OUTLINES - CRITICAL PRACTICE STUDIES

Transformative anti-ableist pedagogy for social justice: Charting a critical agenda for inclusive education

Dušana Podlucká

Department of Social Science, LaGuardia Community College

City University of New York

New York, USA

Abstract

Higher education institutions are legally bound to provide equal educational opportunities for diverse learners, traditionally materialized as individualized accommodations. This paper contends that despite the growing interest and scholarship in implementing more inclusive pedagogy enabling access to education for all students (e.g. Universal Design for Learning), those efforts still fall short of systematically addressing intersecting, oppressive, and anti-ableist practices in the classroom. I argue that in order to develop a truly inclusive, equitable, socially just and transformative pedagogy, we need a theory that frames disability in the context of learning and development in a manner that overcomes dichotomized and reductionist perspectives of disability and individualistic notions of learning. Drawing on my research on the dis/abling impact of teaching and institutional practices for a community college student diagnosed with autism, analyzed through the lens of Critical Disability Studies in conjunction with Vygotsky's theory of defectology and recent advances in cultural-historical activity theory, especially the Transformative Activist Stance (Stetsenko, 2016), this paper offers steps toward integrating these approaches into a transformative pedagogy framework for inclusive, equitable, and anti-ableist pedagogy for all learners.

Higher education institutions in the U.S. are legally bound to provide equal educational opportunities and inclusive learning environment for diverse learners. However, educators and administrators are struggling to come to a clear understanding of what educational equality and inclusion means and how it should be implemented. Drawing on my research on the dis/abling impact of teaching and institutional practices for a student diagnosed with autism in an urban community college (Podlucká, 2013), I review extant practices based on current legislation for providing accommodations for students diagnosed with a disability in the context of the US higher education. I discuss some key gaps and contradictions in how these are typically implemented, focusing on a critique of educational practices and concepts aimed at supporting students diagnosed with disabilities. My contention is that the dominant institutional ideology utilized by practitioners and materialized in practices of Disability Student Services Office (DSSO, also frequently regarded as Accessibility Office), perpetuates students' disablement and oppressive ableist practices. The DSSO administrators and educators commonly operate from the perspectives that result in promoting individualistic, static, decontextualized understanding of learners and learning such as individualized accommodations and the concept of learning styles (LS) that has been recognized for its outdated conceptual limitations.

This paper further critically examines the pedagogical approaches that focus on extending inclusion of and accessibility for all learners, namely Universal Design (UD) -based approaches. Furthermore, I argue that in order to create equitable educational opportunities based on principles of social justice for students diagnosed with disabilities there is a dire need for faculty and staff to not only recognize disability as socially constructed, a point that has been argued for and well developed by Disability and Critical Disability scholars. It is crucial to conceptualize inclusive pedagogy from a *critical developmental perspective* that theorizes disability in the context of the dialectical relationship between learning and development. As I demonstrate in this paper, without a clearly articulated non-reductionist and dynamic understanding of learning and human development, including theorizing student agency within institutional and social practices in light of access to resources (e.g., cultural tools) and opportunities to meaningfully contribute to community practices, even those progressive approaches to inclusion fall short of challenging deeply ingrained and widespread individualist, essentialist, and static conceptions of learning that ultimately disempower and de facto disable students. Drawing on recent advances in Disability Studies and Critical Disability Studies, and Vygotsky's general theory of development and theory of defectology, and Stetsenko's Transformative Activists Stance approach, I explore the possible integration of these approaches and outline a framework for transformative, inclusive, equitable, and anti-ableist pedagogy for all *learners.*

Higher education institutional policies and practices

The Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and 2004, under Section 504, require higher education institutions in the U.S. to provide *reasonable accommodations, academic adjustments,* and *equal access* for students diagnosed with a disability[1] to all college programs and services. The initial implementation of this law was mostly concentrated on the needs of physically disabled students, such as providing ramps for wheelchair users or books in Braille for the blind (Freedman, 2010). However, when the legislation was later applied to students diagnosed with invisible disabilities[2], the very understanding of what constitutes equal access, reasonable accommodations, and academic adjustments became a controversial issue. Besides lack of funding, the ambivalence and resistance of instructors to implement this legislation further contributed to problems while attempting to enforce equal access and reasonable accommodations. For example, the literature consistently reports that the instructors who are mandated to provide reasonable accommodations, often without much guidance, understanding of specific disability, or knowing individual students, express concerns about lowering academic standards and rigor (Cook, Hennessey, Cook, & Rumrill, 2007; Cook et al., 2006; Freedman, 2010; Grigal & Hart, 2009) or that providing reasonable accommodations is too time consuming (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000).

Given the dearth of detailed guidelines and, as I argue below, the undertheorized character of extant conceptions of disability, it is not surprising that the ways in which the policies and practices are interpreted and implemented in the context of providing education to students diagnosed with invisible disabilities in individual colleges vary greatly (Podlucká, 2013). Though all colleges and universities are required to have a DSSO or its equivalent (e.g. Accessibility Office), those offices often focus on a narrow interpretation and mechanical application of accommodation services. The main role of DSSO is to assure that colleges implement the law and legislative policies aimed at providing access to education for students diagnosed with disabilities. However, in order for students to receive services and assistance from the DSSO, which purportedly enable "equal access" to education, they must provide documentation of a diagnosed disability so they can register at the office. In other words, student access to services and support considered as any *additional* services, as well as academic or nonacademic support to those commonly available to any student, is contingent on disclosed and documented disability[3]. In addition, those students need to register with the office every semester in order to continue to receive those services and accommodations.

---

[1] Instead of using person-first language (e.g. student with disability) or identity-first language (disabled student) I use a term "student diagnosed with a disability" to emphasize the socially constructed nature of disability and marked identity that the person may or may not choose to identify with)

[2] Invisible disabilities refer to broad range of disabilities or challenges that are not immediately "apparent" to others, including psychiatric disabilities such as depression, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, Post-traumatic disorder, as well as chronic pain, asthma, HIVAIDS, diabetes and neurological diagnosis (e.g. dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia, ADHD) and autism.

[3] For example, a student diagnosed with autism can request additional support only if s/he identifies as *disabled,* or as '*a student with disability*' and registers with the DSSO. Some higher education institutions provide specific services, for example autism-related support and services outside of the DSSO, in some cases at additional cost.

Therefore, one consequential implication of this legislation, or the very basis of it, is the affirmation of a disabled identity, which is reestablished and confirmed every semester in order to maintain access to services and accommodations by providing necessary documentation. It can be argued that a student has to position herself as marginalized in order to gain access to the resources, tools, and spaces needed be included in learning, which is readily available to other students. Quite ironically, students have to exclude themselves as non-normative learners in order to access inclusion resources. Although the role of DSSO is to enable equality, the official discourse of the DSSO and institutional practices locates disability within individual students, thus positioning them as the 'owner' of the disability. Arguably, this limits their participation in learning and other institutional practices by establishing an unequal and marginalized position of disabled learner right from the start. *Claiming* the identity of "student with disability" is a starting position from which those students engage in learning activities which then becomes incorporated in their identity construction as learners – a "learner with disability" that is disempowering and ultimately disabling to learning.

Furthermore, in the process of claiming disability status, students are encouraged to disclose their diagnosis to administrators of the DSSO. Although the disclosure of a disability occurs on a voluntary basis, a student will not receive accommodations unless he or she discloses this information. Usually, once a student is registered and her eligibility for services is acknowledged, the student must meet with and discuss appropriate accommodations with a counselor. These are often based on the "documented needs, previous accommodations, and functional limitations of the student" as explained on college website. The counselor then issues accommodation letters for instructors. Students diagnosed with a disability are responsible to hand in those letters to all instructors, but in order to protect their privacy and prevent stigmatization, they are not required to disclose their disability to instructors. However, as Barnard-Brak, Lechtenberger, and Lan (2010) note, the socio-cultural necessity of maintaining information regarding one's disability as private and confidential, "this imperative for privacy in itself implies that there's something wrong with being disabled" (p. 421) and may be perceived and experienced as contributing to further stigmatization. Not surprisingly, research suggests that a significant number of students do not disclose their diagnosis and opt not to register with DSSO to avoid labeling and stigma associated with disability, especially invisible disability diagnosis (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010; Cole & Cawthon, 2015).

Individualized accommodations

I turn now to individual accommodations, the main aspect of implementing the disability legislation in higher education institutions, which colleges are required by law to provide in the form of "any reasonable accommodation that may be necessary for equal access to education"[4] Typically, accommodations to students are provided on an individual basis and may include extended testing time, interpreters, note taking, and other adaptive technology services. However, higher education institutions are not required to develop

[4] As commonly stated on the US universities websites

any special programs for disabled students or have Individualized Educational Plans[5] (IEP's), as is the case for students in elementary or high school. Furthermore, a college student diagnosed with a disability is not only encouraged but actually expected by the institution to act independently and advocate for herself. Positioned by the institution as young adults, as opposed to dependent children, students have the right to choose having information about their case discussed with their parents through signing a release of information document. Because the college student is in charge of their educational planning, they decide what is to be disclosed to parents or guardians. Although this policy positions the student as an independent self-advocate, in some situations this may disadvantage the student, especially if they are not used to or unable to effectively self-advocate. Frequently, DSSO staff members encourage students to develop a set of self-advocacy skills and abilities, including (a) *understanding their disability*; (b) *communicating disability* (i.e. students should be able to describe how the disability limits them functionally); and (c) *being proactive*.

The educational and life goals for students diagnosed with a disability, on which higher education institutions and DSSOs operate, aim at developing individual responsibility, self-determination, self-reliance, and, ultimately, autonomy and independence. These goals and their corollary institutional policies and practices reflect the mainstream social discourse of independent and autonomous human being as an ideal vision for students diagnosed with disabilities. Such individualized and autonomous notion of self, re/produced mostly by psychology and related disciplines and institutions (Danziger, 1990, 1997; Goodley, 2017; Rose, 1998), aligns with and further promotes the neoliberal mantra of capitalism that values an able individual (Goodley, 2017) that is able to participate in production of surplus (Erevelles, 2011, 2016). Despite the fact that major theories of selfhood consider the social and interdepend origins of self-development and learning (Martin & McLellan, 2008), educational institutions and individual practitioners serving students diagnosed with disabilities continue to rely on individualistic psychologized notions of self. Hence, they focus on "fostering the independence of individual learners" (for an extensive critique, see Robertson, 2001, p. 122). My contention is that transforming prevailing educational goals and ideologies, on which support to students diagnosed with disabilities are based, requires a radical epistemological shift towards a contextualized understanding of human development and the self that focuses on the social and interdependent nature of psychological processes.

Institutional practices for accommodating students diagnosed with a disability

Individual accommodations are implemented via institutional practices designed and proposed by the DSSO. As they emphasize providing information to and communication

---

5 Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) – is a plan or program designed with a goal of addressing educational needs of a child who attends either elementary or secondary institution and is diagnosed with a disability. The plan identifies type of specialized instruction and related supportive services and educational and developmental goals for a child. Every child who receives special education services must have an IEP. The IEP is developed by a team that includes key school staff , the child's parents that might be accompanied or represented by a child's advocate.

with faculty, they decisively contribute to how instructors understand and position their students. DSSO practices are mediated by a range of resources, including information for instructors about the legal rights and responsibilities of students registered with DSSO, faculty's own rights and responsibilities, specific disability information for teaching 'students with disabilities' and suggestions and teaching strategies related to these specific diagnoses. However, due to established practices for securing confidentiality of information regarding student disability, the information that the DSSO makes available to faculty, such as required accommodations and recommendations for best practices for teaching students with particular disabilities, are quite limited from the point of view of faculty in need of adjusting their pedagogical practices to meet the needs of students diagnosed with a disability. In some instances, instructors are informed in greater detail about the legislation based on which reasonable accommodations are expected to be provided and made available to students, and that these accommodations are not supposed to lower standards of learning, but rather to enable students' access to it. Instructors are usually made aware of the fact that the accommodations might be determined based on the specific disability or "functional limitations" resulting from it, though neither will be disclosed to them. Instructors are informed that they are not going to be involved in the accommodation selection process. They are simply expected to provide or allow students to utilize mandated accommodations. Consequently, the very instructors who are responsible to design course curriculum, organize learning spaces in order to create opportunities to access course content and promote student's learning, are typically excluded from discussing the specific needs of students diagnosed with a disability taking their courses. This in fact precludes instructors from identifying preferable modes of participation and evaluation for their students, as well as other aspects of their learning in the context of the given course and subject area. For instance, this was made evident to me when I interviewed faculty and the DSSO director during my research project (Podlucká, 2013) centered on examining teaching and institutional practices for a student diagnosed with autism. Overall, the instructors I interviewed reported that, for various reasons, communication between them and the DSSO is more of an exception rather than regular practice. Nonetheless, they indicated that informal negotiations with the DSSO was the most effective practice to help them work with and support students diagnosed with a disability, suggesting that they would benefit from more significant support from the DSSO and the institution in general. Thus, the ability of the DSSO to attain its official goal to support students *and* faculty is quite limited. In reality, the DSSO operates predominantly as a merely administrative body, managing students registered with the DSSO.

Instructors often perceive that the institution leaves them ill equipped to design instruction and utilize effective accommodations for students diagnosed with a disability. If information of a specific disability is provided to or shared with them at all, it often lacks clear guidelines regarding how they are supposed to put to use information on specific disabilities, especially in the case of invisible and/or undisclosed disabilities. Typically, the information colleges make available to instructors is limited to providing a series resources to faculty, including a general description of specific disabilities that usually contains the definition of common conditions, brief description of their symptoms and their possible manifestations, as well as typical accommodations students might benefit from suggesting the selection of accommodation type based on disability type. As a result, instructors face tensions in their efforts to adjust teaching practices based on such limited necessary institutional support. For instance, it is problematic for instructors to provide

accommodations relevant to a specific disability without trying to monitor, observe or identify students' 'symptoms' themselves. Such attempts can easily lead to the risk of misinterpreting and neglecting to accommodate students' actual needs as well as stigmatizing and subjecting students to ableism.

Pedagogical recommendations: The persistence of learning styles

In addition to delivering accurate information about legislation requirements for the provision of accommodations to students diagnosed with a disability, DSSOs commonly make available pedagogical recommendations and suggestions for faculty teaching those students. As I quickly learned while interacting with the staff from the DSSO in the college where I conducted my research, and reading the materials they provide to faculty, recommendations and support for instructors to develop inclusive teaching practices are typically based on the notion of learning styles. This was corroborated by reviewing pedagogical recommendations in different US colleges. The concept of learning styles, represented in a range of theories and inventories (including David Kolb's experiential learning model (1984), Dunn & Dunn's Learning Style Inventory (1975), Neil Fleming's VAK-visual, auditory, kinesthetic- model (1995), or Honey & Mumford's Learning Styles Questionnaire (1992)) refers to the notion that learners have an individual style of learning understood as a stable characteristic. An abundance of critical and systematic reviews have demonstrated that the theoretical construct of learning styles does not fit with and in fact clashes with most commonly accepted constructivist and sociocultural theories of learning and development due to its theoretical incoherence, low reliability, poor validity and "minimal impact on teaching and learning" (Coffield, Moseley, Hall, & Ecclestone, 2004a, 2004b; Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, & Bjork, 2008). Nevertheless, this concept continues to be extremely influential as a guiding principle of teaching and providing educational support to students diagnosed with disabilities in higher education. Its widespread use is particularly alarming given that the concept has been thoroughly criticized as oppressive and discriminatory due to its individualistic and decontextualized connotation of learners and the learning process (e.g., Reynolds, 1997; Guttierez & Rogoff, 2003, for excellent critiques).

Paradoxically, the still growing influence of learning styles as guiding principle for developing instructional support especially for students diagnosed with invisible disabilities, can be traced to the well-intentioned efforts concerned with rejecting a deficit view of disability. Drawing on the recently emerging movement of neurodiversity and on the social model of learning difference, proponents of this notion call for understanding invisible disabilities as 'neurological differences' (e.g. Armstrong, 2011, 2012; Griffin & Pollak, 2009; Lawson, 2001, 2006; Martin, 2009; Pollak, 2009; Symonds, 2009). My contention is that such claims deserve careful scrutiny. To be sure, efforts of applying the concept of neurodiversity in higher education by a number of authors (e.g. Pollak, 2009; Armstrong, 2011, 2012) should be commended for attempting to contribute a positive view of students diagnosed with neurological diagnoses by (a) emphasizing social and therefore anti-deficit view of disability, (b) valuing the diversity of neurodiverse students contributing to body of learners and teaching process, (c) promoting implementation of rules and tools of Universal Design for Instruction and other nontraditional methods of instruction and assessment, and (d) increasing awareness of neurodiversity and embracing it as a part of human diversity. However, though advocates of the neurodiversity approach

endorse the social model of disability, thus rejecting in principle individualistic views of disability (and of human nature in general), they nonetheless contradict their own efforts as they unwittingly continue to rely on individualistic notion of human mind and learning. This is clearly manifested in reductionist claims, central to their neurodiversity position that we should speak of 'difference' rather than 'disability', that a different type of brain results in different cognitive processing that consequently leads to different learning styles. Although the concept of neurodiversity has undeniably played a pivotal role in forming a societal "counter-narrative" in the "process of cultural critique and resistance to ideological hegemony" (Broderick & Ne'eman, 2008, p. 459), it is necessary to recognize its limitations and to fully acknowledge its potentially harmful implications, especially if implemented in educational practice.

In my view, using neurodiversity to view students diagnosed with autism, or other 'neuro-atypical' learners, as essentially having different brains and, consequently corresponding different learning styles that simply need to be adequately 'matched' with a variety of types of assignments and evaluation and assessment methods, amounts to an oversimplified and de facto reductionist view of the learners and the process of learning itself. This view is essentially relying on a cognitivist view of 'neurological differences' that, despite the efforts of focusing on nondeficit aspects, sustains locating them in the individual's brain. The following quote by Ravet (2013, p. 948) illustrates the level of misconception underpinning fashionable but inflated promises of neuro-explanations in psychology and education in the current wave of neuromania (Arievitch, 2017). In an article about the inclusion of learners on the autism spectrum, the author claims that unless teachers understand and recognize their students' "autism learning style" they are "likely to revert to a normative, 'majoritarian' construction of learning" which may lead to teachers misreading "what is going on *inside the heads of learners* on the autism spectrum, and cause them to make partial and inaccurate inferences about their learning" (Ravet, 2013, p. 948, emphasis added). As this example makes clear, our pedagogical approaches, especially for students diagnosed with invisible disabilities, frequently suffer from reducing the learning process to the biology of brain, or what Bakhurst calls 'brainism' (2008, 2011). Arievitch (2017), in his eloquent discussion of the inadequacy of neuro-explanations in education, points out that learning cannot be explained exclusively in terms of neural mechanisms—as in theories that describe abnormalities in brain wiring in autism. As he argues, while "brain functions create the necessary physiological support for the mind, these functions can neither determine nor "explain" the mind" (p. 22). As an illustration, Arievitch explains that while it may be "possible to describe what is going on in the brain when an individual buys something, or when an individual decides whether someone is guilty of some wrongdoing," it is nevertheless "impossible on this basis to *explain* the concepts of exchange value or criminal justice." (p. 22, emphasis in the original). Rather than reducing learning and knowledge construction to patterns of firing and inhibiting groups of neurons, genuinely "explaining" mental processes such as learning requires addressing *"the agent's activity in the world"* (p. 23). This is what McDermott (1993) accomplished in his now classic description of "The acquisition of a child by a learning disability". Rather than locating the disability in the depths of the child's brain, McDermott describes it as emerging from the situated dynamics of the child's interactions with teachers and peers mediated by specific cultural tools, including diagnostic discourses and pedagogical practices, in the context of an afterschool program.

My contention is that if we continue to design our educational practices on such outdated understanding of the human mind as locked inside of heads of our students, and remain stubbornly focused on individual students, we will continue failing and disabling all of our students, regardless of treating their brains as "different" or "disabled". Furthermore, the notion of 'matching' in relation to learning styles has been rejected as impractical and empirically unsupported by research (Curry, 1983; Doyle & Rutherford, 1984; Ruble & Stout, 1993). Such narrow understandings of 'neurological' or other cultural difference as an individualistic trait leads to what Gutiérrez and Rogoff (2003) recognize as:

> strategy of locating characteristics separately in the person and in the "context," and "crossing" style and context as in the Aptitude X Treatment approach. In educational settings, work on learning styles has often attempted to take context into account by seeking style matches between students and schooling experiences or between student and teacher (Banks, 1995). However, some application of this approach are based on an assumption that an individual's "style" is a trait that is independent of task and context, and that is constant over time. Such a matching strategy does not account for change- in the individual, the activity setting, or the community-and it assumes one style per person according to the individual's group categorization. (p.19)

Similarly, Reynolds (1997) points out the danger of such student-dependent and decontextualized understandings of learning and pedagogy. Drawing on notions of difference as "historical construction" (Popkewitz, 1988, cited in Reynolds, 1997), and political rather than technical category (Giroux, 1991, cited in Reynolds, 1997), Reynolds (1997) argues that the "very *concept* of learning styles obscures the social bases of difference expressed in the way people approach learning", which provides "discriminatory basis for dealing with difference in gender or race" (p. 122). Indeed, the learning styles concept has been used by psychologists as a discriminatory and ableist tool to explain 'cognitive deficit' and 'academic failures' in 'minority students' (for critique see Foley, 1997; Irvine & York, 1995; Kavale & Forness, 1987; McCarthy, Lynch, Wallace, & Benalty, 1991; Reynolds, 1997). However, though the learning style concept "deflects attention from the larger social system as a determinant of inequality", it remains attractive because "it appears to be humanistic, concrete, direct and immediate" (Sarup, 1986, as cited in Reynolds, 1997, p. 125).

The learning style concept wrapped in the discourse of promoting difference, diversity, and inclusion appeal to well-meaning education professionals because it seems to offer them guidance in developing inclusive teaching and institutional practices. School counselors and staff supporting students diagnosed with invisible disabilities are recommended to employ learning styles-based assessment instruments to facilitate transitioning from high school to college, including identifying students' learning styles so they can become more independent and advocate for themselves in college (e.g., Krell & Pérusse, 2012; Roberts, 2010). Teachers' training and professional development are designed based on the learning style concept in order to be prepared educational professionals "to address different learning styles and cultural backgrounds" and thus create a "more inclusive campus" (Williams, 2016). What usually escapes their scrutiny is how this concept fits neatly in the neoliberal discourses that promote a business model of education couched in notions of individualism and independence, which feeds into the blooming industry of publishing learning styles assessment tests and guides for educators.

As Hick, Kershner, and Farrell (2009) point out, education often suffers from adapting psychological concepts uncritically, including learning styles, without examining relevant

research evidence. The upshot is that conventional college support practices for students diagnosed with disabilities continue to be grounded in outdated individualistic, deficit-driven medical models, which perpetuates the understanding of disability as an individual characteristic of the learner.

Expanding inclusive education beyond accessibility and disability rights: Addressing disability from a social justice perspective

With the increasing diversification of higher education student populations, educators recognize the limitations of accommodations geared exclusively towards individual learners diagnosed with disabilities. The search for a more inclusive and equitable pedagogy has made some approaches, such as the Universal Design based approaches to learning, increasingly popular. UD based approaches to learning include Universal Design in Education, Universal Design for Learning, Universal Design for Instruction, Universal Design of Instruction, and Universal Instructional Design (see McGuire, 2014 for the review of the frameworks), all of which apply principles of Universal Design (UD)[6] originally developed in architecture, to education and learning contexts. Their goal is to enhance accessibility of learning instructions to all learners, including students diagnosed with disabilities, by designing and delivering instruction by identifying and eliminating unnecessary barriers to teaching and learning while maintaining academic rigor (Burgstahler, 2015; Burgstahler & Cory, 2010). Universal Design frameworks strategies aim at enhancing accessibility of learning materials and meeting the needs of all students regardless of a disclosed and/or identified disability (Orr & Bachman Hamming, 2009).

Unfortunately, many educators and service providers understand UD frameworks as a practical extension to learning styles, as a set of tools that "acknowledge the different learning styles of students in the classroom and encourages teachers to create flexible approaches to learning that can accommodate many students' learning styles" (Williams, 2016, p. 48). Thus, despite the enormous value of UD frameworks, it is important to recognize its limitations as well. UD related frameworks represent a valuable set of strategies that can enhance accessibility of teaching instructions for all learners. For example, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL), the most widely used UD framework developed by the Center for Applied Special Technology, "guides the design of instructional goals, assessments, methods, and materials that can be customized and adjusted to meet individual needs" (CAST, 2018). It offers "a set of concrete suggestions that can be applied to any discipline or domain to ensure that all learners can access and

---

[6] Universal Design (UD) concept – developed by the Center for Universal Design in North Carolina State University in 1997 and calls for "The design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design" (NC State University, The Center for Universal Design, 1997). The seven principles of UD include: Equitable use; Flexibility in use; Simple and intuitive use; perceptible information; Tolerance for error, Low physical effort; Size and space for approach and use (CUD, 1997).

participate in meaningful, challenging learning opportunities", by providing "multiple means of engagement, representation and action and expression" for all learners (ibid.). As such, UD frameworks have been integrated with sociocultural theories of learning that emphasize making available multiple tools and flexible forms of participation in learning activities. However, inasmuch as UD frameworks are not grounded in a broader theory of learning at the intersection of human development, they do not conceptualize fundamental and highly contested issues underpinning pedagogical practices, such as the nature of conceptual development and knowledge construction, the relationship between teachers and students, curriculum organization and, more generally, the purpose of learning. Moreover, although UD frameworks challenge the uniformity of pedagogy, authors such as Waitoller and Thorius (2016) have pointed out that they do not allow for dismantling the prevailing ableism and other forms of oppression in educational practices. Hence, they propose a 'cross-pollination' between Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP)[7] (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014, 2017), as the latter was develop to "account for students dis/ability in addition to race, ethnicity, language, and class" and "dismantle intersecting and compounding forms of exclusion" (p. 368). According to them CSP is crucial to inclusive pedagogy as it sustains (i.e., supports and fosters) "linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of a democratic project of schooling" (Paris, 2012, p 95). Importantly, CSP calls for all involved in the education process to reflect on their own cultural practices that might be oppressive to other groups and reproduce hegemonic oppression such as sexism, ableism, homophobia and racism (Paris & Alim, 2014).

Disability studies and critical theory scholars have long pointed out that learning and development, especially in students diagnosed with disabilities, is hindered by ableism, frequently intersecting with racism, sexism, classism, and other discriminatory and oppressive practices (e.g., Alim et al., 2017; Annamma, Connor, & Ferri, 2013; Annamma, Ferri, & Connor, 2018; Broderick & Lalvani, 2017; Connor, Ferri, & Annamma, 2016; Gabel & Connor, 2014; Promis, Erevelles, Matthews, 2001). Though the need to address disability has given rise to the notion of inclusive education, underpinned by a social justice ethos, historically, disability has been systematically excluded from the discourses of social justice and diversity (Buffington-Adams & Vaughan, 2019; Gibson, 2015; Liasidou, 2014), intersectionality (Erevelles & Minear, 2010; Nocella, 2009), and critical perspectives of education (Anderson, 2006; Erevelles, 2000; Goodley, 2007; Liasidou, 2012). Thus, Disability and Critical studies scholars have called for understanding inclusive education as a political process (Dolmage, 2017; Gibson, 2015) that engages in dismantling social injustices and challenges the status quo and normative practices (Burke, 2012). Indeed, Broderick and Lalvani, (2017) suggest that in order to eliminate ableist practices from educational institutions and "promote social justice agendas for learners with diverse needs" (ibid, p. 209), it is necessary to engage prospective teachers in critically understanding intersecting oppressive practices. In addition, I suggest that such critical analysis also needs to be incorporated into the teaching agendas of all postsecondary educators, not just in the curriculum for student teachers in training or Disability Studies programs. This is in consonance with disability

[7] Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014, 2017), is one among several approaches aimed at redressing the dominance of white middle class values and norms in education, such as multicultural and culturally responsive pedagogy.

scholars who propose to incorporate Disability Studies into the curriculum in US schools (Baglieri & Shapiro, 2012; Gabel & Connors, 2009; Ware, 2002) so that *all learners* engage in social justice investigation (Beckett, 2015; Florian & Spratt, 2013). Systematic recognition and interrogation of intersecting oppressive practices must become an integral part of college education so students can understand, actively challenge and resist ableism and other structural inequities of social order. Importantly, a truly transformative inclusive education moves beyond helping students to recognize social injustices by providing them with tools of agentive and activist positioning to challenge and resist ableism and other systems of oppression in which we are all implicated, participate in, and contribute to.

In addition, preparing faculty to develop inclusive pedagogies requires broadening current forms of institutional support beyond the narrow focus on (a) increasing awareness of disability and developing positive attitudes toward students' diagnosed with a disability (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Hong & Himmel, 2009; Leyser & Greenberger, 2008; Love et al., 2014; Rao, 2004; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999) ; and (b) providing professional development for faculty on disability issues and inclusive education (Debrand & Sazberg, 2005; Davies, Schelly, & Spooner, 2013) and implementing UDL strategies in teaching (Black, Weinberg, & Brodwin, 2014).

Inclusive education has also been influenced by the disability rights movement. Recently, scholars have called for expanding this movement with a focus on learning from and with students diagnosed with disabilities. According to Gibson (2015) their experiences constitute an invaluable source of knowledge for educators who seek to design and implement inclusive pedagogy. She suggests that engagement in political conversations among "diverse and 'non-diverse' voices" to "challenge hegemonic power constructs" is indispensable to develop what she calls 'post human rights' inclusive education (p. 884). In her words,

> [s]pace is needed for cultures of difference to be explored, for questions to be asked, political conversations to be held and or educators to reflect on and reaffirm their political and moral commitments to our diverse [higher education] worlds. For a new post-rights inclusive pedagogy to evolve, all who engage with these processes need to remember that the most important task is to continue pushing against the flow. (pp. 884-885)

I fully concur that the experiences of students diagnosed with disabilities should undoubtedly be considered as constitutive elements of creating inclusive higher education institutions and challenging ableist practices. Nonetheless, I argue, that in order to develop a truly inclusive, equitable, socially just and transformative pedagogy, we need a theory that posits disability in the context of learning and development, a theory that integrates disability into human development in a manner that overcomes dichotomized and reductionist perspectives of disability and individualistic notions of learning (Podlucká, 2013).

Toward a transformative activist anti-ableist pedagogy

In articulating the principles for an inclusive transformative pedagogy, I draw on Vygotsky's general theory of development (1978, 2004), his theory of defectology (1993), and on Stetsenko's Transformative Activist Stance (TAS; 2016).

While Vygotsky's theory of development posits learning as a relational process situated in a student's meaningful engagement in social practices mediated by cultural tools, this idea

is further developed within the TAS approach (Stetsenko, 2016) with its emphasis on learning as a pathway to finding one's place among others in society by contributing to a sought-after future that moves beyond the status quo.

Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory of development and theory of defectology

Vygotsky suggests that social interactions mediated by cultural tools are the source and foundation of human development, which is dialectically connected with learning as interdependent processes, fundamentally social and collaborative in their nature (Vygotsky, 1978). This dialectical unity of learning and development posits learning as a leading force of development, and a process of identity making. Therefore, learning is central to understanding student development. Consequently, a pedagogy that makes a promise of inclusion and commits to equity requires that we take into consideration the dynamic, dialectical and intersecting relationships between learning, self and disability. Vygotsky's theory of defectology[8] (1993), also referred as theory of disontogenesis, which focuses specifically on the development of cognitively and physically disabled children, is of particular relevance. It is important to note that both Vygotsky's general theory of development and his theory of defectology are the result of his deep social commitment and engagement with the most disadvantaged members of society, such as homeless and disabled children (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004). His involvement with his society, its old and emergent issues, together with his commitment to building a new, just society were materialized in this (till this day) revolutionary understanding and explanation of human development (for further discussion of socio-historical context of Vygotsky's work (see e.g. Knox & Stevens, 1993; Lompscher, 2006; Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004). It is no surprise that one of the most important assets of his theory, although often overlooked in many of its modern interpretations, is the commitment to social justice.

This point is extremely important as it converges with the focus of disability studies on the inclusion of disabled persons, which is ultimately an issue of social justice. Regarding the development of disabled children, Vygotsky provides a theoretical explanation of why, for them, equal access to cultural tools that allow for participation in and contribution to collective activities is not only a matter of human rights, or merely an opportunity that *might* enhance development, but rather these are *necessary* and *constitutive* forces and conditions of development. In fact, Vygotsky (1993) called for a modern defectology that would be liberated from "any trace of philanthropic, invalid-oriented, or religious atmosphere based on an interaction of pity and charity" (p. 17).

The fundamental principles of Vygotsky's defectology is understanding the development of a disabled child from a *positive differential approach*. Specifically, he argued for disability to be understood and approached as a different path of development and becoming, rather than deficiency of normalcy. This point is complementary with a

---

[8] The language used by Vygotsky to refer to disability, disabled children, and their development appears outdated. For a reader in the 21st century might seem to reflect a deficit model of disability. However, it is important to read his work within the historical context and keep in mind that Vygotsky wrote a theory of defectology in the early 20th century, when such terminology was a common (and the only available) practice. When I wrote about his theory, I made an effort to change and update the original language as much as possible, while maintaining the original meanings. I kept the original expressions (e.g. "abnormal child") when directly quoting Vygotsky. For more on the terminology see Gindis, 1994, 2003).

positive view of disability championed by Disability Rights Movements and Disability Studies scholars that is in contrast with the traditional positioning of children diagnosed with disabilities as deficient and pathologized individuals (Gibson, 2015). According to Gibson (2015), the goal of inclusive education to achieve accessibility and equality have been mostly realized via 'widening participation' of disabled students, however without providing adequate support to students and educators (ibid, p. 877). Vygotsky's theory provides theoretical guidance for creating such practices. Indeed, a number of scholars have turned to Vygotsky's defectology (1993) and explored its potential to guide inclusive education in the context of K-12 (Daniels, 2009; Daniels & Hedegaard, 2011; Gindis, 1995, 1999, 2003; Kozulin & Gindis, 2007; Vik & Somby 2018).

One of the most important contributions of Vygotsky's theory of defectology (1993), and principle based on which inclusive pedagogy can be based, is his dynamic conceptualization of disability based on distinguishing between *primary* and *secondary* causes and impairments. This distinction provides a theoretical explanation for how disability is socially constructed from a psychological perspective. Vygotsky (1993) proposed that the primary impairment is an organic one, due to either endogenous and exogenous biological causes. The secondary impairment refers to a consequent alteration of higher psychological functions (e.g. abstract reasoning, logical memory, voluntary attention, etc.) that results from the interaction of the primary impairment with the social environment of the disabled child. The primary, organic impairment can prevent a child from mastering some social skills and knowledge, which usually leads to irregular or what would be considered delayed development. However, Vygotsky argued that many of the resulting symptoms are of a secondary nature, as they are acquired in the process of social interactions. As Vygotsky emphasized, it is the child's social milieu, including social interactions and cultural tools available (or not) to the child, not the organic impairment per se, that alter the child's development and results in disontogenesis ("defective" development). Obviously, the quality and accessibility of social interactions and cultural tools mediating all the activities of the child are of utmost importance for her development.

As Vygotsky emphasized, the distinction between primary and secondary causes of developmental impairments is not simply of theoretical interest, but has profound implications for intervention, and education in particular, because its secondary complications and delays are more responsive to therapeutic pedagogical activity- unlike organic conditions that cannot be eliminated. Therefore, the focus for educators' endeavor to create an inclusive pedagogy should always be providing support that would address, and possibly prevent, the secondary causes of the learner's disablement. Furthermore, Vygotsky (1993) suggested that positive differential approach represented understanding disability as a unique rather than deficient path of development that requires *diversified and adequate cultural tools* materialized in a special system of cultural signs and symbols adapted to the specific psychophysiological characteristics of a developing child. Vygotsky attributed a prominent role to cultural tools in human learning and development, in his own words (1993):

> [I]n order that the child mediates, makes sense of, and interacts in a meaningful way with the environment, he or she must have access to and acquire a multitude of psychological tools or artificial, historically developed, cultural signs available to shape and organize the world. (p.15)

Vygotsky further points out that because most of the psychological tools are designed for the typically developing person with all senses and mental functions in principle intact, "special psychological tools must be developed for the abnormal child which focus on his or her other healthy functions and residual strength" (1993, p. 15). The implication here is that all children, with or without biological impairment, follow the same general principles and laws of development and education. Consequently, the psychological nature of instruction should be identical. However, the techniques for instructing a child must differentiate depending on the nature of her impairment. The meaning of the tool and the goal of the psychological function to be developed by mastering the tool is the same for typically and atypically developing children. However, the technical shape and the actual type of tool is different and must be adapted to, and be in congruence with the impairment, so the mediation of a cultural and/or psychological meaning is possible. For instance, in the case of language, the leading and the most important tool for child development, it is not important what form it takes (e.g. sign language, Braille or other forms of language representation, or a special communication devise). What matters is that the child appropriates the tool through its meaning, as it is the meaning encoded in the tool that is important, not the tool itself. Therefore, it is the activity and its context, including the goals and motives in which the meaning of the tool is embedded and gives a rise to such meaning, that is crucial, not the type of the tool. Vygotsky's articulation of the pivotal role and the meaning of cultural tools in learning and development suggest that while learners diagnosed with a specific disability would benefit from tools, including specific devices, instructions and other accommodations designed as disability specific (e.g. a specific mode of communication such as Braille or sign language), the function and the meaning of the tools (e.g. facilitation of communication) is identical for all learners. This point serves as an important guide for designing curriculum, teaching instructions and for providing accommodations for students diagnosed with disabilities because it addresses a common reservation among educators about lowering the expectations and watering down the content. For example, although the means of re/presenting the conceptual tools, or implementing assessment strategies, might be different to accommodate different types of communication, the meaning of the tool remains the same for all learners.

Furthermore, Vygotsky repeatedly emphasized that in order to truly understand the child's *complex* developmental path, the socio-cultural and historical contexts in which it occurs must be considered as constitutive forces, rather than additive factors. He called for understanding the disabled child as a complete being, focusing on his or her entire personality, rather than on isolated impairments and diagnosed disabilities. In addition, Vygotsky warned that focusing on "defects" themselves does not produce understanding of neither the "defect" nor the child. Rather, we need to view development as context-dependent and focus on the dialectical relationship between the impairment and the child's personality (i.e., the socio-psychological realization of disability). It is impossible to understand the impairment itself unless it is studied in connection to psychological structures and the child's personality, what for Vygotsky means the system of activities and hierarchy of motives in which the defect enters. This point further illustrates the dialectical unity of disability, learning and development.

The overarching idea of Vygotsky's disontogenesis can be summed up in a single statement that the child, even if born with impairment, only *becomes* disabled in the process of her development. Disability, just as the self, mind, as well as all psychological functions, originates and develops in human activity, always mediated through cultural

tools. Therefore, the extent of a learner's disablement is understood as a result of lacking or inadequate cultural tools and/or social interactions through which the tools are introduced, not the "deficiencies" of the individual. Vygotsky, in his theory explains that depending on the organization of social practices in which a child (with impairment) participates and engages in, and the cultural tools available to her, the child can achieve different levels of development. Consequently, the principal role of education is to create opportunities that will promote learners' engagement and mastery of cultural tools and practices. Vygotsky's conceptualization of development and learning, the role of social interactions and cultural tools in human development, clearly point out to the roots of inequality and exclusion in education, and provide a framework for creating socially just inclusive pedagogy.

Transformative activist stance based pedagogy and its implications

Expanding on Vygotsky's ideas, the Transformative Activist Stance developed by provides the theoretical grounding to further elaborate an inclusive transformative pedagogy based on principles of social justice (Stetsenko, 2008, 2014, 2016, 2017 and for applications, see Darley, 2018; Vianna & Stetsenko, 2011, 2014). The fundamental principle advanced by the TAS that offers further guidance for inclusive pedagogy is that all humans are "equal in their core capacities" and that all persons have "infinite potential" for development. Such open-ended, dynamic understanding of human development and learning posits *all* learners, including those who have traditionally been excluded from education, as capable of learning with infinite potential to change. Though the similar concept of transformability, which posits that all students can learn and have capacity to change, has been proposed in disability scholarship (Hart, Dixon, Drummond, & McIntyre, 2004), the TAS offers a more radically egalitarian grounding for inclusive pedagogy by arguing that all students despite their uniqueness, including the corresponding educational support each requires, have "unlimited potential" and are "*equal precisely in the incalculable and immeasurable infinity of their potential*" (Stetsenko, 2014, pp. 116-117, emphasis in original).

In sharp contrast views of the learner as a solitary, independent and autonomous entity, the TAS posits human development and learning to be grounded in unique agentive contributions to *transformative collaborative activities* through which a person participates, engages and *contributes* to social practices, thus transforming those practices and oneself in the process (Stetsenko, 2014). This notion of individual contribution challenges the traditional dichotomy of social and individual as "contribution is something that individuals do but only as members of their communities who are fully immersed in social collaborative practices" (Stetsenko, 2010, p. 9). According to this view, the key role of teaching and learning is to create opportunities for individuals to acquire the cultural tools (e.g. scientific concepts) that allow learners to contribute to social practices and society (Stetsenko, 2008). Hence, the role of the educator is to facilitate students' mastery, creation, and transformation of cultural tools; the tools of their own development that enable them to position themselves and act as *agents of change* in their professional communities and cultural worlds. The TAS further emphasizes that this change is always oriented towards the future, as every knowledge and its construction arrives from "a particular historical location" and from within leaners' "agendas and visions for the future" (Stetsenko, 2014, p. 195). These agendas, always located in the past and present and oriented towards the future, involve taking an activist stance of "how present

community practices *ought* to be changed and, thus what kind of future *ought* to be created" (Stetsenko, 2014, p. 192, emphasis in the original).

Accordingly, a TAS-based pedagogy conceives of the curriculum in terms of providing tools of agency (Stetenko, 2016; Vianna & Stetsenko, 2019) with which students can explore, interrogate and destabilize inequalities, including intersecting oppressive practices that students are subjected to, or otherwise participate in or contribute to. As a result, students are viewed not merely as consumers of an accessible curriculum, as is often the case in implementation of UD instructions in the absence of a broader pedagogical framework that clearly specifies how teaching, learning and development are connected. Rather, according to the TAS, students are positioned as activist agents engaged in co-creating the conditions of their own learning in inclusive classroom environments and building inclusive and equitable communities (Stetsenko, 2016). Such activist positioning of students is particularly important to students diagnosed with disabilities, who have traditionally been treated as objects of education (Dolmage, 2017). Indeed, a TAS based pedagogy positions *all learners* as contributors to collaborative practices, social change, and their own learning and development. Instead of merely giving a nod to diversity, which is often addressed as an add-on to currently existing educational practices through accessibility efforts, diversity is at the core (or the very fabric) of a TAS-based pedagogy insofar as it is *inter*dependently realized by the unique contribution of each and *all* students.

Furthermore, the notion of a learner (and teacher) actively taking a stance towards the future-in-the-making distinguishes a TAS-based pedagogy from asset and emancipatory pedagogies, including culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP). CSP focuses on *sustaining* cultural pluralism, for example, by interrogating and critiquing "the simultaneously progressive and oppressive currents in […] youth practices" (Alim, 2011, p. 93, cited in Waitoller and Thorius). While fully concurring with this view, I contend that the importance of critique notwithstanding it needs to be complemented with more agentive and activist emphasis on transforming community practices, including teaching-learning, through spurring learners' agency.

Importantly, the TAS highlights human agency as socially, collectively and historically constructed. This fundamental point seems to get lost when the agency and subjectivity of disabled people are considered, and those diagnosed with intellectual disabilities in particular, as these concepts are usually replaced by the individualized, decontextualized and a-historical notions of the self and disability (Goodley, 2017). Opposition to such limited reading of agency, and of subjectivity and disability, is also echoed by Critical Disability Studies scholars. For instance, Erevelles (2005) calls for a 're-configuration' of human agency in relation to disability, which remains conceptualized in terms of normative ability, rationality and autonomy. As she explains, such deficit view of agency is due to a historical association of disability with disease, which has been further associated with "inconvenience, nonproductivity, weakness, lack of autonomy, and incapacity" (2005, p. 74). Such non-agentic view of disabled persons has contributed to their systemic exclusion from social practices, including labor and education. It is precisely such re-configured conceptualization of agency, which is currently missing from Disability Studies and Critical Disabilities Studies scholarship, that the TAS offers. As Stetsenko (2019) argues, the TAS counters narrow views of agency that closely align with neoliberal views that take it to be about:

being able to effect changes that are only narrowly efficient for the goals of taking control of one's life, achieving success and other serving egoist pursuits centered on individuals, each on their own, fitting in with the present regime of neoliberalism. In other words, this type of agency is not about efficacy and efficiency of individuals taken as autonomous entities. (p. 8)

Rather, radical transformative agency is realized as a "confrontation with the status quo" (Stetsenko, 2019, p. 8) in which students and teachers collaboratively engage, "as part of their struggle for a better world coterminous with their own becoming-their becoming agents of history and of the world-in-the-making" (p. 8). This recasts the goal of teaching and learning as "assisting students in developing their ability to take their own stands and stake their own claims on what is going on in the world and their communities, including their place and role in these processes", of which their lived experiences and funds of knowledge are an important part of, "while learning to matter, that is to imagine and commit to a future they come to believe is worthy a struggle." (Stetsenko, 2019, p. 10).

In my view, it is such notion of agency that is needed to more resolutely reposition disabled, as well as other marginalized and oppressed social groups of difference, as agentic and activists actors of community and social practices. As previously suggested, in order to practice a truly inclusive pedagogy and society, it is imperative to address widespread normative and ableist practices, and their intersections with other types of oppressions. Not only does a the TAS based pedagogy call for creating opportunities for students diagnosed with disabilities, whose unique voices, bodies and minds have been historically and systematically ignored and excluded from contributing to learning communities. Crucially, the TAS calls for positioning them as experts of their lives who have intimate knowledge of ableism and disableism. Critically, this pedagogy is not about a superficial tokenistic way of allowing students with disabilities to participate, voice their stories, and be tolerated in the classrooms. It is about an opportunity for able-bodied learners to learn from and with those who are the most marginalized, in and outside of the classrooms, and whose experiences and knowledge are essential in our struggles against alarming disparities in education and other areas of the society. Their marginalized positions, stories of discrimination, and their knowledge of reality and the extent of everyday oppression are central to our understanding of conflicts and contradictions, how to resist, overcome and change social inequalities.

Conclusion

This paper reviews institutional policies and current practices for providing support for students diagnosed with a disability common to higher educations in the U.S. and discussed key gaps and contradictions in how they are typically implemented. It also examines the institutional processes that the students diagnosed with disabilities undergo in order to gain access to learning, the role of offices for students diagnosed with a disability in providing this access in the form of individual accommodations, and the impact of this implementation strategy on teaching practices. This review revealed that some higher education institutional policies and practices aimed at enabling accessibility of learning re/produce ableism and position students as 'disabled'. The review also disclosed that learning styles concept are still the common basis for interpreting disability and providing instructional support in higher education. I propose to move away from these practices that rely on individualized notion of learning and learners. Furthermore,

the paper discusses Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP), approaches that are increasingly gaining attention from educators and disability studies scholars in their efforts at designing and implementing inclusive instructional practices. While acknowledging the value of UDL and CSP for enhancing accessibility of learning and promoting inclusion of diverse learners, I call for moving beyond these approaches towards transformative pedagogy.

The focal goal of this paper is to contribute to a conversation about what transformative pedagogy for inclusive, equitable, and anti-ableist education for *all learners* might look like. Though this is undoubtedly a daunting task, I believe that engaging in interdisciplinary dialogue between developmental perspective and disability scholarship can be not only fruitful but necessary. Specifically, I propose that in order to develop a truly inclusive, transformative and socially just pedagogy it needs to be based on a developmental perspective that posits disability in the context of a dialectical and dynamic relationship between learning and development and breaks away from individualistic and reductionist notions of learner, learning and disability.

In addition to pedagogy, the practices and policies, including educational goals and ideologies on which education and support to students diagnosed with are formulated, require a radical epistemological shift towards an interdependent, contextual and dynamic understanding of learning, human development and agency. Consequently, in our efforts of developing and practicing inclusive pedagogy we need to shift our attention from individual learners to learning as a collective and collaborative activity. I suggest that a Vygotskian conceptualization of disability and development, together with Stetsenko's TAS approach, can provide theoretical guidance for developing adequate instructional educational support and pedagogy as well as institutional policies.

Vygotsky's general theory of development, and his theory of defectology in particular, provide a strong foundation for inclusive pedagogy by explaining psychological and developmental disability and disablement as socially constructed. He also made clear that the foremost role of educators is to promote students' development of higher mental functions by providing them with differentiated instructions and other culturally mediated tools. Importantly, as Vygotsky pointed out, given the socio-cultural origins of development, educators can (and should) focus on limitless opportunities for students' development instead of students' impairments.

Stetsenko's further expansion of the Vygotskian project with TAS approach provides a road map for inclusive pedagogy by pointing to the infinite human potential to change and contribute, independently or interdependently, to transformative collaborative activities. Based on the TAS, the proposed transformative pedagogy positions all students as agents of change within the teaching/learning process in reciprocal, mutually constitutive manner. Importantly, the teaching/learning process is not organized as a purely abstract intellectual endeavor distanced and separated from the real life of students and their communities. Quite the opposite, a TAS-based pedagogy suggests that we design and practice teaching and learning as a process of promoting and developing students' and teachers' radical-transformative agencies, understood as collectively and historically constructed in the process of collaborative engagement against the status quo while employing critical-theoretical tools of the corresponding disciplines. Ineluctably, a transformative pedagogy represents a political process rather than one of acquisition of neutral and objective information. According to this view, issues of social justice and

diversity, including disability, must be infused into curriculum of all disciplines for all learners. A socially just, anti-ableist, transformative pedagogy invites students and teachers of all disciplines to interrogate the ethico-political underpinnings of competing disciplinary knowledge, thus collaboratively and agentively engage in the exploration of how their fields contribute to addressing, either transforming or re/producing social, economic, cultural, environmental and other inequalities.

References

Alim, H. S., Baglieri, S., Ladson-Billings, G., Paris, D., Rose, D. H., & Valente, J. M. (2017). Responding to "cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for dis/ability". *Harvard Educational Review*, *87*(1), 4-25.

Anderson, R. C. (2006). Teaching (with) disability: Pedagogies of lived experience. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *28*(3-4), 367-379.

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(1), 1-31.

Annamma, S. A., Ferri, B., & Connor, D. (2018). Disability critical race Theory: Exploring the Intersectional lineage, emergence, and potential futures of DisCrit in Education. *Review of Research in Education, 42*, 46-71.

Arievitch, I. M. (2017). *Beyond the brain: An agentive activity perspective on mind, development, and learning*. Springer.

Armstrong, T. (2011). *The power of neurodiversity: Unleashing the advantages of your differently wired brain*. Da Capo Lifelong Books.

Armstrong, T. (2012). *Neurodiversity in the classroom: Strength-based strategies to help students with special needs succeed in school and life*. ASCD.

Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European journal of special needs education*, *17*(2), 129-147.

Baglieri, S., & Shapiro, A. (2012). *Disability Studies and the Inclusive Classroom: Critical practices for creating least restrictive attitudes*. Routledge.

Bakhurst, D. (2008). Minds, brains and education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *42*(3-4), 415-432.

Bakhurst, D. (2011). *The formation of reason*. John Wiley & Sons.

Barnard-Brak, L., Lechtenberger, D., & Lan, W. Y. (2010). Accommodation strategies of college students with disabilities. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(2), 411-429.

Beckett, A. E. (2015). Anti-oppressive pedagogy and disability: possibilities and challenges. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, *17*(1), 76-94.

Black, R. D., Weinberg, L. A., & Brodwin, M. G. (2014). Universal design for instruction and learning: A pilot study of faculty instructional methods and attitudes related to students with disabilities in higher education. *Exceptionality Education International*, *24*(1), 48-64.

Bourke, A. B., Strehorn, K. C., & Silver, P. (2000). Faculty members' provisions of instructional accommodations to students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *33*, 26-32.

Broderick A., & Ne'eman A. (2008). Autism as metaphor: narrative and counter-narrative. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *12* (5-6), 459-476.

Broderick, A., & Lalvani, P. (2017). Dysconscious ableism: toward a liberatory praxis in teacher education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 894-905.

Buffington-Adams, J., & Vaughan, K. P. (2019). The Curriculum of Disability Studies: Multiple Perspectives on Dis/ability. Introduction: An invitation to complicated conversations. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *34*(1).

Burgstahler, S. E., (Ed.). (2015). *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice*. Harvard Education Press, Cambridge.

Burgstahler, S. E., & Cory, R. C. (Eds.). (2010). *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice*. Harvard Education Pres, Cambridge.

CAST (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. Retrieved from http://udlguidelines.cast.org

Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E., & Ecclestone, K. (2004a). *Should we be using learning styles?: What research has to say to practice*, LSRC reference, Learning & Skills Research Centre, London.

Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E., Ecclestone, K. (2004b). *Learning styles and pedagogy in post-16 learning. A systematic and critical review.* London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.

Cole, E. V., & Cawthon, S. W. (2015). Self-Disclosure decisions of university students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *28*(2), 163-179.

Connor, J. D., Ferri, B., & Annamma, S. A. (2016). *DisCrit: Disability studies and critical race theory in education*. Teachers College Press.

Cook, B. G., Rumrill, P. D., Becket-Camarata, J., Mitchell, P. R., Newman, S., Sebaly, K. P., Steuernagel, G. A., Cook, L., & Hennessey, M. L. (2006). The impact of a professional development institute on faculty members' interactions with college students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities, 14* (1), 67-76.

Cook, L., Hennessey, M., Cook, B. G., & Rumrill, P. D. (2007). The views of university faculty members and service providers regarding the increased enrollment of students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 14*(3), 205-216.

Curry, L. (1983) An organisation of learning styles theory and construct. ERIC document no. ED 235 185.

Daniels, H. (2009). Vygotsky and inclusion. In P. Hick, R. Kershner, & P. Farrell (Eds.). *Psychology for inclusive education*. Routledge, pp. 36-49.

Daniels, H., & Hedegaard, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Vygotsky and special needs education: Rethinking support for children and schools*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Danziger, K. (1990). *Constructing the subject: Historical origins of psychological research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Darley, S. (2018). Learning as a process of personal-social transformation: Volunteering activity in health and social care charities. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 25(3), 199-215. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039.2018.1476549

Davies, P. L., Schelly, C. L., & Spooner, C. L. (2013). Measuring the effectiveness of Universal Design for Learning intervention in postsecondary education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *26*(3), 195-220.

Debrand, C. C., & Salzberg, C. L. (2005). A Validated Curriculum to Provide Training to Faculty regarding Students with Disabilities in Higher Education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *18*(1), 49-61.

Dolmage, J. T. (2017). *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education*. University of Michigan Press.

Doyle, W., & Rutherford, B. (1984). Classroom research on matching learning and teaching styles. *Theory Into Practice, 23*(1), 20-25.

Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1975). *Educator's self-teaching guide to individualizing instructional programs*. Parker Publishing Company.

Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational theory*, *50*(1), 25-47.

Erevelles, N. (2005). Rewriting critical pedagogy from the periphery: Materiality, disability and the politics of schooling. In S. Gabel (Ed.). *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method* (Vol. 3). Peter Lang, p 65-83.

Erevelles, N. (2011). *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. Springer.

Erevelles, N. (2011). The "other" side of the dialectic: toward a materialist ethic of care. In *Disability and difference in global contexts* (pp. 173-197). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Erevelles, N., & Minear, A. (2010). Unspeakable offenses: Untangling race and disability in discourses of intersectionality. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, *4*(2), 127-145.

Fleming, N.D. (1995), *I'm different; not dumb. Modes of presentation (VARK) in the tertiary classroom*, in Zelmer, A., (Ed.) Research and Development in Higher Education, Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Conference of the Higher Education and Research Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA), HERDSA, Volume 18, pp. 308 – 313.

Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). Enacting inclusion: a framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *28*(2), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111

Foley, D. E. (1997). Deficit thinking models based on culture: The anthropological protest. In. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*, (pp. *113-131).* Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Freedman, S. (2010). *Developing college skills in students with autism and Asperger's syndrome*. London, Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Gabel, S., & Connor, D. (2014). *Disability and Teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gabel, S. L., & Connor, D. J. (2009). Theorizing disability: Implications and applications for social justice in education. In *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 395-417). Routledge.

Gibson, S. (2015). When rights are not enough: What is? Moving towards new pedagogy for inclusive education within UK universities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *19*(8), 875-886.

Gindis, B. (1994). Vygotsky's defectology. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 100 (2), 214-216.

Gindis, B. (1995). The social/cultural implication of disability: Vygotsky's paradigm for special education. *Educational Psychologist*, *30*(2), 77-81.

Gindis, B. (1999). Vygotsky's vision: Reshaping the practice of special education for the 21st century. *Remedial and special education*, *20*(6), 333-340.

Gindis, B. (2003). Remediation through Education: Sociocultural theory and children with special needs. In *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. Cambridge University Press. A. Kozulin,, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, Suzanne M. Miller (Eds.), Cambridge University Press, p 200-221.

Goodley, D. (2007). Towards socially just pedagogies: Deleuzoguattarian critical disability studies. *International journal of inclusive education*, *11*(3), 317-334.

Goodley, D. (2017). *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction*. Sage, London.

Griffin, E., & Pollak, D. (2009). Student experiences of neurodiversity in higher education: Insights from the BRAINHE Project. *Dyslexia, 15*, 23-41.

Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 19.

Hart, D., & Grigal, M. (2009). Students with intellectual disabilities in postsecondary education: The question of "otherwise qualified.". *Students with disabilities: Striving for universal success*, 37-46.

Hart, S., Dixon, A., & Drummond, McIntyre, D. (2004) *Learning Without Limits*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hick, P., Kershner, R., & Farrell, P. T. (2009). Introduction. In psychology for inclusive education. In P. Hick, R. Kershner, & P. Farrell, P. (2009). Psychology for inclusive education. *New directions in theory and practice. London and New York: Routledge*. P 1-10.

Hong, B. S., & Himmel, J. (2009). Faculty attitudes and perceptions toward college students with disabilities. *College Quarterly*, *12*(3), 678-684.

Irvine, J. J., & York, D. E. (1995). Learning styles and culturally diverse students: A literature review. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 484-497). New York: Macmillan.

Kavale, K. A., & Forness, S. R. (1987). Substance over style: Assessing the efficacy of modality testing and teaching. Exceptional Children, 54(3), 228–239.

Knox, J. E., & Stevens, C. L. (1993). Vygotsky and Soviet Russian defectology: An introduction (1993). In R. W. Rieber, & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 2, The fundamental of defectology* (pp. 1-25). New York: Plenum Press.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Kozulin, A., & Gindis, B. (2007). Sociocultural theory and education of children with special needs: From Defectology to Remedial Pedagogy. In: H. Daniels, M. Cole, J. Wertsch, Eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky.* Cambridge University Press, NY 2007, pp. 332-363.

Krell, M., & Pérusse, R. (2012). Providing college readiness counseling for students with autism spectrum disorders: A Delphi study to guide school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, *16*(1), 29-39. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.29

Lawson, W. (2006). Typical development, learning styles, single attention and associated cognition in autism (SAACA). *Good Autism Practice, 7* (2), 61-71.

Leyser, Y., & Greenberger, L. (2008). College students with disabilities in teacher education: Faculty attitudes and practices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *23*(3), 237-251.

Liasidou, A. (2012). Inclusive education and critical pedagogy at the intersections of disability, race, gender and class. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, *10*(1), 168-184.

Liasidou, A. (2014). Critical disability studies and socially just change in higher education. *British journal of special education*, *41*(2), 120-135.

Lompscher, J. (2006). The cultural-historical activity theory. In Sawchuk, P., Duarte, N., & Elhammoumi, M. (Eds.). *Critical perspectives on activity: Explorations across education, work, and everyday life*. Cambridge University Press, 35-51.

Love, T. S., Kreiser, N., Camargo, E., Grubbs, M. E., Kim, E. J., Burge, P. L., & Culver, S. M. (2014). STEM Faculty experiences with students with disabilities at a Land Grant Institution. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *3*(1), 27-38.

Martin, J., & McLellan, A.M. (2008). The educational psychology of self-regulation: A conceptual and critical analysis. *Studies of Philosophy and Education, 27*, 433-448.

Martin, N. (2009). Asperger's syndrome: Empathy is a two-way street. In D. Pollack (Ed), *Neurodiversity in higher education: Positive responses to specific learning differences*. Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.

McCarthy, T.L., Lynch, R.L., Wallace, S., & Benalty, A. (1991). Classroom Enquiry and Navajo Learning Styles: a Call for Reassessment. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 22, 42-59.

McDermott, R. P. (1993). The acquisition of a child by a learning disability. In S. Chaiklin and J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (269-305).

McGuire, J. M. (2014). Universally accessible instruction: Oxymoron or opportunity? *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 27 (4), 387-398.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice*, *31* (2), 132-141.

Mumford, A., & Honey, P. (1992). The Manual of Learning Styles. Maindenhead: Peter Honey.

Nocella, I. J. (2009). Disabling Dis-ability: Re-building inclusive into social justice. *Theory In Action*, *2*(1), 140-157. doi:10.3798/tia.1937-0237.08033

Orr, A.C., & Bachman Hamming, S. (2009). Inclusive postsecondary strategies for teaching students with learning disabilities: A review of the literature. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 32,* 181-196.

P. Hick, R. Kershner, & P. Farrell (Eds.). *Psychology for inclusive education*. Routledge.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational researcher*, *41*(3), 93-97.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What Are We Seeking to Sustain through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 85-100.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., Bjork, R. (2008) Learning Styles. Concepts and evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 9 (3), 106-119.

Podlucká, D. (2013). *Dis/Abling a learner diagnosed with autism: The dialectics of learning and development in higher education*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.

Pollack, D. (2009). Introduction. In D. Pollack (Ed.), *Neurodiversity in higher education: Positive responses to specific learning differences* (pp. 1-12). Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.

Pollack, D. (2009). *Neurodiversity in higher education: Positive responses to specific learning differences*. Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.

Promis, D., Erevelles, N., & Matthews, J. (2001). Reconceptualizing inclusion: The politics of university sports and recreation programs for students with mobility impairments. *Sociology of sport journal*, *18*(1), 37-50.

Rao, S. (2004). Faculty attitudes and students with disabilities in higher education: A literature review. *College Student Journal*, *38*(2), 191-199.

Ravet, J. (2013). Delving deeper into the black box: formative assessment, inclusion and learners on the autism spectrum. *International Journal Of Inclusive Education*, *17*(9), 948-964. doi:10.1080/13603116.2012.719552

Reynolds, M. (1997). Learning styles: A critique. *Management Learning*, *28*(2), 115–133. https://doi-org.rpa.laguardia.edu/10.1177/1350507697282002

Roberts, K. D. (2010). Topic areas to consider when planning transition from high school to postsecondary education for students with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Focus On Autism And Other Developmental Disabilities*, *25*(3), 158-162.

Robertson, C. (2001). Autonomy and identity: The need for new dialogues in education and welfare. *Support for Learning*, *16* (3), 122-127.

Rose, N. (1998). *Inventing ourselves: Psychology, power, and personhood.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ruble, T., & Stout, D. (1993). Learning Styles and End-User Training: An Unwarranted Leap of Faith. *MIS Quarterly, 17*(1), 115-118. doi:10.2307/249512

Sarup, M. (1986). The Politics of Multiracial Education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stetsenko, A. (2010). Teaching–learning and development as activist projects of historical Becoming: expanding Vygotsky's approach to pedagogy. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 5, 6-16.

Stetsenko, A. (2008). From relational ontology to transformative activist stance: Expanding Vygotsky's (CHAT) project. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3 (2), 471–491.

Stetsenko, A. (2014). Transformative activist stance for education: Inventing the future in moving beyond the status quo. In T. Corcoran (Ed.), *Psychology in Education: Critical Theory Practice* (pp. 181-198). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Stetsenko, A. (2016). *The Transformative Mind: Expanding Vygotsky's Perspective on Development and Education*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stetsenko, A. (2017). Putting the radical notion of equality in the service of disrupting inequality in education: Research findings and conceptual advances on the infinity of human potential. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 112-135.

Stetsenko, A. (2019). Radical-Transformative Agency: Continuities and Contrasts with Relational Agency and Implications for Education. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 4, p. 148). Frontiers.

Stetsenko, A., & Arievitch, I. M. (2004). The self in cultural-historical activity theory: Reclaiming the unity of social and individual dimensions of human development. *Theory & Psychology, 14* (4), 475–503.

Symonds, H. (2009). Teaching, learning and assessment: 'It is not like you think'. In D. Pollack (Ed.), *Neurodiversity in higher education: Positive responses to specific learning differences*. Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.

Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2011). Connecting learning and identity development through a transformative activist stance: Application in adolescent development in a child welfare program. *Human Development, 54*, 313-338.

Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2017). Expanding student agency in the introductory psychology course: transformative activist stance and critical-theoretical pedagogy. In Obeid, R., Schwartz, A., Shane Simpson, C. & Brooks, P. (Eds.), *How We Teach Now: The GSTA Guide to Student-Centered teaching.*

Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2019). Turning resistance into passion for knowledge with the tools of agency: teaching-learning about theories of evolution for social justice among foster youth. *Perspectiva*, *37*(4), 864-886.

Vik, S., & Somby, H. M. (2018). Defectology and inclusion. *Issues in Early Education*, 3(42), p 94-102.

Vogel, S. A., Leyser, Y., Wyland, S., & Brulle, A. (1999). Students with learning disabilities in higher education: Faculty attitude and practices. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *14*(3), 173-186.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1993). The fundamentals of defectology. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*, (Vol 2) (pp. 29-338). New York: Plenum Press.

Vygotsky, L., Rieber, R., & Robinson, D. (2004). *The Essential Vygotsky*. The Collected Works of LS Vygotsky. *New York: Plenum*.

Waitoller, F. R., & Thorius, K. K. (2016). Cross-Pollinating Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy and Universal Design for Learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for Dis/Ability. *Harvard Educational Review*, *86*(3), 366-389.

Ware, L. P. (2002). A moral conversation on disability: Risking the personal in educational contexts. *Hypatia*, *17*(3), 143-172.

Williams, L. B. (2016). Student life on the Autism Spectrum: Helping to build a more inclusive campus. *Change: The Magazine Of Higher Learning*, *48*(4), 48-54.

Acknowledgement

About the author

Dušana Podlucká is currently based at LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York, New York City. Her research centres on dynamic relationship between learning, development and disability.

Contact: Social Science Department at Laguardia Community College, City University of New York, Email: Dpodlucka@lagcc.cuny.edu