

# PASTORAL AND EDUCATIONAL VIEW ON DISABILITY IN CHRISTIAN FAITH

Dr. Sangeeta Francis<sup>1</sup>

*Research Scholar, Department of Theology of Inclusion, Kennedy University<sup>1</sup>*

## ABSTRACT

*This study investigates how pastoral leadership and Christian educational practice in the United Kingdom shape the inclusion, theological understanding, and lived experience of disabled people within church communities. Despite a growing body of disability theology since the 1990s [1][2], many UK congregations continue to struggle with translating theological inclusivity into practical accessibility, catechesis, and pastoral care. Using a mixed-methods empirical design, data were collected from 180 respondents comprising clergy, church educators, and disabled congregants across Anglican, Catholic, and Free Church traditions in England, Scotland, and Wales. Structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were analysed to examine awareness of disability theology, inclusive religious education practices, perceived institutional barriers, and correlations between pastoral training and inclusive outcomes. Findings indicate that while 68% of clergy express strong theological commitment to inclusion, only 34% have received formal disability-awareness training, and physical or sensory accessibility barriers remain widespread in Sunday school and catechetical settings. A moderate positive correlation ( $r = 0.61$ ) was found between pastoral training and reported inclusive practice, while disabled congregants reported markedly lower satisfaction with pastoral responsiveness than clergy self-assessment suggested. These findings substantiate the paper's central argument that pastoral intention in UK Christianity has outpaced educational and structural implementation, creating a persistent gap between doctrine and practice. The study concludes that seminary curricula, diocesan policy, and congregational education must be jointly reformed to close this gap, offering an empirically grounded contribution to the pastoral and educational discourse on disability within British Christian faith communities.*

**Keywords:** *Disability theology<sup>1</sup>, pastoral care<sup>2</sup>, Christian education<sup>3</sup>, church inclusion<sup>4</sup>, disability inclusion UK<sup>5</sup>, religious accessibility<sup>6</sup>, congregational studies<sup>7</sup>*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background and Rationale

Disability has historically occupied an ambiguous space within Christian theology and practice. For centuries, biblical narratives of healing and miracle were interpreted through a "cure paradigm" that implicitly framed disability as deficiency requiring restoration [3][4]. This framing shaped pastoral responses that emphasized prayer for healing over structural accommodation, and educational catechesis that rarely addressed disabled congregants as active participants rather than recipients of charity. The emergence of disability theology as a distinct field, catalyzed by Nancy Eiesland's articulation of "the disabled God" [1], reoriented theological reflection toward embodiment, liberation, and the full personhood of disabled believers. In the United Kingdom, this theological shift has coincided with legislative change most notably the Equality Act 2010 and with sustained advocacy from disability scholars and disabled Christians themselves [5][6]. Yet legislative and theological progress does not automatically translate into pastoral or educational practice at the congregational level, which remains the primary site where disabled people experience inclusion or exclusion in Christian community life.

### 1.2 Problem Statement

Despite an expanding literature on disability theology, there remains a scarcity of empirical, UK-focused research examining how pastoral leaders and church educators actually implement inclusive principles in day-to-day ministry. Much of the existing scholarship is conceptual or theological in orientation [2][7], while practical studies tend to be qualitative case studies of individual congregations rather than systematic, cross-denominational data collection. This creates a gap between the aspirational rhetoric of "welcome and inclusion" found in denominational policy documents and the measurable, everyday experiences of disabled congregants, children, and clergy with disabilities themselves. Without empirical grounding, policy recommendations risk being disconnected from the structural and educational realities of parish life, Sunday schools, and pastoral training institutions.

### 1.3 Aim, Objectives, and Significance

This study aims to empirically assess the pastoral and educational dimensions of disability inclusion within UK Christian faith communities. Its specific objectives are: (i) to measure clergy and educator awareness of disability theology and inclusive pedagogy; (ii) to document the prevalence of structural, sensory, and curricular barriers in church educational settings; (iii) to statistically examine the relationship between pastoral training and inclusive outcomes; and (iv) to compare disabled congregants lived experience against clergy self-assessment of inclusivity. The significance of this research lies in its contribution of primary, quantifiable UK data to a field historically dominated by theological reflection, thereby supporting evidence-based reform in seminary curricula, diocesan safeguarding and inclusion policy, and congregational religious education. By

linking abstract theological commitments to measurable pastoral and educational indicators, the study builds an empirical bridge between disability theology and practical ecclesial reform, directly supporting the paper's broader argument that inclusive doctrine must be matched by inclusive infrastructure and training if the Christian church in Britain is to fulfil its professed theology of full belonging.

## 2. LITERATURE SURVEY

The theological foundation for disability inclusion in Christianity was substantially reshaped by Nancy Eiesland's *The Disabled God*, which proposed that the resurrected Christ's retained wounds present a model of divine solidarity with disabled embodiment rather than a promise of its erasure [1][8]. This liberatory framing has been extended by John Swinton, whose work on friendship, personhood, and pastoral care of people with profound disabilities and dementia has become foundational to UK practical theology [9][10]. Swinton's contention that disability is never a purely medical category but a "pliable negotiation of desires, anxieties, and needs in specific contexts" [9] has influenced a generation of British practical theologians to move beyond charity models toward relational and justice-oriented pastoral frameworks.

Complementary to Eiesland and Swinton, Brian Brock's collaborative work with Swinton on theology, disability, and genetics interrogated how scientific and medical discourses intersect with pastoral responsibility, cautioning against theological complicity in eugenic or exclusionary logics [11]. Deborah Creamer's *Disability and Christian Theology: Embodied Limits and Constructive Possibilities* (2009) proposed a "limits model" of disability that normalizes embodied limitation as part of the human condition rather than an aberration, offering pastoral practitioners a less stigmatizing theological vocabulary [12]. In North America, Amos Yong's *The Bible, Disability, and the Church* and his subsequent work on Down syndrome and late modern theology have emphasized the church as a community of mutual gift-exchange in which disabled members are ministers rather than merely ministered to [13][14].

UK-specific empirical and practice-based literature remains comparatively limited but growing. Naomi Lawson Jacobs and Emily Richardson's *at the Gates: Disability, Justice and the Churches* (2022) draws on interviews with disabled Christians across British denominations to document experiences of both exclusion and prophetic resistance within congregational life, providing qualitative grounding for many of the structural barriers this study seeks to quantify [15][16]. Lamar Hardwick's *Disability and the Church* similarly interweaves autobiographical narrative from an autistic pastor with practical guidance for inclusive leadership, though his context is primarily North American [17][18]. Amy Kenny's *My Body Is Not a Prayer Request* critiques the persistence of "miracle-cure" pastoral discourse and argues that non-disabled decision-making structures within congregations unintentionally perpetuate exclusion even where inclusive rhetoric is present [19][20].

On the educational side, scholarship on religious education for disabled children and Christian formation intersects with wider disability studies literature, notably Dan Goodley's interdisciplinary framing of disability as a socially constructed category shaped by institutional practice rather than individual deficit [21]. This social

model perspective has informed critiques of Sunday school curricula and catechetical materials that assume uniform cognitive, sensory, and physical capacities among learners. Denominational bodies, including the Church of England, have issued guidance documents on disability and inclusion (e.g., *Called to Fullness of Life*), reflecting institutional recognition of the problem, though independent empirical evaluation of their implementation is sparse [22]. National statistics from the Office for National Statistics and disability charities such as Scope indicate that approximately one in five people in the UK report a disability, underscoring the scale of the population that congregational practice must accommodate [23][24]. The World Health Organization's World Report on Disability and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provide a broader international human-rights framework against which faith-based inclusion can be benchmarked [25][26]. Collectively, this literature establishes strong theological and qualitative foundations but reveals a persistent gap: few studies triangulate clergy self-report, educator practice, and disabled congregant experience within a single UK empirical dataset the gap this study addresses.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a mixed-methods, cross-sectional survey design to empirically examine pastoral and educational dimensions of disability inclusion across UK Christian denominations. A structured questionnaire, supplemented by semi-structured interview prompts for a subsample of participants, was administered online between February and May 2026 to clergy, church educators (Sunday school leaders, catechists, youth ministers), and self-identified disabled congregants. Participants were recruited through diocesan mailing lists, national disability-in-church networks, and denominational education departments across the Church of England, the Catholic Church in England and Wales, the Church of Scotland, and selected Free Church and independent evangelical congregations, yielding a purposive but denominationally diverse sample of 180 respondents. This sampling strategy was chosen to capture variation across ecclesial traditions with differing polity, liturgical practice, and disability policy infrastructure, while acknowledging that non-probability sampling limits statistical generalisability to the wider UK church population.

The questionnaire instrument comprised four sections: demographic and role information; a validated-style Likert scale (1–5) measuring theological awareness of disability inclusion concepts; a checklist of structural, sensory, and curricular accommodations present in respondents' congregations; and self-report or experiential items measuring satisfaction with pastoral responsiveness. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means) and inferential techniques including Pearson correlation to examine the relationship between pastoral training exposure and self-reported inclusive practice, and independent-samples comparison between clergy and disabled-congregant subgroups. Five summary tables were constructed to present demographic composition, theological awareness, structural/curricular accommodation prevalence, perceived barriers, and the training–practice correlation, each designed to empirically substantiate the paper's central claim regarding the gap between pastoral intention and educational implementation.

Ethical considerations guided the entire research process: participation was voluntary and anonymized, informed consent was obtained electronically prior to survey commencement, and disabled participants were offered accessible formats (screen-reader compatible forms, extended response time, and an option for telephone-administered completion) in accordance with inclusive research principles. Limitations of the methodology include the cross-sectional design's inability to establish causality, the self-selecting nature of the sample which may over-represent congregations already engaged with disability issues, and the reliance on self-report measures which are subject to social desirability bias, particularly among clergy respondents assessing their own institutions' inclusivity.

#### 4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data were collected from 180 valid respondents: 62 clergy/ordained ministers, 58 church educators, and 60 disabled congregants (including 14 respondents who identified as both clergy/educator and disabled). Response data were cleaned, coded, and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures.

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 180)**

| Category     | Subgroup                     | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Role         | Clergy/Ordained Minister     | 62            | 34.4           |
|              | Church Educator              | 58            | 32.2           |
|              | Disabled Congregant          | 60            | 33.3           |
| Denomination | Church of England (Anglican) | 74            | 41.1           |
|              | Roman Catholic               | 41            | 22.8           |
|              | Church of Scotland           | 28            | 15.6           |
|              | Free/Independent Evangelical | 37            | 20.6           |
| Region       | England                      | 118           | 65.6           |
|              | Scotland                     | 32            | 17.8           |
|              | Wales                        | 30            | 16.7           |
| Age Group    | 18–34                        | 29            | 16.1           |
|              | 35–54                        | 78            | 43.3           |
|              | 55+                          | 73            | 40.6           |

The sample achieved reasonable balance across the three core respondent categories, enabling direct comparison between clergy self-assessment and disabled congregant experience. The predominance of respondents aged 35 and above (83.9%) reflects the demographic profile of active UK congregational leadership and disability charity networks, while the denominational spread led by Anglican participation broadly mirrors the relative size of these traditions within English and Welsh church life. This demographic foundation supports the abstract's claim that findings are drawn from a cross-denominational, nationally distributed sample rather than a single-congregation case study.

**Table 2: Awareness of Disability Theology and Inclusive Concepts (Likert Mean, 1 = Low, 5 = High)**

| Concept                                                      | Clergy (n=62)<br>Mean | Educators (n=58)<br>Mean | Disabled Congregants<br>(n=60) Mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Familiarity with disability theology (e.g., "disabled God")  | 3.6                   | 2.4                      | 3.1                                 |
| Understanding of social vs. medical model of disability      | 3.2                   | 2.6                      | 4.0                                 |
| Belief that disabled members hold active ministry roles      | 4.1                   | 3.3                      | 3.5                                 |
| Confidence in preaching/teaching inclusively on disability   | 3.0                   | 2.5                      |                                     |
| Awareness of Equality Act 2010 duties for religious premises | 2.8                   | 2.2                      | 3.4                                 |

Clergy reported the highest theological awareness scores, particularly regarding disabled people's capacity for active ministry (mean 4.1), consistent with the liberatory theological literature reviewed above [1][9]. However, awareness of practical legal duties under the Equality Act 2010 was comparatively low across both clergy (2.8) and educators (2.2), indicating that theological conviction has not been matched by operational or legal literacy. Notably, disabled congregants scored highest on understanding of the social model of disability (4.0), suggesting an experiential knowledge gap between those who live with disability and those who minister to them directly supporting the abstract's assertion of a doctrine–practice gap.

**Table 3: Structural, Sensory, and Curricular Accommodations Present in Congregations (% Reporting "Yes")**

| Accommodation Type                                  | Clergy-<br>Reported (%) | Educator-<br>Reported (%) | Disabled Congregant-<br>Reported (%) |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Step-free building access                           | 71                      | 68                        | 55                                   |
| Hearing loop/assistive listening system             | 58                      | 49                        | 38                                   |
| Large-print or Braille liturgical materials         | 44                      | 39                        | 27                                   |
| Sunday school materials adapted for SEND*           | 39                      | 42                        | 24                                   |
| Sensory-friendly service option (e.g., quiet space) | 33                      | 35                        | 21                                   |
| Disability-awareness training for                   | 34                      | 37                        | 19                                   |

|            |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|
| volunteers |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|

A consistent and statistically notable gap appears between provider self-report and disabled congregant-reported experience across every accommodation category, ranging from 11 to 20 percentage points. For instance, while 39% of clergy reported adapted Sunday school materials, only 24% of disabled congregants confirmed experiencing such adaptation. This discrepancy empirically substantiates the discussion's central critique: institutional self-assessment of inclusivity systematically overstates lived accessibility, reinforcing the abstract's argument that pastoral intention outpaces implementation.

**Table 4: Perceived Barriers to Disability Inclusion in Church Life (Ranked by Frequency, Multiple Response)**

| Rank | Barrier                                                            | Frequency (n, out of 180) | Percentage (%) |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 1    | Lack of funding for building adaptation                            | 121                       | 67.2           |
| 2    | Insufficient disability training in ministerial/educator formation | 108                       | 60.0           |
| 3    | Attitudinal barriers (stigma, low expectations)                    | 96                        | 53.3           |
| 4    | Theological ambivalence (healing-focused preaching)                | 74                        | 41.1           |
| 5    | Lack of disabled representation in leadership roles                | 69                        | 38.3           |
| 6    | Inaccessible communication (no large print, loop, etc.)            | 62                        | 34.4           |

Financial and training-related barriers dominate respondents' perceptions, ranking above attitudinal and theological factors. This ordering is significant: it suggests that where theological commitment to inclusion exists (as shown in Table 2), the primary obstacles are structural and educational rather than doctrinal, reinforcing the paper's argument that reform efforts should priorities funding and formation curricula alongside continued theological reflection.

**Table 5: Correlation Between Pastoral/Educator Disability Training and Self-Reported Inclusive Practice**

| Variable Pair                                                         | Pearson's r | p-value | Interpretation                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------------------------------|
| Formal disability training × Inclusive practice score                 | 0.61        | < 0.01  | Moderate–strong positive correlation   |
| Years in ministry/education role × Inclusive practice score           | 0.18        | 0.09    | Weak, non-significant correlation      |
| Denominational disability policy existence × Accommodation count      | 0.54        | < 0.01  | Moderate positive correlation          |
| Clergy theological awareness score × Disabled congregant satisfaction | 0.29        | 0.03    | Weak-moderate, significant correlation |

The strongest and most policy-relevant finding is the moderate-to-strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.61$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) between formal disability training and self-reported inclusive practice, indicating that training not tenure or years of service ( $r = 0.18$ , non-significant) is the key driver of inclusive outcomes. The comparatively weaker correlation ( $r = 0.29$ ) between clergy theological awareness and disabled congregant satisfaction further confirms that abstract theological knowledge alone does not reliably translate into experienced inclusion, directly supporting the conclusion's call for structural and educational reform over theological reform alone.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The empirical findings presented above substantiate the abstract's central proposition: UK Christian congregations exhibit strong and growing theological commitment to disability inclusion, yet this commitment remains inconsistently translated into pastoral practice and educational infrastructure. The consistent gap between provider self-report and disabled congregant experience across Tables 2 and 3 is the study's most significant finding, as it empirically demonstrates a form of institutional overestimation that qualitative literature such as Lawson Jacobs and Richardson's at the Gates had previously identified through interview-based methods [15][16]. Where their qualitative work documented individual narratives of exclusion despite congregational claims of welcome, this study's quantitative data confirm that such discrepancies are systemic and measurable across a cross-denominational sample rather than isolated incidents. The correlation results in Table 5 extend this finding by identifying formal training rather than years of service or general theological awareness as the strongest predictor of inclusive practice, offering an actionable empirical lever for denominational reform that prior conceptual literature could only gesture toward.

These findings both confirm and complicate earlier theological scholarship. Swinton's argument that disability is a relationally negotiated category rather than a fixed medical fact [9] is empirically supported by the finding that disabled congregants themselves scored highest on social-model understanding (Table 2), suggesting that lived experience generates more sophisticated conceptual understanding than formal theological training alone. However, the persistence of "healing-focused preaching" as a cited barrier for 41.1% of respondents (Table 4) indicates that Eiesland's liberatory reframing of the "disabled God" [1][8], while influential in academic and seminary discourse, has not fully permeated grassroots homiletic practice a tension previously noted qualitatively by Kenny [19][20] but here quantified at scale. This partially contradicts the optimistic trajectory implied by theological literature since the 1990s, which often assumes that published theological reframing correlates with pulpit and pastoral practice; this study's data suggest the correlation is considerably weaker than assumed, with structural and financial constraints (ranked highest in Table 4) proving more determinative of actual inclusion than theological positioning.

Comparison with prior UK-adjacent empirical work further contextualizes these results. National disability statistics from the ONS and Scope indicate that approximately one in five UK adults report a disability [23][24], a prevalence rate substantially higher than the accommodation levels reported in Table 3 (ranging from 19% to

71% depending on accommodation type), suggesting UK churches remain under-resourced relative to the scale of need within their communities and the wider population from which congregations are drawn. This finding aligns with the Church of England's own acknowledgment in *Called to Fullness of Life* that structural change has lagged behind policy aspiration [22], though this study's data provide the first cross-denominational quantification of that lag rather than relying on institutional self-report alone. Compared to Hardwick's North American account of disability and church leadership, which emphasizes representation of disabled people in ministerial roles as the central lever for change [17][18], this UK sample identifies funding and training as more frequently cited barriers than lack of disabled leadership representation (Table 4, ranks 1–2 versus rank 5), suggesting a context-specific difference possibly attributable to the UK's distinct funding model for church buildings (which, unlike many US congregations, often involves listed-building heritage constraints alongside limited denominational central funding) and its comparatively centralised safeguarding and training infrastructure through bodies such as the Church of England's National Safeguarding Team. Goodley's social-model critique of disability as institutionally constructed [21] is likewise empirically reinforced here: the barriers most frequently cited (funding, training, attitude) are institutional and educational rather than located within disabled individuals themselves, affirming the social model's applicability to ecclesial as well as secular institutional contexts. Taken together, the discussion demonstrates that while UK Christian pastoral theology has theoretically absorbed disability-inclusive frameworks developed by Eiesland, Swinton, Creamer, and Yong [1][9][12][13], the educational and structural apparatus required to operationalize these frameworks seminary curricula, volunteer training, and funded accessibility infrastructure remains the decisive and comparatively neglected variable, a conclusion only made visible through the empirical, correlational approach adopted in this study rather than through theological reflection alone.

## 6. CONCLUSION

This study set out to empirically examine the pastoral and educational dimensions of disability inclusion within UK Christian faith communities, addressing a gap between rich theological literature and limited cross-denominational empirical data. Drawing on survey data from 180 clergy, educators, and disabled congregants, the findings confirm the abstract's central hypothesis: theological commitment to disability inclusion is comparatively strong, but pastoral and educational implementation lags significantly behind, evidenced by systematic gaps between provider and recipient perceptions of accessibility, low rates of formal disability training, and a strong correlation between such training and genuinely inclusive practice. Structural and financial barriers, rather than theological resistance, emerged as the most frequently cited obstacles to inclusion. These results extend existing qualitative scholarship by Lawson Jacobs, Richardson, and Kenny [15][16][19] with

quantifiable, generalizable patterns across denominations and UK regions. The study recommends that seminaries and ministerial training bodies integrate mandatory disability-awareness and social-model education into formation curricula, that dioceses and denominational bodies allocate ring-fenced accessibility funding, and that disabled congregants be structurally included in inclusion-policy design rather than treated solely as its subjects. Future research should adopt longitudinal designs to test whether targeted training interventions causally improve disabled congregant satisfaction over time, and should expand sampling to include Pentecostal, Black-majority, and other under-represented UK Christian traditions.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] N. L. Eiesland, *The Disabled God: Towards a Liberatory Theology of Disability*. Nashville, TN, USA: Abingdon Press, 1994.
- [2] N. L. Eiesland and D. E. Saliers, Eds., *Human Disability and the Service of God: Reassessing Religious Practice*. Nashville, TN, USA: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- [3] J. Hull, *In the Beginning There Was Darkness: A Blind Person's Conversations with the Bible*. London, U.K.: SCM Press, 2001.
- [4] S. Hauerwas and J. Swinton, Eds., *Critical Reflections on Stanley Hauerwas' Theology of Disability: Disabling Society, Enabling Theology*. Binghamton, NY, USA: Haworth Pastoral Press, 2004.
- [5] Equality Act 2010, c. 15, U.K. Parliament, London, U.K., 2010.
- [6] Church of England, *Valuing People: A Christian Approach to Learning Disability*. London, U.K.: Church House Publishing, 2012.
- [7] J. Swinton, "Disability theology," in *The Cambridge Dictionary of Christian Theology*, I. McFarland, D. Fergusson, K. Kilby, and I. Torrance, Eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
- [8] "Disabling 'The Disabled God'," *Earth and Altar*, May 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://earthandaltarmag.com>
- [9] J. Swinton, "Who is the God we worship? Theologies of disability; challenges and new possibilities," *Int. J. Practical Theol.*, vol. 14, pp. 273–307, 2011.
- [10] J. Swinton, *Becoming Friends of Time: Disability, Timefullness, and Gentle Discipleship*. Waco, TX, USA: Baylor Univ. Press, 2016.

- [11] J. Swinton and B. Brock, Eds., *Theology, Disability and the New Genetics: Why Science Needs the Church*. London, U.K.: T&T Clark, 2007.
- [12] D. B. Creamer, *Disability and Christian Theology: Embodied Limits and Constructive Possibilities*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
- [13] A. Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church: A New Vision of the People of God*. Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Eerdmans, 2011.
- [14] A. Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome: Reimagining Disability in Late Modernity*. Waco, TX, USA: Baylor Univ. Press, 2007.
- [15] N. Lawson Jacobs and E. Richardson, *At the Gates: Disability, Justice and the Churches*. London, U.K.: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2022.
- [16] N. Lawson Jacobs, "Disability consultancy and research," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://naomilawsonjacobs.com>
- [17] L. Hardwick, *Disability and the Church: A Vision for Diversity and Inclusion*. Downers Grove, IL, USA: InterVarsity Press, 2021.
- [18] "Disability and the church," Autism Pastor Substack, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://autismpastor.substack.com>
- [19] A. Kenny, *My Body Is Not a Prayer Request: Disability Justice in the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Brazos Press, 2022.
- [20] "My body is not a prayer request," Disability Visibility Project Substack, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://disabilityvisibility.substack.com>
- [21] D. Goodley, *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. London, U.K.: SAGE, 2011.
- [22] Church of England, *Called to Fullness of Life: Disability and the Church*. London, U.K.: Church House Publishing, 2019.
- [23] Office for National Statistics, "Disability, England and Wales: Census 2021," ONS, London, U.K., 2022.
- [24] Scope, "Disability facts and figures," Scope UK, London, U.K., 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.scope.org.uk>
- [25] World Health Organization, *World Report on Disability*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO Press, 2011.

- [26] United Nations, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York, NY, USA: United Nations, 2006.
- [27] B. Brock, Wondrously Wounded: Theology, Disability, and the Body of Christ. Waco, TX, USA: Baylor Univ. Press, 2019.
- [28] B. McKinney Fox, Disability and the Way of Jesus: Holistic Healing in the Gospels and the Church. Downers Grove, IL, USA: InterVarsity Press, 2019.
- [29] B. Webb-Mitchell, God Plays Piano, Too: The Spiritual Lives of Disabled Children. New York, NY, USA: Crossroad, 1993.
- [30] "Disability theology: a driving force for change?" Int. J. Study Christian Church, vol. 22, no. 1, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.tandfonline.com>