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Violent Life in an Inclusive Classroom: Come on Read Peter! Moving From Moral Judgment to an Onto-Epistemological Ethics

Inge Van de Putte, Elisabeth De Schauwer, Geert Van Hove, and Bronwyn Davies

Abstract
In this article, we begin with a story in which a teacher is perceived as cruel, a boy experiences exclusion, and a support worker feels guilty for not responding. Working together with students, we have written a play script that explores the entangled intra-active perceptions of the various players. The script was used in the professional development of educators as a means of exploring the diffractive movements through which differences are made in inclusive classrooms. It opens the possibility of moving away from thinking in terms of individual accountability toward an intra-active exploration of the ethics of such encounters.
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Introduction

The four authors of this article have worked collaboratively for several years in the field of disability studies in education (Davies et al., 2013). Three of us have used the diffractive methodology of collective biography to extend our thinking about disability and difference (e.g., De Schauwer, Van de Putte, Blockmans, & Davies, 2018). In the post-structural methodology of collective biography (Davies & Gannon, 2013), knowledge emerges through collectively working with memories, (re)telling, (re)listening, (re)writing, and reading them out loud. Emergent listening is crucial to collective biography work; it is a mode of listening that is without moralistic judgments and in which the participants are open to what they do not already know. Together, the participants explore the possibilities opened up in a diffractive, post-human space-time-mattering, where memory stories are not taken to be signs of individualized essential selves, but a means of tracing the space-time-mattering of the worlds they live in. The concept of space-time-mattering is a critique of a classical ontology in which there are discrete and bounded entities that act through casual relations in linear time and space. In new materialist thought, the thing we called “I” doesn’t exist outside the world: “humans are themselves specific local parts of the world’s ongoing reconfiguring” (Barad, 2003, p. 829). In line with new materialist thinking, we used a diffractive methodology to make the intra-active material and discursive practices visible through which people, events, and (material) surroundings emerge.

In this article, we focus on a memory told in a collective biography workshop where the possibility of emergent listening was closed down in a series of moral judgments that the participants were entangled in. That memory came up in a collective biography workshop run by Inge (the first author of this article) with a group of four Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs). Their topic was the taking and not taking up of responsibility. Inge told one of her memories that had had a strong impact on her, and bothered her for over a decade, because she believed she had not acted responsibly. The participants found themselves rushing to moral judgment of the teacher in the story, and determined to defend Inge, reassuring her she could not have acted differently. Their impulse to protect her from her interpretation of having acted irresponsibly was linked to their own memories of the impossibility of escaping such difficult situations in their own work. As a result, the
collective biography workshop became mired in concepts of individual accountability, responsibility, moralism, and judgment, and the move toward new ways of thinking was foreclosed (Mazzei, 2016).

We needed to develop a new strategy—to extend the membership of the project and to find new ways of working with the memory story—to move beyond and away from our closed thinking. How might the story itself be brought to life differently? How might we involve others (e.g., researchers, educational professionals, and students) in lifting the story out of its entanglement in individualism and moral judgment? In thinking of the story as alive and having agency in its entanglement with us, we were drawing on Bennett’s (2000) observation that “things do in fact affect other bodies, enhancing or weakening their power” (p. 3). Things, she says, such as this story, have “the ability to make things happen, to produce effects” (Bennett, 2000, p. 5). How might the story be worked with to produce different effects? The memory story had force that had worked on Inge for more than ten years. We decided to bring students into the project with the task of transforming the story into a play that incorporated multiple perspectives. The play would not be about individual failure but would open a window on the entangled space-time-mattering of the particular classroom.

We begin with Inge’s memory story on the topic of not taking up responsibility. (The story can be found in audio format [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8Zhl1NaDEE&feature=youtu.be], and the reader is invited to listen to the audio play while reading the memory story.)

We are in Teacher Ida’s class. She is the teacher of the first grade. The school is located in a rural area. It’s a class of 18 students, of which Kobe and Peter are two. Inge is also there, she’s Kobe’s support worker.

(Sounds of the playground.)

(School bell.)

Inge sits at the back of the classroom. She is sitting on a chair with a stack of workbooks on her lap. As she corrects each book of mathematical exercises, she puts it on a pile on the ground. In the background you can hear the buzzing noise of children.

Kobe begins to read: “An and . . . [pause].

Inge stops correcting and raises her head.

Kobe: “An and Tom go to . . . go to . . . [big pause] the moon.”

“Very well, Kobe!” says Ida. She gives two thumbs up.
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“It was her individual responsibility to address such a situation in a competent manner (Bansel, 2007). It was not the support worker’s responsibility because she was there for Kobe, the child with a disability, and thus had no mandate to interfere with the teacher’s actions. With this interpretation of the event, she could not be blamed for her response. Above all, she should be praised for humanizing Peter when she had the chance, making a coalition with him and Kobe when teacher Ida left the classroom. When Ida returned, they agreed, the support worker would have no other option than to reterritorialize Ida’s order and so place him back in his position of torture and humiliation. In this version of the event, Peter became the victim because he had no strategies to cope with the teacher’s violence.

The idea of transforming the memory story into a play first emerged in a discussion among the four authors over dinner after reading the memory story and the transcription of the discussion that followed in the collective biography. As a play, rather than an individual’s memory, we could multiply the perspectives and show the entangled agencies of the participants, including nonhuman participants, in the place-time-mattering of the classroom. We wanted to open up lines of flight that made the normalizing forces visible, but were not limited by them. We turned to Barad for inspiration on how this might be done. Barad is not interested in critiquing a person or a situation, but in thinking diffractionally, reading insights through one another to build new insights. A diffactive analysis does not individualize or pathologize a problem but instead explores the lines of force that are at work in any particular situation (Barad, 2007). The concept of diffraction is a “tool” to highlight the entanglement of material-discursive phenomena in the world (Bozalek & Zembylas, 2016). In reworking the story in a script, we want to counteract that individualization of responsibility that slips in our relationships.

Instead of letting go of this memory and categorizing it as “data that does not yield the desired result,” the four authors, over dinner, treated the memory, and the response to it in the collective biography, as a “possible opening onto wonder” (Maclure, 2011). We looked at it as a “liminal hotspot” (Maclure, 2011), as an in-between-situation, in which Peter is part of the class group but at the same time excluded, and the support worker is in the class but her responsibility is focused on one individual. We were interested in highlighting the different, contrasting feelings, such as pride, shame, and humiliation, and in contesting the binaries such as good/bad support worker/student/teacher (Kofod & Stenner, 2017).

Our discussion—helped by sushi and wine—became more and more animated, and our ideas flowed as we started thinking about what was possible. We came up with the idea of recounting the memory through a “performative ethnography” (Goldstein, 2010), modeled in the fashion of a script that can be read aloud by a group of participants. We wanted to explore what could happen if we worked with a diffactive script that contained the multiple voices, the desires, the histories, and the ambiguities. Could this take us beyond what we thought we already knew? The script is based on data from the collective biography with the four SENCOs (both the memory and the discussion afterward). It also draws on the field notes of the first author from 16 years ago, when she was a support worker in that particular classroom; on her research in the context of the professionalization of teachers in inclusive education, and the advocacy of parents and children with special needs who seek an inclusive life. The different voices were with us when we tried to materialize them in the script, but they were also based on imagination. Creativity

The script is based on data from the collective biography with the four SENCOs (both the memory and the discussion afterward). It also draws on the field notes of the first author from 16 years ago, when she was a support worker in that particular classroom; on her research in the context of the professionalization of teachers in inclusive education, and the advocacy of parents and children with special needs who seek an inclusive life. The different voices were with us when we tried to materialize them in the script, but they were also based on imagination. Creativity
and imagination can be important to enrich the diffractive process. In new materialism, we are not looking for totalizing truths, but we are interested in profound learning processes. We used fiction to animate the multiple characters and to make their multiplicity more visible. To incorporate “an intra-active relationship between all living organisms and the material environment such as artefacts, spaces and place that we occupy and use in our daily practice” (Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 10), a Greek choir—as it was used in ancient Greek theater—was to be included in the script that we envisaged. A Greek choir was an essential element of Greek drama and acted as the ideal observer, reacting and sympathizing with what happened on stage. It provided comments and expressed feelings. In contrast to the heroic and extreme personalities of the main characters, the Greek choir often played the role of mediocrity, offered plaints and represented mainstream thoughts, and made the discourses that were working on us and through us visible.

**Creating the Diffractive Script**

To create the play, Inge worked in collaboration with four students from the Department of Special Needs Education at Ghent University. The task was to open up thinking about all the different discourses that could possibly be at work in the story of Peter. To do this work, the students had to become familiar not only with the concept of “diffraction” but also with the means of understanding the lines of force at play—neoliberal discourses and practices, processes and practices of normalization, the way a regular school system operates, governmental (educational) policy, globally shifting value systems, transformation in teachers’ practices and teacher education, disability discourses, and so on (Van de Putte, De Schauwer, Van Hove, & Davies, 2018). At the same time, it was an opportunity to involve the students in a new materialist way of doing research, which contrasted with the qualitative inquiry they were familiar with. They were used to following carefully laid out steps of a particular, conventional, and well-known qualitative method, such as conducting focus groups and semi-structured interviews, and using triangulation, in the hope that “the research question is approached from different sides so their conclusion must be true” (Davies & Gannon, 2009, p. 12).

Together with the students, Inge held different performances of the script, with every performance providing input for reworking the script and the way we worked with it. Nine different experimental performances were held, one with students in the teacher training course, six with teachers and SENCOs in the context of professional development courses, one with the academics in the disability studies group where three of us work, and one at the Disability Studies Conference in Education in Minneapolis. The experimental performances not only opened up a means of students working with a diffractive methodology, but they became a form of professional development; they were collective assemblages through which knowledge was being constructed collaboratively with the participants.

Through each of the different performances, the script evolved as we read it and worked with it toward new ways of thinking. Three research strategies we used in the collaborative, experimental performances were the following: connecting with participants’ memories, using the audio play, and setting up a “social atom.” These strategies were emergent, arising out of the collaboration in which the strategy of emergent listening was used to open up new ways of thinking. We paid more attention to the relational, material entanglement; as a result, the material turn became gradually incorporated in the research.

**Connecting With Participants’ Memories**

In this project, the researchers, our student, and teacher participants were not recipients of already-formed ideas, but co-researchers/co-learners (Lenz Taguchi, 2010). We began with a memory that each participant had of their time at school. We asked them to go back in time and capture such a memory, which they then exchanged with the other participants. The first memory that came to their mind was good to serve as a lens of lived experience that helped them to think about the concepts of “responsibility,” “position,” and so on. As co-researchers they were collaboratively and actively engaged in their own professional development and knowledge construction. They encountered multiple characters in classroom situations, they thought with new concepts (e.g., entangled agency with intra-active human and nonhuman agents), and they were connected within different assemblages as they collectively listened to and thought with each other’s memories. They became part from (sometimes) very different backgrounds (research, student, educational professional) in assemblages of the experimental performance. They thought and acted together on the memories on teacher Ida and Peter and connected with their own ways of working and thinking in education. Their own vulnerabilities were brought into the encounter, and in that temporary way, they deterritorialized knowledge construction as a space of researchers/experts. Professional development was not coming from the expert and transferred to educators, with the students in an observational and assisting role, but lived and enacted together in HERE-and-NOW, in an experiential and co-constructed way.

**Introducing Audio Into the Mix of Sensations**

To bring in materiality and to de-center the human subject, the students and Inge audio-recorded the class situation.
The story itself, which was already powerful in its capacity to affect and be affected (Davies, 2014). The recording made that capacity even more vivid, with the addition of sounds (the school bell, the book that falls, the silence, etc.). One of the participants said afterward,

It was brilliant to start with the audio play, it gave the feeling I was IN the situation. The sound of the book that falls and then the silence . . . it made me shiver and touched me deeply. It appealed to me to be involved.

The audio play created a strong link with the classroom context and resonated with the memories and experiences of each participant. It tended to produce a strong identification with one of the characters—the teacher (recognizing the feeling of frustration when things do not work out as you had hoped), the support worker (identifying the feelings of powerlessness), Peter (feeling humiliation to have such an experience in front of a group), the way of working together, or the way support is individualized to the child with special needs.

Social Atom

In the conversations after hearing the audio play, it became clear that the world can be viewed from the perspective of multiple characters, not in isolation from what is going on around them, but as intricately embedded in the social worlds they experience: “We are positioned and position ourselves moment by moment as we make our way through the everyday world” (Davies, 2008, p. 2)

Participants searched at first for the essential, independent entities/identities, and there was always the temptation to search for a single truth. At first, it was difficult to take into account the different lines of force that worked on the characters/the school/the education system and also on each of the participants. There was a temptation to take a position and interpret the event from that one positioning:

Once having taken up a particular position as one’s own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, storylines and concepts that are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned. (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 89)

We looked at how we could disrupt this tendency by setting up a “social atom,” which made it possible to think in terms of relations and positioning. To do this, we encouraged the participants to visualize the different positions of the different agents in the class situation with material (dolls, toy animals, and other material that was present in the space). The materiality had agency and added a different layer (St. Pierre, Jackson, Mazzei, 2016). The discussions that came along with it provided access to the ideas and discourses of the participants, for example, the protective and caring discourses toward children with special needs.

As the image below shows, for example, teacher Ida was put in a higher, hierarchical position. Significantly, the participants chose to use a “police officer” to represent her, and the discursive practice of “the teacher as expert in charge of the classroom” became visible. Her responsibility lies with the whole class group, and her face is turned toward Kobe because he fits into the regular classroom with the support of Inge. Kobe wears a helmet because he has to be protected because of his special needs. Peter is lying down, his legs in the air, in a precarious situation, with his head turned away from teacher Ida.
In thinking through the challenges of creating a script, we thought with different diffractive concepts. For example, the concept of “intra-action” ensured that the script did not become a dialogue between people, but an intra-active process between human and nonhuman agents (Greek Choir). This material and collaborative way of working (with the students and the participants) was important in taking up the challenge of reading and “thinking with theory” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). To do this, we had to make the theory and concepts accessible. Inspired by new materialist thinking, we searched for different, creative sources, which could help each of the participants to understand the concepts. We watched, for example, a three-minute YouTube film where “intra-action” was explained and visualized. We contested the separation of theory and action by setting up a “community of inquiry” (Bozalek & Zenbylas, 2016), where situational knowledge emerges through our encounters.

Undertaking a diffractive analysis requires not knowing where you are going beforehand, even as you take the continuous interference of intra-actions seriously (Davies, 2014). Allowing this openness is challenging. We sought to facilitate the dialogical spaces during the experimental performances, ensuring that we did not end up in a judgmental moralistic framework that dictated how people should think and act. Working in this way required trust: “Trust in another way of thinking, a more rhizomatic thinking instead of linear and arborescent thinking, and it involved us in trusting in our capacity to collectively increase the power of life” (Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. xii).

Mapping Differences: Process of Moving From Story to Script

By working with the diffractive script, the researcher(s), the students, and the audiences came to more nuanced views of a very complex situation. Together, we produced a space to bring to the forefront the ethical mattering of pedagogies, in this case around inclusive education that asks response-ability of every actor.

We have chosen not to include the entire script or parts of the script. We invite you to listen to the audio format of the performance of the script—https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cWFvu469G8&feature=youtu.be. The sounds file is intrinsic to this article. It allows the reader to experience this work in a totally different way and supports the diffractive readings of the script. The entangled relationship between discursive practice and materiality comes to the foreground. In the following part, we hope we have found a way to represent the script in connection with the analyzing and theorizing, so they support each other.

Encounters with the script. In the process of moving from the story to performing the diffractive script, the identities of the characters were enlarged, and the multiplicity of the different actors came to the foreground. It was an exploration in space-time-matterting (De Schauwer et al., 2017). The script, as it emerged, carried diffractive possibilities. When teacher Ida said, “Do you know the wonder in their eyes when they make the connection between letters and words? Then they start playing around with them. That’s why you teach. Sometimes in the supermarket I meet an old student and then they say, ‘Ah, Teacher Ida, you taught me to read’,” it showed her desire to teach Peter, and all the other students, how to read became one of the visible lines of force. She was very passionate about introducing them to the world of reading, where reading was not simply the mastery of a specific skill, but a basis to becoming an agent in the world, who can change the world (Freire, 2000). What at first could only be interpreted as cruelty and a display of power, also, then, held an emancipatory line of force. The domination and the emancipation can run together, or apart—against each other. Her actions can be seen as passionate, and they can be seen as obsessive. And standing in another position, it is possible to see the force of the expectation that teachers will ensure all children can read by the end of the first year of primary school. It has become a requirement that teachers take up responsibility for making sure children become regular school students who can be measured as successful. The demand that differently abled students be included in regular school is in tension with this requirement. The Greek Choir brought in this pressure:

It starts with not reading but where does that end? Behavioural problems, difficult students, aggressive students . . . It really challenges our resilience. Sometimes it’s depressing that you give so much with so few results. It’s never good enough.

We live in an area of accountability, and it makes teachers insecure and asking questions such as whether they are doing well enough. The measurement and audit strategies are used to determine whether the children’s accomplishments are normative and normalized and generate the fear that an individual is not good enough (Davies & Bansel, 2007). That fear is relevant both to students and to teachers. Teacher Ida’s identity is built on her history of success, and Peter gives her the terrifying feeling that she is failing. When teachers think of involving students in educational practices, they assume students are productive, skilled, and accountable individuals who are ready and willing to learn (Gabel & Peters, 2004). Peter is not that normative child. Kobe is similar to Peter in this regard, but teacher Ida is protected from his failure because he is regulated through his labels, his Individual Educational Plan, and the support he receives from the support worker. It liberates the teacher from responsibility for him and his learning results.

The script also shows that individual identities intra-act with time in how and when they come to matter (Davies, 2017; De Schauwer et al., 2017). When teacher Ida was...
trained, teachers where positioned with a high status and were seen as the experts in their classrooms. The expert discourse works on her and through her in didactics and management, and it cements her position as superior in the educational hierarchy. History is working through the past, present, and the future (Davies, 2017). She’s always been the teacher of first grade and will be undeniably the teacher for the coming years:

I don’t want to go to another class! I still know the principal proposed I teach another grade. But I said, “thanks but no thanks.” Who would let them read? I know the in and outs of the first grade.

The diffractive intra-active methodology shifted the focus from exploring the situation through the eyes of the support worker toward a larger engagement with material and discursive forces (Claiborne, 2017). The Greek Choir materialized the multiple different discourses about labeling, support and the responsibility for special needs, audit and blame mentality. For example, when they declared that “Everyone is equal before the law! Everyone is equal before the law!”, the Greek Choir brought in the difference between equality and equity, where equality suggests that everyone should be treated in the same way and equity aims to provide everyone with equal opportunities and so differentiate in how we work with them. It’s because of this confusion that regulations and practices of inclusive education are under discussion and are difficult to implement. Through the diffractive script it became possible to recognize that nonhuman elements are always present (Ulmer, 2017) and to see how material realities can be understood as having agency (the assumptions that are made, the school building, the classroom space, etc.). There are statements and unwritten rules that arise during meetings in schools and represent the tension between intersecting spaces, whereby the multiplicity of and entanglements with different agents, assemblages, places, discourses, historicities, and so on become visible. The diffractive script makes it possible to set the “subject free of the repetitive, constitutive discursive practices that would pin the characters down as an entity with clearly defined boundaries existing independent of others” (Davies, 2017, p. 267). The teacher is not narrowed down to the “bad teacher,” nor is the child who does not behave seen as the “bad student.” The support worker who does not respond does not have to be seen as “irresponsible”; rather, there is space for ambiguities—space for the complexities of every agent in the assemblage.

**Positioning**

By performing the script, the participants and researchers explored the lines of force that ran through the bodies of the teacher, the support worker, Peter, Kobe, the other teachers, the school, the educational system, their own bodies, and other assemblages. For example, the person who performed teacher Ida felt the loneliness and isolation. She was seen by her colleagues as somebody who is hard to work with and who is singled out. The response of Inge highlights the isolation of her position:

She doesn’t really care about the others. Like the performance she made the children do for the school party—song from the old times that nobody knew. It didn’t match with the theme of the party at all. And she really made the children practice it, again and again. No one seems to tell her this is not ok. They laugh with her. The classroom in the outskirts of the school campus is her territory—her domain.

We see how she is put in the position of the outsider. However, at the same time, she has put herself in that position. The complex and ambiguous movements become visible by performing the script. For example, even though she was seen as a weird, authoritarian teacher who is difficult to collaborate with, she stays in the grade she prefers to. It is as if she is “untouchable,” and together with the assumption “what you do yourself, you do best,” this leads to her seeking less cooperation. Through this embodied experience of performing the script, the participants experience the connections and relations with human and nonhuman agents, whereby they (re)think agency and responsibility. One principal said,

I have a teacher Ida in my team. She’s poorly appreciated by the other teachers, parents but also by me. This performance makes me think what can I do as a principal to ensure she is not put in the corner of the school like teacher Ida.

In the encounters with the participants, we wanted to explore an immanent truth in the moment, in which we are ontologically and epistemologically not separate from each other (Davies, 2014). Knowledge emerged in the intra-active spaces in which we developed strategies for rethinking and contesting some normative ideas that usually go unquestioned. Such collaborative work deterritorializes the static and fixed structures of thought, and creates creativity and flow, in which taken-for-granted practices are questioned. One participant said,

I found setting up the social atom an eye opener. I want to integrate this during our consultation with different agents. The arrangement with the material makes the relationships, positions and assumptions visible. It could help our discussions and open up our thinking.

The script and the performance are creative interventions that come along with a strong intra-action of each participant’s own memories, own history, own space-time-mattering. Assumptions, fears, and ideas become visible, as does the possibility of a new line of action. Like one teacher said,
By performing the support worker, and feeling how she struggles with being responsible for one child and how Kobe also claims her to get her whole attention, . . . it makes you think there must be other ways for doing that.

This teacher experienced what individualizing responsibility did with relationships and opened up new thoughts to rethink her own collaboration in her classroom.

The collaborative development of the script provides an interesting example of coming to know through being and doing in a collaborative research project where researchers, students, and teachers become engaged in a diffractive research methodology. At times, in the discussions, categorical and binary thinking slipped in again, and moral judgment lay just around the corner, for example, older traditional teachers versus young innovative teachers. The discussions made visible how easy it is to be trapped in normative modes of thought and how important it is to be attentive at all times to how research can be de-railed by (unintended) binaries. The diffractive methodology we have described here troubled the taken-for-granted deficit-based thought and brought out other voices that are usually silenced. From a disability studies perspective, we also noticed that Kobe’s perspective was not often taken into account—he was forgotten. An intra-active pedagogy can break up the normative dominant discourses, but at moments it reterritorializes them again. This observation shows that we all constituted and constitute ourselves through discursive practices. The paradigm of excluding and segregating children with a disability is part of our social world. It’s one of the forces that we take up and comes together with the idea that some children can’t participate in our ordinary, daily lives without special measures. They become invisible and are forgotten. The pitfall as a facilitator of the professional development is to become moralistic and judgmental toward participants. This can bring in a sense of “moral superiority” and to take up the position of the “right minded.” Research is an ethical encounter and it challenges us constantly in further re-turning our data, methodologies, concepts, and so on to open up habitual modes of thinking.

**Ethical Implications for Students and Teachers**

Experiencing the entangled relation of knowing, being, and doing through research was significant, especially through an enlarged vision whereby we make a difference in the world with ethics as an integral part (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743). As one of the students said,

In my practical training I work with teachers. They are always searching for the “toolbox”—“the tips and tricks.” When during the experimental performance I heard the teachers asked such profound and fundamental questions, it became clear to me that something else was triggered here. I’m really convinced that the teachers will look differently and make a difference for some children. And this also applies to me—things will also be different.

Rather than simply judging and dismissing the teacher’s behavior as unethical, this project mobilized a Deleuzian ethics to ask of each character “what is it to be this?” (Deleuze, 1994). As Deleuze (1994) states, ethics can open up the creative forces that enable us to evolve beyond the fixities and limitations of the present moment . . . Deleuze invites us to open ourselves to multiplicity, to openness of the other and the possibility of oneself becoming different of coming to know and to be differently. (p. 106)

After the memory story, Peter was seen by the participants as traumatized, a victim of the terror of teacher Ida. Peter had no strategies to cope with the teacher violence. The participants thought it would be important to talk to Peter or to investigate whether he had a reading problem. By bringing in Peter’s perspective in the diffractive script, the connection was made with the playground: “At lunch break I’ll be the goalkeeper. Logan is not capable. How many goals were there yesterday? One from Jason, one from Vince, one from Emma . . . three goals. I will be the goalkeeper!” The perspective was broadened, another place and space came in, and Peter was seen as a resilient child. The participants investigated their own space-time-mattering and, for example, became aware that they are constituted by the dominance of deficit thinking and labeling.

The intra-active performances challenged discourses about good teaching, how a good student should act, and what is expected from support workers (Lenz Taguchi & Palmer, 2013). Seeing the multiplicity of the different actors and the intra-actions between the entangled agents made different thoughts and actions possible. As one of the teachers said after performing the script,

After working with the script I cannot say I have answers but one question comes to mind: which position do I take up and let myself be put into to encourage togetherness at school—a school where students and teacher belong?

The discussion shifted from moral judgment to a way of questioning the individual’s position in the world—as part of the world. The experimental performances showed how “we are completely entangled with the world, . . . and then we are responsible to and for the world and all our relations of becoming with it” (St. Pierre et al. 2016, p. 101). A teacher said,

In a multidisciplinary meeting, I’m always very empathic with all the different people around the table, but it paralyzes me so I
can’t act. The script shows how you can act from everybody’s position. Everybody can do something. For example how can we appreciate somebody like teacher Ida with so much experience.

The ability to respond came to the foreground and can be used to approach the neoliberal abled school ethically, moving “from making judgments in terms of deviations from the norm and thus from the point of negativity” (Lenz Taguchi 2010, p. 58). Instead, it made us think about “social bonds that make it more difficult to marginalize others and convinced us of the need to engage in the world in the struggle for social justice” (Taylor, 2000, p. 60).

(In)conclusion

This article started with a critical incident that was perceived as a static moment with fixed identities, but which evolved through the diffra ctive methodology in a mo(ve)ment of transforming normative ideas. We worked collaboratively with students, researchers, and educational professionals and brought our work into the context of teacher professional development. That professional development became a space to learn/think with new materialist concepts. This way of working broadens our perspective of what a qualitative inquiry course can be and helps us to re-imagine the place of it. There are many spaces and places where we can experience, experiment, and understand what new materialist concepts do. There is no handbook on new materialist methods, and we also don’t want one. What we want are strategies for remaining open to experimentation in opening up our data to new ways of thinking and (en)acting. We want to deterritorialize the expert position of the researcher, of authoritative methods, and of pre-existing knowledges and to bring, in collaboration with students and teachers, an openness to new thought, to recognize the humanity of those who are perceived as different. Like Barad (2007) says, “It’s about re-turning- not by returning as in reflecting but re-turning as in turning it over and over again, . . . in making new temporalities (spacetime-mattering).”

In this project, the collective work of (re)listening to the story, performing the script at several places and times, and reflecting upon it in mutual entanglement with divergent agents helped us to become aware of our own thinking and acting and broke up habitual modes of thinking. The diffra ctive method made the multiplicity of the different agents and the repeated citations visible, and it destabilized them, reconstructing and deterritorializing ideas and thoughts about responsibility, education, and teaching in an assembled way. It helps us to develop a new understanding of the relational work that needs to be done by the various players in the (inclusive) classroom. In this way, the script shows that inclusion opens up the possibility of becoming different. Individual entities are not seen as separate from everything but as constituents in never-ending space-time entanglements. The diffra ctive intra-active pedagogy we have been exploring enables a move away from guilt and individual responsibility to ethics. The intra-active pedagogy brings in an ethics of openness to difference and asks us to think about what and who comes to matter. It enables participants to ask and explore different questions, such as the following: Can we question the social reality, the power relations between teachers, supporters, children, discourses, and so on? Can we question how we might see teachers as powerful and capable beings and not as novices who need to learn the same things over and over again? Can we question the way teachers, children, support workers, and parents embody the pressure that is increased by the neoliberal ideology? Can we question what it means to be singled out and to not belong?

Thinking about these questions offers no certainties and no predetermined outcomes, but questions our own position in the world—as part of the world—in the struggle for social justice. We are all constituted and constitute ourselves through discursive practices, of which nobody is free. The collaborative work with students intra-acted with the participants in the experimental professional development, and with the authors of this article, setting up a community of inquiry. The process of engaging with diffra ctive thought and practice was important in breaking up habitual modes of thinking. We have worked toward collective response-ability as a means of disrupting the neoliberal lines of force that have the potential to make abled schools into ethical places (Revelles-Benavente, & Gonzales Ramos, 2017). Ethical places are places where we do not individualize responsibilities and put the blame on other agents but places where we give attention to the affective and relational dimensions of education. This renewed attention to relationships and connections can give the false idea that the research remains very human centered. Throughout our research, we paid more attention to the material turn (e.g., the Greek Choir) to see ourselves as subjects-in-relation and to make the entanglement visible of material and discursive practices through which people and events emerge.

The new materialism turn makes a radical shift that is possible in research methodology. We hope that our attempt to do other research is inspirational for other researchers, but it will need more time and research that enters this space of new materialism and collaborative ways of working together to see what new possibilities emerge to reconfigure research.
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Notes
1. Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO) is a function in Flemish school to create equal opportunities for all children. The four SENCOs participated in the collective biography workshop around responsibility and they collaborated in the wider research project with the first author about the position of the SENCO in supporting teachers.
2. In Flemish education and legislation, the term special needs is used. From a Disability Studies perspective, we see difference as a continuous process of becoming different.
3. Many thanks to the students (Barbara Sanders, Louise Mostaert, Rien Borgmans and Karen De Coster) for giving us the opportunity to work with them and elaborate upon the script and this way of working.
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