Disability matters: pedagogy, media and affect

Anna Hickey-Moody & Vicki Crowley

INTRODUCTION

Disability matters: pedagogy, media and affect

Anna Hickey-Moody[a]* and Vicki Crowley[b]*

[a]*Gender and Cultural Studies, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia;* [b]*School of Communication, Languages & International Studies, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia*

This edition of *Discourse* comes into being after two decades of engagement with the cultural politics of the body – through the arts, teaching, research and varied encounters with 'disability' ranging from the very personal to the professional. From the critique of 'the medical model' of disability undertaken during the early and mid-1990s, a 'social model' emerged, particularly in the caring professions and those trying to shape policy and practice for people with disability. In education and schooling, it was a period of cementing inclusive practices and the 'integration' and inclusion of disability into 'mainstream' (Northway, 2002; Vincent, Evans, Lunt, & Young, 1996; Vislie, 2003). What was lacking in the debates around the social model, however, were the challenges to abledness that were being grappled with in the routine and pragmatics of self-care by people with disabilities, their families, carers and caseworkers. Outside the academy, new forms of activity and new questions were circulating. Challenges to abledness flourished in the arts and constituted the lived experience of many disability activists. In the early 1990s, for instance, performing arts companies such as the London-based CanDoCo and Restless Dance Theatre[1] in Adelaide, Australia, were making dance and redefining its boundaries as physically based performance sourced in bodily capacity (in preference to disciplining the body into extant genres of 'the dancing body').

It was the body, arts, and dance in particular, that provided us with our first touchstone as colleagues, researchers, performers and educators and which constituted our earliest professional precursor to this special edition. CanDoCo Dance Company and Restless Dance Theatre captured, and continue to press into being, expressions of worlds in which bodies and embodiment and the complexities of intellectual actualities can incite curiosity, challenge and redefine how bodies (including the thinking body) foster convivial communities of diversity and complexity. Restless and CanDoCo expressly create performance art through collaborative processes between disabled and non-disabled dancers and performers. Restless frames itself as 'a centre of excellence for disability ethos and practice' (Restless Dance Theatre, 2010). CanDoCo views its work as 'pushing the boundaries of contemporary dance' in ways which 'broaden people's perception of what dance is and who can dance'. As CanDoCo's website states, 'We want to excite by being daring, inspire by being excellent, and question by being diverse' (CanDoCo Dance

*Email: anna.hickey-moody@sydney.edu.au; vicki.crowley@unisa.edu.au

Company, 2010). Here we see, in Jean-Luc Nancy's (2000) terms, that there is no existence without co-existence and the necessity of being becomes a necessity of 'being-with', a being-with that is a mutual exposure to one another.

As editors of this special issue, we are drawn to the capacity of art and media as forms of cultural pedagogy that confront, challenge and re-define knowledge and practice, and mediate altered sensibilities. Further, we are inspired by the ways in which encounters with different forms of knowledge (art, philosophy, curriculum) can shift the *techne* of disability from its historically and continuingly oppressive ideation and practice into a *techne* of possibility.

A precursor that brought impetus to this special edition was a two-day seminar titled 'Ordinary Lives: Narratives of Disability' sponsored by the Cultures of the Body Research Group at the University of South Australia. The seminar brought together disability activists, policy makers, artists (performers, writers, film-makers) and academics. Conversations arising from this event bring diverse explorations of the body, education, media, art and a range of theoretical frameworks into this issue. This special issue, therefore, is not a collection of articles on disability read through select philosophers, or cultural theorists, or community arts-based works,[2] or a direct selection of papers from the seminar. It is a collection of articles whose critique arcs toward emergent epistemologies hinged to technologies of disability, their myriad refusals, joys, curiosities, tensions, convergences and re-shapings through digitization, medical interventions and 'advances'. Some of the articles brought together here also gesture towards the role played by the concept of affect and affect theory in education over the past seven years, and as such we would like to offer a contexualization of this concept in relation to the field of education.

Affect in educational theory

Affect, influenced as it is by the work of Deleuze (1988, 1990a, 1990b, 2002) and Deleuze and Guattari (1983, 1986, 1987, 1994), is beginning to be utilized widely as a conceptual resource in educational theory. Across the past seven years, educational theorists have begun to work with this concept. Here, we consider some of the earliest theorists to bring affect into education because the conceptual move that accompanies this turn towards affect creates space for embodied knowledges of disability. Affect validates emergent epistemologies, which all too often remain silenced from theorizations of education. Christa Albrecht-Crane and Jennifer Daryl Slack (2003), Megan Watkins (2006) and Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005) are theoreticians working in and across education who have begun to employ the idea of affect. Other cultural studies theorists who take up the concept of affect in ways that are of use in considering classrooms include Elspeth Probyn (2000) and Anna Gibbs (2002). We would like to point towards their scholarship, as well as that of Brian Massumi (2002), Felicity Colman (2002, 2005), Gregory Seigworth (2003) and Melissa Gregg (2006), as resources of significant importance in the theoretical project of taking up affect to consider the pedagogical nature of culture.[3]

The concept of affect was not specifically introduced into educational practices until 2003 when Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack (2003, p. 191) made the argument that '[t]he importance of affect in the classroom is inadequately considered in scholarship on pedagogy'. While the work of the theorists cited above moves to address the current gap in research on affect and education, the potential of affect to

reconfigure theories of education in significant ways has not yet been fully realized. Affect maps the micro-political relations that constitute the beginnings of social change. In order to understand the lived politics of disability in education and, indeed to read disability as a kind of cultural pedagogy, we must begin by thinking through affect (Hickey-Moody, 2009). It is our contention that understanding, naming, illustrating and analyzing the beginnings of social change is imperative if we are to recognize and instantiate disability as a valuable cultural resource and create classrooms that are disability friendly.

Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack provide a critical structure for thinking pedagogy through affect by establishing a framework well suited to educational policy and discourse analysis. They do this in a discreet chapter in a cultural studies style anthology of applied Deleuzian theory, titled *Animations (of Deleuze and Guattari)* (2003). Taking Deleuze's Spinozist body as a point of departure, Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack note:

> In most pedagogical models, individuals are defined or positioned to take up posts or places in terms of who they are; that is, in terms of their social identities: gender, race, class, ethnicity, and so forth, and they are seen as possessing varying degrees of agency – that is, an ability to act – as an attribute of who they are. In contrast, Deleuze and Guattari do not begin with the question 'What is a body?' but 'What can a body do?' and 'Of what affects is a body capable?' (2003, p. 192)

While Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack's reading of the body as affective is certainly core to Deleuze and Guattari's work, this model for thinking the body is not at all contra agency. In fact it is quite the opposite. Within Deleuze and Guattari's work, agency changes along with subjective experience and evolves in relation to the affects of which a body is capable. Agency is an inherent part of any body, be it a disabled human body, a body of water, a political party. Following Spinoza, Deleuze takes individual material bodies as a challenge to think through the physical dimensions of agency. Deleuze states:

> Spinoza ... proposes to establish the body as a model: 'We do not know what the body can do' ... We speak of consciousness and its decrees, of the will and of its effects, of the thousand ways of moving the body, of dominating the body and the passions – but *we do not even know what a body can do.* (1988, p. 18)

'What a body can do' is a material act and it is also a degree of agency. After establishing the affective body as the primary site – or origin – with which a pedagogy of affect would be concerned, Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack's focus shifts from the body of the subject and the micro-political realm to social machinations, and it is here that their theorization gains particular momentum. Adopting a meta-perspective, they note that:

> Deleuze and Guattari's project of rhizomatics maps three types of lines that are central to understanding the work of the socius: molar lines, molecular lines, and lines of flight. Molar lines 'overcode' dual segmentations that follow 'the great major dualist oppositions: social classes, but also men–women, adults–children, and so on' ... the molecular, distributes 'territorial and lineal segmentations' ... a 'supple fabric without which their [molar lines] rigid segments would not hold' ... The third line, the line of flight, is also a molecular line (as opposed to a molar line), 'one of several lines of flight,

marked by quanta and defined by decoding and deterritorializations'... This third line acts as a line of mutation, of decoding; it is 'the ultimate quantum line' (p. 225). (2003, pp. 194–219)

It is this positioning of Deleuze and Guattari's work as a tool with which to analyze the 'Molar lines [that] "overcode" dual segmentations that follow "the great major dualist oppositions: social classes, but also men–women, adults–children, and so on"' (2003, pp. 194–195), which lends Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack's work to analyzing affective movement of social bodies more than of individual bodies. Disability studies in education, as an academic field, or the disability rights movement, might be considered molar discourses that overcode the affective everyday experience of disability education.

In contrast to Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack, Watkins (2006) takes a micro-analytic approach. Watkins' research methodology was designed in order to evaluate pedagogy through the concept of affect. As such, Watkins' research is of particular interest because the methodology she employs has been designed specifically to record and 'capture', if you will, the embodied negotiations pertaining to – and arising from – affect in the classroom. Whereas Albrecht-Crane and Daryl Slack offer affect as a tool that will support a meta-analysis of classroom politics and discourses, Watkins takes up affect with a focus on learning and teaching literacy. The ways in which her classroom-based research methodology is oriented towards capturing embodied affect are illustrated in the extended quotation below:

> Merilee . . . gave particular attention to this textual form in a unit of work about pirates in which she used *Treasure Island* as the focus text. In addition to reading this novel, Merilee set a term assignment that students read another two texts dealing with themes related to pirates or the sea. At the same time the class was working on writing their own narrative. She explained that in this lesson they were going to write a description of one of the characters for their story . . . Merilee asked students for suggestions for words to describe either the protagonist or antagonist that they would be writing about in their story. Students offered an array of words relating to personality. She recorded students' suggestions on the board and then asked which referred to the protagonist and the antagonist. The class then moved on to list words describing the character's appearance . . . Throughout this brainstorming session, Merilee did not simply act as a scribe, but encouraged students to use their imagination by offering her own examples. (Watkins, 2006, p. 278)

Students really responded to this performance and added to the image Merilee had created with one student calling out, 'He might have a wart on his face'. Merilee replied jokingly that 'Oh, yes, all antagonists have warts!' At this point the class all laughed, clearly enjoying the discussion and enthused about writing their own description which Merilee then asked them to begin. She allotted the class 20 minutes to do this and insisted they write no more than half a page. During this time Merilee progressed around the room offering advice. After 20 minutes she asked students if they were finished and then had them read out their work. The first student to do so was a boy called Adrian. He had written the following about the pirate:

> A hideous fellow walked through the door.
> Unkempt with black hair, he was staring hard at me.
> His scared face, a scarred and wrinkled face, like a soldier back from battle.
> His clothes ragged and torn. He stank like a dead animal.

After reading this out he was met with spontaneous applause from the class and Adrian beamed. This example is significant in terms of what it suggests about a notion of pedagogic affect demonstrating three different ways in which it can function, that is as discipline, praise and contagion (see Watkins, 2006, pp. 278–279).

As the negotiations between student and teacher in this passage of text illustrate, embodied affects occurring in the classroom constitute a kinesthetic economy of knowledge exchange. Learning is about moving the margins of knowledge from exterior to interior locations and this process of movement, or folding, is an embodied act. The affective image of the pirate prompts this young student to negotiate the margins of their knowledge and technical skills of writing. Watkins' data show this clearly and also unpack the kinesthetic economy of relations between teacher and student that leads the student to 'invent' or arrive at the affective image of the pirate. The teacher deploys affects in her pedagogic practice: 'she took on the character of the pirate she was describing using an exaggerated tone in her voice to heighten the impact of what she was saying' (Watkins, 2006, p. 278). For Watkins, then, affect in the classroom is mediated as three pedagogical forms: discipline, praise and contagion.

Ellsworth (2005) talks about affect as a material entity and also as a mode of cognition. She does not draw on Deleuzian theory, although her arguments pertaining to affect have strong parallels to those advanced by Deleuze. Deploying the word 'affect' to articulate a material state of affairs, Ellsworth says:

> Experience, of course, presupposes bodies – not inert bodies, but living bodies that take up and lay down space by their continuous, unfolding movement and that take up and lay down time as they go on being. When we begin to think of experience as an event in time that also takes place, we can see why a number of contemporary theorists are using media and architecture to help them structure their concepts about experience. While both media and architecture can be said to communicate ideas, sensibilities, assumptions, and sometimes hidden power relations to their users and viewers, our experiences of the cinema or of a building exceed merely reading or decoding their signs and meanings. The visual experience of watching a film entails not only representation. It has a material nature that involves biological and molecular events taking place in the body of the viewer and in the physical and imagined space between the viewer and the film. Affect and sensation are material and part of that engagement. (2005, p. 4)

On cognition and affect, Ellsworth develops a theory of pedagogy as an interleaving of the materiality affect and subjective processes of cognition. She says:

> There is a difference . . . between the 'evidence of the ocular senses' in which one notices 'that the sensorium has been stimulated' and this other way of knowing, which he . . . describes as an interleaving of affect and cognition. (2005, p. 135)

On one level, then, affect is the concept of taking something on, changing in relation to an experience or an encounter. On another level an affect is a material entity: an aesthetic compound produced in relation to particular assemblages of space-time. As discussed elsewhere (Hickey-Moody, Windle, & Savage, in press), there are parallels between the notion of affect as the concept of taking something on, of changing in relation to an experience and the process of changing bodies that theorists such as Giroux (1999, 2004), Lusted (1986), Ellsworth (1997, 2005), and McWilliam and Taylor (1996) call 'pedagogy'. Just as the readings of affect discussed above each

differ, so too do the theories of cultural pedagogy put forward by Giroux, Lusted, Ellsworth, and McWilliam.

Affect can thus be considered an emerging point of intervention and analysis in education, pedagogy and schooling. It expresses the embodied experience of learning, the places in which we learn, the histories and desires we bring to learning. Affect cannot be brought to bear on a lived situation – it is the lived reality of the situation – the feeling of learning and the excesses not captured through academics' frameworks for considering teaching, learning and disability. In this edition of *Discourse* we bring this site of intervention to disability education, which is, as noted in the early part of this introduction, an arena of emerging transformation.

The articles within this special issue of *Discourse* are drawn from scholars responding in various registers and contexts to questions of disability, pedagogy, affect, sensation and education. The articles appear in three sections, each of which explores disability, affect and pedagogy in different ways. These sections are 'Education and Schooling', 'Media and Pedagogy' and 'Art, Affect and Becoming'.

Section One: Education and Schooling

Section One opens with Julie Allan, who considers the practices and potentialities of the aspiring inclusive teacher educator in the contemporary climate of academic accountability and mistrust. Responding in part to disability activist and former academic, Mike Oliver, and his frustration with non-disabled academics, Allen traces the conflicted position of academics and the question of civic responsibility. Calling in Pierre Bourdieu's (1998) notion of 'serious play', Allan asks, 'how might teacher educators regain control, rediscover their civic duty and engage in serious play?' She responds to this through Michel Foucault's (1994) framework of ethics and James Joyce's (1963) epiphanies to argue that the aesthetic (sensory and sensual 'affects') and the epiphanic (the unforeseen and inaccessible aspects of ordinary life) are extremely productive practices for re-orientations and de-territorializations through which teacher educators can reinvent themselves in ways that might help recover civic duty through enactment.

Cassandra Loeser's article, 'Muscularity, mateship and malevolent masculinities: experiences of young men with hearing disabilities in secondary schools', brings us into the world of schools, education, young men, masculinity and hearing impairment. Designed around the question, 'How do young men with hearing disabilities simultaneously occupy their gender and their disability?' Loeser draws on Judith Butler's notion of performativity and Michel Foucault's '*techne* of the self' to explore the practices and techniques critical to understanding hearing disability and men as subjects of masculinities. From research conducted within contemporary Australian school sites, Loeser uses the stories and experiences of two young men with hearing impairment to demonstrate that the active construction of gendered subjectivity occurs through a variety of strategies mobilized to navigate and, at times, subvert aspects of the regulative mechanisms of masculinity – especially those deployed by the young men's peers. The article suggests that identity formation and practices of masculinity and disability are fragile, antagonistic and mediated productions, contingent upon approximate performances grounded in what different male peer cultures deem 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable'.

Continuing the exploration of education and schooling in, 'Mobile asylums: psychopathologisation as a personal, portable psychiatric prison', Valerie Harwood draws into contention the motif of the asylum, suggesting that the exercise of power can produce 'asylum type effects'. Bringing together popular culture, Michel Foucault's 'tokens of knowledge' (2006), and Irving Goffman's (1961) *Asylums*, Harwood formulates the concept of the 'mobile asylum'. To amplify the subtleties of her case for the 'mobile asylum', Harwood draws on the case studies of Elijah and Martin (relayed through a key informant) from her broader research on the psychopathologization of children. Here she details the experiences of two African-American children deemed through small events to be within the spectrum of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and/or Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD) to be conveying the *effects of power*. It is the relationship between the power of diagnosis in these stories and the confinement that occurs in the classic psychiatrist–asylum couplet that points to the possibility of the existence of the mobile asylum.

The final paper in the first section is an opinion piece by Elizabeth Hayman describing the *UTS AccessAbility* project – the newly established, student-generated disability website at the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS). Hayman relates how the website evolved and grew organically through a process of ongoing, collaborative debate inspired by the commitment of its co-authors who were also intended users. The paper tours the construction of the website, via a 'geographical approach' to disability, in terms of practical, political, aesthetic and scholarly terrain, with a view to unpacking the cultural politics of disability as played out in the design and construction of the site. Hayman argues that the site generates a multiplicity of ways of relating to the all-too-often unexplored phenomenon of student life as it plays out in relation to disability. Further, she argues that the website became a nuanced political forum that, through its use of humour, politicizes the limitations of the institution. She concludes her analysis and commentary by way of ironic concession noting that the challenge to 'cripping' an institution 'would involve a pervasive infiltration of every aspect of the larger (university) website with a deep and complex understanding of the extreme value of the human differences already existing within the University community and the extended implications they present'.

Section Two: Media and Pedagogy

Gerard Goggin opens Section Two with an analysis of the reception of filmmaker Michael Noonan's doctoral research project, 'Laughing at the Disabled'. The film (its title was subsequently changed to 'Laughing with the Disabled') was a collaboration between Noonan and three people with intellectual disabilities. After its initial release, Noonan and the film became the subject of attack by two academics at the university in which the research was conducted, and the film then became a *cause célèbre*, not only in Australia but around the world. Goggin analyses the public record covering the criticisms of Noonan's research project, the disciplinary action taken by Queensland University of Technology, and the responses of those involved in the research in order to shed light on the place of disability in Australian culture, the role of power, questions of ethics – and, importantly, the cultural politics of disability in education. For many, including the editors of this

issue, the furore was proof of the troubling status of disability in Australian universities.

The co-authored article by Elizabeth Christie and Geraldine Bloustien engages with the cultural and sonic experiences of Elizabeth's Cochlear Implant. 'I-cyborg: disability, affect and public pedagogy' brings the reader into the interior worlds of 'becoming more' through 'becoming cyborg'. Christie and Bloustien use Christie's Facebook postings and her personal navigations of her altered sonic world to trace affect and its utility as pedagogy. The article discusses neural plasticity (the brain's age-related – but not restricted – capacity to create new pathways), the daunting and physically painful experience of new sounds, the joys of altered sociality and the continued need to rely on old strategies for hearing and navigating degrees of deafness. We are taken into the world of hearing impairment, the world of digitized hearing and into Facebook as a means for enabling individual acquisition of critical knowledge and as a site of public pedagogy. In the language of Henry Giroux, Christie and Bloustien, 'bear witness to the ethical dilemmas that animate broader debates within the dominant culture' (2000, p. 355). As Christie notes to herself, and in the public arena of Facebook:

> Just as Lithium can make the bipolar patients just like themselves only a little less so, the Silicon chip allows those with a hearing loss to be 'themselves', only much more so.

Here Christie further demonstrates that, as Neil Marcus, poet and actor argues, 'Disability is an art. It is an ingenious way to live' (Hamilton, 2008, cited in Goggin, 2009, p. 490).

Anna Hickey-Moody's article takes aspects of Deleuze's writing on diagrams and revisits the 1997 Australian-made Rolf De Heer film – *Dance Me to My Song* – a film collaboratively devised with the late Heather Rose, a person with Cerebral Palsy, who also plays the lead character, Julia. While acknowledging that the film is problematic, and is seen as such by disability audiences and scholars in disability and media studies, Hickey-Moody engages Deleuze's concepts of the diagram to argue that an ethic of engagement is present and through diagrams, the film can be understood as opening up the potentiality of social relations and acts as a means of erasing cliché. In particular, it is the film's framing of disability through the use of diegetic sound (in Julia's breathing) and Madeline's emotional disability (Julia's carer) blur the boundaries of disable/able and enfold audience and character through affect. Hickey-Moody suggests that that the project of developing a cinematic ethics that is responsive to the disabled body is a question of inventing new diagrams, or models for feeling and thinking the disabled body. She concludes by suggesting that it is in 'hearing Julia and feeling Julia that the spectator/aurator feels their own body differently and the celluloid becomes modulated as flesh'.

Section Three: Art, Affect and Becoming

Section Three opens with Jessica Cadwallader's 'Stirring up the sediment: the corporeal pedagogies of disabilities'. Cadwallader takes up the workings of the Cartesian mind–body dualism in university pedagogy and her teaching of two courses, one on queer theory and the other on technologies of bodily alteration (primarily medical), that have a specific focus on disability, which acts as a lynchpin

on which the rest of the course turns. Cadwallader argues that disability troubles a range of 'common sense' assumptions and in so doing troubles students' habituated styles of being-in-the-world. She suggests that the troubling can be a powerful pedagogical tool, and one that works through understanding students as *embodied* subjects, rather than simply minds tucked away within bodies. To this Cadwallader brings Maurice Merleau-Ponty's (1964) description of the subject as an embodied being always already thoroughly intertwined with the world, notions of syncretic sociability and 'syncreticothers', issues of intercorporeality and Lévinas's (1998) anachronistic sedimentary styles of being-in-the-world. Cadwallader concludes that troubling sedimented styles of being-in-the-world enables a reworking of the structures of habituated comportments and that this is critical to understanding university pedagogy as an embodied process. Certainly, such an understanding needs to be developed if tertiary education is to become more inclusive.

In 'Anxiety and niceness: drawing disability studies into the art and design curriculum through a live brief', Nicole Matthews argues that it is the responsibility of currently non-disabled teachers to provide space in the curriculum for their students to consider and interrogate the conventions of representing disabled people. Drawing on Sianne Ngai's (2005) understanding of affect and 'taste concept' and working through Sherry Adrian's (1997) strategies for raising the profile of disability studies across the arts and humanities, Matthews analyses the occurrence of absences, anxiety and niceness as they are experienced in a 'live brief' set for art, design, illustration and multimedia students at four UK universities. She contends that refocusing on affect underscores the complexity, unpredictability and inter-subjectivity of what happens in classrooms, studio spaces, libraries and all the other spaces where encounters that prompt learning occur. The emergence of both anxiety and niceness in the 'live brief' emphasizes that the experience that the bodies in the classrooms can draw upon shapes the movement and impact of intensities of affect.

In the final piece, 'A rhizomatics of hearing', Vicki Crowley stages a corporeal and affective trail through plateaus of 'Becoming deaf' in her workplace of academia. Crowley works through the unfamiliarity of deafness in a profession whose ability to speak and hear the written word is commonsense. In this piece, Deleuze and Guattari's 'rhizome' acts as a sensibility and motif for the experience of a body deafening. Crowley makes use of photography, poetry and poesis as multi-textual pedagogy of the disjuncture between advocacy and experience, and draws attention to the dysphoria of theorising affect and the multidimensionality of experiential relations of affect. Crowley asks her readers 'how to speak disability?' and she suggests the discursive domain of binary overcode between disabled and non-disabled, which is so often invoked in answering this question is, in fact, a catastrophe. The piece calls for us to listen to how, according to varying intensities and a multiplicity of material needs, dis/abled bodies labour in pedagogical spaces and practices. Such rhizomic becomings, in an ethico-aesthetic proliferation, might evoke both experience and experiment. Here deafness/becoming deaf is always a form of hearing and the 'strange label' (Kuppers, 2009, p. 228) of disability is brought into question just as it increasingly opens presence, tension, texture, and inter-dependence.

Questions of embodiment, affect and disability are woven throughout these contributions. The diverse ways in which these concepts appear emphasize both the utility of these ideas and the timeliness of their application. We very much hope that

this collection prompts further consideration of the scholarly relationship between disability, affect and education.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. Restless Dance Company was formed in 1991 and became Restless Dance Theatre in 2008.
2. We would like to acknowledge the work of Leslie Roman (2009a, 2009b) in this area and particularly the leadership in disability arts in education demonstrated in the special issue, "Disability, arts, culture and politics: New epistemologies for qualitative research" in *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* (2009).
3. More recently, *Body and Society* has published a special edition on the turn to affect, (see vol. 16, no. 29, 2010). Of particular interest is Patricia Ticineto Clough's 'Afterword: The future of affect studies' (2010).

References

Adrian, S.E. (1997). Disability, society, and ethical issues: A first-year experience for university students. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, *32*, 178–185.

Albrecht-Crane, C., & Daryl Slack, J. (2003). Toward a pedagogy of affect. In J. Daryl Slack (Ed.), *Animations (of Deleuze and Guattari)* (pp. 191–216). New York: Peter Lang.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

CanDoCo Dance Company. (2010). *About us*. Retrieved January 23, 2010, from http://www.candoco.co.uk/general.php?tm = 1

Clough, P.T. (2010). Afterword: The future of affect studies. *Body & Society*, *16*(1), 222–230.

Colman, F.J. (2002). Passaic boys are hell: Robert Smithson's tag as temporal and spatial marker of the geographical self. *Reconstruction: Studies in Contemporary Culture*, *2*(3). Retrieved July 16, 2009, from http://www.reconstruction.ws/home2.htm

Colman, F.J. (2005). Deleuze's kiss: The sensory pause of screen affect. *The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, *16*, 101–113.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Deleuze, G. (1990a). *The logic of sense*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1990b). *Expressionism in philosophy: Spinoza*. New York: Zone.

Deleuze, G. (2002). *Francis Bacon: The logic of sensation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1986). *Kafka: Towards a minor literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* London: Verso.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, and pedagogy*. Routledge: New York.

Foucault, M. (2006). *Psychiatric power: Lectures at the College de France 1973–1974*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (1994). A preface to transgression. In M. Foucault, *Aesthetics: Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984* (Vol. 2). London: Penguin.

Gibbs, A. (2002). Disaffected. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, *16*, 335–341.

Giroux, H.A. (1999). Cultural studies as public pedagogy making the pedagogical more political. In *Encyclopaedia of philosophy of education*. Retrieved May 15, 2005, from www.vusst.hr/encyclopaedia/main.htm

Giroux, H.A. (2000). Public pedagogy as cultural politics: Stuart Hall and the 'crisis' of culture. *Cultural Studies*, *14*(2), 341–360.

Giroux, H.A. (2004). Cultural studies, public pedagogy, and the responsibility of intellectuals. *Communication and Critical Cultural Studies*, *1*(1), 59–79.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums, essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Anchor Books.

Goggin, G. (2009). Innovation and disability. *M/C: Media and Culture, 11*. http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/view/56

Gregg, M. (2006). *Cultural studies, affective voices*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hickey-Moody, A. (2009). *Unimaginable bodies: Intellectual disability, performance and becomings*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Hickey-Moody, A.C., Windle, J., & Savage, G. (in press). Pedagogy writ large: Public, popular and cultural pedagogies in motion. *Critical Studies in Education*.

Joyce, J. (1963). *Stephen hero*. New York: New Directions.

Kuppers, P. (2009). Toward a rhizomatic model of disability: Poetry performance, and touch. *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*, *3*, 221–240.

Lévinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being: Or, beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen*, *27*(5), 2–15.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

McWilliam, E., & Taylor, P.G. (Eds.). (1996). *Pedagogy, technology and the body*. New York: Peter Lang.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The primacy of perception: And other essays on phenomenological psychology, the philosophy of art, history and politics* (W. Cobb Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Nancy, J.-L. (2000). *On being singular plural. Being singular plural* (Trans. R.D. Richardson and A.E. O'Byrne). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ngai, S. (2005). *Ugly feelings*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Northway, R. (2002). Integration and inclusion: Illusion or progress in services for disabled people? *Social Policy and Administration*, *31*(2), 157–172.

Probyn, E. (2000). *Carnal appetites: FoodSexIdentities*. London: Routledge.

Restless Dance Theatre. (2010). *About us*. Retrieved January 23, 2010, from http://www.restlessdance.org/AboutUs.htm

Roman, L.G. (2009a). Disability arts and culture as public pedagogy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13*(7), 667–675.

Roman, L.G. (2009b). The unruly salon: Unfasten your seatbelts, take no prisoners, make no apologies! [Special issue: Disability, arts, culture and politics: New epistemologies for qualitative research]. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(1), 1–16.

Seigworth, G. (2003). Fashioning a stave, or, singing life. In J.D. Slack (Ed.), *Animations of Deleuze and Guattari* (pp. 75–105). New York: Peter Lang.

Vincent, C., Evans, J., Lunt, I., & Young, P. (1996). Professionals under pressure: The administration of special education in a changing context. *British Educational Research Journal*, *22*, 475–491.

Vislie, L. (2003). From integration to inclusion: Focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *18*(1), 17–35.

Watkins, M. (2006). Pedagogic affect/effect: Embodying a desire to learn. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *1*, 269–282.