THEMATIC SECTION: DISABILITY
STUDIES AND EDUCATION

Destabilizing Disabilities: a crippled implications analysis

Gisele De Mozzi[I]

[I]Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura (Unesco), Brasília/DF – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Destabilizing Disabilities: a crippled implications analysis. The aim is to discuss some intersections in the process of doing research in the disability's field. To weave these problematizations, extracts from a survey carried out with disabled students who entered a federal public university through the affirmative action policy are used. To cripple the implications analysis, it is suggested to invest in the ethical-political power of the existence of difference, anticipate and desire diversity in the most diverse spaces, contexts, and academic temporalities, destabilize hegemonic knowledge and, finally, assume an ethical-political position committed to the anti-ableism struggle.

Keywords: **Disability Studies. Implications Analysis. Ableism. Public University. Public Policies.**

RESUMO – Para Desestabilizar Deficiências: uma análise de implicações aleijada. Pretende-se discorrer sobre alguns atravessamentos do processo de fazer pesquisa no campo da deficiência. Para tecer estas problematizações são utilizados extratos de uma pesquisa realizada com estudantes com deficiência que ingressaram em uma universidade pública federal por meio da política de ações afirmativas. A fim de aleijar a análise de implicações, sugere-se apostar na potência ético-política da existência da diferença, antecipar e desejar a diversidade nos mais diversos espaços, contextos e temporalidades acadêmicas, desestabilizar saberes hegemônicos e, por fim, assumir um posicionamento ético-político comprometido com a luta anticapacitista.

Palavras-chave: **Estudos da Deficiência. Análise de Implicações. Capacitismo. Universidade Pública. Políticas Públicas.**

http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236141804vs02

Introduction

Carrying out scientific research based on a critical perspective requires analyzing “our knowledge-power practices as producers of truths” (Coimbra; Nascimento, 2008, p. 3). In the field of disability studies, taking responsibility for the scientific knowledge produced and its implications in research participants’ lives and, specifically, people with disabilities are a fundamental premise for social justice (Baglieri et al., 2011; Martins et al., 2012; Moraes et al., 2018).

Authors from the disability studies in education field defend the need to undertake investigations able to include the participation of people who are disabled and problematize the naturalization of differences. Therefore, it would be possible to overtake merely technical actions in favor of an ethical and political enterprise, capable of sustaining the relationship between theory and the politicization of disability. In this context, the analysis of implications will be discussed in this text as a theoretical and methodological strategy that allows one to reflect about research and the researcher’s relationship with the theme in question, in addition to contributing to problematize the reverberations of the modern political, economic, social and educational context.

By using, as a background, the problematizations developed in a doctoral thesis on the affirmative action policy for students who are disabled at public universities, this text intends to deal with some crossings of the research process that move and make people talk, not just a research problem, but also a body-researcher temporarily non-disabled. More specifically, some extracts from the interview carried out in a Tuesday afternoon with one of the research participants, whose fictitious name is Tereza Cristina, known as Cris, will be presented. Based on a conceptual perspective that mixes elements of critical social psychology, school and educational psychology, disability studies and crip studies, neomaterialist and intersectional feminism, I analyze the discomfort with disability and the shared pains, whose emergence was possible in this meeting between researcher and research participant.

The analysis of implications is activated by understanding that it allows one to pay attention to the effects, repercussions and agencies that our ways of researching operate in the relationship with research participants (Coimbra; Nascimento, 2008). On this account, it is expected that the discussions here presented allow one to expand their understanding of ways of relating to multiple disabilities and understand how the disability category is materialized in the spaces and temporalities of public universities.

Cripped implications analysis and knowledge production in the ivory tower

As a higher education institution, academia is traditionally known as an elitist place (Gillberg, 2020; Mozzi; Nardi, 2020; Nardi et al., 2013; Dolmage, 2017; Brown, 2020). Just like an ivory tower, its contours are defined by rigidity and based on a neoliberalism that measures prestige and credibility through productivity metrics in research and teaching (Gesser; Block; Leite, 2023; Brown, 2020) while, simultaneously and controversially, determine restrictions and reductions of governmental investments (Brown, 2020).

In another text (in press), that also use doctoral research extracts with students with disabilities that entered a public university through the affirmative action policy, we problematize some statements that denounce the meritocratic premise present in the daily life of this higher education institution. This can be exemplified in participant Roberto's report: "Why after, enrolled in college, there, each one… let the best win, right? [laughing] who studies more, dedicates oneself, right? This person will be able to succeed, right?" *(sic)*. Permeated by an elitist and ableist perspective, meritocracy speeches state that only the "best" will be able to succeed and, above all, define that college is not for everyone. Following this logic, "failure" is conceived because of impediments and injuries linked to disabilities, without taking into account ableist structures that do not contemplate human diversity (Böck; Nuernberg, 2018).

Based on Maria Helena Souza Patto (2003, p. 33), we can understand that meritocracy "scientifically reinforces the belief that social places are distributed according to each person's merit" what, in turn, collaborates with the impression of equal opportunities. However, by analyzing social inequalities in connection with disabilities, it's even more evident that this premise of equality comes up against a series of barriers – urban planning, architectural, transports, communications and information, attitudinal and technological, as listed in the Brazilian Law of Inclusion (Brasil, 2015) – that prevent full participation of all people, as well as their inclusion in the most diverse contexts.

To occupy this space of merit, privilege and excellence, as a professional that works in the institution or as a student, university requires a normative subject, fully capable and with high performance, thus a "perfect academic". Above all, it antagonizes bodies and mentalities understood as uncapable of corresponding to its ideals of intellectuality and excellence, as Disability Studies in Education denounce. In line with Nicole Brown (2020, p. 3): "In short, ableism in academia is endemic".

Jay Timothy Dolmage (2017) analyzes how university systematically contributes to create categories of binary differentiation – like normal or abnormal, capable or incapable, among others – that restrict the possibilities of understanding disability and operate as producers of a series of obstacles that prevent the participation of people with disabilities in university spaces and times. As a system of differentiation and oppression (Mello, 2016; Dolmage, 2017), ableism transforms the requirement for capable bodies into compulsory regulation, indispensable for occupying the academic environment.

Being a space of the reproduction and updating of social inequalities and hierarchies (Henrique Caetano Nardi; Paula Sandrine Machado; Frederico Viana Machado; Letícia Zenevich, 2013), by seeking to normalize and homogenize the ways of being in academic ecosystems, higher education does not contemplate difference as a reflex of society (Brown, 2020). In addition to the underrepresentation of minority groups, the presence of populations such as people who are disabled, black, indigenous, and transsexual people, among so many, is usually restricted to the scope of research, as study objects, or the extension, as subjects of interventions from diverse knowledge and power fields. Still, when entering higher education institutions, they tend to come across with a series of barriers to accessibility and permanence (Farias et al. 2022; Angelucci; Santos; Pedott, 2020).

Since ableism is endemic to the university, it can be presumed its influence in a series of practices, beliefs, processes, discourses, policies, actions and identities. On the other hand, positivist references of perfectionism, productivity and capacity internalized and updated daily in academic contexts show that scientific knowledge production cannot be affirmed as neutral. This finding can be corroborated by authors like Annemarie Mol (2002), Carla Biancha Angelucci; Luciana Stoppa dos Santos; Larissa Gomes Ornelas Pedott (2020); Claudia Gillberg, 2020; Donna Haraway (1995), Márcia Moraes and Alexandra Tsallis (2016), Sheila Jasanoff (2004) and Silvia Lane (1985), to whom, “Science is always engaged, knowledge is always interested” (Patto, 2003, p. 34).

Based on what has been said until now, we can assume that intellectual privilege attributed to those who manage to enter the university walls positions them as holders of a supposed knowledge and power – over others and over the truth, as Foucault teaches us. Given the impossibility of neutrality, taking a position is, therefore, fundamental. It is in this interim that the analysis of implications is activated, for it allows one to undertake a critical practice (or attitude) (Foucault, 1978; Butler, 2013) and positioned practice (Haraway, 1995), as a dispositive for knowledge production. According to Donna Haraway (1995), taking a position is to place oneself not in a position of identity, but in the inseparable relationship between researching, the description of what is being researched, the effects of research and the constitution of the researcher as someone who studies a particular field-theme.

To practice a critical attitude when carrying out research, it is therefore necessary to think of the present time in its transience and contingency, and not as a historical totality or linearity, as Foucault indicates (1978). Still according to Donna Haraway (1995), the world is not inert, pre-existing, waiting to be read, decoded and interpreted by the researcher. Based on the concept of coproduction (Jasanoff, 2004), it is understood that different elements such as social practices, identities, conventions, discourses, techniques, institutions, among others, reinforce each other and create conditions for stability and consolidation in modes of understanding and relating to multiple disabilities.

We understand, therefore, that the policy of reserving places for students who are disabled in higher education, which characterized this research's object-field of study, cannot be read as a passive object-field, materialized in the body of a fixed and definitive law. When engendered, this policy also acts in the production of disabilities, while it can reiterate or destabilize corponormativity (Mello, 2016). Thus, it's in this micropolitical process of co-engendering and partial and provisory connections that possibilities of transformation and diversification of forms of social life are opened. As Cecília M. B. Coimbra e Maria Lívia do Nascimento (2008, p. 5) propose:

> By considering the analysis of implications as a dispositive, we're refusing universalisms, totalizations and unifications and affirming processualities, singularities and multiplicities. Therefore, it is fundamental that we undertake a constant and daily analysis of the places we occupy and the forces that cross and affect us at different times, not only in our intervention work but also in our lives. That is, we want to point out that the analysis of implications, take as a dispositive, is always micropolitical, it is always an analysis of our modes of existence which, according to Espinoza and Nietzsche, must be thought of from immanent criteria, without any appeal to transcendental values. Thus, for being micropolitical, the analysis of implications is found in the level of immanence, at the level of encounters where enunciations are produced, where "make one see and make one speak" are present. That is, using the analysis of implications is to make visible and audible the forces that crosses us, affects us and constitutes us daily.

This way, we are in line with the theoretical and methodological perspectives that recognize the need of adopting an ethical-political standing that, aware of its commitment with knowledge production and its reverberations in everyday life, acts in favor of transformation and social justice, premises of Disability Studies in Education (Connor, 2013; Böck et al., 2020; Baglieri et al., 2011; Silva; Beche; Costa, 2022). Together with Maria Helena Souza Patto (2003), we understand that it is needed to review concepts and practices that contribute to the reproduction of a hierarchical and unfair society. We seek to invest in a "practice of objectivity that privileges countercharge, deconstruction, network connections and hope in transforming knowledge systems and the ways of seeing" (Haraway, 1995, p. 24). Still referencing Donna Haraway (1995), we invest in recognizing contingency and partiality in scientific knowledge production as a possibility of expanding connections with other localized and partial knowledges, capable of being called to account.

Cripping the analysis of implications offers, therefore, theoretical-methodological possibilities to complexify the ways of understanding multiple experiences of disability and, at the same time, creates space for cracks and the invention of other ways of relating with disability, as has been proposed by authors such as Márcia Moraes and Alexandra Tsallis (2016), Eliza Chandler (2010), Carla Rice et al.

(2015). According to Anahí Guedes de Mello, Valéria Aydos e Patrice Schuch (2022, p. 18):

> Cripping theory questions the exclusion of ableism as a matrix of intersectional discrimination in the feminist, *queer* and decolonial theories. As with *queer*, the terms *crip* and *cripping* have purposefully pejorative and subversive meanings, lining off the importance of the cripping engagement against practices of normalizing bodies, through criticism of oppression systems marked by the patriarchy and compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 2010), by the compulsory cisgenderness (Simakawa, 2015) and compulsory bodily capacity (McRuer, 2002).

By incorporating ableism and disability as analytical categories in research processes, as has been proposed in this text through a cripped analysis of implications, we can destabilize hegemonic thinking and established notions about disability, normality, capacity. Furthermore, as David J. Connor (2013, p. 124) states, cripping – based on the critical social perspectives of Disability Studies – opens space to claim disability as an integral part of human variation, providing "opportunities to all of us rethink the way we interpret and give meaning to human differences and the profound implications this has for students".

By highlighting what Marco Antônio Gavério calls "cri(p)tical threats, crippled in their oddities, monstrosities, perversions and flaws", we aim to contest "[...] the very fragility and incoherence of bodily and aesthetic norms when they are minimally threatened, destabilizing the able/disable binarism". (Marco Antônio Gavério, 2015, p. 114). In addition, sharing stories and experiences with disability, constituted by counter-hegemonic narratives, is characterized as an ethical and political strategy by activists, artists, authors aligned to the Disability Studies in Education. Taking Carla Biancha Angelucci; Luciana Stoppa dos Santos; Larissa Gomes Ornelas Pedott (2020, p. 62) as a reference:

> Daring to produce counter-hegemonic thoughts and proposals means breaking with propositions that establish an obsession with explaining the other, with the normalization and standardization of life, opening space to countless personal and collective gains from coexistence among all people.

Hereafter, there will be presented some productions that were made possible, contingent, partial and transitory in the encounter between a researcher temporarily non-disabled a research theme-field on the policy of affirmative actions for students with disabilities in higher education, academic ableism and shared pain with one of the doctoral research participants.

Shared pains: making disabilities, research and researcher

"It is not something delicious to say, nor something pleasant to say 'I have the company of a pain', but it is here" *(sic)*, confesses Tereza Cristina, fictitious name from one of the students who are disabled that entered a federal public university through the affirmative action policy. She was participating in a doctoral research interview and at that moment, on the other side of the round table, a body-researcher of the doctoral student and interviewer felt pain: her pain and mine. I became aware of my tired back and headache. Unable to disable my body and occupy hers to feel exactly the companionate pain she described, somehow, I also felt pain. It was not about empathy, or some conception of empathy as a synonym of putting oneself in someone else's shoes, because we are uncapable of leaving the materiality of our bodies to occupy another's. Our pains became companions there, in that space-time of the interview. Along with the shared pain, other attachments and effects from this interview-encounter with disability emerged. Some of them will be discussed next, using discomfort as a conceptual operator of an analysis of implications that is proposed to be implicated and cripped.

To begin, I present the two members of this interview-encounter: Tereza Cristina, a student with disabilities that activated the affirmative action policy to join the higher education of a federal public university and that was in the position of interviewee; and the researcher and interviewer, doctoral candidate in Psychology, scholarship holder of CAPES (Coordination of Superior Level Staff Improvement)[1], also a student at a federal public university. We both occupy the same academic territories and temporalities, although there, in that space-time of the interview, we were in distinct positions.

Tereza Cristina does not like her first name very much, she prefers to be called Cristina or just Cris, as she refers to herself in the interview – therefore, we proposed a fictitious name[2] for her which also had this possibility of abbreviating. She was finishing the first step of an undergraduate course at the federal university. She reported being happy with this new experience and fine with the choices and learning that have happened to her in her 50 years of life. She is the mother of a boy and two daughters – one of whom has completed a degree and the other studying for an undergraduate degree at the same institution. In some moments, Cris walks with a cane, a coupling that highlights the reduced mobility. When meeting me after class, without the brace, she commented that some people do not realize she is disabled: "Of course, they'll notice if they see me walking. They'll see that I have some additional difficulties and such. But no… no, no, it isn't connected to a disability, right?" *(sic)*. In others, she is accompanied by pain, modulated by using Codeine and Morphine medications. In these situations, the cane is used not because of the pain itself, as she says, "but it's because, mainly when using medication, you get… slower! So that – the beat of the cane, it makes you have a, a better sense of direction, right?" *(sic)*.

The uses and negotiations she makes with medications and the orthosis are challenged and modified by her relationship with the university, to the extent that the side effects of medications interfere with her cognitive capacity, as she reports. In this game, she measures the effects of feeling pain or "reasoning" *(sic)*, balancing limitations and gains, and dissolving a supposed duality between corporeality and intellect. It is also in this co-production that a disabled identity is constituted, insofar as the visibility related to disability is present due to the use of the cane – which sounds Cris' routes by the university – and the interaction with medications.

Based on Sheila Jasanoff (2004), Annemarie Mol (2002) e Bruno Latour (2012), we understand that not only statements about disabilities, but also a series of other factors, processes, technologies, mechanisms and human and not-human objects – sometimes contradictory ones – coordinate to produce (or co-produce) disability. Crossed by power relations, the process of co-engendering between these different elements contributes to creating conditions for stability and materialization of disability by reiterating regulatory norms, at the same time as it creates possibilities for the destabilization and invention of multiple disabilities during this reiteration.

By using the language of co-production (Jasanoff, 2004) and assuming that multiple disabilities are being made in the articulation between different human and not-human elements and agents that make up the university, it has become necessary to also focus on the researcher as an actor of carrying out research on the affirmative action policy for students who are disabled in higher education. Besides, based on the references selected to this text, it is understood that the research process transforms the researcher as well and displaces her body and identities. Above all, by recognizing that this one who speaks to you also integrate the university territories and temporalities and is, therefore, permeated by its endemic ableism. It is also worth noting that the interview described here was carried out in the room of a study and research center located within the higher education institution that was the object of the research.

Regarding the researcher's acknowledgments and from where she stands, I am a cisgender[3], heterosexual, Latin-American and white woman, temporarily non-disabled – term I use by understanding that disability may become part of mine and anyone's life trajectory at any time. Due to these identities, I experience certain privileges attributed to the bodies perceived and recognized as supposedly capable. First generation of a family from the southern countryside to complete higher education, I attended all elementary education in a public school, pursued an undergraduate degree in a private institution, and completed master's and doctor's degree as a scholarship holder in two renowned public universities. My body, although it is not read as disabled and therefore, does not experience the barriers faced by these individuals – even though I do experience others through the intersectional articulation of identities – was receptive to these interpellations. The specific focus of my listening in this relationship was vulnerable and open to embracing the shared pain with the research participant.

Questioning about my experiences and trajectories in university and how the ways of being in the academia impact my own corporeality and functionality was not an automatic process, nor was it obvious. To let one be affected by the ways in which our practices may be reproducing ableism, for instance, can be distressing. Not all these affects can be translated into words, because scientific rationality is not the only way to signify what happens to us – nor is it able to do so on its own. However, I understand that pain and discomfort can be powerful when they invite us to destabilize established knowledge and practices. They are also the actors in this process of co-producing research in its articulation with multiple disabilities.

From the reading of Vinciane Despret's text (2004), I elaborated some questions, based on this pain and discomfort: did I start to feel pain because Cris was feeling pain? Or did she express her pain in solidarity with mine, so that my pain would have space and be welcomed? So that it could emerge there, in the spatialities and temporalities of the university, the same one that became the field of research. An institution based on an ableist perspective, which delimits the subjects who belong to the inside – only the intellectual elite of society – and those who have no place except as an object of research, as a problem to be studied (Farias et al., 2022; Angelucci; Santos; Pedott, 2020). To be on the inside, it is necessary to submit a body to academic spaces and temporalities: it is a high-performance place. To be able to overcome barriers, to dedicate oneself to the maximum, to be successful, something that depends only on individual effort within the meritocratic logic.

My discomfort came from the impression that there was no room to feel pain there, not even time. It was necessary to pay attention to what was being said during the interview, to the statements, to the articulations with disability, to Cris's educational trajectory and her paths through the university, to the theoretical and methodological references that would support an analysis. Better to repress affection and pain, to silence the body's cues. Maybe a painkiller? But this shared pain did not just speak to what I felt, from an individual sphere; it referred to something in the ordinary, signaling that it was necessary to look at structures and, especially, at ableism.

Jorge Larossa Bondía (2002) describes experience as an event that crosses us, producing affects and effects. By using analysis of implication as a methodological tool, discomfort and shared pain were taken as reverberations of the experience of researching the multiple ways in which disability materializes in the temporalities, corporealities and spatialities of the university. In this way, it is intended to present some clues that contribute to problematize – although they do not exhaust the possibilities of answers, nor of inventing other questions – the following questions: Why does disability usually cause discomfort? To whom does disability bother? In what ways does it bother? What are the circumstances that rise this affect? In what relationships does it place itself in? What are its effects? What other affects are possible? What can be produced when this discomfort is sustained?

Fear of becoming disabled

By following Donna Haraway's provocations and "staying with the problem" evidenced in these questions – the discomfort produced in the relationship with disability – the first clue points to the fear of discovering or acquiring some bodily and/or functional condition that makes us a person with a disability. In the context of the interview, I feared becoming someone who lives with pain, like Cris. After all, aging, getting sick, feeling pain, and becoming disabled are events inherent to the human condition.

> The truth is that disability is more than an enigma: it is an unknown mistakenly described as abnormal, monstrous or tragic, but one that will be part of the life trajectory of all people who experience the benefits of civilization. With the increasing aging of the population, the category 'disabled' as an expression of a 'personal tragedy' will lose its meaning. To be old is to experience the disabled body. To be old is to live in a social order that oppresses the disabled body (Diniz, 2007, p. 32).

Why was I afraid? Because we live in a society that teaches us every day that living with a disability is a personal tragedy, as stated by Debora Diniz (2007). That expects our bodies to conform to the parameters of what is considered normal and healthy and do not feel pain. We are constantly informed, based on a corponormative and ableist logic, that becoming a person with a disability is to constitute oneself as someone who experiences a tragic and individual accident whose effects continue to reverberate in the form of irreversible damage and suffering. These people's experiences are described in terms of the losses caused by the event: the loss of a limb or functionality, the ability to walk, to see, to hear, to continue to communicate verbally; the loss of autonomy to carry out daily activities and perform a professional performance.

By using the concept of anguish from bodily transgression to talk about the recognition of rupture, anxiety, pain and suffering incited by sensory deprivation, Bruno Sena Martins (2009) brings elements that help us to understand this fear of becoming disabled. He states that non-blind people who empathically project possible vision loss may conclude: we are or could be like blind people. The author also differentiates this anguish in the experiences of people who lose their sight gradually, those who lose their sight suddenly, and people blind from birth, for whom there is no break in the way of being/living. People with congenital disabilities do not know other ways of living without the bodily and functional conditions that constitute them as subjects, so that, for them, there is no state of normality or absence of suffering prior to the disability to which they must return. Despite the empathetic projections that we, people without disabilities, can undertake to try to understand the possible impact of a loss of vision, there is no fixed and predefined identity or a restricted way of experiencing a bodily condition.

Based on the understanding that people who are disabled suffer a personal tragedy, they are usually given the adjective “poor things”. The two interviewees that afternoon – Nicole and Cris – shared some strategies they use to avoid falling into this stereotype. Nicole places herself as a person who doesn't like to “play the poor thing” *(sic)* because she has a disability, reiterates several times what she calls victimhood as something bad and negative, which she tries to avoid, for the sake of her independence. Cris describes her posture as: “yes, because, actually, like: I'm not the poor thing. And I'm not the best of them all. I'm just another one of you. Period.” *(sic)*. In this way, she understands that she circulates among her classmates as one more among them, not someone extraordinary or exotic. We can assume that the strategies implemented by Nicole and Cris operate as attempts to avoid other adjectives that demean them as incapable, abnormal, special, invalid[4]. Radically, and based on the problematizations of Lígia Assumpção Amaral (1994), they seek to prevent their bodies from being read as deviant and monstrous.

This negative and derogatory way of framing disability as a personal tragedy, emphasizing the incapacities and dysfunctions of a body, composes the discursive repertoire of what is named, within the field of disability studies, as a medical model. For this model, an alteration and/or limitation in body structure or function incapacitates not only the injured region, but the subject as a whole, who becomes the object of medical interventions and rehabilitation practices with the objective of adapting this body to supposed standards of normality (Barnes, 2009; Diniz, 2003; 2007; Martins et al., 2012; Böck; Nuernberg, 2018).

And then I felt shame and guilt: how could I, a researcher in the field of disability studies, who argues that all ways of life should be worth living, feel that way in front of a person who was reporting and experiencing – right in front of me – the materiality of her daily experience with pain and disability? However, these affects did not speak exclusively of my individuality. They denounced a way of subjectivizing me and others in an ableist society. Of learning to differentiate between a self without a disability and another with a disability, as if this dichotomy could be clear and permanent. Individually, I did not want to feel any of that. I wanted to be an ally, a person who, despite not being read as someone who has a disability, relates to this agenda, sympathizes with the anti-ableist movement. A person who accepts and welcomes the diversity of ways of being in the world.

Disability as something that crosses us and constitutes us

Since we fear becoming people with disabilities because, in the social imaginary, this identity category is usually linked to a series of impediments and negative adjectives, we can assure that disability is something that crosses us and constitutes us. As an analytical category, disability crosses us and defines who we are every time we differentiate which bodily and functional conditions can be classified as disabled; when we assume that only a few subjects without disabilities are able to access and remain in the university, reiterating corponormativity; each time we affirm "I have nothing to prevent me from living" *(sic)* – a sentence mentioned by an informant of the doctorate course – as a way of differentiating our ways of life from those experienced by people who are disabled. By understanding that these regulatory norms that delimit what disability is are performed daily (Butler, 2000), we allow the opening of fissures and instabilities that are characterized as deconstitutive possibilities in the process of repetition itself, possibilities of disturbance of hegemonic positions, possibility of unexpectedly becoming someone who is disabled.

Shared pain is in the realm of the we, of the collective, something that can become part of the life of any of us; it's not something only me and Cris feel. We feel pain, at different times in our lives, for different reasons, but feeling pain is part of our human condition. Pain shows us the limits of a body and what a body can do. In the context of the interview, it blurred the boundaries between a researcher temporarily non-disabled and a research participant who is disabled. Besides pain, what else do I, who am dealt with as a person without a disability, share with this other person with a disability?

In general, my existence is placed in a privileged place of differentiation, which minimally protects me from suffering discrimination and violence of the most diverse, especially those directed at LGBTQIA+, black, indigenous and people who are disabled populations. If we analyze this positionality exclusively from an identity perspective, my corporeality will be placed outside of many claims and discussions that take place in the field of differences. I recognize that for many people whose corporeality, mentalities and functionalities are framed as pathological, abnormal, deviant, abject, among other adjectives, occupying this place is not a choice.

As I have been discussing, differences are performed in specific spatialities and temporalities, framing corporealities that may (or may not) be read by the mark of disability. This marking is, in turn, provisional and unstable, composed of a series of elements that, once combined, consolidate a categorization circumscribed to that temporal and geographical instant. Different combinations of specific corporealities, technical instruments and apparatuses, policies, practices, institutions and spatialities stabilize understandings of disability, which can, therefore, be modified and include experiences that, until then, were not understood as belonging to the sphere of disability. Thus, I try to point out the need to analyze disability as a historical, social, cultural, temporal and spatially constituted category. That is, to understand it in the complementarity inherent to this process of constitution that, by making a disability and a disabled subject, also does its opposite – a repertoire of practices, corporalities and institutions supposedly not crossed by the category of disability.

I share these impermanent territories of belonging and recognition not to name differences or situate where I stand from and move forward. Nor do I intend to neglect the relevance and legitimacy of identity politics for guaranteeing rights and access to resources and services, for equalizing opportunities and for confronting inequalities. The intention is to position the difference in the movements of co-production of multiple disabilities in the context of the public university and based on this positionality, to invent other possible strategies of relating with disability.

Shared pains denounce the imposition of standardized temporalities and spatialities on borderline, unstable and inconstant bodies. They show that sitting for many hours doing activities understood as intellectual: reading, studying, writing, participating in a class, paying attention to someone's narratives during an interview... cause bodies to feel pain. Not all people will feel and experience it in the same way, but the fact that some bodies do not feel pain should not be used to counter this debate. The pains in our bodies have exposed an ableist academic structure that subjects diverse bodies to a unique regime that, in turn, causes many bodies to feel pain.

However, destabilising the disability category is not the same thing as saying that we are all disabled. What we intend with this is to bet on the importance of this movement of contesting the categorizations, classifications and hierarchies that make us differentiate lives worthy of being lived or not. Marivete Gesser and Adriano Nuernberg (2014) point out the need to recognize the importance of the experience of disability in the constitution of subjectivity and not only as a condition of a minority. In this way, without denying bodily impairments and their possible implications for people who are disabled, it is possible to value the unique and creative ways of experiencing disability experiences.

For Tanya Titchkosky and Rod Michalko (2009, p. 6), disability “is an integral part of the essential diversity of human life, both individually and collectively”. We understand disability, therefore, as something that constitutes us, as an experience, an event that produces affects and effects (Jorge Larrosa Bondía, 2002). Far from framing disability as a negative, unfortunate and tragic event of human existence, disability studies describe it as a legitimate way of being in the world. “It's a way of understanding who we are, or at least a part of who we are” (Titchkosky; Michalko, 2009, p. 6). Constituent part of who we are, disability is produced and understood in the daily relationships we establish with each other. It is not something that happens only to people with disabilities who experience barriers imposed by social environments that are insensitive to human bodily and functional variation. It is, as stated by Marcia Moraes, Luiza Teles Mascarenhas, Fernando Fontes and Bruno Sena Martins (2018), a political and social issue that concerns all of us.

Final considerations to implicate and crip knowledge production

Facing discomfort with the companion pains which inquired a doctoral research interview with students who are disabled who entered the university through the affirmative action policy, the researcher in question was led to problematize, through the analysis of implications, some elements that make up the contemporary ways of doing research. I wanted to do something to solve that discomfort. I did not want to be one more person reproducing ableism of academia, which forces tired and painful bodies to remain for long periods within the spatialities and temporalities formatted by the university, when all the body asks for is a place to lie down and rest a little. As Carla Biancha Angelucci; Luciana Stoppa dos Santos; Larissa Gomes Ornelas Pedott (2020, p. 68) write: “Let's face the ableism of every day that inhabits all of us, including well-intentioned, studious, and engaged people”.

In this interview-encounter, certain questions were possible to be said and heard; shared pains were able to materialize in that space-time of the academia, provoking noises in the ableism intrinsic to the university. In this relationship between a shareholder student and a scholarship researcher, space was opened to talk about this discomfort, especially due to my qualified listening that, for some time, has been questioned by the field of studies and experiences with disability and education. I intuited that I could not move on as if nothing had happened, especially because I felt responsible for the reproduction of an ableist logic that contributed to both of us feeling pain. Would our tired and pained bodies relinquish the possibility of encounter for the sake of our shared pain?

By bringing these reflections, it is not intended to affirm that the totality of practices and professionals who work in academic contexts, or even with people with disabilities, are faced with the same questions that implied me in this interview, nor that they respond in the same way and always in an ableist way. The purpose of these discussions was to highlight how much we are all socialized by ableism. We can assume that spaces, temporalities, and contexts are, for the most part, ableist. We need to recognize these influences in our practices and delimit their boundaries. We understand that, based on these questions, we can identify what the gaps are, what are the possibilities of encounter, of proposing collectively constructed alternatives. As Claudia Gillberg (2020) urges, we can make this restlessness, characteristic of disability activism, an opportunity to build new scientific knowledge and formulate new insights into what academia can be.

We intend to show how university is constituted as a rhetorical space, which carries a history of injustice and (re)production of social inequalities, while occupying a privileged place for contestation, criticism and social transformation. The implementation of affirmative action policies has compelled public universities to open their doors to accommodate diversity. But more than that, the expansion of the entry of a diverse public into federal institutions of higher education makes it necessary to rethink their structures, paradigms, epistemologies, references, practices and pedagogies. When disability begins to occupy academic spaces and temporalities, no longer only as an object of study, but as an analytical and political category, in addition to being an identity component that singularizes the life trajectories of students, it calls us to rethink education systems from a structural dimension. Above all, it denounces the ableism intrinsic to the university.

At the same time, this movement of looking inside the public university, elaborating reflections and criticisms, analyzing tensions and controversies, is possible precisely because it is an autonomous and democratic social institution. In line with the provocations of Marilena Chaui (2003, p. 6), we understand that it is essential for the university as a social institution to “discuss or question its own existence, its function, its place within the class struggle”. This analytical and political proposal differs radically from the policies of contingency and devaluation of public universities. Because, to maintain a critical stance and continue serious and committed work that intends to think about the university and its social function, it is necessary to invest in education.

Facing what is exposed, a cripped analysis of implications, supported by Disability Studies in Education, can expand the possibilities of contesting universal, naturalized and totalizing modes, in favor of the affirmation of a micropolitical plan of singular and multiple encounters with disability. And, although in this text cripped analysis of implications has been implemented in a scientific research context, such as this mode of contestation and invention of multiple forms of relationship with disability, it can be taken to the most different scenarios. On this level of processualities and contingencies, it is possible to claim disability as an experience inherent to human existence and a constituent of subjectivities, in articulation with the social markers of difference.

As I have tried to unfold in this text, I understand that, to crip the analysis of implications, it is necessary to be available to sustain possible discomforts, to bet on the ethical-political power of the existence of difference, to anticipate and desire functional and bodily diversity in the most diverse spaces, contexts and temporalities. Thus, it is suggested that the availability of each one of us to analyze the implications of the knowledge and practices instituted on disability is characterized as an ethical-political position committed to diversity, social justice and the production of anti-ableist knowledge, as Disability Studies has been proposing. By analyzing our corporeality and our modes of existence, it is possible to contest the supremacy that hierarchizes bodies and mentalities through an ableist logic. Furthermore, we understand that theoretical-methodological proposals that break with the hegemonic perspectives of knowledge production about disability can be considered strategies of resistance and emancipation, especially when they start from a perspective of co-production with people who are disabled.

Received April 9, 2024
Approved on June 11, 2024

Notes

[1] It is the official translation of the acronym in Brazilian Portuguese: Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior.

[2] It is worth noting that the adoption of fictitious names was the strategy understood as possible and coherent at the time of this research. However, based on the theoretical and methodological perspectives that support this work, we understand the need to propose other modes of participation, autonomy and self-identification of subjects in academic research.

[3] A term used to refer to people who recognize themselves in the gender assigned at birth based on their genitalia.

[4] Adenize Queiroz de Farias; Andreza Vidal Bezerra; Lívia Laenny Vieira Pereira de Medeiros and Jackeline Susann Souza da Silva (2022) discuss in greater depth the analytical categories of inferiorization and heroization of women with disabilities in higher education. On the other hand, Carla Biancha Angelucci; Luciana Stoppa dos Santos; Larissa Gomes Ornelas Pedott (2020) problematize the implicit ableism in the use of some nomenclatures referring to special education.

References

AMARAL, Lígia Assumpção. Corpo desviante/olhar perplexo. **Psicologia USP**, São Paulo, v. 5, n. 1/2, p. 245-268, 1994.

ANGELUCCI, Carla Biancha; SANTOS, Luciana Stoppa dos; PEDOTT, Larissa Gomes Ornelas. Conhecer é transformar: notas sobre a produção implicada de modos anticapacitistas de habitar a universidade. In: GESSER, Marivete; BÖCK, Geisa Letícia Kempfer; LOPES, Paula Helena (Org.). **Estudos da deficiência**: anticapacitismo e emancipação social. Curitiba: CRV, 2020. p. 55-72.

BAGLIERI, Susan et al. Disability Studies in Education: The Need for a Plurality of Perspectives on Disability. **Remedial and Special Education**, v. 32, n. 4, p. 267-278, 2011.

BARNES, Colin. Un Chiste “Malo”: Rehabilitar a las personas con discapacidad en una sociedad que discapacita. In: BROGNA, Patricia (Comp.). **Visiones y Revisiones de la discapacidad**. México: FCE, 2009. p. 101-122.

BÖCK, Geisa Letícia Kempfer; NUERNBERG, Adriano Henrique. As concepções de deficiência e as implicações nas práticas pedagógicas. In: CONGRESSO DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA - DOCÊNCIA NA SOCIEDADE MULTITELAS, COEB, 7., 2018. Florianópolis. **Anais [...]**. Florianópolis: Prefeitura Municipal, 2018. p. 01-10.

BÖCK, Geisa Letícia Kempfer et al. Estudos da Deficiência na Educação: reflexões sobre o capacitismo no ensino superior. In: GESSER, Marivete; BÖCK, Geisa Letícia Kempfer; LOPES, Paula Helena (Org.). **Estudos da deficiência**: anticapacitismo e emancipação social. Curitiba: CRV, 2020. p. 211-225.

BONDÍA, Jorge Larossa. Notas sobre a experiência e o saber de experiência. Tradução de João Wanderley Geraldi. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 19, p. 20-28, abr. 2002.

BRASIL. Lei nº. 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015. Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, 2015.

BROWN, Nicole. Introduction: Theorising ableism in academia. In: Nicole Brown; Jennifer Leigh (Ed.). **Ableism in Academia**: Theorising experiences of disabilities and chronic illnesses in higher education. London: UCL Press, 2020. p. 1-10.

BUTLER, Judith. Corpos que pesam: sobre os limites discursivos do "sexo". In: LOURO, Guacira Lopes (Org.). **O corpo educado**: pedagogias da sexualidade. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2000. p. 151-172.

BUTLER, Judith. O que é a crítica? Um ensaio sobre a virtude de Foucault. Tradução de Gustavo Hessmann Dalaqua. **Cadernos de Ética e Filosofia Política**, São Paulo, n. 22, p. 159-179, 2013.

CHANDLER, Eliza. Sidewalk Stories: The Troubling Task of Identification. **Disability Studies Quarterly** (Online), v. 30, n. 3/4, 2010.

CHAUI, Marilena. A universidade pública sob nova perspectiva. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 24, p. 5-15, dez. 2003.

COIMBRA, Cecília Maria Bouças; NASCIMENTO, Maria Lívia do. Análise de implicações: desafiando nossas práticas de saber/poder. In: GEISLER, Adriana Ribeiro Rice; ABRAHÃO, Ana Lúcia; COIMBRA, Cecília Maria Bouças (Org.). **Subjetividades, violência e direitos humanos**: produzindo novos dispositivos em saúde. Niterói: EdUFF, 2008. p. 143-153.

CONNOR, David J. Social Justice in Education for Students with Disabilities. In: FLORIAN, Lani (Ed.). **The SAGE Handbook of Special Education**. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2013. p. 111-128.

DESPRET, Vinciane. The body we care for: figures of anthropo-zoo-genesis. **Body and Society**, v. 10, n. 2-3, p. 111-134, 2004.

DINIZ, Debora. Modelo social da deficiência: a crítica feminista. **SérieAnis**, v. 28, p. 1-10, 2003.

DINIZ, Debora. **O que é deficiência**. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 2007. 96 p.

DOLMAGE, Jay Timothy. **Academic Ableism**: Disability and Higher Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017. 256 p.

FARIAS, Adenize Queiroz de et al. Estudos da deficiência: implicações do capacitismo no âmbito do ensino superior. In: SILVA, Solange Cristina da; BECHE, Rose Clér Estivalete; COSTA, Laureane Marília de Lima. **Estudos da deficiência na educação**: anticapacitismo, interseccionalidade e ética do cuidado. Florianópolis: UDESC, 2022. p. 170-186.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **O que é a crítica?** 1978. (Conferência).

GAVÉRIO, Marco Antônio. Medo de um planeta aleijado? Notas para possíveis aleijamentos da sexualidade. **Áskesis**, São Carlos, v. 4, n. 1, p. 103-117, jan./jun. 2015.

GESSER, Marivete; BLOCK, Pamela; LEITE, Lúcia Pereira. Do Capacitismo ao Acesso Coletivo no Ensino Superior. In: MARTINS, Sandra Eli Sartoreto de Oliveira; CIANTELLI, Ana Paula Camilo (Org.). **Inclusão universitária no século XXI**: dilemas atuais. Marília: Oficina Universitária; São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2023. p. 79-110.

GESSER, Marivete; NUERNBERG, Adriano Henrique. Psicologia, Sexualidade e Deficiência: Novas Perspectivas em Direitos Humanos. **Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão**, v. 34, p. 850-863, 2014.

GILLBERG, Claudia. The significance of crashing past gatekeepers of knowledge: Towards full participation of disabled scholars in ableist academic structures. In: BROWN, Nicole; LEIGH, Jennifer (Ed.). **Ableism in Academia**: Theorising experiences of disabilities and chronic illnesses in higher education. London: UCL Press, 2020. p. 11-30.

HARAWAY, Donna. Saberes Localizados: a questão da ciência para o feminismo e o privilégio da perspectiva parcial. **Cadernos Pagu**, Campinas, n. 5, p. 7-41, 1995.

JASANOFF, Sheila. Ordering knowledge, ordering society. In: JASANOFF, Sheila. (Ed.). **States of Knowledge**: The co-production of science and social order. Nova Iorque: Routledge, 2004. p. 13-45.

JASANOFF, Sheila. The idiom of co-production. In: JASANOFF, Sheila (Ed.). **States of Knowledge**: The co-production of science and social order. Nova Iorque: Routledge, 2004. p. 1-12.

LANE, Silvia Tatiana Maurer. A psicologia social e uma nova concepção do homem para a Psicologia. In: LANE, Silvia Tatiana Maurer; CODO, Wanderley. **Psicologia social**: o homem em movimento. 10 ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1992.

LATOUR, Bruno. **Reagregando o Social**: uma introdução à Teoria do Ator-Rede. Tradução de Gilson César Cardoso de Sousa. Salvador/Bauru: Edufba/Edusc, 2012.

MARTINS, Bruno Sena. O “corpo-sujeito” nas representações culturais da cegueira. **Fractal**: revista de psicologia, v. 21, n.1, p. 5-22, jan. 2009.

MARTINS, Bruno Sena et al. A emancipação dos estudos da deficiência. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais** (Online), v. 98, p. 45-64, 2012.

MELLO, Anahi Guedes de. Deficiência, incapacidade e vulnerabilidade: do capacitismo ou a preeminência capacitista e biomédica do Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa da UFSC. **Ciência & saúde coletiva**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 21, n. 10, p. 3265-3276, out. 2016.

MELLO, Anahí Guedes de; AYDOS, Valéria; SCHUCH, Patrice. Aleijar as antropologias a partir das mediações da deficiência. **Horizontes Antropológicos**, v. 28, n. 64, p. 7-29, set. 2022.

MOL, Annemarie. **The body multiple**: Ontology in medical practice. Durham: Duke University Press: 2002.

MORAES, Marcia et al. Introdução. In: MORAES, Marcia et al. (Org.). **Deficiência em questão**: para uma crise da normalidade (recurso eletrônico). 1 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nau, 2018.

MORAES, Márcia; TSALLIS, Alexandra. Contar histórias, povoar o mundo: a escrita acadêmica e o feminino na ciência. **Revista Polis e Psique**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 39-50, 2016.

MOZZI, Gisele De; NARDI, Henrique Caetano. Imbricamentos da deficiência na universidade: incorporando a deficiência nas discussões interseccionais. In: WIRTH, Ioli Gewehr; FONTOURA, Julian Silveira Diogo de Ávila; PRESTES, Liliane Madruga (Org.). **Diálogos insurgentes durante a pandemia**: vozes para uma educação (trans)formadora. Marília: Editora Lutas Anticapital, 2020. p. 349-362.

MOZZI, Gisele De; NARDI, Henrique Caetano. Intersecções entre Gênero e Deficiência: marcadores sociais e suas hierarquias. In: GESSER, Marivete; MORAES, Márcia. **Psicologia Social e Estudos da Deficiência**. (no prelo).

NARDI, Henrique Caetano et al. O "armário" da universidade: o silêncio institucional e a violência cotidiana dos preconceitos sexuais e de gênero. **Teoria & Sociedade**, Belo Horizonte, n. 21.2. p. 179-200, jul./dez. 2013.

PATTO, Maria Helena Souza. O que a história pode dizer sobre a profissão psicólogo: a relação psicologia-educação. In: BOCK, Ana Mercês Bahia. **Psicologia e o compromisso social**. São Paulo: Cortez; 2003.

RICE, Carla et al. Project Re•Vision: disability at the edges of representation. **Disability & Society**, v. 30 n. 4, p. 513-527, 2015.

SILVA, Solange Cristina da; BECHE, Rose Clér Estivalete; COSTA, Laureane Marília de Lima. **Estudos da deficiência na educação**: anticapacitismo, interseccionalidade e ética do cuidado. Florianópolis: UDESC, 2022. 346 p.

TITCHKOSKY, Tanya; MICHALKO, Rod. **Rethinking normalcy**: A disability studies reader. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2009.

Gisele De Mozzi holds a PhD in Social and Institutional Psychology from the Institute of Psychology of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). She holds a master's degree in Psychology from the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). She works as a clinical psychologist, consultant, and speaker.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7470-1588
E-mail: gisele.dmozzi@gmail.com

Availability of research data: the dataset supporting the results of this study is published in this article.

Editor in charge: Carla Karnoppi Vasques