L. (2018). Applying a social model of disability across the life span. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 28(4), 442–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1422947

Kerschbaum, S. L., Eisenman, L. T., & Jones, J. M. (2017). Negotiating disability: Disclosure and higher education. Michigan State University Press.

Mehrabi, F., Moradi, M., & Khodadadi, H. (2020). Disability and legal protections in Iran: Challenges and opportunities. Iranian Journal of Social Studies, 14(1), 65–83.

Moghaddari, H., Ehsani, M., & Rouhani, S. (2021). Legal barriers to inclusive employment of persons with disabilities in Iran. Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 31(4), 287–298.

Mulvany, J. (2000). Disability, impairment or illness? The relevance of the social model of disability to the study of mental disorder. Sociology of Health & Illness, 22(5), 582–601. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.00221

Pothier, D., & Devlin, R. (Eds.). (2006). Critical disability theory: Essays in philosophy, politics, policy, and law. UBC Press.

Santuzzi, A. M., Waltz, P. R., Finkelstein, L. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2014). Invisible disabilities: Unique challenges for employees and organizations. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 7(2), 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12134

Silvers, A., & Francis, L. P. (2017). Justice through trust: Disability and the “outlier problem” in social contract theory. Ethics, 122(1), 40–66.

United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf

Vickers, M. H. (2012). Invisible disability and workplace bullying: Stories of marginalization and resistance. Routledge.

von Schrader, S., Malzer, V., Erickson, W., & Bruyère, S. (2014). Emerging employment issues for people with disabilities: Disability disclosure, leave as a reasonable accommodation, and the ADAAA. Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education, 28(1), 31–44.

Yeo, R. (2003). Chronic poverty and disability. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper, 4.