

IDH@ECER 2023 in Glasgow

Beiträge mit Kooperationspartner*innen oder in Netzwerken

Inclusive Education is not Dead, it just Articulates Differently. Discussing Approaches and Pitfalls to the International Comparison

Robert Aust¹, Julia Gasterstädt², Andreas Köpfer³, Michelle Proyer⁴, Raphael Zahnd⁵

¹University Leipzig, Germany; ²University Kassel, Germany; ³University of Education Freiburg, Germany; ⁴University of Vienna; ⁵University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland

Presenting Author: **Aust, Robert; Gasterstädt, Julia; Köpfer, Andreas; Proyer, Michelle; Zahnd, Raphael**

Inclusive education can be described as an international paradigm that focuses on participation as well as processes of inclusion and exclusion in educational contexts – and the barriers and discrimination embedded therein. On the one hand, this paradigm has been incorporated into the policies of international (educational) organizations, such as the European Union, the OECD, UNESCO or the World Bank, while on the other hand, it has gained significant visibility through international agreements, such as the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education of 1994, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 2006 and the UN Sustainable Development Goals of 2018. The political normative (pro)positions and goals in inclusive education associated with this are currently adopted in national and regional education policies and, subsequently, specific steering processes in education systems are being initiated. Thereby, inclusion needs to be adapted, at both the national and regional level, into different educational systems with differing historical developments, distinct cultures, normative and legal foundations, and then be transferred into practice and specific conditions. Against this backdrop inclusive education is discussed to be a fuzzy or slippery concept, meaning that it is difficult to define or operationalize it in a clear and precise way.

As this fuzziness might be very well a problem for developing inclusive education systems, it also presents a specific challenge for international comparative research regarding inclusive education. Therefore the DFG-funded scientific network "Inclusive Education: International and Comparative Perspectives" (2020-2024), researchers from Germany, Austria and Switzerland explore how these processes, reaching from global to local levels, can be studied in an internationally comparative manner. In the framework of the joint work within the network, different theoretical and/or methodological approaches are compared and discussed with scientists from the international arena. The aim is to analyze the potentials and limitations of these approaches for international comparative (educational) research.

One of many possible examples concerning fuzziness is represented in the terminology "Inklusive Didaktik" - we will use this example as a case during our research workshop. The terminology, literally translated as 'inclusive didactic' represents an interesting case for international comparative research. In the German speaking discourse, the terminology is at the core of the discourse surrounding the implementation of inclusive education and the question "how to teach well, in an inclusive manner". Framing the debates about teaching practices in the context of inclusive education - "didactics" as a concept refers to the "art of teaching". Even though German speaking countries are only representing a small part of the world, conceptualizations of "inclusive didactics" are diverse and contradictory (Moser Opitz 2014, Zahnd 2021). This is a challenging situation to situate and contrast the specific discourse of "inclusive didactics" against other discourses of e.g. the English-speaking dominating debates and gets even worse because there is no conceptual counterpart to "didactics". Thus, it remains unclear how to compare and connect two discourses if a core concept of one discourse does not even exist in the other or presents itself in many shapes and forms or interpretations, such as inclusive instruction, inclusive teaching, inclusive pedagogy etc.

Within the research workshop we like to present our ongoing discussion in connection with the case "Inklusive Didaktik" and open it up for a broader discussion within network four.

Methodology, Methods, Research Instruments or Sources Used

In the sense of a research workshop, we aim to initiate a theoretical and methodological discussion and to provide the basis for it. Therefore, the analytical focus of the research workshop is rather put on the development process regarding the international comparative research discourse on inclusive education than on the implementation process. Hence, the question is asked how inclusive education is articulated in the research discourse and which symbols of un/belonging and de/classification are made. In addition, we aim to explore which strands of discourse in educational as well as other sciences are connected to the thematic complex of inclusive education, and how, against this background, knowledge production processes, such as data production. The aim is not to evaluate approaches in the sense of a best practice, but to make clear which scope of knowledge are connected with the respective approaches and what they mean in regards of inclusive education. Therefore, the research workshop provides the opportunity to discuss options and opportunities to conduct international comparative research on inclusive education and theoretical and methodological challenges involved in such research designs.

To do so, we will firstly present results (e.g. own research from different scientific backgrounds and field experience concerning inclusive education) of our network regarding the following aspects:

- the diversity of understandings of inclusion and synonymous concepts that deal with inclusive education as well as their theoretical foundations
- translating inclusion between "global-national-local" levels and the problem of translation and context-dependence of researcher perspective(s)
- classification, categories and the problem of normativity and reification

Secondly, we like to exemplify these aspects using a case study of inclusion dynamics regarding the terminology "Inklusive Didaktik".

After presenting the theoretical and methodological considerations and the case, this research workshop aims to enable debate about the mentioned aspects with the audience to value the diversity of research perspectives.

Conclusions, Expected Outcomes or Findings

The workshop rather likes to open a discussion about the diversity of ways to develop knowledge about inclusive education than to present empirical findings. Especially in the context of this European conference, where different country-specific theoretical and methodological approaches come together, an exchange can be considered extremely fruitful. In addition to productive lines of connection, areas of tension

should also be addressed and the question should be continually asked as to which understanding of inclusion is invoked with which approach. Reading inclusion divergently (Amrhein & Naraian 2022) can be seen as a necessary prerequisite for the European and international analysis of inclusive education. At the same time, a methodological discussion is necessary - e.g. using the example of inclusive didactic - which tertium comparationis are tangible, workable and comparable.

References

- Amrhein, B. & Naraian, S. (2022). *Reading Inclusion Divergently*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Moser Opitz, E. (2014). *Inklusive Didaktik im Spannungsfeld von gemeinsamem Lernen und effektiver Förderung*. Ein Forschungsüberblick und eine Analyse von didaktischen Konzeptionen für inklusiven Unterricht. In K. Zierer (Hrsg.), *Jahrbuch für Allgemeine Didaktik* (S. 52–68). Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.
- Zahnd, R. (2021). *Inklusion als Schulkritik. Überlegungen zum Zusammenspiel von Fachdidaktik und inklusiver Pädagogik*. In K. Resch, K.-T. Lindner, B. Streese, M. Proyer, & S. Schwab (Hrsg.), *Inklusive Schule und Schulentwicklung. Theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Befunde und Praxisbeispiele aus Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz: Bd. Beiträge zur Bildungsforschung* (S. 231–237). Waxmann.

Inclusive Education... What Are we Really Talking About? A 10 Country Reflection (Part 2)

Ines Alves¹, Donatella Camedda², Cecilia Simon³, Raphael Zahnd⁴

¹University of Glasgow, United Kingdom; ²Trinity College Dublin, The University of Dublin, Ireland; ³Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain; ⁴University of Applied Sciences Northwestern Switzerland, Switzerland

Presenting Author: **Alves, Ines; Camedda, Donatella; Simon, Cecilia; Zahnd, Raphael**

'there is a conceptual confusion surrounding what inclusion is, what it is supposed to do and for whom'¹

Generating inclusive learning environments is a global priority and is recognised as being a key component in establishing a more equal world (United Nations Sustainable Development Goal - SDG 4).

The notion of inclusive education, which has been strongly developed through the Salamanca Statement⁵ and the United Nations Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD), has developed historically from the provision of special education for learners with disabilities, evolving to encompass the international Education for All movement which 'targets' other 'disadvantaged' populations such as girls and learners from ethnic minorities². However, despite being a widespread concept, Inclusive Education (IE) is still debated by academics 3–6, educators 7–9, parents^{10, 11}, and learners^{2, 12}. How can we justify using a concept that has been described as being 'fuzzy'¹³, and 'fluid'¹⁴ be used as a universal target in the United Nations SDG4? Despite strong policies being developed internationally, it seems that the existing structures and systems make it difficult to move forward from the discourse of inclusive education into the implementation of a quality, inclusive education for all.

This 2-part discussion panel will bring together academics working in the area of inclusive education, with a focus on ten different country contexts: Australia, China, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Scotland, Spain, and Switzerland.

We will use the dimensions of Artilles and Dyson's¹⁵ Comparative Cultural Historical Analysis framework to structure our discussion, by focusing on: 1) participants (targets and 'actors' involved in IE), 2) cultural (models of inclusion, provision taking place; beliefs, values, expectations regarding particular groups or learners), 3) temporal/ historical (development of IE), and 4) outcomes. This framework will allow us to discuss how governments and educators in different contexts define and implement Inclusive Education – how it is defined in public policies, what it implies in practice and who the target populations are in each of the contexts. For example, while in some countries there is still a strong focus on supporting disabled students when referring to IE, others refer to 'Special Educational Needs', or 'Additional Support for Learning' (Scotland) which include aspects such as poverty, linguistic and cultural background, or being 'in care/ looked after'. While some contexts have considerable differences between regions (e.g. Germany, Spain), others have rather centralised policies and practices (e.g. Portugal).

The countries represented have a variety of approaches and traditions regarding responding to student diversity, and how 'inclusive education' is conceptualised and realised. Reports from several contexts suggest clarifying the meaning of the education policy in practice at all levels and how to implement it as a key lever for moving forward (e.g. the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education audit of the Icelandic system for IE). And so, the aim of this discussion panel is to explore similarities and differences between contexts and to interrogate to what extent education systems are presently places where all learners are experiencing equitable, quality education, where all feel welcome, challenged and supported, and where all learners are able to access, participate and succeed in education. Or whether we value some children more than others¹⁶, namely learners with intellectual disabilities¹⁷.

We will then discuss how we can develop education systems that are based on inclusive: concepts, policies, systems and structures, and practices¹⁸. Systems that truly engage with learners' voices, that are based on the collaboration between different actors (namely educators, learners, and families; education, health and social work), and where inclusive curricula and inclusive pedagogy¹⁹/ 'didactics' are core, rather than an afterthought for a minority of learners.

References

- 1 Allan J. Inclusion for all? In: Bryce TKG, Humes WM. *Scottish Education: Beyond Devolution*. Edinburgh University Press; 2008:701-710.
- 2 Miles S, Singal N. Education for All and inclusive education debate: conflict, contradiction or opportunity? *Int J Incl Educ*. 2010;14:1-15.
- 3 Walton E. Decolonising (Through) Inclusive Education? *Educ Res Soc Chang*. 2018;7(June):31-45.
- 4 UIS. *Combining Data on Out-of-School Children, Completion and Learning to Offer a More Comprehensive View on SDG 4*. Montreal; 2019.
- 5 UNESCO. *Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. 1994.
- 6 United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. 1989.
- 7 Sharma et al. Addressing barriers to implementing inclusive education in the Pacific. *Int J Incl Educ*. 2019;23(1):65-78.
- 8 Slee R. Belonging in an age of exclusion. *Int J Incl Educ*. 2019;23(9):909-922.
- 9 UN. *General comment 4 (2016), Article 24: Right to inclusive education*. UN Comm Rights Pers with Disabil. 2016;(September):1-24.
- 10 Department for Education and Science. *Special Educational Needs: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (The Warnock Report)*. London; 1978.
- 11 Florian et al. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on the Classification of Children With Disabilities. *J Spec Educ*. 2006;40(1):36-45.

- 12 Alves I. The transnational phenomenon of individual planning in response to pupil diversity: a paradox in educational reform. In: Hultqvist E et al. *Critical Analyses of Educational Reform in an Era of Transnational Governance*. Springer; 2017.
- 13 Kiuppis F. Why (not) associate the principle of inclusion with disability? Tracing connections from the start of the Salamanca Process. *Int J Incl Educ*. 2014;18(7):746-761.
- 14 Human Rights Committee. UN CRPD: Reservations/ Interpretative Declaration. House of Lords and Commons; 2009.
- 15 Artiles, A. J., & Dyson, A. (2005). Inclusive education in the globalization age: the promise of comparative cultural-historical analysis. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualising Inclusive Education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives*. Routledge.
- 16 Wang, Y. 2021. "Teachers did not let me do it.": Disabled children's experiences of marginalisation in regular primary schools in China." *Disability & the Global South*. 8(2): 2053-2070.
- 18 International Bureau of Education-UNESCO. (2016). *Reaching out to all Learners: a Resource Pack for Supporting Inclusive Education*.
- 19 Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828
- 20 Zahnd, R. (2021). Inklusion als Schulkritik. Überlegungen zum Zusammenspiel von Fachdidaktik und inklusiver Pädagogik. In K. Resch et al. *Inklusive Schule und Schulentwicklung*. (S. 231–237). Waxmann.

Chair

Ines Alves, University of Glasgow

Lani Florian, University of Edinburgh (to be confirmed)

New Comparisons. Methodological Approaches to Comparing Multi-Language Data from an International Systematic Review of the ICF and Education

Gregor Maxwell¹, Ines Alves², Marta Moretti³, Michelle Proyer⁴, Raphael Zahnd⁵, Patricia Soliz⁶

¹UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Norway; ²University of Glasgow, UK; ³Zurich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland; ⁴University of Vienna, Austria; ⁵University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland; ⁶Pan American Health Organization/ World Health Organization (PAHO/WHO)

Presenting Author: Maxwell, Gregor

This paper explores new boundaries relating to comparisons of German, Portuguese, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, and South African publications in a systematic literature review of research publications related to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (World Health Organisation, 2001, ICF) and education. New ground-breaking methodological approaches are required when comparing multi-language data from an international systematic review, similarly there are practical issues when working globally relating to cross-cultural understandings, work practices and time-zones.

This study is the outcome of a systematic literature review on the use of the ICF and its Children and Youth version (WHO, 2007, the ICF-CY) in the field of education and specifically education for children with disabilities, special educational needs and those requiring additional support in school. In 2010 Moretti, Alves, and Maxwell (Maxwell et al., 2012; Moretti et al., 2012) carried out a similar review and set the scene for how the ICF is used in the education field. In the intervening decade much has developed with the ICF and it is time for another measure of the situation. Throughout this paper we will refer the "ICF" as both the ICF (2001) and the ICF-CY (2007), unless otherwise specifically indicated.

The *ICF* is a bio-psycho-social classification framework developed by the World Health Organization based on a non-categorical approach to human functioning contextualizing the functioning of an individual in their current environment without the use of 'traditional' categories or diagnoses. The framework incorporates 'all components of health described at body, individual and societal levels' (WHO, 2007). The ICF is intended for all people but is particularly applicable and appropriate for persons with disability.

The term *education* in this article means the "development of human potential...personality, talents and creativity as well as...mental and physical abilities" (United Nations, 2006) made in a formal context, usually a school or other setting in which the main aim is not medical or clinical rehabilitation. All education levels are taken into account, from early years, compulsory schooling, further education, and lifelong learning of persons with disabilities and those working with persons with disabilities in a formal educational setting. The educational environment or setting is of importance both in terms of setting the scene in which an activity occurs and as a factor that can facilitate or hinder participation in a setting. The environment can be represented as dimensions that relate to the availability, accessibility, affordability, accommodation and acceptability of the participation situation or experience (Maxwell, 2012). By investigating the educational environment, we can shed more light on effective inclusive practices by providing more accurate representations and measures of the participation of children.

The current paper explores the methodological challenges and consequences of carrying out an international, multi-lingual, cross-comparison in-depth review of the main findings from a systematic literature search. Data come from systematic database searches using selected search terms in different languages in national databases in the partner countries. Searches were carried out in Portuguese, Italian, Spanish, English, Afrikaans, German, and Mandarin.

The main literature review aimed to explore how the ICF is currently situated in the field of education in different global contexts with a specific focus on children with disabilities, Special Educational Needs (SEN) and those requiring additional support in school. With a comparison of how the ICF is applied a different levels and processes in various global contexts, this paper aims to:

- Explore the methodological consequences of carrying out an in-depth systematic review of the ICF and education in different global contexts.
- Describe the practical implications of carrying out the review.

Methodology, Methods, Research Instruments or Sources Used

While the main study itself aims to explore how the ICF is situated in the field of education in different global contexts, this paper focuses specifically on the final cross-country comparison.

A systematic review of the literature was carried out using database electronic searches performed during the second half of 2021 and in to 2022 analysing studies published from 2001 in English, German, Spanish, Afrikaans, Italian, Portuguese, and Chinese. Journal articles, books and book chapters, and reports were included in the initial search. Database search terms referring to the ICF components and education were combined. Each language required its own selection and refinement of search terms. The relevance of the chosen search terms

was explored through discussions among the authors, with experts in the field, and expert research librarians. The search terms were chosen based on the focus of the study and current debate and were refined to include widely used variations and abbreviations. Search terms had to be related to the ICF (e.g. ICF, International Classification of functioning, environment*, personal factors, participation) and to education (school, education*, inclusion/inclusive, eligibility, goals, identification) and various abbreviations/ combinations of the phrase special education needs (SNE, SEN, "special needs", Special Ed, SpecEd, SPED). The final searches were run after qualitative test searches to establish the suitability of the terms: four combinations of the search terms were initially trialled; however, difficulties arose relating to translating a number of the terms and concepts into the various languages involved in this study so the search string was condensed into one: • ("ICF" OR "International Classification of functioning") AND (school OR inclus* OR SNE OR SEN OR "special needs" OR Special Ed OR SpecEd OR SPED)

The string was translated into Italian, German, Portuguese, Spanish, Afrikaans, and Mandarin, and applied to various national databases. In each national context the selection of studies was then refined further using three protocols: inclusion and exclusion protocols at abstract and full text and extraction levels. Studies exploring the direct relationship between education and the ICF were sought.

A multi-lingual cross-comparison between countries was then carried out where descriptive summaries of the findings based on the extraction-level protocol were translated back into English in order to provide a common working language. Initial comparisons were piloted between two of the language groups (Portuguese and Chinese) before the addition of the other language groups occurred step-wise: German, Italian, South African, the Spanish.

Conclusions, Expected Outcomes or Findings

Articles were mainly published in special education journals. Overall, the most used ICF components are activity and participation, and environmental factors. The ICF is still used as a research tool, theoretical framework, and tool for implementing educational processes. Although the review does not report a high incidence of the use of the ICF in education, the results show that within certain local context (e.g. Portugal, Zürich, and Italy) the ICF model and classification have shown potential to be applied in education systems.

In terms of the methodological consequences of carrying out an in-depth systematic review of the ICF and education in different global contexts, this study highlights the viability of such an approach if suitable consideration is taken to language translation and cultural differences. A descriptive summary of the third protocol helped enable cross-comparisons.

Differences exist in cultural and linguistic understandings of things and awareness of which of these are being analysed is essential to ensure reliable data interpretation; different understandings of concepts such as disability, and personal or environmental factors are common. Diversity also varies as a concept across languages and cultures. Differences are also seen with the differing use of the ICF and whether the focus was on rehabilitation, intervention, or education. The ICF's role in the discourse of the concept of inclusion within the field of education also varied considerably with contexts.

Practical implications mainly relate to the technology of working at a distance and the real challenge of time zones – people will have work early and late when trying to meet live and online with colleagues in Brazil, Europe, South Africa, and Asia!

References

- Maxwell, G. (2012). *Bringing More to Participation: Participation in School Activities of Persons with Disability Within the Framework of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health for Children and Youth (ICF-CY)*. 16 Doctoral thesis, Comprehensive summary, School of Education and Communication, Jönköping. Available online at: <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hj:diva-18079Di-VAdatabase>
- Maxwell, G., Alves, I., and Granlund, M. (2012). Participation and environmental aspects in education and the ICF and the ICF-CY: findings from a systematic literature review. *Dev. Neurorehabil.* 15, 63–78. doi: 10.3109/17518423.2011.633108
- Moretti, M., Alves, I., & Maxwell, G. (2012). A systematic literature review of the situation of the international classification of functioning, disability, and health and the international classification of functioning, disability, and health–children and youth version in education: a useful tool or a flight of fancy?. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 91(13), S103-S117.
- United Nations (2006). *UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York, United Nations.
- World Health Organization (2001). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: ICF*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization (2007). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health: Children & Youth Version: ICF-CY*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Challenging contemporary orthodoxy in Autism Studies – implications to inclusive education

Chair: **Fiona Hallett** (Edge Hill University)

Discussant: **Andreas Köpfer** (University of Education Freiburg)

Autism is a frequently articulated category in the current debate on inclusive education, in inclusion research as in school practice. Not only did it rise to become a buzz-word in the discourse around difference, it also hints at fundamental mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion in educational contexts. For example, it reveals a tension between identification, diagnosis and needs-based support on the one hand – and a marketized autism regime on the other, which requires a deficit-based production of difference first to then introduce the marker 'autism' as a legitimacy figure to initiate intervention programs (Broderick & Roscigno, 2022; Runswick-Cole, 2014). However, the extent to which the category 'autism spectrum' and its contextualizing practices are involved in processes of inclusion and exclusion is an empirical question. Surprisingly, there is limited discourse on methodological issues in the context of inclusion-oriented autism research so far. In light of the fact that autism is defined differently and consequently captured differently in empirical studies, we see the need to discuss methodological issues related to autism studies.

To do so, we draw on perspectives from the Critical Autism Studies (e.g., Davidson & Orsini, 2013), which move away from essentialist conceptions of autism (Begon & Billington, 2019). Against this backdrop, we ask how methodological approaches should be constituted that can empirically capture the production and processing of autism spectrum on the one hand, and the (marginalized) voices on the other. Hence, the focus is on methodological questions such as how to deal with categories, who the relevant actors are, and how contextual (and cultural) settings can be taken into account in the research.

The symposium intends to initiate an international and at the same time methodological discussion on autism and autism research. For this purpose, the symposium is organized and structured in such a way that first, in an introductory paper, basic and traditional methodological

questions of autism studies will be challenged and discussed. Based on this, in the second and third paper alternative forms of analyzing autism and their practice will be presented along exemplary methods. Three different country contexts are dealt with: While the first paper focuses on UK-based Anglo-American discourses, the following papers will present empirical examples from the German-speaking context and from the Ukraine.

The overall aim of the symposium is to challenge existing notions and approaches to autism research and to point out potential academic injustice. In doing so, we will distance ourselves from understandings that conceptualize autism as a purely person-related characteristic - and accordingly research it in this simplicity or assume that a direct comparison is possible. Rather, we see autism as a situationally embedded and complex phenomenon, which requires complex methodological approaches. These will be presented in this symposium as examples to create first approaches to necessary international comparisons and to stimulate discussions. Furthermore, the methodological reflections on empirical research on autism suggest that inclusion and exclusion in educational settings cannot be considered without an analytical view of the powerful (national, cultural, organizational) context and their impact on the students' subjectivity process (Pluquailec, 2018).

References

- Rob Begon & Tom Billington (2019) Between category and experience: constructing autism, constructing critical practice, *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 35:2, 184-196.
- Broderick, A. A. & Roscigno, R. (2021). Autism, Inc.: The Autism Industrial Complex. *Journal of Disability Studies in Education*, 2(1), 77-101.
- Davidson, J., & Orsini, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Worlds of Autism: Across the Spectrum of Neurological Difference*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Pluquailec, Jill (2018). Affective economies, autism, and 'challenging behaviour': socio-spatial emotions in disabled children's education. *Emotion, Space and Society*.
- Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). 'Us' and 'them': the limits and possibilities of a 'politics of neurodiversity' in neoliberal times, *Disability & Society*, 29:7, 1117-1129.

Presentations of the Symposium

WITHDRAWN Autism, Epistemic Injustice and Education Research

Allison Moore (Edge Hill University)

In recent years, there has been growing criticism of the way in which much autism research has been conducted and, of its epistemological integrity. Knowledge about autism is usually generated from an external position; "expertise and knowledge production are situated in the hands of the, usually, neurotypical professional, clinician and researcher, with autistic subjectivity being marginalised or dismissed." (Moore, 2020: 42). Contemporary orthodoxy of theorising autism is predicated on notions of deficit and lack. In both the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) and International Classifications of Diseases (ICD-11) autism is characterised as a condition typified by persistent deficits in reciprocal interaction and communicative behaviours. This construction of autism as a deficit of language and interaction leads to the delegitimization of autistic knowledge. Once positioned as incapable with regards to social communication and interaction, all autistic utterances become "suspect on the basis of... [their] very being" (Yergeau, 2016: 89) and autistic knowledge production based on subjective experience is dismissed as uncredible. Positioned as unknowing, autistic people are denied epistemic agency. Meanwhile, the dominant autism narrative of lack and deficit continues to perpetuate its epistemic violence, "whereby our [autistic people's] status as knowers, interpreters, and providers of information, is unduly diminished or stifled in a way that undermines the agent's agency and dignity" (Chapman & Carel, 2021: 1) Epistemic injustice is compounded when the category of autism intersects with the category of childhood. Developmentalism positions children as ontologically different from adults and, in education, they are observed, assessed, and evaluated against pre-determined 'Ages and Stages' standards of development (Burman, 1994, 2017; Walkerdine, 1988). In much the same way that neurotypicals claim the authority to construct knowledge about autistic people, so too do adults claim the authority to speak about and for children. This paper will consider the claims much autism research in the area of education perpetuates epistemic violence against autistic children and it will suggest ways in which we can make an epistemological shift towards acknowledging autistic children as epistemologically agentic, with the "capacity for an individual to produce, transmit and use knowledge" (Catala, Faucher & Poirer, 2021: 9015) It will argue that, in order for autism research to have epistemological integrity it must include autistic voices and lived experiences and move to a collaborative way of doing research with, rather than on autistics.

References:

- Burman E (1994) Development phallacies: Psychology, gender and childhood. *Agenda* 22: 11–17.
- Burman E (2017) *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge
- Catala, A., Faucher, L & Poirer, P. (2021) Autism, epistemic injustice, and epistemic disablment: a relational account of epistemic agency *Synthese* (2021) 199:9013–9039 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-03192-7>
- Walkerdine V (1988) *The Mastery of Reason: Cognitive Development and the Production of Rationality*. London: Routledge
- Yergeau, M. (2016) *Occupying Autism: Rhetoric, Involuntarity, and the Meaning of Autistic Lives*. In: Block P., Kasnitz D., Nishida A., Pollard N. (eds) *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_6 83-95

Situational Analysis as a Methodological Approach to Face the Complexity of the 'Autism Arena' in Education

Andreas Köpfer (University of Education Freiburg), **Katharina Papke** (University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland)

Focusing developments on a macro-level Maynard and Turowetz (2019: 90) emphasize "social, political, and cultural forces that have shaped and transformed autism, especially in the last thirty years, when its prevalence has risen dramatically". Similarly, outlining an "Autism Industrial Complex" Broderick and Roscigno (2022: 85) expose "interlocking strands of social policy, business, education, and medicine". However, these 'interlocking strands' resp. the structural couplings seem to be the missing link as even in (educational) science and pedagogy there is a strong concentration on the (inner life of) autistic persons – while its surroundings are rarely re-garded. Considering the observations on complexity and linkage cited above, isolated considerations of autism are challenged – and for empirical research designs the question of how this complexity can be engaged arises. The paper presents and discusses the Situational Analysis (SA) following Clarke (2018) as a possibility to pursue this target. Bringing a postmodern turn into the Grounded Theory Methodology, Clarke argues that post-

modernity itself is no consistent system of convictions and assumptions, but rather a continuous linking of possibilities. Consequently, she renounces to methodological developments which focus on the 'voice of the individual' – employing for example autoethnography or biographical studies. Clarke (2018) instead devotes to the 'situating of interpretations' and orients her methodical approach to Strauss (1978) conceptualization of Social Worlds: These find themselves in constant negotiations which take place in so-called Arenas. The Situational Analysis therefore aims to draw an ideally complete picture of these Arenas by using mapping techniques. Mapping an 'Autism Arena' in its details – and in a second step undertake cross-cultural comparisons – seems to be of special importance, since in the field of educational practice there e.g., is a loud call for medical and psychological knowledge and biographical views play a huge role in pedagogical advice literature (Köpfer, Papke & Zobel, 2021). These dominant interpretations impede a view on the complexity of the situation – its negotiations and structural couplings. The paper therefore shows the first results of a situational analysis conducted in the southwest of Germany within which interviews are carried out not only with diagnosed pupils and parents of these but also with representatives of the education authority, of the medical resp. psychiatric services as well as the social services providing school assistance.

References:

Broderick, A. A. & Roscigno, R. (2021). Autism, Inc.: The Autism Industrial Complex. *Journal of Disability Studies in Education*, 2(1), 77-101.
Clarke, A. E. (2018). *Situational analysis: grounded theory after the postmodern turn* (2. ed.). London: Sage.
Köpfer, A., Papke, K. & Zobel, Y. (2021). Situationsanalyse Autismus – empirische Perspektivierungen zwischen Ratgeberliteratur und pädagogischem Handeln [Situation Analysis Autism - empirical perspectives between advice literature and pedagogical practice]. *Inklusion online*, 15(1), <https://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/592>
Maynard, D. W. & Turowetz, J. (2019). Doing Abstraction: Autism, Diagnosis, and Social Theory. *Sociological theory*, 37(1), 89-116.
Strauss, A. L. (1978). A Social World Perspective. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 1, 119-128.

Photographs as Representation in Ukraine

Fiona Hallett (Edge Hill University), Allison Moore (Edge Hill University)

This paper will present reflections upon the use of photo-elicitation as a method for capturing the day-to-day lives of families of disabled children in Ukraine at a time of conflict. In recent years, the Ukrainian government has committed to transforming the national care system for children as outlined in The National Strategy of Reforming the System of Institutional Care and Upbringing of Children (2017-2026). However, due to uncertainty in times of war, responses to this strategy have changed and the absence of consistent and accessible support for families of disabled children has led to a growing network of self-help and advocacy groups, established and run by parents. Many of these groups are supported by Disability Rights International (Ukraine), a human rights advocacy organization dedicated to the protection and full community inclusion of children and adults with disabilities. Working within the UKRI/unicef framework on Ethical Research in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Contexts (2021), a photo-elicitation project was designed between researchers at Edge Hill University and the Director of the Ukraine Rapid Response team of Disability Rights International with a view to capturing the lived experiences of the families of children with disabilities. Whilst questionnaire-based research has been undertaken with the parents of children with disabilities in Ukraine (Telna, et al., 2021), this methodology was selected to be more accessible for those participating in the research, and those engaging with the research outputs. In this way, seeking out the way in which meaning is co-constructed using visual representations, discoveries can be made about how images 'embody and enfold people into particular ideologies' (Stockall, 2013: 31). An additional value of using a photograph is that it can prick the conscience of the viewer, asking them to reflect on what they think and do. When analysing images, Barthes (1980, 1984) draws our attention to conceptualisations of studium (the element that creates interest in a photographic image) and punctum (the element that jumps out at the viewer from within a photograph). These concepts will be discussed in this presentation.

References:

Barthes, R. (1980) *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
Barthes, R. (1984) *Camera Lucida*. London: Harper Collins.
Stockall, N. (2013) Photo-elicitation and Visual Semiotics: A Unique Methodology for Studying Inclusion for Children with Disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17 (3):310–328.
UKRI/unicef (2021) *Ethical research in fragile and conflict-affected contexts*. Available at: [UKRI-161121-Ethical-Research-in-Fragile-and-Conflict-Affected-Contexts-Guidelines-for-Applicants.pdf](#)
Telna, O., Klopota, Y., Klopota, O. and Okolovych, O. (2021) Inclusive Education in Ukraine: parents of Children with Disabilities Perspective. *The New Educational Review* Vol. 64 pp. 225-235