

INFORMATION SYSTEMS EDUCATION JOURNAL

In this issue:

- 4. An IT Strategy Course: Why and How**
David M. Woods, Miami University Regionals
Elizabeth V. Howard, Miami University Regionals
- 12. Live, Model, Learn: Experiencing Information Systems Requirements through Simulation**
Kathleen S. Hartzel, Duquesne University
Jacqueline C. Pike, Duquesne University
- 24. Steganography and Cryptography Inspired Enhancement of Introductory Programming Courses**
Yana Kortsarts, Widener University
Yulia Kempner, Holon Institute of Technology, Israel
- 33. The Flipped Classroom in Systems Analysis & Design: Leveraging Technology to Increase Student Engagement**
Bruce M. Saulnier, Quinnipiac University
- 41. A Basic Set of Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching Case Studies: Students' Perspective**
Douglas Havelka, Miami University
Catherine S. Neal, Northern Kentucky University
- 51. Engaging Engineering and Information Systems Students in Advocacy for Individuals with Disabilities through a Disability Film Media Project**
James Lawler, Pace University
Val Iturralde, Pace University
Allan Goldstein, Pace University
Anthony Joseph, Pace University
- 64. The Effectiveness of Data Science as a means to achieve Proficiency in Scientific Literacy**
Wendy Ceccucci, Quinnipiac University
Dawn Tamarkin, Springfield Technical Community College
Kiku Jones, Quinnipiac University
- 71. Experiential Learning using QlikView Business Intelligence Software**
RJ Podeschi, Millikin University
- 81. Addressing the 21st Century Paradox: Integrating Entrepreneurship in the Computer Information Systems Curriculum**
Guido Lang, Quinnipiac University
Jeffry Babb, West Texas A&M University

The **Information Systems Education Journal** (ISEDJ) is a double-blind peer-reviewed academic journal published by **EDSIG**, the Education Special Interest Group of AITP, the Association of Information Technology Professionals (Chicago, Illinois). Publishing frequency is six times per year. The first year of publication is 2003.

ISEDJ is published online (<http://isedj.org>). Our sister publication, the Proceedings of EDSIG (<http://www.edsigcon.org>) features all papers, panels, workshops, and presentations from the conference.

The journal acceptance review process involves a minimum of three double-blind peer reviews, where both the reviewer is not aware of the identities of the authors and the authors are not aware of the identities of the reviewers. The initial reviews happen before the conference. At that point papers are divided into award papers (top 15%), other journal papers (top 30%), unsettled papers, and non-journal papers. The unsettled papers are subjected to a second round of blind peer review to establish whether they will be accepted to the journal or not. Those papers that are deemed of sufficient quality are accepted for publication in the ISEDJ journal. Currently the target acceptance rate for the journal is under 40%.

Information Systems Education Journal is pleased to be listed in the 1st Edition of Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Technology and Library Science, in both the electronic and printed editions. Questions should be addressed to the editor at editor@isedj.org or the publisher at publisher@isedj.org.

2015 AITP Education Special Interest Group (EDSIG) Board of Directors

Scott Hunsinger
Appalachian State Univ
President

Jeffry Babb
West Texas A&M
Vice President

Wendy Ceccucci
Quinnipiac University
President – 2013-2014

Eric Breimer
Siena College
Director

Nita Brooks
Middle Tennessee State Univ
Director

Tom Janicki
U North Carolina Wilmington
Director

Muhammed Miah
Southern Univ New Orleans
Director

James Pomykalski
Susquehanna University
Director

Anthony Serapiglia
St. Vincent College
Director

Leslie J. Waguespack Jr
Bentley University
Director

Peter Wu
Robert Morris University
Director

Lee Freeman
Univ. of Michigan - Dearborn
JISE Editor

Copyright © 2015 by the Education Special Interest Group (EDSIG) of the Association of Information Technology Professionals (AITP). Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this journal for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial use. All copies must bear this notice and full citation. Permission from the Editor is required to post to servers, redistribute to lists, or utilize in a for-profit or commercial use. Permission requests should be sent to Nita Brooks, Editor, editor@isedj.org.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS EDUCATION JOURNAL

Editors

Nita Brooks
Senior Editor
Middle Tennessee State Univ

Thomas Janicki
Publisher
U of North Carolina Wilmington

Donald Colton
Emeritus Editor
Brigham Young University Hawaii

Jeffry Babb
Associate Editor
West Texas A&M University

Wendy Ceccucci
Associate Editor
Quinnipiac University

Melinda Korzaan
Associate Editor
Middle Tennessee State Univ

Guido Lang
Associate Editor
Quinnipiac University

George Nezlek
Associate Editor
Univ of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Samuel Sambasivam
Associate Editor
Azusa Pacific University

Anthony Serapiglia
Teaching Cases Co-Editor
St. Vincent College

Cameron Lawrence
Teaching Cases Co-Editor
The University of Montana

ISEDJ Editorial Board

Samuel Abraham
Siena Heights University

Mark Jones
Lock Haven University

Alan Peslak
Penn State University

Teko Jan Bekkering
Northeastern State University

James Lawler
Pace University

Doncho Petkov
Eastern Connecticut State Univ

Ulku Clark
U of North Carolina Wilmington

Paul Leidig
Grand Valley State University

James Pomykalski
Susquehanna University

Jamie Cotler
Siena College

Michelle Louch
Duquesne University

Franklyn Prescod
Ryerson University

Jeffrey Cummings
U of North Carolina Wilmington

Cynthia Martincic
Saint Vincent College

Bruce Saulnier
Quinnipiac University

Christopher Davis
U of South Florida St Petersburg

Fortune Mhlanga
Lipscomb University

Li-Jen Shannon
Sam Houston State University

Gerald DeHondt

Muhammed Miah
Southern Univ at New Orleans

Karthikeyan Umapathy
University of North Florida

Audrey Griffin
Chowan University

Edward Moskal
Saint Peter's University

Leslie Waguespack
Bentley University

Janet Helwig
Dominican University

Monica Parzinger
St. Mary's University

Bruce White
Quinnipiac University

Scott Hunsinger
Appalachian State University

Peter Y. Wu
Robert Morris University

Engaging Engineering and Information Systems Students in Advocacy for Individuals with Disabilities through a Disability Film Media Project

James Lawler
lawlerj@aol.com

Val Iturralde
vi59354n@pace.edu

Allan Goldstein
AGoldste@poly.edu

Anthony Joseph
ajoseph2@pace.edu

Pace University
Seidenberg School of Computer Science and Information Systems
New York, New York 10038 USA

Abstract

College curricula of engineering and information systems do not afford frequent engagement with individuals with disabilities. The authors of this research study analyzed the benefits of disability films for a community film festival of largely engineering and information systems students and individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities. The authors learned that disability film media enables discernable engagement and advocacy of the students for the rights of individuals with disabilities. The authors also learned that the disability film media facilitates engagement and self-advocacy of the individuals for themselves. This study will be beneficial to instructors in engineering and information systems, and instructors in liberal arts, evaluating film media as an exciting method for involving students with individuals with disabilities on multidisciplinary projects of public service.

Keywords: community engagement, engineering and information systems curricula, disability film media, disabilities, multidisciplinary projects, public service.

1. BACKGROUND OF PAPER

"Disability is a natural part of life ... it is the barriers that [others without disabilities] erect that are the problem ... and it is time [the] media reflected this truth" (Levine, 2013).

Disability can be an alarming and even "frightening" consideration (Ross, 2013, p.1) for a college student without a disability. Disability

covers different developmental and intellectual, physical, psychological, sensory and social impairments. Estimates denote a dimension of 49-54 million individuals with disabilities in this country (Riley II, 2005, p.15) – 19% of the population (United States Department of Commerce, 2008). Estimates denote a higher 650 million individuals with disabilities globally (International Labor Organization, 2013). The civil rights of individuals with disabilities in this

country are covered in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Riley II, 2005, p.7), but crime (Harrell, 2014) and discrimination if not disempowerment (Willis, 2012) is experienced frequently by them. 2012. The perception of others without disabilities of individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities as persons of potential is flavored by fear, focus on impairments and prejudice (European Commission, 2013, p.21), inevitably precluding them as contributors in fruitful positions in industry. This perception may be dissipated by the impact of film industry media representation of them as a diverse population. The reality is that the influence of mainstream film media is of marginalization - misrepresentation and underrepresentation - of individuals with disabilities in society.

The misrepresentation of individuals with disabilities in mainstream film media is clear if they are defined by identifiable impairments distanced from individuals or students without disabilities (Disability Planet, 2013, p.3). Inherent in the misrepresentation of individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities is that they are devoid frequently of intricate but normal personalities as people distinct from other people or students in a social setting (Disability Planet, 2013, p.2). The limiting media notion of individuals with disabilities is a factor in negative perception of them. The perception may even be of pity, victimization or vulnerability (Special Olympics, 2013). Their underrepresentation in mainstream film media is manifest in the often representation of them by individuals without disabilities (Norden, 1994), further perpetuating misrepresentations of reality (National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation, 2002, p.41).

This misrepresentation in mainstream media is evident in a history of misleading portrayals. For example, in the original *The Phantom of the Opera*, the phantom is negatively portrayed through his disability as a freak, not as a human through his mobility as a person, effectively isolating him from society. In the recent *I Am Sam*, Sam is negatively portrayed through his disability as an oddity and a problem for society, but is concurrently portrayed positively through his parenting sensitivity (Nelson, 2001), a dual portrayal, although he is still isolated from mainstream society. Though individuals with intellectual disabilities in the films *Forrest Gump* and *Rain Man* are portrayed positively as sanitized savants, they are represented as powerfully special in society, inevitably isolating or marginalizing them from others not of

resemblance or special (Barnes, 1992a). Individuals with disabilities in *Dumb and Dumber* and *There's Something About Mary* are portrayed in scenarios of snickering stereotyping (Carson, 1995) and in "r" (retarded) terminology in *Tropic Thunder* (Haller, 2010). The negative portrayals in the mainstream media are perpetuating stigmatization. The persistence of the stigmatization is precluding recognition of the rights of individuals with disabilities to be equal with individuals and students without disabilities. Those with disabilities have often responded with disability film media as a model of potential positivity for those with disabilities in society.

The proper representation of individuals with disabilities in disability films is considered to be evident in disability film festival maturation (National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, 2002, p.4). Film festivals are frequently perceived to be positively portraying them, not through their impairments but through their diversity and fortitude (Grandin and Panek, 2013) as persons. For example, festivals are perceived to be focusing on individuals with disabilities in a manner of positively portraying them in *Getting Up*, *The Importance of Tying Your Own Shoes* and *Wampler's Ascent of the Reelabilities Disabilities Film Festival*, and in *Deedah* and *Finding Fred* of the Sprout Film Festival, through their functioning as normal persons speaking for themselves (International Labor Organization, 2013, p. 27) in an ecosystem of society (Newman, 2013). The individuals with disabilities are the individuals with disabilities in the disability film festival media and in limited mainstream media, as for instance in *The King's Speech* and *The Station Agent*. The representation of them in the disability film festival media is not often perceived to be of the marginalizing and stereotyping stigmatization of the mainstream media (International Labor Organization, 2013, p.5).

The benefits of the disability film media are cited in the literature. The more individuals with disabilities are portrayed in proper representations in film media, the more pride they may have as members of society. The more individuals and students without disabilities learn of individuals with disabilities through the disability film media, the more respect they may have of this marginalized population. The literature indicates the influence of positive stories on individuals and students without disabilities (Saito and Ishiyama, 2005). Not evident however is the extent of the

features of the disability film media perceived to impact the individuals and students with and without disabilities positively, or even negatively. Might not disability film festival media focusing on individuals with disabilities portraying themselves be perceived to be marginalizing or oppressing (Baird, Rosenbaum, and Toombs, 2009) if not stigmatizing them? Might not disability media producers inadvertently infuse sanitized sensitive situations that might be perceived by individuals and students with disabilities to be misrepresenting or negatively stigmatizing them? (Wall, 2013, p.1). In this paper, the authors analyzed, as part of a multidisciplinary project of largely engineering and information system systems students, the exact features and impacts of disability film media that influence perceptions of positivity.

2. INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT

"[Individuals with disabilities] need to be present ... on screen ... to [enable] a paradigm shift in perception for [them]; a real change in attitudes by all members of society can then [be] a reality ..." (Council of Europe Disability Action Plan, 2006).

The authors of this study analyzed the features of disability film media in a community engagement project for a Disability Film Festival at Pace University. The project consisted largely of engineering and information systems students without disabilities of the Seidenberg School of Computer Science and Information Systems of Pace University, and of Polytechnic / New York University, a partnered school, which evaluated disability film media from dominant film festivals – Reelabilites Disabilities Film Festival, Sprout Film Festival and Welcome Change Productions. The project concurrently consisted of families, individuals with disabilities and staff from AHRC New York City, an organization for helping individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities, partnered with the university, and evaluating the film festival media with the students. This project consisted further of limited mainstream film media that includes individuals with disabilities. The essence of the project was in evaluating the features of the disability film festival, and limited mainstream media, for proper representation of the individuals that impact if not influence perceptions of positivity. The evaluation of the features and impacts was conceptually formulated from engagement and advocacy factors in earlier projects of the first author (Lawler and Li, 2005, & Lawler and Joseph,

2013). The goal of the project was to furnish the highest media of proper representation of the individuals in the film stories for the Disability Film Festival at the university in spring 2014. The outcomes of the project were in increased knowledge of the capabilities and contributions of individuals with disabilities; and increased involvement in advocacy for proper representation of the individuals and in self-advocacy for disability rights – a modern and relevant inclusion of service-learning introduced into the curriculum of information systems.

The project consisted of 23 engineering and information systems students and 6 communications disorders liberal arts students, 29 students, for the fall 2013 – spring 2014 semesters. Each of the students learned of individuals with disabilities in a community engagement course of the first author (Lawler and Joseph, 2013) and the third author, in which they partnered in media productions of storytelling (Klanten, Ehmann, and Schulze, 2011), a few of which were previewed at the Sprout Film Festival. The students learned engagement and advocacy methods in proper representation of situations of individuals with disabilities, through the storytelling (Lawler and Joseph, 2013). Few of the engineering and information systems students learned of individuals with disabilities and disability issues in the curricula of the schools until they were in the community engagement course (Lawler and Joseph, 2013), with the individuals as mentor – mentee partners in the productions of the storytelling, and from the course the students were inherently motivated to be in the current project (Hoxmeier and Lenk, 2003). The project coincidentally consisted of 22 families, higher-functioning individuals and staff from the non-profit organization, in the spring 2014 semester. There were 51 films or "flicks" from 3 – 21 minutes furnished by the film festivals and by extracted mainstream media, for condensing by 7 expert faculty and field professionals in disability studies at the schools to 9 films for evaluation by the families, individuals and staff and the students. The participants were definitely knowledgeable in disability issues, though the families, individuals with disabilities and the staff are more intimately knowledgeable in the issues than the students. Finally, the participants were led by the primary and secondary authors of this study, as to the features and the impacts that might or might not be the perceptions of positivity on the film media of the project.

Therefore, this study evaluated the features and the impacts of the disability film media, and the limited mainstream media, as to audience participant perceptions of positivity in the media, so that the film media of the project was presentable at the Disability Film Festival at Pace University in 2014. The manner in which the media represents individuals with disabilities is important in the response to the film stories: How might the features of the storytelling impact engagement of the audience participants on the project?; Is the project impacting importance and satisfaction from the storytelling?; How might the features of the storytelling impact advocacy of the participants on the project?; and Is the project at the university impacting self-sufficiency and sociality from the storytelling? If the media of the project properly represents individuals with disabilities in the storytelling, the impacts of the integrity of the media might influence perceptions of positivity (Wall, 2013, p.2). Few scholarly studies evaluate the disability film media systemically.

3. FOCUS OF PAPER

The authors evaluated the features and the impacts of the disability film festival media, by a focus on factors of engagement and advocacy of the audience participants of the project.

Engagement from Features of Media

Importance – Extent of impact from which the participants perceived the generic features of the disability media in proper representations of individuals with disabilities; and

Satisfaction – Extent of impact from which the participants perceived the specific features of the media productions in furnishing satisfaction from proper representations of the individuals with disabilities in the media.

Advocacy from Features of Media

Self-Efficacy – Extent of impact from which the participants perceived the storytelling of the disability film media in furnishing a foundation for them to be advocates for individuals with disabilities in society; and

Sociality – Extent of impact from which the participants perceived the storytelling of the media in influencing a motivation for them to be involved in other programs of public service with individuals with disabilities.

These factors were derived from earlier studies of the first author on movie productions of storytelling (Lawler and Joseph, 2013) and projects of public service with individuals with disabilities (Lawler and Li, 2005); and the features of the factors were determined from research sources (Riley II, 2005). The focus of the new study was on the benefits of disability film media as perceived by real individuals with disabilities and by students without disabilities, focusing on engineering and information systems students. The model furnished for the disability film media, and the mainstream media, increased proper representations of individuals with disabilities in the dual media and involved the students on a multidisciplinary project new to them.

4. METHODOLOGY OF PAPER

The audience of this research study consisted of engineering and information systems faculty and students of the Seidenberg School of Computer Science and Information Systems of Pace University, and of partnered Polytechnic / New York University, in New York City; and of families, individuals with disabilities and staff of partnered AHRC New York City. The methodology covered the fall 2013 – spring 2014 semesters. The films of the disability film media, and of the limited mainstream media, were evaluated by the participants and the authors in the following iterations:

- A checklist instrument, of 7 yes / no questions on characteristics of the participant students, 7 engagement Likert-like questions on generic features of importance of the media, 13 engagement Likert-like questions on specific features from satisfaction of the media, 7 advocacy Likert-like questions on the current impacts of self-efficacy from the media, and 9 advocacy Likert-like questions on the future potential impacts from sociality of the media, or 43 item questions, was evolved from interviews with the 7 expert faculty and field professionals in disability media studies and from research studies (Riley II, 2005);
- A choice of 51 films condensed to a manageable 9 films of 3 – 21 minutes, from mostly producers of the Reelabilities Disabilities Film Festival, Sprout Film Festival and Welcome Change Productions of individuals with different disabilities, was identified from interviews with the 7 expert faculty and professionals and by the second

and first authors, for evaluation by the families, individuals and students;

- A design of 3 focus groups –22 families (8), individuals with disabilities (8) and staff (6) of the non-profit organization, 17 students without disabilities of Pace University and 12 students without disabilities at Polytechnic / New York City, or 51 focus group members – enabled evaluations independently of the features and the impacts of the 9 chosen films, moderated by the second and first authors;
- An evaluation of the 9 films by the 51 focus group members was performed anonymously on a Likert-like rating scale of 5 – very high in perceptions to 1 – very low in perceptions of the features and impacts of the films, with 0 – no perceptions, followed by a generic moderator participant review; and
- An interpretation of the resultant statistics was performed by the first and fourth authors of this study from the MAT LAB 7.10.0 Statistics Toolbox (Evans, 2014).

This methodology conformed generically to principles of critical and emancipatory participatory action research (Koshy, Koshy, and Waterman, 2011). The first, second and third authors educated the focus groups on the evaluation questions of the checklist instrument, before the members looked at the film media, and moderated the pre- and post- screenings of the sessions through principles of focus group research (Krueger and Casey, 2009). The fourth author of this study evaluated the instrument before the evaluations, in the context of construct, content and face validity, including content validity measured in the context of sampling validity.

(The checklist instrument is furnished in Table 7 of the Appendix.)

5. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

An analysis of the data from the focus group of engineering and information systems students without disabilities disclosed an appreciable engagement in importance (means = 3.47/5.00) and satisfaction (3.21), and in advocacy in self-efficacy (3.23) and sociality (3.14), or collectively 3.26, from the features of the disability film media. The evaluations of the films indicated a high of 3.98 (Film 1 -

Breadmakers) and a low of 2.28 (Film 7 – *Miss You Can Do It* [Beauty Contestants]) collectively in engagement and advocacy of the group. Students without disabilities citing they were not in an earlier community engagement course, a course with individuals with disabilities or a community action program indicated an encouraging 3.26, 3.23 and 3.19 collectively in their engagement and advocacy. Those citing they were not exposed to individuals with disabilities in their families or in their own social settings indicated an also encouraging 3.32 and 3.29 collectively in their engagement and advocacy. The data from the students without disabilities indicated definite impacts from the film media.

Tables 1 and 2 detail the findings from the students without disabilities.

An analysis from the focus group of the families, individuals with disabilities and organizational staff disclosed a clear engagement in importance (3.79) and satisfaction (3.05), and in advocacy in self-efficacy (3.13) and sociality (3.60), or a collectively higher 3.39, from the film media. The evaluations of the films indicated a high of 4.23 (Film 3 – *The Interviewer*) and a low of 2.58 (Film 7 – *Miss You Can Do It*) collectively in engagement and advocacy of this group. The individuals indicated that they felt part of the actions portrayed in the film showings. They felt related to roles presented in situations of the stories and were highly sensitive to inadvertent characterizations (e.g., individuals with cerebral palsy - Film 7 – *Miss You Can Do It*). The data from the families, individuals with disabilities and staff also indicated definite impacts from the media as in the students without disabilities.

Tables 3 and 4 detail the findings from the families, individuals with disabilities and staff.

An overall analysis from the data of the focus groups disclosed discernable impacts in engagement in importance (3.64) and satisfaction (3.14), and in advocacy in self-efficacy (3.19) and sociality (3.35), or collectively 3.33, from the features of the media. The evaluations from this group indicated highs of 4.06 (Film 3 - *The Interviewer*) and 4.00 (Film 1 - *Breadmakers*) and lows of 2.42 (Film 7 - *Miss You Can Do It*) and 2.87 (Film 5 - *Life with Asperger's*) collectively in engagement and advocacy from the media. The participants indicated that except for Film 7 – *Miss You Can Do It*, perceived to be inappropriate condescending, almost all of the films depicted individuals with disabilities credibly and interacting in multidimensional normalized roles.

They indicated that the films focused on the individuals (e.g., Film 1 - *Breadmakers*), not on the disabilities of the people; and as applicable on inherent issues (e.g., bullying of individuals with autism and Down syndrome – Film 4 - *Bystander at Grocery Store*, prejudices of individuals with Down syndrome – Film 3 - *The Interviewer*, and poor special services on subways for individuals in wheelchairs – Film 6 - *The Commute*). They indicated that the films involved the individuals with others without disabilities in realistic roles and stories. The impacts were evident from the increased knowledge of the engineering and information systems students of disability issues learned in the films. Their future involvement in advocacy for individuals with disabilities indicated in the data was a refreshing insight. The impacts were evident further from indications of expanded future self-advocacy of the individuals with disabilities inspired by the media. The participants noted the generally high professionalism of the media, which were all documentary person-centered storytelling. In summary, the analysis of the findings noted perceptions of positivity from both the individuals and the students when film media portrays properly those with disabilities in our society.

(Spearman correlation coefficients of the factors across the films indicated statistical significance at the 0.01 level of significance across the films, with the lowest correlation of 0.4144 between satisfaction and sociality and the highest correlation of 0.8732 between satisfaction and self-efficacy; and Wilcoxon rank sum hypothesis testing of the factor participant ratings indicated statistical significance for sociality at the 0.05 level.)

Tables 5 and 6 document the findings from all the focus group participants of the study.

6. IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY

“It is not a competition ... [individuals with disabilities] ... do not have to earn or prove [their] place ... [they] have a right just because [they] are alive” (Mason, 2002).

An impact of this research study is that the findings from the focus group data confirmed the benefits of disability film media in representing authentic and credible portraits of individuals with disabilities (Ross, 2013, p. 8) having multidimensional personalities (Barnes, 1992b). The film media in the study disclosed diverse experiences of the individuals living their lives like individuals and students without disabilities

(International Labor Organization, 2013, p. 21). The implication is that proper realities and representations in the disability film media enable increased respect of individuals and students with disabilities.

Another impact is that the findings from the groups of engineering and information systems students without disabilities disclosed the benefits of engaging them on disability media projects. Even in colleges, few individuals or students without disabilities know others with disabilities. The more engineering and information systems students, and liberal arts students, without disabilities learn of the “lived” lives (Simon, 2013) of others with disabilities, through proper realities and representations in the disability film media, the less they might be prejudiced and the more they might be proactive in disability rights of inherently “good people” (Solomon, 2012) unnoticed in mainstream society (Shapiro, 1994), who might also be prospective information systems students. Those with or without disabilities might leverage multimedia production technologies on projects of disability storytelling (Anspach, 2013). The implication is that storytelling in the disability film media enables productive service skills of engineering and information systems students with or without disabilities in higher institutions of learning.

Another impact is that in a few instances the findings disclosed contrary depictions of improper but inadvertent misrepresentations in the disability film media of the study. These depictions were perceived by the families, fellow individuals with disabilities and staff in that focus group as negative sanitizing or stigmatizing of some of them. The implication is that storytelling in this maturing media might enable equally improper and proper realities and representations of individuals and students with disabilities that might not be filtered in existing producer standards.

A further impact is that the findings divulged proper representations in selected Hollywood mainstream media. The inclusion of individuals with disabilities as the individuals with disabilities in the mainstream media might be a prerequisite (Ross, 2013, p.5). The inclusion of disability equality sensitivity in the mainstream media involving disability media organizations and non-profit organizations for disability rights might be a specification (European Commission, 2013, p. 13). The issue of marketing media portrayals of individuals with disabilities profitably (O’Shaughnessy, 1999) might

nevertheless limit progress. The implication is that the model of proper realities and representations of individuals with disabilities in the disability film media might enable proper storytelling in the mainstream media.

The final impact is that the findings from the study highlighted the requisite of self-advocacy of those with disabilities to be not only in the disability media but also in the mainstream media. From the perspective of disability media, they might be motivated to be not only disability or mainstream media performers, but even producers and technicians (European Commission, 2013, p. 27). The implication is that the disability media might be a visual storytelling success, but lacking more mainstream personnel of those with disabilities, resolution of the misrepresentations and repressions of individuals and students with disabilities in the mainstream media will not be a success.

7. LIMITATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The research at a few schools and at one disability organization, having a relatively limited participant sample, limits the reach of the study. The sample of students is largely limited to a niche segregation of engineering and information systems students. The study is limited to the narrow subject of the disability media, not the broad subject of the mainstream media, in which misrepresentations of individuals with disabilities are more obvious than in the disability media. However, the disability film media might be a model for mainstream media producers on proper representations of a marginalized population, if producers are open to positive promotion (Carter-Long, 2013). Moreover, the opportunity for engineering and information systems schools, and liberal arts schools, in involving students in the fascinating field of film media for public service is a potential of this study, especially from future Disability Film Festivals at Pace University, an opportunity with guest participants for a new study.

8. CONCLUSION OF PAPER

This study evaluated the features and the impacts of the disability film media for a film festival at a major metropolitan university. The authors learned in the main that this media properly represented individuals with disabilities and their lives. Individuals with disabilities have lives like others without disabilities, but are not often perceived properly in the mainstream

media. This study included focus groups of individuals with disabilities and engineering and information systems students without disabilities, in interpreting media perceptions of representations. Information systems students without disabilities, like most others without disabilities, have perceptions of individuals and students with disabilities largely through prejudiced mainstream media. They have inevitable perceptions that are not the proper realities of representations of those with disabilities and of issues of disability rights. In conclusion, this study might be a model for the mainstream media, and it will be helpful to instructors in engineering and information systems schools and liberal arts schools that hope more students might be participants, beyond their disciplinary expertise, on outward looking projects of public service involving visual storytelling technologies.

9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge funding of \$1,200 from the Undergraduate Student - Faculty Research Program of the Provost of Pace University.

10. REFERENCES

- Anspach, B. (2013). Disabled film student directs his vision. *Dayton Daily News*, April 10, 1-3.
- Baird, R.M., Rosenbaum, E., & Toombs, S.K. (2009). *Disability: The social, political, and ethical debate*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 38.
- Barnes, C. (1992a). Discrimination in the media. *Disability Studies*, October 27.
- Barnes, C. (1992b). An exploration of the principles for media representations of disabled people. Krumlin, Halifax: British Council of Organizations of Disabled People and Ryburn Publishing Limited.
- Carson, D. (1995). Hollywood's handicap. *Kaleidoscope*, 30, 15-18.
- Carter-Long, L. (2013). The projected image: A history of disability on film. *Turner Classic Movies*, June, 1-2.
- Evans, A.N. (2014). Using basic statistics in the behavioral and social sciences. Thousand

- Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 5th Edition.
- Grandin, T, & Panek, R. (2013). What's right with the autistic mind: By focusing on the deficits, we overlook the strengths of brains built differently. *Time*, October 7, 56-59.
- Haller, B.A. (2010). Representing disability in an ableist world: Essays on mass media. Louisville, Kentucky: The Avocado Press, 181.
- Harrell, E. (2014). Crime against persons with disabilities, 2009-2012 statistical tables. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, February.
- Hoxmeier, J., & Lenk, M.L. (2003). Service-learning in information systems courses: Community projects that make a difference. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 14(1), 91-100.
- Klanten, R., Ehmann, S., & Schulze, F. (2011). Visual storytelling: Inspiring a new visual language. Berlin, Germany: Gestalten, 4.
- Koshy, E., Koshy, V., & Waterman, H. (2011). Action research in healthcare. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 5,8-10,18-23,29-31,40-41.
- Krueger, R.A., & Casey, M.A. (2009). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 4th Edition, 85-108.
- Lawler, J., & Li, Z. (2005). Student engagement in a flexible model of service learning in information systems curricula. *Journal of Informatics Education Research*, 7(2), 86-90.
- Lawler, J.P., & Joseph, A. (2013). A case study of engaging community service students through visual storytelling of high school students with disabilities. *Proceedings of the Information Systems Educators Conference (ISECON)*, San Antonio, Texas, November.
- Levine, S.C. (2013). Reporting on disability. *Media Alliance*, May, 2.
- Mason, M. (2002). Mass media and disability: Media and disability. *National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research*, September, 14.
- Nelson, J. (2001). I am Sam. Los Angeles, California: New Line Productions.
- Newman, A.A. (2013). A campaign urges listening to those torn by mental illness. *The New York Times*, October 2, B9.
- Norden, M. (1994). The cinema of isolation: A history of physical disability in the movies. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- O'Shaughnessy, M. (1999). Media and society. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Riley II, C.A. (2005). Disability and the media: Prescriptions for change. Lebanon, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 7,15.
- Ross, K. (2013). Disability and the media: A suitable case for treatment? *World Association for Christian Communication (WACC)*, May, 1,5,8.
- Saito, S. & Ishiyama, R. (2005). The invisible minority: Under-representation of people with disabilities in prime-time television dramas in Japan. *Disability & Society*, 20(4), 437-451.
- Shapiro, J.P. (1994). No pity: People with disabilities forging a new civil rights movement. New York, New York: Three Rivers Press, 4.
- Simon, C.C. (2013). The new normal: A progressive and empowering approach, for those able-bodied or not. *The New York Times*, November 3, 18.
- Solomon, A. (2012). Far from the tree: Parents, children, and the search for identity. New York, New York: Scribner, 176.
- Wall, J.M. (2013). Movies as mirrors and windows: Depicting disabilities in film. *World Association for Christian Communication (WACC)*, May, 1,2.
- Willis, J. (2012). Held: To carry a story below. *The Children of Freire Community Cultural Development (CCD) Journal: New Writings*

- on *Community Cultural Development*, 1,3,5,7.
- _____ (2002). Mass media and disability: Final report of the international experts meeting. *National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research*, September 26-29, Moscow, Russia, 4,41.
- _____ (2005). Changing attitudes changing the world: Media's portrayal of people with intellectual disabilities. *Special Olympics, Inc.*, January, 1.
- _____ (2006). Media representation of disabled people: Hidden impairments - Social
- _____ (2013). Media representation of disabled people: A critical analysis. *Disability Planet*, May, 2,3.
- barriers and ethical issues. *Disability Planet*, December, 3.
- _____ (2007). Increasing and improving portrayal of people with disabilities in the media. *European Commission*, July 20, 13,21,27.
- _____ (2008). Americans with disabilities: 2005 household economic statistics. *United States Census Bureau - United States Department of Commerce*, December, 70-117.
- _____ (2010). Media guidelines for the portrayal of disability: Decent work for people with disabilities. *International Labor Organization*, January 5,11,21,27.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Evaluations of All Students without Disabilities – Summary

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Engagement from Features of Media | | |
| Importance | 3.47 | 1.63 |
| Satisfaction | 3.21 | 1.67 |
| Advocacy from Features of Media | | |
| Self-Efficacy | 3.23 | 1.67 |
| Sociality | 3.14 | 1.75 |
| Consolidated Engagement and Advocacy | 3.26 | 1.68 |

Table 2: Evaluations of All Students without Disabilities – Detail

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Engagement and Advocacy from Features of Media | | |
| Film 1 (<i>Breadmakers</i>) | 3.98 | 1.27 |
| Film 2 (<i>Sensory Overload</i>) | 3.22 | 1.80 |
| Film 3 (<i>The Interviewer</i>) | 3.92 | 1.64 |
| Film 4 (<i>Bystander at Grocery Store</i>) | 3.63 | 1.57 |
| Film 5 (<i>Life with Asperger's</i>) | 2.91 | 1.47 |
| Film 6 (<i>The Commute</i>) | 3.72 | 1.44 |
| Film 7 (<i>Miss You Can Do It</i>) | 2.28 | 1.61 |
| Film 8 (<i>Getting Up</i>) | 2.97 | 1.60 |
| Film 9 (<i>Motherly</i>) | 2.73 | 1.87 |

Table 3: Evaluations of All Individuals with Disabilities – Summary

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|
| Engagement from Features of Media | | |
| Importance | 3.79 | 1.60 |
| Satisfaction | 3.05 | 1.91 |
| Advocacy from Features of Media | | |
| Self-Efficacy | 3.13 | 1.84 |

| | | |
|---|------|------|
| Sociality | 3.60 | 1.71 |
| Consolidated Engagement and Advocacy | 3.39 | 1.79 |

Table 4: Evaluations of All Individuals with Disabilities – Detail

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Engagement and Advocacy from Features of Media | | |
| Film 1 (<i>Breadmakers</i>) | 3.89 | 1.64 |
| Film 2 (<i>Sensory Overload</i>) | 3.64 | 1.55 |
| Film 3 (<i>The Interviewer</i>) | 4.23 | 1.26 |
| Film 4 (<i>Bystander at Grocery Store</i>) | 3.44 | 1.85 |
| Film 5 (<i>Life with Asperger's</i>) | 2.82 | 2.01 |
| Film 6 (<i>The Commute</i>) | 3.35 | 1.87 |
| Film 7 (<i>Miss You Can Do It</i>) | 2.58 | 1.88 |
| Film 8 (<i>Getting Up</i>) | 3.44 | 1.76 |
| Film 9 (<i>Motherly</i>) | 3.16 | 1.71 |

Table 5: Evaluations of All Students without Disabilities and All Individuals with Disabilities – Summary

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Engagement from Features of Media | | |
| Importance | 3.64 | 1.62 |
| Satisfaction | 3.14 | 1.79 |
| Advocacy from Features of Media | | |
| Self-Efficacy | 3.19 | 1.75 |
| Sociality | 3.35 | 1.75 |
| Consolidated Engagement and Advocacy | 3.33 | 1.74 |

Table 6: Evaluations of All Students without Disabilities and All Individuals with Disabilities – Detail

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | Importance | | Satisfaction | |
| Engagement from Features of Media | | | | |
| Film 1 (<i>Breadmakers</i>) | 4.17 | 1.16 | 4.25 | 1.21 |
| Film 2 (<i>Sensory Overload</i>) | 3.66 | 1.63 | 3.25 | 1.80 |
| Film 3 (<i>The Interviewer</i>) | 3.51 | 1.76 | 4.40 | 1.06 |
| Film 4 (<i>Bystander at Grocery Store</i>) | 4.21 | 1.26 | 2.68 | 1.92 |
| Film 5 (<i>Life with Asperger's</i>) | 3.26 | 1.70 | 2.32 | 1.71 |
| Film 6 (<i>The Commute</i>) | 3.75 | 1.57 | 3.38 | 1.61 |
| Film 7 (<i>Miss You Can Do It</i>) | 3.08 | 1.69 | 2.09 | 1.77 |
| Film 8 (<i>Getting Up</i>) | 4.11 | 1.46 | 3.02 | 1.49 |
| Film 9 (<i>Motherly</i>) | 3.02 | 1.79 | 2.87 | 1.95 |
| Advocacy from Features of Media | Self-Efficacy | | Sociality | |
| Film 1 (<i>Breadmakers</i>) | 4.06 | 1.51 | 3.53 | 1.67 |
| Film 2 (<i>Sensory Overload</i>) | 3.45 | 1.65 | 3.26 | 1.74 |
| Film 3 (<i>The Interviewer</i>) | 4.43 | 1.18 | 3.91 | 1.66 |
| Film 4 (<i>Bystander at Grocery Store</i>) | 3.02 | 1.78 | 4.26 | 1.11 |
| Film 5 (<i>Life with Asperger's</i>) | 2.53 | 1.71 | 3.36 | 1.62 |
| Film 6 (<i>The Commute</i>) | 3.26 | 1.69 | 3.83 | 1.73 |
| Film 7 (<i>Miss You Can Do It</i>) | 1.98 | 1.70 | 2.51 | 1.64 |
| Film 8 (<i>Getting Up</i>) | 2.98 | 1.49 | 2.62 | 1.92 |
| Film 9 (<i>Motherly</i>) | 2.96 | 1.76 | 2.85 | 1.77 |

| Consolidated Engagement and Advocacy | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Film 1 (<i>Breadmakers</i>) | 4.00 | 1.42 |
| Film 2 (<i>Sensory Overload</i>) | 3.41 | 1.70 |
| Film 3 (<i>The Interviewer</i>) | 4.06 | 1.49 |
| Film 4 (<i>Bystander at Grocery Store</i>) | 3.54 | 1.70 |
| Film 5 (<i>Life with Asperger's</i>) | 2.87 | 1.73 |
| Film 6 (<i>The Commute</i>) | 3.56 | 1.66 |
| Film 7 (<i>Miss You Can Do It</i>) | 2.42 | 1.74 |
| Film 8 (<i>Getting Up</i>) | 3.18 | 1.69 |
| Film 9 (<i>Motherly</i>) | 2.92 | 1.81 |

Table 7: Model of Disability Film Festival Media Study
 (Checklist Instrument is available upon request of the first author of this study.)