# Normalcy, Intersectionality and Ableism : teaching about and around ‘inclusion’ to future educators

SLATER, Jenny <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6739-7784> and CHAPMAN, Elizabeth

**Normalcy, Intersectionality and Ableism: Teaching about and around 'inclusion' to future educators**

Jenny Slater and Elizabeth L. Chapman (Liz)

## *Accessible summary*


- *In this chapter, we talk about teaching university students about inclusion in schools and universities.*
- *We began by focusing our teaching on disabled children and other 'groups' such as children of colour.*
- *However, this did not work very well. Our students wrote essays that focused on the differences between disabled and non-disabled people.*
- *We changed our teaching to focus on the problems caused by an unfair society. This has worked better.*
- *We also include disabled people's personal stories in our teaching.*


## *Summary*

*This chapter reflects on our experiences of teaching about and around 'inclusion' to undergraduate students on an Education Studies programme, in a post-1992 (new) university in the north of England. We argue that, while we keep disabled children's experiences in the forefront of our minds, approaching 'inclusion' with a focus solely on disabled children can be detrimental. Instead, we propose an approach which contextualises these experiences within the systemic and violent dis/ableism of educational systems. To do this, we draw on three theoretical concepts: ableism, intersectionality and normalcy. We conclude that a focus on specific 'groups' often results in an individualising perspective on the part of students, whereas a focus shifted to structures, as outlined in this chapter, has resulted in less Othering perspectives.*

> 'whilst claiming 'inclusion', ableism simultaneously always restates and enshrines itself. On the one hand, discourses of equality promote 'inclusion' by way of promoting positive attitudes (some legislated in mission statements, marketing campaigns, equal opportunities protections) and yet on the other hand, ableist discourses proclaim quite emphatically that disability is inherently negative, ontologically intolerable and in the end, a dispensable remnant'.
>
> (Campbell, 2009, 12)

## *Introduction*

This chapter reflects on our experiences of teaching about and around 'inclusion' to undergraduate students on an Education Studies programme, in a post-1992 (new) university in the north of England. The focus on 'inclusion' has emerged through a number of modules.

In all these modules (and, indeed, in this chapter) we have kept disabled children and young people in the forefront of our minds. We will argue here, however, that despite good Disability Studies, de-individualising intentions, approaching 'inclusion' with a focus solely on disabled children in education can be detrimental. Despite what message a teacher (us!) thinks is being *taught*, the strong dominance of individualising discourses of disability mean that the *differences* between disabled children and their non-disabled peers, is what students often *learn*.

*A note on terminology*

We use the term 'disabled people/children/young people' in this chapter following the social model distinction between 'impairment' (meaning the problematically perceived difference in body/mind) and 'disability' (meaning the subsequent societal oppression faced by people with impairments) (Oliver, 1990). Where terminology alters, that is due to its use in another context. For more on language pertaining to disability, see Mallett and Slater (2014).

Furthermore, we use the term 'people/children/women of colour' which is a preferred term in the North American context. We prefer this to the common UK term 'BME' (black and minority ethnic) as the word 'minority' can be taken to imply a subordinate position; moreover, students of colour are not necessarily in the minority in our university classrooms or in schools. We have also avoided the term 'non-white' as this defines all people of colour with reference to the 'unmarked' white majority. 'People of colour' allows for solidarity on the basis of shared oppression, without assuming a biological commonality (Vidal-Ortiz, 2008).

*Background*

To give this chapter some context, our teaching is around the academic study of education. Although none of the courses that we teach on qualify the students to teach, many students do go into work as educators (often through further teacher training).

We felt it important to reflect on our own positionalities as they relate to both teaching (discussed later) and writing this chapter. One of us (Jenny) has been teaching on the Education Studies Programme discussed for three years. She has a background in disability studies (particularly in relation to youth and young people, see Slater, 2015). The Education Studies Programme encompasses a range of courses and when she began teaching, Jenny was largely teaching on a course in Education and Disability Studies. Now she teaches more

broadly around social justice issues in/of education. The other one of us (Liz) comes from a background in library and information studies (LIS), where her work focused on inclusive provision, particularly LGBTQ* inclusion in libraries and representation in young people's literature (Chapman, 2013, 2015). Liz joined the Education Studies programme in January 2014 and also teaches on social justice issues.

We both identify as queer, white, cisgender, non-disabled women, and, as we will go onto discuss, these various intersecting areas of privilege and marginalisation come into play in our teaching.

Jenny's first semester of teaching gave her two modules relevant to this chapter: *Disability and the Family* (key text: Curran & Runswick-Cole, 2013); and *Inclusion in Educational Contexts*. These modules had been taught for several years and were popular with students. So, with only a few weeks to settle in to her new job and get prepared, she initially taught them largely as they were previously set out.

*Disability and the Family* was organised so that each week the class discussed and theorised a particular family role. Jenny attempted to discuss these 'family roles' as relational. For example, the class looked at 'disabled children and their parents' one week, and 'disabled parents' the next. The students' assignment was to use secondary sources (e.g. families already in the media, or fictional accounts), to provide a 'case study of a family where one or more person is labelled with an impairment'.

In some ways *Inclusion in Educational Contexts* functioned similarly. The taught sessions were separated out to look at particular 'groups': one week was spent on 'gender', one on 'race', one on 'disability' and so on. The students' task was to 'explore the main barriers to inclusion for two excluded groups'. For example, a student may concentrate on 'disability' and 'race'; looking at the barriers for disabled children and children of colour in education.

As she continued through the first semester, however, Jenny felt troubled. There was a disjuncture here between what (Jenny thought) she was teaching, and what the students were learning (Kelly, 2009). The work students were handing in was overwhelmingly individualising, and far from the largely disability studies teachings that Jenny thought that she'd delivered. Writing this with hindsight, we can both see how and why student accounts became individualising. Both modules made it too easy for the focus to be on the individual student and/or family/family member, rather than exclusionary and oppressive systems.

Although far from the intention of teaching sessions, the message which was fed back through student assignments was largely that the 'problem' was within the individual (or, at the least, the particular 'group').

Disability and disabled children still remain paramount in our teaching. Reflecting on our own teaching, however, we will argue through this chapter that *starting* with disabled children's experiences when teaching around issues of inclusion can be detrimental. Whilst important to share, disabled children's experiences need to be strongly foregrounded and contextualised within a focus on the systemic and violent dis/ableism of educational systems which sustain a narrative of disability as devalued difference (Goodley & Runswick-Cole, 2011). Whilst writing about the experiences of Black Muslim women in Britain, Johnson (2014, 8) asks us to consider what would happen if 'instead of focusing solely on the product of […] differences (which is an endless task) we […] focus on the processes that precede these differences'? In this chapter we argue similarly: what happens if, instead of concentrating endlessly on the (often harmful) product of disabled children's perceived differences in the education system, we concentrate on how these differences are produced in the first place?

To make such an argument, this chapter is structured as followed. We first introduce three concepts which have been crucial to our own teaching around 'inclusion': 'ableism' (Campbell, 2009), 'intersectionality' (Crenshaw, 1989) and 'normalcy' (L. J. Davis, 2010). We then move on to reflect upon our own teaching, outlining how a shift to utilise these concepts has led to a shift in gaze – from one on disabled children and young people, to one on oppressive systems and structures. Before we begin, however, it is important to stress that the concepts outlined in this chapter are, through necessity of space, somewhat simplified. Furthermore, there are debates as to the co-option of intersectionality by White people, when it was originally a term used to theorise the lives of women of colour (Johnson, 2014), and similar debates within and around Disability Studies about the use (and possible appropriation) of queer theory (Sherry, 2004, 2013), postcolonial theory (Sherry, 2007) and so on. We are always learning (from students, from each other and from external sources), and from this reflecting on and revising our teaching. We have surely not got everything quite 'right' and would welcome further discussion. However, we remain mindful of our own positionalities within teaching around these complex issues, whilst also considering the positionalities of our students for whom these theories may be a way to navigate the world.

For the sake of space and purpose in this chapter, therefore, we have given an account that is 'a way in'. We have also pointed to where more in-depth accounts of each concept can be found. All the texts we refer to below are texts that have been used and discussions that have been had (and proven productive) with students.

*Three key concepts: Ableism, Intersectionality and Normalcy*

***Concept 1: Ableism***

According to Campbell (2001, 44) ableism is a 'network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the corporeal standard) that is projected as the perfect, species-typical and therefore essential and fully human'. Disablism, on the other hand, is the resultant 'attitudes and barriers that contribute to the subordination of people with disabilities' (Campbell, 2009, 4). She argues that instead of focusing all our attention on disabled people (and indeed disablism) we should instead think about how dominant ideas of the 'able body' (which she maintains is a social construct) are *produced* in the first place.

Let's take an educational example. In the run-up to the UK general elections 2015 there was an announcement from the Conservative Education Secretary, Nicky Morgan, that all children should know their 12 times table by age 11 (BBC News, 2015). Such a declaration is an example of ableism. It projects an image of a 'a particular kind of [11-year-old] self and body' (Campbell, 2009, 44) that can, along with other things, perform their 12 times tables. Any 11-year-old unable to perform their 12 times tables is made Other to this standard set out. Disabled children are one group that can become Othered through this announcement (and other recent UK announcements around a shift back to 'rote-based' learning) (Contact A Family, 2013a). This particular *ableist* statement then (that projects an 11-year-old doing their 12 times table as the expected norm), leads to *disablism*. There are a number of disablist practices that could result from this. For example, disabled children could be met with paternalism. There may be that an assumption that disabled children cannot perform these tasks, and an assurance that the announcement was not aimed at them, that that they will have alternative provision. This, however, could lead to segregation, especially in a climate where school leagues tables are key, so disabled children could be considered to be compromising that school (ALLFIE, 2011). It could also lead to expulsion. In 2013 Contact A Family reported that disabled children are routinely illegally excluded from school (Contact A Family, 2013b).

We see then that ableism (the expectation of an 'able' body and mind), leads to disablism (the marginalisation and oppression of disabled people). Campbell points out, however, that much scholarship and practice in the field of Disability Studies has concentrated on the experiences of disablism, 'essentially relat[ing] to reforming those negative attitudes, assimilating people with disabilities into normative civil society and providing compensatory initiatives and safety nets in cases of enduring vulnerability' (Campbell, 2009, 4). Of course, attending to experiences of disablism is important. Yet, reflections on our own teaching (which will follow) tend to support Campbell's argument. When we concentrate only on looking at the disablism faced by disabled children and young people, '[d]isability, often quite unconsciously, continues to be examined and taught from the perspective of the Other (Marks, 1996; Solis, 2006).' For Campbell then, the challenge 'is to reverse, to invert this traditional approach, to shift our gaze and concentrate on what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism' (Campbell, 2009, 4).

As we move on to outline some of our own teaching experiences, we will show how by focusing only on experiences of disablism, without foregrounding with an understanding of ableism, disabled children remain a 'special case', requiring 'special provision'; they remain Other. The disabled body continues to 'secure the performative enactment of the normal' (Campbell, 2009, 12). Also key to Campbell's definition of ableism is that this projected (and expected) 'able body' isn't only reliant on the category of dis/ability, rather it has 'specific cultural alignments with other factors such as race, gender, sexuality and coloniality' (Campbell, 2012, 214). Mingus (2011) therefore argues that 'ableism' is not just about disability or disabled people, but an important way to understand all experiences of systemic oppression or marginalisation:

> 'Ableism cuts across all of our movements because ableism dictates how bodies should function against a mythical norm—an able-bodied standard of white supremacy, heterosexism, sexism, economic exploitation, moral/religious beliefs, age and ability. Ableism set the stage for queer and trans people to be institutionalized as mentally disabled; for communities of color to be understood as less capable, smart and intelligent, therefore 'naturally' fit for slave labor; for women's bodies to be used to produce children, when, where and how men needed them; for people with disabilities to be seen as 'disposable' in a capitalist and exploitative culture because we are not seen as 'productive;' for immigrants to be thought of as a 'disease' that we must 'cure' because it is 'weakening' our country; for violence, cycles of poverty, lack of resources and war to be used as systematic tools to construct disability in communities and entire countries.'

Mingus' analysis of ableism allows us to see how disability as a difference (Erevelles, 2011) is produced in relation to axes of race, sexuality, gender, class/poverty, faith, global location and age. To return to the example offered above, we could also think of the ableist expectation of all 11-year-olds knowing their 12 times table along some of these other 'axes of difference'. For example, we could see this pronouncement as classed, in that 'attainment' is consistently lower in those with a low socio-economic status (Department for Education, 2014a; Goodman & Gregg, 2010), and that 'rote learning' sustains the already 'middle-class' field of education. We can see it as raced (and colonial), as it comes as part of a package in a Conservative vision of an education system aiming to 'promote British values' (Department for Education, 2014b). We can see it as gendered as it emerges as part of a wider shift back to more 'traditional' subjects in response to the so-called 'feminisation' of the curriculum purportedly favouring girls (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2009), the assumption of which also works through cultures of cissexism and heteronormativity (see, Payne & Smith, 2012; Snyder & Broadway, 2004; Sumara & Davis, 1999). This brings us to our second concept, *intersectionality*.

***Concept 2: Intersectionality***

Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) is widely credited as the originator of the term 'intersectionality'. She used it to describe how structures and processes relating to race, class and gender worked to oppress women of colour (in ways that were different to those experienced by men of colour, or white women, or other poor people). In order to describe this, in 1989, Crenshaw (1245-1246) wrote:

> 'Many women of color, for example, are burdened by poverty, child care responsibilities, and the lack of job skills. These burdens, largely the consequence of gender and class oppression, are then compounded by the racially discriminatory employment and housing practices women of colour often face, as well as by the disproportionately high unemployment among people of color that makes battered women of color less able to depend on the support of friends and relatives for temporary shelter.'

For Crenshaw, however, these different 'axes of difference' are not merely additive or descriptive, but are co-constituted through and by one another. Intersectionality, then, can help us to understand that processes of categorisation (through class, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, age, and so on) are not just *descriptive* markers which produce different experiences, but are in fact co-constituting of one-another (Erevelles, 2011).

The work of disability and critical race education scholar, Nirmala Erevelles, is particularly useful here. In a paper with Ivan Watts, for example, Watts and Erevelles (2004) explore 'violence' in/of schools. Although this paper has a US focus, it is pertinent to us in the UK (similar processes are explored in a UK context in Slater, 2016). Watts and Erevelles highlight that 'violent' is a label often given to young men of colour. They argue, however, that by individualising 'violence' (considering it as a problem belonging to a particular racialized person/population), we ignore the *structural* violence of school systems:

> 'the real violence in schools is a result of the structural violence of oppressive social conditions that force students, especially low-income African American and Latino male students, to feel vulnerable, angry, and resistant to the normative expectations of prison-like school environments.' (Watts & Erevelles, 2004, 274)

Watts and Erevelles explain how many poor young men of colour, considered 'violent', are then excluded from the school system. Ironically, this often means they end up in more violent systems (streets, prisons and so on) (A. Y. Davis, 2003; Zahm, 1997). However, when 'school administrators have refrained from using expulsion and suspension to remove "violent" students from schools, they have often labelled those students as mildly mentally retarded, behaviourally disordered, or emotionally conflicted, and have banished them to segregated special education classrooms (Noguera, 1995; Artiles, 2003)' (Watts & Erevelles, 2004, 288). We begin to see then how processes of racialization and labels of 'special educational needs' may not merely be productive of similar or different experiences, but processes that co-constitute one-another.

### *Concept 3: Normalcy*

> 'In short, normality and normalcy is achieved through an unsaying: an absence of descriptions of what is to be normal'
>
> (Goodley, 2009, x)

The final concept we introduce here is that of 'normalcy' (L. J. Davis, 2010). This is the concept we have found students to grasp most readily and it is useful in order to grapple with both ableism and intersectionality. As Mallett and Runswick-Cole (2014, 23-24) explain:

> 'Davis contends that in order to understand 'disability', we must begin by examining the idea of 'normal'. Indeed, he draws our attention to what he describes as the hegemony, or dominant, of the 'world of norms' (1995: 23). The world of norms is one in which intelligence, height, weight and many other aspects of the body are measured in comparison to the 'normal'. In some disciplines,

> such as psychology and medicine, the 'normal' range is often depicted on a bell-shaped graph that offers a visual representation and statistical description of the limits of normal'

In the same way that ableism helps us to understand the social construction of the 'able' body, normalcy helps us to turn our attention onto the social construction of 'norms'. Davis points out that '[o]ur children are ranked in school and tested to determine where they fit into a normal curve of learning, of intelligence' (L. J. Davis, 2002, 3). Let us again return to the expectation on 11-year-olds to know their 12 times tables. We can begin to deconstruct this around the norms it is based upon. Developmental psychology, and the associated 'learning theories' (Piaget, Vygotsky and so on) are a good place to begin here (Burman, 2008). From developmental psychology, there is an expectation that by a certain *age*, one should have met a certain *stage*. Yet, although human 'development' is often presented to us as a 'biological reality' (Slater, 2015, 40), according to Burman (2008, 5), studies of child development have always been 'instrumental in terms of the fashioning of future citizens – including the generation of appropriate workers and consumers'. Our interrogation then becomes broader: we begin to hunt for developmental assumptions within the education system; we simultaneously ask what the purpose of education is (especially in relation to capitalist relations and producers/consumers); and we think of disabled people's place, not only in education, but in society more broadly.

*Utilising 'Ableism', 'Intersectionality' and 'Normalcy' in teaching*

Reflecting on our own teaching, we have changed, and continue to change, our approach to teaching. We are going to concentrate for the majority of this chapter on *Inclusion in Education Contexts* (partially because *Disability and the Family* no longer runs in the institution, partially because modules on 'inclusion' are more commonly taught than those focusing explicitly on disability and the family, and partially because this is the module that both authors currently teach on). However, we want to give a 'nod' to how, for the second and final time Jenny taught it, *Disability and the Family* was revamped (resulting in assignments much more focused on structural, systemic and societal problems, rather than those perceived to 'belong' to individuals).

Rather than focus on individual family members, Jenny set out by talking about normative assumptions around 'families'. The approach became rooted in critical disability studies. As Goodley (2011, 157) puts it, 'while critical disability studies may start with disability, they never end with it'. We worked with other critical theory. Rather than thinking about 'disabled

children' for example, we used critical psychology to examine how expectations of children work upon normative developmental assumptions (Burman, 2008) and asked how that positions disabled children as 'abnormal'. We drew on queer theory throughout to deconstruct normative notions of 'the family' and applied this to think about the implications of normative ideas of the family for disabled people. Rather than consider 'disabled parents' or 'disabled young people' we thought about the discursively oppositional positioning of disability and sexuality (Liddiard, 2012; Liddiard & Slater, f.c.; Slater, 2012, 2015), and how this might lead to certain perceptions about disabled people's family roles. The final session drew on Allison Kafer's (2011) analysis of Sharon Duchesneau and Candy McCullough's fight, as a d/Deaf lesbian couple, to use the sperm of a deaf donor, in the hope of conceiving a d/Deaf baby. The discussions in class centred around the bureaucratic hoops that a same-sex couple may have to jump through in order to conceive/adopt (and how these may also be classed, raced, gendered, dis/ableist and so on), alongside dis/ableist assumptions 'that life as a Deaf person is inferior to life as a hearing person' (Kafer, 2011, 228). The session therefore helped students to think about ableist assumptions around families, alongside structures of heteronormativity.

Rather than say any more about *Disability and the Family*, however, we want to concentrate for the remainder of this chapter on teaching about and around 'inclusion'. Our approach is similar to the one outlined in *Disability and the Family*. We start with the education system, and from there we think about how it functions to oppress individual lives, framing with the three key concepts outlined earlier: ableism (Campbell, 2009), normalcy (L. J. Davis, 2010) and intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989). We feel that it is also important to note here that we introduce these three concepts early in the module – partly to give students a chance to understand the concepts, and partly so that they can apply them throughout the sessions.

As discussed in the introduction, the module as originally devised focused on one 'marginalised group' each week. The first move we made was to move away from this structure, as it inadvertently gave the impression that such groups were discrete and existed in isolation to one-another: instead we encouraged students to think intersectionally throughout the module. We also chose to move away from this structure as it encouraged a tick box approach: that when you have had the session on 'race', for example, you know everything there is to know about race and education; and when you have finished the module you have covered all the 'marginalised groups'. We wanted students to understand 'inclusion' as complex, often contradictory and on-going (not something that can be 'achieved'): as Naylor

(2005) puts it, ‘always a journey, never a destination’. Finally, in purely practical terms, a structure that focuses on each group in turn leads to low student attendance at later sessions once they have decided which ‘groups’ they are focusing on in their assignment.

Students begin by reading Michalko's (2001) ‘*Blindness Enters the Classroom’*. The assumption that many students enter with is that the module will be around ‘how to teach disabled students’. Michalko's piece straight away ‘disorientates’ them, by getting them to think about disabled educators. Michalko’s account of lecturing as a blind man beautifully captures the ableist assumption of teacher = non-disabled. In a subsequent lecture which brings in critiques of developmental psychology (Burman, 2008) we ask students to read Baglieri et al.’s (2011) *‘[Re]Claiming “Inclusive Education”. Toward Cohesion in Educational Reform: Disability Studies Unravels the Myth of the Normal Child’*. As part of this preparatory work students are also asked to think about ideas of normalcy (L. J. Davis, 2010) by making a list of what we expect from the ‘normal’ student at school, which we then discuss in class. Through these lectures we interrogate who the ‘expected participant’ (Titchkosky, 2011) is within our education systems. This serves a threefold purpose of critiquing ableist structures which posit an expected ‘normal’ student; helping us to remain mindful about the complex intersecting identities of our students; and encouraging the students to not make assumptions about who is in the classroom as either ‘student’ or ‘teacher’.

Both of us are (continuously) ‘coming out’ to our students as openly queer and discuss this in the context of the module. This is, of course, a personal decision, but also one that is for us political. It was a decision that began to feel more possible after some years of experience of teaching and in the context of a particular set of circumstances, including relatively privileged positions, and a particular working environment. Turner (2010, 287) discusses (in an American context) how for many academics, especially those not on permanent contracts, ‘the decision to be ‘out’ in the classroom is perhaps joyous, unadvisable, potentially dangerous and often difficult’. This resonates: there have been both positive and negative aspects of this process for us. Positives include a potentially safer space for discussion of some complex issues and opportunities for queer (and potentially other marginalised) students to share their experiences. Negatives include a potential for negative student feedback or reaction, and being viewed as ‘the face of an agenda’ (Turner, 2010, 297). The issue of student self-censorship falls somewhere between ‘positive’ and ‘negative’: positive in that it perhaps offers some protection to other students holding that particular identity

within the classroom; but negative as it may dissuade students from expressing and unpicking views on important issues in both the classroom situation and their written work.

We also encourage attention to the privileged aspects of our and student identities; by doing this we hope to model a process of critical reflexivity to potential future educators. Like Campbell (2009), we try to notice the supposedly 'unmarked' identities of 'ablebodiedness', 'Whiteness', 'heterosexuality' and so on (Dyer, 1997). This draws attention to the fact that 'identity' is not the sole preserve of people marked as Other. We all have identities and thus intersecting areas of privilege and marginalisation (Crenshaw, 1989). As Dyer (1997, 1) notes, 'As long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people'.

Moreover, this encourages students to think critically about how privileged aspects of their identities might give them the luxury of overlooking some aspects of exclusion in education. For example, many students begin the module with the assumption that education is 'fair'. In one session, we challenge this assumption by showing students statistics around school exclusions in the UK (Department for Eduucation, 2014c). These statistics show disproportionately high levels of school exclusion amongst Black Caribbean and dual-heritage young men. We ask the students to work in groups to identify potential societal explanations for the figures, considering the ways in which raced and gendered stereotypes position young Black men as violent (Watts & Erevelles, 2004) and the ways in which 'challenging behaviour' is read as pathological (Timimi, 2005). (The students have been asked to read the two previously referenced articles in preparation for the session). To make the task concrete (and to open the chance for class discussion) part of their task is to finish the sentence: "Statistics on school exclusions show us the importance of taking an intersectional approach to think about 'inclusion' because..." As with the *Disability and the Family* module, this shifts the focus from the 'problematic' individual, to societal structures of oppression.

Before we conclude, we want to make clear that although we have focused upon the structural in the examples given above, this is not to say that the use of personal stories isn't relevant or necessary. Indeed, personal narrative is something that we utilise throughout the module alongside other forms of 'evidence'. For example, in one session we give the students 'packs' containing different sources of information. These include statistics about attainment, progression into further and higher education, and the representation of staff with different

social positionings. Alongside these we use personal narratives (including accounts of disabled childhoods), whether published in academic books (Haraldsdóttir, 2013), newspaper articles (Sennello, 2013) or blogs (Sheffield University BME Students' Committee, 2015). We encourage students to think about how these different forms of 'evidence' are valued, which dominate in the media, and the different perspectives they provide on educational and societal in/exclusion. We see the use of personal stories as really important, so long as they are contextualised within wider systems and structures (Curran & Runswick-Cole, 2013).

*Conclusion*

In this chapter we have by necessity only given a few (somewhat simplified) examples of teaching tools, methods and concepts. Of course, the relational nature of pedagogy means that each time we teach this module it is different. There are always moments where a student challenges the teacher or another student, where we redirect or broaden thinking ('how about if you think about this?'), or where we recognise or a student draws attention to areas for improvement in our own teaching. We do not seek here to give definitive answers but rather would welcome further discussion with educators, students and others with an interest in the topics discussed. Indeed, in writing this chapter we have already noticed changes that we'd make. For instance, our example of engaging with the concept of intersectionality inadvertently refocused attention on experiences of Black men, which is somewhat troubling in light of the theory's original aim of creating a space to discuss the experiences specific to Black women. In future, further attention needs to be paid to social structures that exclude Black women in educational contexts (Alexander & Arday, 2015).

We are also aware that the focus in this chapter hasn't solely (or even predominantly) been on disabled children and young people, as audiences of this book may expect. However, as outlined in the introduction, in previous teaching a focus on specific 'groups' has led to individualising perspectives, whereas a focus shifted to structures, as outlined in this chapter, has resulted in less Othering approaches. We hope that students come away from the module with less an idea of inclusion as something which they, as potential future educators, will (or will not) attempt to do 'to' particular groups. Instead, exclusionary structures affect us all to differing extents depending upon our intersecting social positions of privilege and oppression.

*References*

Alexander, C. and Arday, J. (Eds) (2015). Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy (London: Runnymede).

http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/Aiming%20Higher.pdf, date accessed 11 March 2016.
ALLFIE (2011). Response to the Government 'Support and Aspiration: a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' Green Paper (London: ALLFIE).
Baglieri, S., Bejoian, L. M., Broderick, A. A., Connor, D. J. and Valle, J. (2011). '[Re] Claiming "Inclusive Education". Toward Cohesion in Educational Reform: Disability Studies Unravels the Myth of the Normal Child.' *Teachers College Record, 113*(10), 2122-2154.
BBC News (2015, 1st February). Nicky Morgan Announces 'War on Illiteracy and Innumeracy', *BBC News*, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-31079515, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Burman, E. (2008). *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* (Hove: Routledge).
Campbell, F. K. (2001). 'Inciting Legal Fictions - Disability's Date with Ontology and the Abieist Body of the Law.' *Griffith Law Review, 10*(1), 42-62.
Campbell, F. K. (2009). Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Campbell, F. K. (2012). 'Stalking Ableism: Using Disability to Expose "Abled" Narcissism.' In D. Goodley, B. Hughes and L. Davis (Eds), *Disability and Social Theory: New Approaches and Directions* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.212-230.
Chapman, E. L. (2013). 'No More Controversial than a Gardening Display? Provision of LGBT-Related Fiction to Children and Young People in U.K. Public Libraries.' *Library Trends, 61*(3), 542-568.
Chapman, E. L. (2015). Provision of LGBT-Related Fiction to Children and Young People in English Public Libraries: A Mixed-Methods Study. PhD, University of Sheffield, Sheffield. http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/11802/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Contact A Family (2013a). Changes to National Curriculum Could Disadvantage Disabled Children, http://www.cafamily.org.uk/news-and-media/changes-to-the-national-curriculum-could-disadvantage-disabled-children/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Contact A Family (2013b). Disabled Children Illegally Excluded From School Every Week, http://www.cafamily.org.uk/news-and-media/disabled-children-illegally-excluded-from-school-every-week/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Crenshaw, K. (1989). 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrince, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.' *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.
Curran, T. and Runswick-Cole, K. (Eds). (2013). *Disabled Children's Childhood Studies: Critical Approaches in a Global Context* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
Davis, A. Y. (2003). *Are Prisons Obselete?* (New York: Seven Stories Press).
Davis, L. J. (2002). *Bending Over Backwards: Disability, Dismodernism, and Other Difficult Positions* (New York/London: New York University Press).
Davis, L. J. (2010). Constructing Normalcy. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The Disability Studies Reader*, 3rd edn (New York/London: Routledge), pp.3-19.
Department for Children, Schools and Families (2009). Gender and Education – Mythbusters Addressing Gender and Achievement: Myths and Realities (London: HMSO). http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/00599-2009BKT-EN.pdf, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Department for Education (2014a, 27 March 2014). GCSE and Equivalent Attainment by Pupil Characteristics: 2013, http://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gcse-and-equivalent-attainment-by-pupil-characteristics-2012-to-2013, date accessed 11 March 2016.

Department for Education (2014b). Promoting Fundamental British Values As Part of SMSC in Schools: Departmental Advice for Maintained Schools (London: HMSO). https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/380595/SMSC_Guidance_Maintained_Schools.pdf, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Department for Education (2014c). Statistics: Exclusions, https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-exclusions, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Dyer, R. (1997). *White* (London: Routledge).
Erevelles, N. (2011). *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
Goodley, D. (2009). 'Foreword.' In F. K. Campbell, *Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness* (Basingstoke:Palgrave), pp. ix-xiv.
Goodley, D. (2011). *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction* (London: SAGE).
Goodley, D. and Runswick-Cole, K. (2011). 'The Violence of Disablism.' *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *33*(4), 602-617.
Goodman, A. and Gregg, P. (2010). Poorer Children's Educational Attainment: How Important are Attitudes and Behaviour? (York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation).
Haraldsdóttir, F. (2013). 'Simply Children.' In T. Curran & K. Runswick-Cole (Eds), *Disabled Children's Childhood Studies: Critical Approaches in a Global Context* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.13-21.
Johnson, A. (2014). 'Questioning "Intersectional" Identities Through Clothing Practices: The Experiences of Black Muslim Women in Britain.' Paper presented at the *Postgraduate Gender Research Network Seminar*, University of Sheffield.
Kafer, A. (2011). 'Debating Feminist Futures: Slippery Slopes, Cultural Anxiety, and the Case of the Deaf Lesbians.' In K. Hall (Ed.), *Feminist Disability Studies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), pp. 218-242.
Kelly, A. (2009). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*, 6th edn (London: SAGE).
Liddiard, K. (2012). *(S)exploring Disability: Intimacies, Sexualities and Disabilities.* PhD, University of Warwick.
Liddiard, K. and Slater, J. (f.c.). '"Like, pissing yourself is not a particularly attractive quality, let's be honest": Learning to Contain through Youth, Adulthood, Disability and Sexuality.' *Sexualities Special Issue: Disability and Sexual Corporeality: Possibilities for Pleasure*.
Mallett, R. and Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). *Approaching Disability: Critical Issues and Perspectives* (London: Routledge).
Mallett, R. and Slater, J. (2014). 'Language.' In C. Cameron (Ed.) *Disability Studies: A Student's Guide* (London: SAGE), pp. 91-94.
Michalko, R. (2001). 'Blindness Enters the Classroom. ' *Disability & Society*, *16*(3), 349-359.
Mingus, M. (2011, 22nd August). Moving Toward the Ugly: A Politic Beyond Desirability. http://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2011/08/22/moving-toward-the-ugly-a-politic-beyond-desirability/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Naylor, C. (2005). 'Inclusion in British Columbia's Public Schools: Always a Journey, Never a Destination?' Paper presented at *Building Inclusive Schools: A Search for Solutions*, Ottawa. http://bctf.ca/diversity/reports/inclusionjourney/report.pdf, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Oliver, M. (1990). *The Politics of Disablement* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
Payne, E. and Smith, M. (2012). 'Rethinking Safe Schools Approaches for LGBTQ Students: Changing the Questions We Ask.' *Multicultural Perspectives*, *14*(4), 187-193.
Sennello, A. (2013, 11th April). My Story: I've been an outcast at school because I'm transgender, *The Guardian*,

http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/apr/11/transgender-discrimination-in-schools-my-story, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Sheffield University BME Students' Committee (2015). I, Too, Am Sheffield, http://itooamsheffield.tumblr.com/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Sherry, M. (2004). 'Overlaps and Contradictions Between Queer Theory and Disability Studies.' *Disability & Society, 19*(7), 769 - 783.
Sherry, M. (2007). '(Post)colonising Disability.' *Wagadu, 4*, 10-22.
Sherry, M. (2013). Crip Politics? Just … No. *The Feminist Wire*. http://thefeministwire.com/2013/11/crip-politics-just-no/, date accessed 11 March 2016.
Slater, J. (2012). 'Youth for Sale: Using Critical Disability Perspectives to Examine the Embodiment of "Youth".' *Societies, 2*(3), 195-209.
Slater, J. (2015). *Youth and Dis/ability: A Challenge to Mr Reasonable* (Farnham: Ashgate).
Slater, J. (2016). The (Normal) Non-Normativity of Youth. In R. Mallett, C. A. Ogden and J. Slater (Eds), *Theorising Normalcy and The Mundane: Precarious Positions* (Chester: Chester University Press), pp. 14-44.
Snyder, V. L. and Broadway, F. S. (2004). 'Queering High School Biology Textbooks.' *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(6), 617-636.
Sumara, D. and Davis, B. (1999). 'Interrupting Heteronormativity: Toward a Queer Curriculum Theory.' *Curriculum Inquiry, 29*(2), 191-208.
Timimi, S. (2005). *Naughty Boys: Anti-Social Behaviour, ADHD and the Role of Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
Titchkosky, T. (2011). *The Question of Access: Disability, Space, Meaning* (Toronto/London: University of Toronto Press).
Turner, S. L. (2010). 'Undressing as Normal: The Impact of Coming Out in Class.' *The Teacher Educator, 45*(4), 287-300.
Vidal-Ortiz, S. (2008). 'People of Color.' In R. T. Schaefer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Society* (London: SAGE), pp.1037-1039.
Watts, I. E. and Erevelles, N. (2004). 'These Deadly Times: Reconceptualizing School Violence By Using Critical Race Theory and Disability Studies.' *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 271-299.
Zahm, B. (1997). 'The Last Graduation: The Rise and Fall of College Programs in Prison,' *Lock Down USA*. TV series. Washington, DC: Citizens for Independent Public Broadcasting.