Weaving Intersectionality into Disability Studies Research: Inclusion, Reflexivity and Anti-Essentialism

Author(s): Tina Goethals, Elisabeth De Schauwer and Geert Van Hove

Source: *DiGeSt. Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies* , Vol. 2, No. 1-2 (2015), pp. 75-94

Published by: Leuven University Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.11116/jdivegendstud.2.1-2.0075

Weaving Intersectionality into Disability Studies Research: Inclusion, Reflexivity and Anti-Essentialism

Tina Goethals, Elisabeth De Schauwer & Geert Van Hove

Much disability studies research has given voice to persons with a disability who are often marginalised by society and given limited, if any, decision-making power. This reputation, however, should be questioned, since a central weakness has been that despite its efforts to be inclusive, the traditional focal points of mainstream disability studies research tends to essentialise the category of people with a disability (Erevelles, 2011). People with disabilities are frequently assumed to share the same views, experiences, and priorities, regardless of gender, age, cultural background, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, religion, and other categories of difference. Consequently, primacy is given to "disability" over other key elements, meaning that the interactions among all determinants are often neglected. Thus, the questions remain whether all people with a disability benefit, and which persons with a disability tend to be excluded from current research projects.

In response to these pressing issues, a growing number of disability studies researchers began to engage in intersectional research that explored multiple axes of difference. Continuous calls have been made to direct explicit attention to diversity among people with a disability (Jacob, Köbsell & Wollrad, 2010; Raab, 2007). Despite the fact that some researchers do incorporate other variables in their research, many continue to limit their analysis to comparing people "with" and "without" disabilities, producing binary data. Another pitfall is that they assign prominence to disability and use an additive approach which entails looking at various variables as isolated and dichotomous rather than interactive and mutually interdependent (Yuval-Davis, 2006). Moreover, it is tempting for many researchers not to represent marginalised positions or voices, and design and produce research that tends not to benefit anyone who differs from the privileged "norm" (Hankivsky et al., 2010). Another important pitfall in much disability studies research is that they tend to be inclusive, which is good and essential, but we argue that this is insufficient when conducting critical disability studies research. Not infrequently, this inclusive approach is the only focus. We believe that, when we really want to trace back the roots of disability studies, this inclusive approach needs to be completed with reflexivity and anti-essentialism, the two other approaches discussed in this article. To our opinion, disability studies research must be basically critical, embracing intersectionality as an important frame of reference. However, as illustrated above, we see that the concept of disability studies is frequently misused as the critical dimension is missing (Goodley, 2013; Meekosha & Shuttleworth, 2009). Consequently, we argue that inclusive, reflexive and anti-essentialist approaches are required for conducting critical and intersectional disability studies research.

This article will draw on current ongoing research of the authors in the Flemish disability studies context, in order to explore the premises and practical challenges of the processes involved in applying an intersectionality paradigm. In this context, we draw on a postmodern version of disability studies where different models of disability (medical, social, cultural) are considered and have their own right to exist. We recognise the existence of the different understandings of disability and undertake rigorous critical reflection of both positive and negative sides of each model. In promoting a multiplicity of readings, as Goodley and Runswick-Cole (2012) suggest, we seek to accept uncertainty, and to challenge the tendency of certain grand narratives to masquerade as truths in a postmodern era. Hence, the solution of problems cannot be conceptualised in dual thinking (in terms of "or"), but rather in thinking in terms of "and", as for us inspiring feminist researchers and philosophers such as Davies, Braidotti, Deleuze and Guatarri as well. We seek to challenge dominant assumptions about living with a disability, and constitute disability as sites of construction and creativity rather than determination; we are thus opposed to the great binary aggregate: abled/disabled. With the latter, we make connection with feminist disability studies (Garland-Thomson, 2005), in tending to avoid impairment-specific or medical diagnostic categories to think about disability, and resist falling back on essentialist definitions of disability as inferior embodiment. By considering feminist disability studies, we go beyond explicit disability topics such as illness, beauty, genetics, etc. (Hall, 2011), and "reimagine disability", as Rosemarie Garland-Thomson states (2005, p. 1557)."

Having observed the concern about these issues, we hope to provide a source of inspiration by conducting research which is based on an understanding of the complexities of people's lives and situations, and contribute to the development of concrete intersectional methodologies. While overall principles and abstract methodologies have already been discussed in the literature, debates are scarce regarding concrete intersectional methodology and analysis (Simien, 2007; Valentine, 2007). Our objective in this article is therefore to contribute to the development of concrete intersectional methods in disability studies research, based on three methodological approaches used in ongoing research of the authors, namely inclusion, reflexivity, and anti-essentialism. The three approaches will be exemplified, comments will be provided about the methodological choices, and the importance of intersectionality for understanding the research material will be elaborated. It is important to point out that the approaches do not represent a unified way or one-size-fits-all solution to conduct intersectional research, instead they offer opportunities to demonstrate the different ways in which an intersectional perspective can be applied to disability studies research. The common characteristic is that they can bring processes into the research leading to more differentiation and embracing complexities in people's lives.

Intersectionality

An emerging paradigm for disability studies research is intersectionality (Goodley, 2010; Jacob, Köbsell & Wollrad, 2010; Söder, 2009). Intersectionality addresses a central feminist concern about capturing multiple positionalities, placing an explicit focus on differences among social groups (Davis, 2008). It seeks to illuminate various interacting factors that affect human lives and tries to identify how these different systemic conditions varying in place, time, and circumstance cooperate to reproduce conditions of inequality.

Although intersectionality theory emerged in the late 1970s, its roots can be traced back to Black Feminism. Female black pioneers such as Sojourner Truth (1851) used their own lives to illustrate the experience of intersectionality. In Thruth's famous "Ain't I A Woman?" speech, she implied that all too often "woman" actually meant "white woman". Later on, the term of intersectionality was coined in 1989 by Kimberlé Crenshaw, and since then has travelled the world as a promising concept offering understanding of how different axes of power intersect. The idea has caught the imagination of different disciplines (Sen et al., 2009), and is now recognised as a relatively new research paradigm (Hancock, 2007a) that builds on a number of assumptions regarding interactions of multiple systems at multiple and often simultaneous levels. First, intersectionality moves beyond traditional frameworks that separate social life into "discrete or pure strands" (Brah & Phoenix, 2004, p. 76). People have multiple roles and identities and being members of more than one "group", they can simultaneously experience privilege and oppression. By no longer considering, for example, "disability" in isolation from other categories (gender, religion, income, age, cultural background, family status, and many others), dynamic and contradictory power dynamics become more apparent and it becomes clear that no one social category is more important than any other. Second, intersectionality offers us a lens through which categories are viewed as mutually constituting processes. Rather than simply adding categories to one another, intersectionality strives to understand the unique experiences and perspectives at the intersection of two or more social or cultural categories and positions that intertwine as complex, overlapping, interacting, and often contradicting systems (Hancock, 2007b). Third, the concept of intersectionality can be used to analyze how power and power relations are maintained and reproduced. Intersectionality scholars tend to look to the perspectives and experiences of unmarked and unheard groups. In Staunæs's (2003, p. 101) words, "the concept can be a useful analytical tool in tracing how certain people seem to get positioned as not only different but also troublesome and, in some instances, marginalized".

Despite the fact that intersectionality is a topic that has caught growing interest, and produced a plethora of literature on the concept, there is a paucity of academic work on intersectionality from a methodological perspective (Bowleg, 2008; Cuádraz & Uttal, 1999; McCall, 2005). In particular, although the concept itself seems to have provided a solid framework, as Nash (2008) notes, there is a "lack of clearly defined intersectional methodology" (p. 4). With a number of studies undertaken (see, for example, Christensen & Jensen, 2012; Sen et al., 2009), the development of methodological practices has the potential to lead to both theoretical and methodological innovation in disability studies research.

Research

This article draws on an ongoing research project of the authors and discusses the challenges of implementing intersectional thinking into disability studies. The key aim of the research project is to examine the inclusion and participation of people with a disability in the Dutch speaking part of Belgium. Whilst people with disabilities account for 15% of the world population and thus comprise one of the biggest minority groups in the world (World Report on Disability, 2011), they seem invisible in most policy domains and have little participation in society. Before starting the research, we drew up a list of basic assumptions, in parallel with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: (a) research results should support the promotion and protection of the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities and to promote respect for their inherent dignity; (b) persons with disabilities are no longer viewed as "objects" of charity, medical treatment, and social protection, but rather as "subjects" with rights, who are capable of claiming those rights, making decisions for their lives based on their free and informed consent, and as active members of society; (c) disability results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinders full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others; (d) we want to have respect for difference and accept persons with disabilities as part of human diversity; (e) we believe that full and effective participation and inclusion are important to empower individuals and to enrich society; (f) all activities (also research) should include the participation of persons with disabilities in parallel with the slogan: "Nothing About Us Without Us".

Within the research, narratives are collected and analyzed to map the subjective stories of people with a disability concerning their inclusion and participation. 383 persons with disabilities were interviewed in Belgium and the Netherlands (339 in Flanders and 44 in the Netherlands) to develop a picture of their personal experiences concerning inclusion/exclusion. The project was developed through a co-operative methodology (analogous to the framework of Van Hove, 1999) to access the perspectives and experiences of people with a disability, which have been often ignored or overlooked in research (Verdonschot et al, 2009). To map the subjective stories of people with a disability, open-ended questions across different facets of social life were discussed in an interview. The interview concerns two main questions: (a) "give examples of moments or situations where you had the feeling that you were taken into account, you were included, that people took you seriously"; (b) "give examples of moments or situations where you felt discriminated or oppressed". All the interviews were video recorded, producing more than 500 hours of footage. Students of Ghent University and the University of Antwerp were called upon to assist with recruiting participants and interviewing them individually at a safe place of their choice. The interviews lasted an hour and a half on average, were filmed and fully transcribed. The research population consists of 383 individuals with a disability, including 202 men and 181 women, from a variety of backgrounds, age, abilities and experiences. The formulation of Turnbull & Turnbull (2002) is used to define disability "... the new paradigm of disability is contextual and societal. A person has an impairment that becomes a disability as a result of the interaction between the individual, and the natural, built, cultural and societal environments. Accordingly, research into the natural, cultural and social environments is warranted and is targeted at enhancing enablement and preventing disablement..." Here we understand disability as a social construction that is not a unified, singular thing or a condition people have (Connor, Gabel, Gallagher & Morton, 2008), but a "quintessential post-modern concept, because it is so complex, so variable, so contingent and so situated. It sits at the intersection of biology and society and of agency and structure. Disability cannot be reduced to a singular identity: it is a multiplicity, a plurality" (Gabel and Peters, 2004, p. 588). We believe that disability cannot be placed squarely in society as the social model suggests (Oliver, 1990), but needs a more complete understanding of disability and impairment as social concepts, with recognition for individual experiences of the body over time and in variable circumstances (Crow, 1996).

It became clear that constructing an intersectional framework in this research entails thinking carefully about the research methodology. Reflecting on our own research experience, three methodological approaches are described and commented in the following section, namely an inclusive, a reflexive and an anti-essentialist approach.

The Inclusive Path

Over the previous few years we have learned a lot from colleagues who we see as "role models" while talking about inclusive/collaborative/cooperative research projects (Goodley, 2000; Walmsley & Johnson, 2003). In this inclusive approach, the research process and its methodologies must ensure that people with disabilities – about whom, and for whom the research is designed – are involved not simply as research subjects, but play a central role as researchers and research participants. We refer to inclusive research as a term that encompasses a range of research approaches that have traditionally been termed "participatory" or "emancipatory" (Walmsley, 2001). In disability studies research, the development of inclusive research, where people with disabilities are active participants, is now fairly common; its impact however has been limited (Walmsley, 2001). Inevitably, following an inclusive approach in research has not been without its critics and presents a number of ethical and methodological challenges: power differences in research relationships are fragile, giving voice can not be organized "in a hurry", co-researchers with disabilities can get alienated from their own research process, language and reporting can be non-transparent for researchers and participants. However, analogous with our basic assumptions ("Nothing About Us Without Us") and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, we highlight the importance and challenge of involving people with a disability in the research; in order to keep the research relevant, honest, and representative; ensuring that the analysis is grounded in the lived experiences of the participants. With all involved in a process of mutual recognition and co-understanding, we try to create a discursive space where we could think and act with one another, doing research *with* rather than *on* or *for* people with disabilities, and co-constructing research where people don't get alienated from the process.

Promoting the engagement of participants in an inclusive debate on issues relevant to them, creates a productive dialogue on developing theory and connects with intersectional theory, participatory methods to achieve social change, and critical engagement with issues of power and structural inequalities (Krumer-Nevo, 2009).

In particular, one of the key features of an intersectional perspective, and one which is a common theme in the inclusive approach, is that it involves the creation of coalitions and strategic alliances to alleviate social exclusion, marginalization, and subordination (Hankivsky, Reid, Cormier, Varcoe, Clark, Benoit, & Brotman, 2010). Through the cooperative articulation of experiences and following each other's footsteps, participants and researchers got to know each other's interests and pluralist meanings while at the same time creating new ones. Moreover, in the inclusive approach, all forms of knowledge are valued as sources of data and information. It generally lends itself more easily to an in-depth investigation into the complexities and intersections of individuals' social lives. In enabling the discussion to ground itself in "real life" where ideas can be discussed and tested against what is known, experienced, and understood (Fine, 2007; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2008), inclusive approaches are therefore particularly complementary to an intersectional perspective. It is key for developing a fully nuanced story and dissolves the distance between those labelled and categorized as "them" or "us", which automatically leads to communal activism and resistance in order to cultivate a desired social change.

Within our research project, the inclusive approach permeated different levels of the research process. Our belief that all participants have valuable knowledge to impart based on their personal perspectives and experiences led to different co-operative methods such as the organization of viewing days and participatory data analysis, the editing of the footage in close collaboration with the participants, the launching of a website with accessible research material and reporting, the participation of representatives with a disability in the advisory committee of the research, but above all, the continuous dialogue and intensive and close collaborative relationships between researchers and participants where opinions, interpretations, and experiences were shared. The participation through the viewing days is felt to be a crucial mechanism to achieve maximal participation from, and dialogue with, the participants within the research project. This dialogue and listening turned the known into the unknown and opens up new modes of knowing and being (Davies, 2014). To illustrate, the researcher wrestled with the fact whether or not – and if yes, how – to use categories such as *inter alia*: age, cultural background, abilities, gender, in the research, without slipping into the trap of labeling people, especially assuming that people fall into one or two categories while realities are much more complex. Participant discussions on this topic during the viewing days, and preferred that some categories of difference should be named and used. They shared the opinion that although it is an ongoing challenge, it is difficult to talk about inclusion and discrimination without talking about people as through they belong in some categories. Beside this, participatory data analysis was also conducted on the viewing days to supplement participants' own analyses. Asking the research participants to help interpret findings brought new perspectives on data. For instance, the researchers' contribution to the analysis was discussed among the participants as the researcher saw the concept of "role models" as an emerging theme out of the data material. Participants questioned this topic because the researcher had interpreted this theme in a passive way (namely, role models *for* people with a disability), whereas the participants saw themselves not only as recipients, looking up to others with respect and admiration, but also as people who can also be respected and admired *by* others and serve as a role model themselves (for others, with or without disabilities).

Although we have encountered some challenges when attempting to integrate these co-operative approaches into our research (with questions such as: whose voices get heard? Who is included? Who may be silenced within the research?), they provide important lenses for discerning the complexities in people's lives and for contributing to intersectional research. The study benefited immensely from the co-operative analysis and the constant dialogue with the participants, as it ensured that the research process and the findings were meaningful and respected the voices of participants themselves. So, briefly, we believe that intersectional disability studies benefits from an the inclusive approach in research as it gives insight in the complexities and multi-layeredness of participants' lives and allows for the in-depth study of individuals' personal and unique social locations and experiences with power and privilege.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is intended here as "storying" lived experiences and multiple intersections through individual and collective narratives together with continuously acknowledging your own positionalities, experiences, roles, and political and theoretical frameworks as a researcher. According to this point of view, stories of lived experience of both the subject and the researcher are co-constructed and negotiated between the people involved as a means of capturing complex, multi-layered, and nuanced understandings. These lived experience approaches have become increasingly recognised as an important strategy in disability studies research (Atkinson, 1997; Booth & Booth, 1996). A leading question in disability studies is how to capture and fully include the voices of persons with disabilities and how to provide opportunities for traditionally marginalized perspectives to be heard (Ashby, 2011; Barton, 2005; Garland-Thomson, 2005; Goodley & Van Hove, 2005). Together with the researchers' reflections on how their own narratives are built in relation to both the research and the subject, this reflexive approach has become a topic for discussion for disability studies Research as positivistic research models are challenged (Rinaldi, 2013; Crooks, Owen & Stone, 2012). Rinaldi (2013), states that engaging reflexively with positionalities and how they affect the production of knowledge can be particularly beneficial in disability studies, aiding in the paradigmatic shift from research *about*, to research *by* and *for*, disabled people.

Together with Cole (2009), we believe that intersectional theory can provide major theoretical support for methodological approaches such as the reflexive approach which permit the exploration of multiple and individual experiences, different connections, new questions and alternative understandings. Meanwhile, storying lived experiences can often illuminate hidden complexities, and invalidate simplistic binary generalisations and essentialisms. Elliot (1991) and Titchkosky (2007) argue that lived experiences have the power to disrupt dominant normative accounts of disability; they can illuminate the embodied reality and complexity of experience in contrast with professional and dominant biological models of disability. Taking personal experiences as a starting point, we agree with Hearn (2011) who in his study of men, suggested that it is necessary "to go back from masculinity to men", that is, to allow space for embodied realities and experiences in stead of starting from subject positions. Also Butler (2011) states that there needs to be a distinction between subjects and individuals: the embodied experiences of real individuals taking subject positions are much more complex than social constructions (see also, Villa, 2011 "Embodiment Is Always More"). Different stories offer data which are open to different readings and interpretations and suggest multiple ways in which disability and other axes of difference might interact. Besides, next to differences between groups, storying lived experiences can take into account intra-group differences, an important feature of intersectionality following Crenshaw (1991, p. 1242). These narratives are helpful in reclaiming the stories of people with disabilities as suitable research material and allow differences among these experiences without the problematic emphasis on the universality of them.

Looking at reflexivity in our research, we can confirm that we concentrated on listening to a diversity of people with a disability in Flanders about their experiences on inclusion and participation in society. Our research material consists of 383 narratives from the participants with examples from their own lives, including their hopes and dreams, the many difficulties they face and their interests. This was one of the research project's goals, as the voice and analyses of persons with a disability are largely absent from research and policy making. As such, they come across as human beings rather than stereotypes, and the findings are grounded in experience.

We argue that the narrative approach we used brings *insider perspectives* and makes room for complexities and embodied realities, illustrating that the method of interviewing allows us to bring intersecting categories into play in order to understand processes of power and inclusion. In addition, we have found that one of the best ways to get at the underlying power dynamics contributing to patterns of domination, oppression, and privilege is by raising open-ended questions across different facets of social life. By doing so we have obtained context rich information about power relations and subjectivity. It is for this reason, we acknowledge the arguments of Bowleg (2008) for a "qualitative stance" of the researcher in order to address the complexities of intersectionality. He developed ideas for conducting intersectional interviews, like Cuádraz & Uttal (1999) who also state that "the method of feminist in-depth interviewing encouraged individuals to explain how they viewed their circumstances, to define issues in their own terms, to identify processes leading to different outcomes, and to interpret the meaning of their lives to the researcher" (Cuádraz & Uttal 1999, p. 160).

We start by looking at the story of Tess, a 50 year old woman with a physical disability who said that she sometimes identified herself as a woman, other times as unmarried, other times as disabled, other times as childless, other times as having children, and other times as a committed swimming teacher, or all combined together in complex ways. She described the intersection of her identities in ways that makes these not discrete categories, but mutually constitutive and interacting. Seen through the lens of Buitelaar (2006), Tess speaks from different "I"-positions, she switches positions or combines different positions when she tells her life-story. Recognizing these circumstances as catalytic factors in the life of Tess is essential in understanding the ways in which various forces and events shape the lives of people with a disability. In the words of Prins (2006): the narrative scripts available for these different collective identities modify one another and produce a unique life-story. Prins argues further that narratives tell us how people draw on different categories in the construction of their life-story. She sees "identity" as a narrative in which we both play the leading role and write the script (p. 281). Categories and their intersections therefore emerge in the way people tell their life-stories. From an intersectional point of view, due to listening to the lived experiences of Tess, this account shows us that disability is imbricated with other categories of "difference" and that these axes of difference are neither hierarchically ordered, nor static or dichotomous.

Additionally, the narratives from the research project are ambiguous and they confuse and tackle certain stereotypes of people with a disability. They call for engaging reflexively with our own positionalities, and the subjectivity of the researcher, in the ongoing process of situating ourselves and acknowledging, or even making use of, our own filters and presumptions. For example, the interview with Titus, a young man with a visual disability, offers the interviewing student some unsettling moments during their conversation. At a given moment, the interviewer asks Titus how he types on his computer and if he needs a special keyboard for his visual impairment. Titus looks right into her eyes and responds very seriously: "*I type blind (touch typing), just like you do I suppose?*" This answer was very confusing for the interviewer, since it was a departure from the expected content, although the created hesitations and stammerings kept the mind of the interviewer open and responsive, just like when he said to her that he swims right, "*right to the other side of the swimming pool and then back*". The interviewer was disrupted because she expected other answers, but as a result she carefully monitored her own subjectivity. Concretely, reflexivity implies here "a critical consciousness of the discourses that hold us in place, that is, a capacity to distance ourselves from them, at the same time as we are being constituted by them; a capacity to see the work they do and to question their effects at the same time as we live those effects" (Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 380). This interview highlights our active, and reflexive, interviewers who are aware of what we are bringing to the research, and how findings are affecting our own perceptions. These accounts also illustrate the strength of narratives because "it privileges the voices of everyday life over the researchers' pre-assumed theoretical perspective" as "researchers do not organize the world in the same way as those whom they are researching" (Cuádraz & Uttal, 1999, p. 168).

To sum up, we highlight the importance of reflexivity in research, the importance of narratives and the analysis of everyday life, and argue that taking this approach as a point of departure has potential for intersectional disability studies research. In attempt to unpack some of the complexities and power relations of research, this approach can function as a tool for revealing positionalities and can build a more careful representation of reality, one that is not assumed to be the objective, positivistic truth.

Anti-Essentialism

The anti-essentialist perspective that disability studies endorses in various manifestations, is important for what it teaches us about disability, and the social construction of human differences generally (Danforth & Gabel, 2007). Throughout history, the impairment label served as the signifier for exclusion, and a pathology where pre-social biological differences are suggested to mark off the "impaired" from the "normal". In this view, social categories and dichotomies (impaired/non-impaired, normal/abnormal) are perceived as "real" and fixed (Price & Shildrickn, 1998; Corker & French, 1999; Corker & Shakespeare, 2002). From anti-essentialist perspectives, disability studies can shed new light on how institutions and researchers use the traditional deficit and deterministic approach to shape interactions and traditional parameters in the theorisation of disability. Within the anti-essentialist outlook, "disability theory centres on the interrogation of cultural categories, discourses, language, and practices in which 'disability', 'impairment' and 'being normal' come into being through their social performance, and on the power that these categories have in constructing subjectivities and identities of self and other" (Thomas, 2004, p. 36).

The Deleuzoguattarian rhizome can offer us both a map and a metaphor for the field of (anti-essentialist) disability studies, a philosophical concept advanced by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987): "unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other point, there are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or root. There are only lines" (p. 9). In contrast, modernist knowledge can be seen as a root tree. "The tree is already the image of the world, or the root the image of the world-tree...Binary logic is the spiritual reality of the root-tree" (pp. 5-6). The rhizome opens up new ways of approaching disabled ways of living and *disability* as a word and concept, and can hold a wide variety of experiences and structured position in moments of precarious productive imbalance (Kuppers, 2011).

Following the intersectional perspective, it is important not to essentialise any group or assume that all members of a single social group share similar experiences, perspectives, and needs (Hankivsky & Cormier, 2009). On the contrary, an essentialist point of view assumes that the experience of being a member of the group under discussion is a stable one, one with a clear meaning, a meaning constant through time, space, and different historical, social, political, and personal contexts (Butler, 1990; Grillo, 2013). For example, the group "women with disabilities" may vary considerably according to income, ethnicity, religious views, age, and geography and consequently may have very different experiences. Moreover, social categories such as disability, gender, age, ethnicity, class, geography, and so on are flexible and fluid. Following Burgess-Proctor (2006) and Weber & Parra-Medina (2003) in the intersectional perspective, we see that social categories are dynamic, historically grounded, socially constructed, and work at both micro and macro structural levels. Postmodern feminist theory has posited these categories as "performative" (Butler, 1990). They are constantly re-made or re-written through daily actions and interactions. Meanwhile, a lot of research tries to "fix" and solidify these performances, for example through a linear analysis. Categories and identities, such as disability, are inherently unstable and dynamic and interact with various other processes. They are not as universal and dichotomous as they look. They are created in relation, and are temporal and contextual. Furthermore, individuals speak from different positions, switch positions, or combine different positions. Telling one's life story thus consists of orchestrating the voices within us that speak from different positions and adjust the narratives for varying audiences (Buitelaar, 2006). Therefore, the concerns of people with a disability can only be properly understood when put within a dynamic context of relations and interactions. This can be likened to Prins (2006), when she makes a distinction between systemic and constructionist interpretations of intersectionality. The first interpretation assumes a more essentialist view on categories which are seen as static and rigid systems of domination. By contrast, the constructionist interpretation adopts a more relational and dynamic view of power where identity is not perceived as a matter of naming, but one of narration. People are both actors in and co-authors of their own life-stories and their positions are not static or given, but sites of constant struggle and negotiation. As such, the conceptualisation of social categories involves a process of construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction (Staunæs, 2003) and asks for a more rhizomatic way of thinking in order to challenge the omnipresent perception of seeing people, society and concepts in linear arborescent ways.

In our research project, the narratives demonstrate no single reality, and consist of multilayered, contradictory, and performative stories in which different categories play a constitutive role. Overzealous focus on extrapolating the data in fixed themes is to commit the error of essentialist thinking and harks back to the positivist tenet that there is a single and fixed reality. So, in our attempts to consider the multiple layers of intersectionality, analyzing the data became more sophisticated than a linear thematic analysis. Viewing the narratives through a rhizomatic structure with multiple entryways, connections from one point to another and without beginning or end (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), allowed us to step away from understanding identities as essentialised or additive. Instead, it allowed us to see them as open, dynamic and in tactile relation with each other. This way of working is associated with the writing of a rhizomatic text where multiplicity and complexity is allowed (Sermijn et al., 2008). Deleuze (1995) writes of treating writing as a flow, as one flow among others, a flow meeting other flows. In writing "messy texts" (Denzin, 1997), we tried to avoid linear figurations, simplistic dichotomies, and encourage the reader thinking rhizomatically, refusing "to impose meaning on the reader" (p. 224). As researchers, we had to be vigilant that we didn't pretend to reveal the complete truth, but only a part of the rhizome. Discontinuous, contradicting, and temporary elements from the narratives get a chance to contrast with linear analysis. The purpose is to disrupt and resist the assumed and known, and give attention to the context and the subtle (Leafgren, 2009). Since there are many different readings possible in the analysis (Goodley & Runswick-Cole, 2012), we choose to make public the multiplicity of stories on the website. Just as a rhizome has multiple entryways, we gave people the chance to pick their point of entry. People could chose different pathways, select themes emerging from the stories, or select to view all the stories of, for example, women with a disability, or even decide to view the whole narrative of every person with a disability. By doing this, we try to show many possible truths and realities that can all be viewed, instead of assuming there is only *the* truth. People have to listen and look at the complexity, uncertainty, and the layers of contradiction that emerge when people with a disability tell their lived experience. As such, multiple, fracturing, and dissident experiences can be found in a diverse array of examples.

To sum up, we believe that an anti-essentialist approach is useful in terms of providing contextual and detailed accounts that illustrate complex social relationships, dynamics, multiple realities, and contribute to an understanding not only of non linear relationships between concepts, but also the making of meaning and the processes behind those dynamics. In our opinion, this approach challenges the idea that the social world is neatly divided into categories, and contributes to the deconstruction of essentializing concepts of "disabled" people in disability studies research. It helps researchers to identify, as an intersectional perspective demands, the full range of interlocking factors that affect the experiences of people with a disability.

Concluding Thoughts

It is increasingly recognised that there is a need for intersectional research so that the full range of experiences and perspectives of diverse people with a disability are not obscured. This intersectional framework provides important insights into the ways in which disability intersects with other identities, contributing to unique experiences. However, bridging theory and method is never an easy undertaking, yet, we see great value in making this attempt because intersectional theory can help us unmask the taken-for-granted knowledge that only reinforce hierarchies and exclusions.

In this article, intersectionality is addressed as a promising methodological tool to explore complex and interwoven categories of difference. By highlighting a few methodological approaches, namely an inclusive, a reflexive, and an anti-essentialist approach, the usefulness of an intersectional perspective for disability studies research is revealed. Inspired by our own empirical research experiences and struggles, the article aims to contribute to concrete innovate intersectional methodology and analysis. The three approaches illustrate how they can illuminate complexities of every day life, rejecting the separability of social categories, as they recognise the heterogeneity of people with a disability. By doing so, we aim to elaborate on the emerging, yet undertheorised, paradigm of intersectionality as an innovative framework that has the potential to counterbalance essentialist interpretations of the category *disability.*

The questions raised by these approaches expose some of the methodological realities of engaging with an intersectional framework. However, we argue that these approaches have the potential to generate complex knowledge and rectify common misperceptions about people with a disability. They can challenge the common

Flemish discourse about "us" and "them", in the sense that they can eliminate stereotypes and boundaries. They encourage "a dialogical process where participants negotiate meanings at the level of question posing, data collection and analysis" and "encourages participants to work together on an equal basis to reach a mutual understanding" (Gitlin & Russell, 1994 in Bridges, 2001, p. 382). By doing so, the article makes reference to the feminist concern about capturing multiple positionalities, where researchers and participants engage in intensive encounters and relationships where values such as trust, openness, involvement, and connection are key concepts (Tillman-Healy, 2003).

Moreover, the three approaches imply an attitude of fundamental "not knowing" (Claes, 2014), an uncertainty that creates space for complexity and ambiguity, an "ignorance that does not show the way, but only issues an invitation to set out on the journey" (Biesta, 1998, p. 505). In Rinaldi's words, by engaging in dialogue we enter "a process of transformation where you lose absolutely the possibility of controlling the final result" (Rinaldi, 2006, p. 184). This dialogue and listening turns the known into the unknown, and opens up new modes of knowing and being (Davies, 2014). This idea of experimentation concerns that which is not yet known and demands more than recognizing or representing the truth (De Schauwer, 2011). This "becoming" (Deleuze, 1994) rests on the capacity to let go of fixed identities and patterns, and to be open to the not-yet-known.

In this article, we do not want to rely on a strictly "methods as tools and techniques" approach to research design, and then universalise or represent the discussed approaches as a unified way to conduct intersectional research. Instead, we demonstrate the various ways in which an intersectional perspective can be applied to disability studies research, by providing concrete illustrations of how an intersectional framework can be applied to research. It is our hope that our reflections can be a source of inspiration for other researchers striving to work from an intersectional perspective. In order for the full potential of intersectionality to be realised in disability studies research, methodologies need to be constantly questioned and improved, so that researchers can take a nuanced approach to power and the fluidity of categories. Here, we consider intersectionality as a chance to abandon disability studies research where impairment is the central focus, and we conclude that we have to retrace the roots of disability studies where the critical dimension and intersectionality should be an inherent component, and where the three approaches discussed in this article, namely inclusion, reflexivity, and anti-essentialism, should be fundamental principles.

References

Ashby, C. E. (2011). Whose "voice" is it anyway? Giving voice and qualitative research involving individuals that type to communicate. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 31*(4), 1723-1771.

Atkinson, P. (1997). Narrative Turn or Blind Alley? *Qualitative Health Research, 7*, 325-344.

Barton, L. (2005). Emancipatory Research and Disabled People: Some Observations and Questions. *Educational Review, 57*(3), 317-327.

Biesta, G. (1998). Say You Want a Revolution... Suggestions for the Impossible Future of Critical Pedagogy. *Educational Theory, 48*(4), 499-510.

Booth, T., & Booth, W. (1996). Sounds of Silence: narrative research with inarticulate subjects. *Disability & Society, 11*(1), 55-69.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + Lesbian + Woman ? Black Lesbian Woman: The

Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality

Research. *Sex Roles, 59*(5-6), 312- 325.

Brah, A., & Phoenix, A. (2004). Ain't I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality. *Journal of International Women's studies, 5*(3), 75-86.

Bridges, D. (2001). The Ethics of Outsider Research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 35*(3), 371-386.

Buitelaar, M. (2006). I Am the Ultimate Challenge. *European Journal of Women's studies, 13*(2), 259-296.

Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Crime: Future Directions for Feminist Criminology. *Feminist Criminology, 1*(1), 27-47.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2011). *Psyche der Macht. Das Subject der Unterwerfung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Christensen, A. D., & Jensen, S. Q. (2012). Doing Intersectional Analysis: Methodological Implications for Qualitative Research. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 20*(2), 109-125.

Claes, L. (2014). *Mensen met een verstandelijke beperking in een vastgelopen situatie: onderzoek naar levenstrajecten vanuit een kruisbestuiving van theoretische perspectieven* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Proefschrift ingediend tot het behalen van de academische graad van Doctor in de Pedagogische Wetenschappen, Universiteit Gent.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and Research in Psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*(3), 170.

Connor, D. J., Gabel, S. L., Gallagher, D. J., & Morton, M. (2008). Disability Studies and Inclusive Education: Implications for Theory, Research and Practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*(5-6), 441-457.

Corker, M., & French, S. (1999). *Disability Discourse.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Corker, M., & Shakespeare, T. (2002). *Disability/Postmodernity: Embodying Disability Theory.* London: Continuum.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum,* 138-167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299.

Crooks, V., Owen, M., & Stone, S. (2012). Creating a (More) Reflexive Canadian Disability Studies: Our Team's Account. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies, 1*(3), 45-65.

Crow, L. (1996). Including All of Our Lives: Renewing the Social Model of Disability. In C. Barnes, & G. Mercer (Eds.), *Exploring the Divide* (pp. 55-72). Leeds: The Disability Press.

Cuádraz, G. H., & Uttal, L. (1999). Intersectionality and In-depth Interviews: Methodological Strategies for Analyzing Race, Class, and Gender. *Race, Gender & Class, 6*(3), 156-172.

Danforth, S., & Gabel, S. (2007). *Vital Questions Facing Disability Studies in Education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful. *Feminist Theory, 9*(1), 67-85.

Davies, B. (2014). *Listening to Children. Being and Becoming.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (2006). *Doing Collective Biography*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition.* London: Athlone Press.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotations: 1972-1990* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* London: Continuum.

Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretative Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21stCcentury.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Schauwer, E. (2011). *Participation of Children with Severe Communicative Difficulties in*

Inclusive Education and Society (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Proefschrift ingediend tot het behalen van de academische graad van Doctor in de Pedagogische Wetenschappen, Universiteit Gent.

Elliot, T. (1991). Making Strange What Had Appeared Familiar. *The Monist, 77*(4), 424-433.

Erevelles, N. (2011). *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fenge, L.-A., Jones, K., & Read, R. (2010). Connecting Participatory Methods in a Study of Older Lesbian and Gay Citizens in Rural Areas. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 9(4), 320-333.

Fine, M. (2007). Feminist Designs for Difference. In S. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Gabel S., & Peters S. (2004). Presage of a Paradigm Shift? Beyond the Social Model of Disability toward Resistance Theories of Disability. *Disability & Society, 19*(6), 585-600.

Garland-Thomson, R. (2005). Feminist Disability Studies. *Signs, 30*(2), 1557-1587.

Goodley, D. (2000). *Self-Advocacy in the Lives of People with "Learning Difficulties".*

Buckingham: Open University Press.

Goodley, D. (2010). *Disability Studies: an Interdisciplinary Introduction*, London: Sage.

Goodley, D. (2013). Dis/entangling Critical Disability Studies. *Disability & Society, 28*(5), 631-644.

Goodley, D., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2012). Reading Rosie: The Postmodern Disabled Child. *Journal of Educational and Child Psychology, 29*(2), 53-66.

Goodley, D. & Van Hove, G. (2005). *Another Disability Studies Reader? People with Learning Difficulties and a Disabling World.* Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Grillo, T. (1995). Anti-Essentialism and Intersectionality: Tools to Dismantle the Master's House. *Berkeley Women's Law Journal, 10,* 16-30.

Hall, K. Q. (2011). *Feminist Disability Studies*. Indiana: University Press.

Hancock, A. M. (2007). Intersectionality as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm. *Politics and Gender, 3*(2), 248-253.

Hancock, A. M. (2007). When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining

Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics, 5*(1), 63-79.

Hankivsky, O., & Cormier, R. (2009). *Intersectionality: Moving Women's Health Research and Policy Forward.* Vancouver: Women's Health Research Network.

Hankivsky, O., Reid, C., Cormier, R., Varcoe, C., Clark, N., Benoit, C., & Brotman, S. (2010). Exploring the Promises of Intersectionality for Advancing Women's Health Research. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 9*(5), 1-15.

Hearn, J. (2011). Neglected Intersectionalities in Studying Men: Age(ing), Virtuality, Transnationality. In Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar & Linda Supik (Eds.) *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Jacob, J., Köbsell, S., & Wollrad, E. (2010). *Gendering Disability. Intersektionale Aspekte von Behinderung und Geschlecht.* Bielefeld: Transkript Verlag.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2008). Participatory Action Research: Communicative Action and the Public Sphere. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Krumer-Nevo, M. (2009). From Voice to Knowledge: Participatory Action Research, Inclusive Debate and Feminism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22*(3), 279-296.

Kuppers, P. (2011). *Disability Culture and Community Performance: Find a Strange and Twisted Shape*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Leafgren, S. (2009). *Reuben's Fall: A Rhizomatic Analysis of Disobedience in Kindergarten.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

McCall, L. (2005). The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*(3), 1771-1800.

Meekosha, H., & Shuttleworth, R. (2009). What's So "Critical" about Critical Disability Studies? *Australian Journal of Human Rights, 15*(1), 47-76.

Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking Intersectionality. *Feminist Review, 89*, 1-15.

Oliver, M. (1990). *The Politics of Disablement: A Sociological Approach.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Price, J., & Shildrick, M. (1998). Uncertain Thoughts on the Disabled Body. In M. Shildrick, & J. Price (Eds.) *Vital Signs: Feminist Reconfigurations of the Biological Body.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Prins, B. (2006). Narrative Accounts of Origins. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 13*(2), 277-290.

Rinaldi, C. (2006). *In Dialogue with Reggio Emilia. Listening, Researching and Learning.* London: Routledge.

Rinaldi, J. (2013). Reflexivity in Disability Research: Disability between the Lines. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 33*(2).

Raab, H. (2007). Intersektionalität in den disability studies. Zur Interdependenz von Behinderung, Heteronormativität und Geschlecht. In A. Waldschmidt, & W. Schneider *Disability Studies, Kultursoziologie und Soziologie der Behinderung. Erkundigen in einem neuen Forschungsfeld.* Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Rogers, J., & Kelly, U. A. (2011). Feminist Intersectionality: Bringing Social Justice to Health Disparities Research. *Nursing Ethics. 18*(3), 397-407.

Sen, G., Iyer, A., & Mukherjee, C. (2009). Methodology to Analyse the Intersections of Social Inequalities in Health. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, 10*, 397-415.

Sermijn, J., Devlieger, P., & Loots, G. (2008). The Narrative Construction of the Self. Selfhood as a Rhizomatic Story. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(4), 632-650.

Simien, E. (2007). Doing Intersectionality Research: From Conceptual Issues to Practical Examples. *Politics & Gender 3*(2), 264-271.

Söder, M. (2009). Tensions, Perspectives and Themes in Disability Studies. *Scandinavian Journal of disability Research, 11*(2), 67- 81.

Staunæs, D. (2003). Where Have All the Subjects Gone? Bringing Together the Concepts of Intersectionality and Subjectification. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 2*(11), 101-109.

Thomas, C. (2004). Developing the Social Relational in the Social Model of Disability: a Theoretical Agenda. In C. Barnes, & G. Mercer *Implementing the Social Model of Disability: Theory and Research.* Leeds: The disability Press

Tillman-Healy, L. M. (2003). Friendship as Method. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(5), 729-749.

Titchkosky, T. (2007). *Reading & Writing Disability Differently: The Textured Life of Embodiment.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tolhurst, R., Leach, B., Price, J., Robinson, J., Ettore, E., Scott-Samuel, A., Kilonzo, N., Sabuni, L.P., Robertson, S., Kapilashrami, A., Bristow, K., Lang, R., Romao, F., & Theobald, S. (2012). Intersectionality and Gender Mainstreaming in International Health:

Using a Feminist Participatory Action Research Process to Analyse Voices and Debates from the Global South and North. *Social Science & Medicine, 74*(11), 1825-1832.

Truth, S. (1851, May). *Ain't I a Woman?* Speech Presented at the Women's Convention, Akron, Ohio, 28-29 May 1851.

Turnbull, A. P., & Turnbull, H. R. (2002). From the Old to the New Paradigm of Disability and Families: Research to Enhance Family Quality of Life Outcomes. In J. L. Paul, C. D. Lavely, A. Cranston-Gingras, & E. L. Taylor (Eds.) *Rethinking Professional Issues in Special Education* (pp. 83-118). Westport, USA: Ablex Publishing.

Van Hove, G. (1999). Coöperatief onderzoek met personen met een verstandelijke handicap. *Tijdschrift voor Orthopedagogiek, Kinderpsychiatrie en Klinische Kinderpsychologie, 24*(1), 24-33.

Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality: a Challenge for Feminist Geography. *Professional Geographer, 59*(1), 10-21.

Verdonschot, M. M. L., De Witte, L. P., Reichrath, E., Buntinx, W. H. E, & Curfs, L. M. G. (2009). Community Participation of People with an Intellectual Disability: a Review of Empirical Findings. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 53*(4), 303-318.

Villa, P. (2011). Embodiment is Always More: Intersectionality, Subjection and the Body. Framing Intersectionality. In H. Lutz, M. T. Herrera Vivar & L. Supik (Eds.) *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept in Gender Studies.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Walmsley, J. (2001). Normalisation, Emancipatory Research and Learning Disability, *Disability and Society, 16*(2), 187-205.

Walmsley, J., & Johnson, K. (2003). *Inclusive Research with People with Learning Disabilities: Past, Present and Futures.* London/New York: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Weber, L., & Parra-Medina, D. (2003). Intersectionality and Women's Health: Charting a Path to Eliminating Health Disparities. In M. T. Segal, V. Demos, & J. J. Kronenfeld (Eds.) *Advances in Gender Research: Gendered Perspectives on Health and Medicine,* Vol. 7(A). San Diego: Elsevier.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. *European Journal of Women's studies, 13*(3), 193-209.