

ARTÍCULO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

**Multi-dimensional (in)justice and socially just pedagogies: the case of a father with a child with disability**

*(In)justicia multidimensional y pedagogías socialmente justas: el caso de un padre de un niño con discapacidad*

**CAMILA MOYANO DÁVILA**  
*Universidad Finis Terrae, Chile*

**JUAN DE DIOS OYARZÚN**  
*Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile*

**ABSTRACT** In this article, we intend to contribute to the debate of educational justice, especially for children with special needs, challenging those theories that focus only on unidimensional aspects. Using Gewirtz's multidimensional model of justice and the frame of socially just pedagogies, we analyse the case of Oscar, a father of a child with Down Syndrome, who is looking for a school for his son. The case develops in the Chilean educational system context, which is known by its neoliberal policy frame and its highly stratified structure. For this reason, a new inclusion law and, specifically, a new school admission system were implemented in 2015 and 2017 respectively, to generate a fairer and more equal school admission policy frame. Therefore, our theoretical proposition has practical implications, in policy terms, and analytical ones. We propose to add two dimensions of educational justice at the time we analyse Oscar's



Este trabajo está sujeto a una licencia de Reconocimiento 4.0 Internacional Creative Commons (CC BY 4.0).

case: first, educational justice must embrace injustices that are not necessarily experienced in formal educational spaces; we call this the multi-spatiality dimension of justice. Second, we propose a multi-temporality analysis of educational justice, one that considers, as socially just pedagogies have established, a focus on the future. In this case the educational policy and discourse promotes a pre-established and normalised future for children, one that is problematic for children with disabilities, whose parents, like Oscar, have a more urgent focus on the present.

**KEYWORDS** Educational justice; school choice; parents; disabilities.

**RESUMEN** En este artículo, pretendemos contribuir al debate de la justicia educativa, especialmente para niños/as con necesidades especiales, desafiando aquellas teorías que se enfocan solo en aspectos unidimensionales. Utilizando el modelo multidimensional de justicia de Gewirtz y el marco de las pedagogías socialmente justas, analizamos el caso de Oscar, padre de un niño con Síndrome de Down, que busca una escuela para su hijo. El caso se desarrolla en el contexto del sistema educativo chileno, que se caracteriza por un marco político neoliberal y con una estructura altamente estratificada. Debido a esto es que en 2015 y 2017 respectivamente, se implementó una nueva ley de inclusión y, específicamente, un nuevo sistema de admisión escolar, para generar un marco de política de admisión escolar más justo y equitativo. De este modo, nuestra propuesta teórica tiene implicaciones prácticas—en términos de política pública— y analíticas. Proponemos agregar dos dimensiones de la justicia educativa al momento de analizar el caso Oscar: primero, la justicia educativa debe abrazar injusticias que no necesariamente se viven en los espacios educativos formales; a esto lo llamamos la dimensión multiespacial de la justicia. En segundo lugar, proponemos un análisis de multitemporalidad de la justicia educativa, que considere, como lo han establecido las pedagogías socialmente justas, un enfoque hacia el futuro. En este caso, la política y el discurso educativo promueven un futuro preestablecido y normalizado para los niños y niñas, lo que es problemático para los niños/as con discapacidad, cuyos padres, como Oscar, tienen un foco en el presenta más urgente.

**PALABRAS CLAVES** Justicia educacional; elección escolar; padres y madres; discapacidades.

## Introduction

This article aims to contribute to the debate of educational justice theories, specifically regarding the multiple forms of injustices that students with a disabled condition have to face every day at school and in their daily life. We propose a theoretical analysis that results from the study of empirical data. We aim to reflect on the life story of Oscar, father of Tomás, a child with Down Syndrome diagnosis. At the time of the interview, Oscar, who lives in Valparaíso, on the central coast of Chile, was looking for a school for Tomás. We analyse this story using a combined philosophical frame of educational justice, namely, the multidimensional frame of Gewirtz and Socially Just Pedagogies (SJP) approach. By doing so, we recall the whole biography of Oscar and Tomás, considering broader social injustices lived by both of them. Using the account of Oscar, we intend to analyse and challenge the limits of particular theories of educational justice and to propose an analysis that appeals to a multidimensional approach, considering the different temporalities (past, present, future) and the multi-spatiality where Oscar and Tomás' story develops. This approach of justice analysis, we argue, is better suited to the complexity of an experience such as this one. Therefore, this multidimensional perspective compels us to account for the whole biography until the moment of school choice, which we consider as a milestone in the educational path.

Philosophically, the theories that we use in this article help to reflect on the participants' story by understanding to what extent social injustices lived by them in multiple and different spaces—educational and beyond— are relevant to an educational justice analysis. We rely on Gewirtz's model, arguing that making a justice analysis in education should take into account other social injustices, considering the multidimensional scenario of a whole story.

We analyse a biography that develops in a particular educational context. Oscar, Tomás' father, is searching for a school in Chile, a country which is widely known as an illustrative case of a neoliberal education system with robust socioeconomic segregation of students and schools (Elacqua, 2012; Valenzuela et al., 2010). From this diagnosis, in 2015, it was enacted the so-called "Inclusion Law"<sup>1</sup> which eliminates the profit in education, prohibits the selection of students in school admission processes, and progressively ends family co-payment in state-funded schools<sup>2</sup>. Since 2017 the second of these dispositions was gradually implemented, which involves the prohibition of the selection of students for schools, and it gave rise to a new School Admission System (SAS). Today, this centralised and transparent system has replaced the previous decentralised processes, which involved parent and student interviews, the presentation of previous academic records, and admission tests to meet different se-

---

1. Inclusion law is the original name gave it by the State to this law.

2. This type of schools covers the 93% of the students' enrolment in the country.

lection criteria<sup>3</sup> of schools. The new system includes an educational justice standard, which was urgent and necessary in the Chilean educational scenario. Indeed, the new inclusion law for education in Chile attempts to address the costly consequences of economic and market logics for Chilean families. Its pursuit of educational justice, however, focuses on only one dimension: the distribution of resources (Rawls, 1971), because it focuses mainly on appeasing social and economic differences.

We submit the story of Oscar and Tomás to a multi-dimensional (distributive, recognition, and associative) analysis of justice to argue that justice in education should go further from compensatory aspects. It should encompass the multiples injustices that they live through their whole life path. Therefore, the story that we present in this article, and the specific context where it is developed, which combines a persistent and historical educational segregation and a very recent effort to generate a more equal and inclusive admission school mechanism, is particularly interesting to analyse using Gewirtz's (2006) contextual approach. We complement this analysis with two other dimensions that emerge from the data and through the reflection of the theory of socially just pedagogies. We call these two dimensions multi-temporality and multi-spatiality, which are the tools that we propose to complete a justice analysis in education. In sum, the objective of this article is to use Gewirtz's (2006) model and a socially just pedagogies approach to tell the life story of Tomás and Oscar, in the Chilean educational context, and to reflect what extend one could conceptualise justice for and from this family. By doing so, we question the exclusive compensatory role of education policy, and we propose a reflection which considers the multi-spatiality and multi-temporality of the injustices, which in turn could give proper justice to students and their families.

## Theory

Educational justice theories have attributed great importance to the distributional dimension of justice (Brighouse 2007, 2010; Schouten, 2012). Brighouse (2007), one of the most contemporary authors examining this perspective, argued that education seeks to prepare students for four things: being autonomous, being self-controlled, making right life decisions, and managing modern life. Education should also give children tools to take part in the labour market and become good citizens. These four objectives are problematic if we consider all children, especially children with disabilities, who, for example, may need assistance for the entirety of their lives (Goodley, 2007).

---

3. The SAS impede families to use their economic, social, and cultural capital to take advantage of the school admission processes, as they were able to do in the previous decentralised and competitive admission policy.

Despite Brighouse's (2007) significant contribution, there is a great tradition of recognitional theories (Fraser, 2009; Young, 2000, 2007) that address the importance of considering other justice dimensions, which could support a better understanding of different sources of injustice: namely, culture and politics. These two dimensions of justice play an important role in cases like the one presented here.

### **Multidimensionality of educational justice: Beyond distributive justice**

Gewirtz's (2006) starting point was to question how we can know whether an educational policy, practice, or entire system is just. In this sense, Gewirtz sought to explain why the answer to this question cannot leave aside the specific context of its enactment. We later present the way she applied this model to an actual case.

The categories of justice used by Gewirtz include (i) distribution, as an economic approach to justice (i.e., exploitation, marginalisation and material deprivation spaces), but also to the distribution of cultural and social resources; (ii) recognition, in relation to identity, cultural domination, non-recognition and lack of respect, or the distinction of "another" who does not participate in "our" dominant culture (Taylor, 1992, as cited in Gewirtz, 2006); and (iii) associative justice, regarding the possibility for an individual to participate in a decision that will affect them directly inasmuch as they are able to be associative.

Gewirtz (2006) studied the case of Mrs. Miles and her son Martin to illustrate these forms of (in)justice. In terms of distributive injustice, Mrs. Miles had three different non-pay labours. Recognition injustice, on its side, was manifested through the fact that Mrs. Miles did not fit the expected model of a mother, and her family did not fit the school's expected model of a family. Such injustices:

Martin's secondary school on academic success and conventional academic measures of performance means that those young people, like Martin, who do not conform to conventional expectations of how to be a student may feel that what is valuable to them is not valued by the system (Gewirtz, 2006, p. 77).

Finally, in terms of associative injustice, Gewirtz (2006) pointed out that schools have standards of parenthood involvement. Though some of Mrs. Miles' characteristics (e.g., she was proactive and involved in her child's education) converged with these standards, they were not sufficient because she did not meet the economic, social, and cultural requirements of the school.

However, having said that, it is important not to over-simplify the highly differentiated and complex nature of parents' encounters with educational institutions: even middle-class parents with the 'right' kinds of social and cultural capital, particularly those with children identified as having lear-

ning or behavioural problems, can experience the same kinds of frustrations that Mrs. Miles describes (Gewirtz, 2006, p. 77).

In a different aspect, Gewirtz (2006) established the "mediated nature of justice", meaning that justice must be thought about and planned as a practical thing. In other words, we should go beyond abstract principles and put them into practice: "we cannot directly translate principle into practice, but we need to think about what it is reasonable to expect given the competing concerns and constraints which help to shape social action in particular instances" (Gewirtz, 2006, p. 78). In this sense, and because different educational actors have various competing concerns, we must consider contextual aspects, because "what counts as a successful just practice is likely to differ according to the level of enactment. (...) What counts as a successful just practice might also differ according to the context" (Gewirtz, 2006, p. 79).

However, Gewirtz (2006) noted that this analytical exercise does not imply having to relativize every educational practice or justice principle. On the contrary, in an educational justice model, "[i]t is imperative that debates about the contestability and context dependency of justice are used to contribute to the development of more just practices in education and not to detract from the moral and political obligation to promote justice" (Gewirtz, 2006, p. 80).

### **Socially just pedagogies**

The concept of socially just pedagogies has been useful for critiquing those theories that focus the tools of justice on redistributive justice only and/or think about educational justice just through the lens of academic outcomes. Indeed, both these approaches are critiqued in the current paper. Lingard (2005) calls socially just pedagogies "productive pedagogies:" pedagogies that seek to manage and vindicate social and cultural differences in an educational space, while criticising models that neglect or invisibilise such differences<sup>4</sup>, reproducing unequal patterns and cultural domination. This approach to pedagogy includes practices like care, support, intellectual demand, connection, and difference value (Lingard & Keddie, 2013). It views education as a good in itself, not only as a means to achieve success in future adulthood.

Like Lingard's work (2005), theories of new materialism agree that socially just pedagogies are those that vindicate differences (Bozalek, 2018; Bozalek et al., 2016; Leibowitz et al., 2017; Postma, 2016). Differences are productive and not a device of otherness, meaning that education should take an autonomous affirmative stance

---

4. Visualization of differences is a different way to stabilize the "pedagogies of disablement [in which] teachers are assessed in ways that celebrate high-achievement over the valuing of difference" (Goodley, 2007, p. 318).

(Braidotti, 2013). In other words, education should leverage differences as a creative tool for imagining pedagogies without inequalities (Bozalek, 2018).

Socially just pedagogies criticise the focus on causality and temporality in theories of educational justice, arguing that thinking about differences as affirmatives positions, implies thinking about learning as a creative process of indeterminacy, without a fixed proposal or "fixed knowledge of bodies" (Braidotti, 2013). As Barad (2014) suggested, beyond being simply subjects, we are constant becomings. Education that focuses on these differences and the infinite possibilities of becoming is an unexpected, productive, and created process, not a predetermined outcome. Socially just pedagogies outline that the work towards justice in education opens endless future possibilities, not only academic ones.

This may well involve elucidating those everyday happenings that constitute social justice: caring, reciprocity in the educational relationship, ordinariness, extraordinariness, intuition and personal shared understandings between the agents of pedagogy. It also involves accepting and facilitating becomings rather than beings (Goodley, 2007, p. 329).

A normalised future could exclude becomings that do not fit the expected educational standard.

### **Methodological approach: The case of Oscar**

This article uses one case study: a parent interviewed in the city of Valparaíso at the beginning of 2019. The methodological approach used in this article is based on the deepening of a particular narrative that offers relevant insights into the theories of justice questioned here. We consider the case of Oscar, a 37-year-old, father of Tomás, his six-year-old son with Down Syndrome. Oscar had a university degree as a secondary teacher and was working in an adult school. He shared custody of Tomás with his ex-wife. We chose this case because, despite not having an extremely vulnerable situation (he was closer to a lower-middle-class background), we argue that Oscar still had a multidimensional experience of injustice that illustrates the importance of visualizing cases considered by the educational system to be "out of the norm." As we mentioned before, Oscar's experience will be analysed since he knew he was going to become a father. Using a multidimensional approach, we rely on the example of Gewirtz when she takes into account more dimensions of Ms. Miles and his son Martin, such as Ms. Miles's job situation.

Using this case, we seek to offer personal and subjective perspectives on general matters of social justice and justice in education. In particular, we aim to consider the difficulties experienced by a parent of a child with disabilities when choosing school, a decision and a process that involves – and only can be understood from – a review of the whole parenting story of Oscar.

### Oscar's story: Academic outcomes are not an urgency

One of the most relevant aspects of Oscar's narration was that, though the first interview topic was about his school experience with his son Tomás, he began by talking about his ex-wife's pregnancy and Tomás' subsequent birth. He explained that one of the main reasons he decided to end his marriage was that his ex-wife experienced psychological rejection toward the baby when they noticed that he was "*coming with something*"<sup>5</sup> This first episode reflects very well how Oscar understands the educational experience with his son Tomás. Academic outcomes are not his priority, because when talking about education Oscar feels the urgency to connect with other stories, like medical situations or his own experience looking for a job.

We organized the analysis as follows: First, we present Gewirtz's (2006) multidimensional analysis model as it applied to the case of Oscar and his son Tomás. Then, we develop an analytical proposition that is based on this multidimensional analysis but goes further to consider socially just pedagogies, here called the multi-spatial and multi-temporal dimensions of educational justice. Gewirtz's model helps us to give the initial multidimensional analysis. Still, our contribution to the debate of educational justice regards the consideration of the multi-spatial and the multi-temporal aspects of the story. We use the case of Oscar for showing that this type of analysis is vital to understand the complexity of these kinds of experiences.

### Distributive (in)justice

In this section, we show how Oscar narrated the journey of choosing a school that initiated with aspects that apparently are not related to education, but that will have consequences to his search for a school, which at the end is the final stage of the story that we recall here. First, medical situations appeared to be radically important in his school choice. Oscar also faced a dilemma between "special school" and "integrated school," taking into account health and care professionals' recommendations. Finally, Oscar lived injustices in the context of job searching.

The first distributive injustice Oscar faced involved having to go to a public hospital for his son's birth. Public health services lacked sufficient resources (e.g., time to dedicate to each patient) to give timely and complete information on Oscar's son's medical situation: "*Ehhh, he was, when he was a new-born in the ICU [Intensive care unit] (...) he has been terminally ill six times*". Oscar mentioned that several times, health professionals (nurses and medical doctors) told him that his son was about to die, though he never understood why. The lack of a proper medical response from the public health service led Oscar and his ex-wife to study and learn about his son's diag-

---

5. We use italics only for interviews quotes.



nosis, seeking to avoid more uncertainty when discussing their son with professionals. Following his time in the intensive care unit, Tomás initiated early stimulation work. Oscar told us that this opportunity was primarily related to his son's personality, and not to a general response from public services. Physical therapists and speech therapists liked Tomás, so they gave him a scholarship to attend regularly. In other words, we also consider this a type of redistribution injustice, as the opportunity was dependent on his son's charm, not as a matter of health rights.

Regarding education, Tomás first attended a school exclusively for "children with special needs." Oscar was encouraged to enrol Tomás in a school for students with special needs before the regular first school's level, in order to aid his transition from a more supported context. But Oscar recalled that, in the first year of this special school, a young teacher asked Oscar and his ex-wife to move Tomás out of the school, because she felt that she didn't have enough experience to work with him:

*The teacher told us already halfway through the first semester that we had to do everything possible to get Tomás out, wait until he finishes the process and take him away, because they also began to realise that, of course, she recognised herself without experience because she was coming out of college recently.*

In other words, although the school was for students with special needs, it did not have enough material or professional support for Oscar's son.

In the new experience of searching for schools, Oscar noted that he excluded the school that despite being close to his ex-wife and his home, he dislikes its academic approach and focus on results model. He also said that this school was presented as a school with "inclusive practices", but:

*The truth is that it is one of these typical schools that work for numbers, for statistics, for reports. They appear to the outside as an outstanding school, but the teachers stand idly by students with special needs.*

This quote illustrates how the school closest to Oscar's home had no resources to support children like Tomás effectively, which deprives Tomás of having the chance of studying in his father's home closest school. This could be seen as a distributive problem because the school doesn't provide Tomás with a specialized team of teachers –which usually means an increase in the school budget– to work with him in an active and inclusive way.

Finally, Oscar told us that he had had problems finding a job. He was asked about his child during job interviews; however, as soon as potential employers realised Oscar had a child with a disability and shared custody, they rejected his application immediately:

*'Ahhh, but that will bring problems at work. You will not be able to come ...'; and they start with buts, buts ... 'yes, but, so sorry, sorry, but we want someone who has full availability, and as you have your son with health problems, it is better that you dedicate yourself to your son (...).'*

In this sense, Oscar suffered distributive injustice that limited his access to and full use of his capital in the job market. Despite being qualified for the jobs, for which he applied, he was discriminated against for having a child with a disability. In other words, in the end Oscar was economically disadvantaged.

In sum, both Oscar and his son suffered several distribution injustices. First, they struggled to gain access and attention in public health services (i.e., the hospital and stimulation centre). They also suffered a lack of schools with the proper educational resources to work with children like Tomás. Finally, Oscar could not find a job to improve his economic situation.

### **Recognition as (in)justice**

And at the most ordinary level, disabled students continue to be singled out for specialised attention, are segregated from non-disabled peers through the presence of non-disabled adult supporters and remain unrepresented in images of schooling and educational attainment (Goodley, 2007, p. 319).

Throughout the interview, Oscar started each new interview by recounting his son's first days. In terms of recognition, the culture of the "normal" body, learning processes, skills, and, ultimately, childhood is what frames the dominant social recognition horizons, which can be lived as injustices in cases like those of Oscar and his son. For example, not being "normal" was a worry for Oscar, who said regarding his son's features, *"Then, you can't notice much, of course. He has the eyes with a hazelnut shape, right? Ehhh, but he is not short-necked"*.

The family's first confrontation with the culture of normality occurred during the medical diagnosis. They were told by a doctor that Tomás would not have "any imagination" because of his Down Syndrome. However, in the interview, Oscar claimed that Tomás has skills related to abstract imagination. Although he acknowledged that part of this first diagnosis captures Tomás' episodes of frustration, he reinforced the idea of his son's autonomy and imagination.

Recognition as an injustice was so embedded in Tomás that he rejected children with Down Syndrome. Oscar commented, *"But, as I say, he realises about his environment. He has this rejection of people with Down Syndrome. Ehhh, I think it's also because he's reflected. He says they're stupid"*.

In this sense, recognition as injustice is different from distributive injustice, because it requires an identification process in which exclusion becomes evident through external categorisations, as forms of labelling that are enacted in the bodies and narratives of oppressed subjects. In the same sense, Oscar had lived different episodes of explicit discrimination with Tomás, especially in the urban space. For example, he told us that, in the park, mothers caring for their children tell them not to play with Tomás because "*something could happen to him, or they [the mothers] stare at you [Oscar and Tomás].*" Sometimes, he was asked whether Tomás' mother was Chinese because of Tomás' eye shape. Differences tend to make people classify, standardise, or express a form of racism that rejects the people who disturb them (as these mothers did). Dissenters then feel guilty about provoking the rejection.

Regarding school choice and education, Tomás had a longer educational journey than other children due to the progression of his skills. For three years, Tomás spent half his day in preschool and the other half in a school for children with special needs. According to Oscar, this second school was essential for helping Tomás avoid a sudden transition from preschool to primary school.

*They told us that he had to go to a special school so that Tomás gets used to being with more children, studying ... Because Tomás is very impulsive. And, of course, we know how to contain it, but not everyone.*

Therefore, Tomás needed to adapt in a proper way to the "normal culture" of being a child in a classroom.

In the search for a new school, one of the principal criteria Oscar mentioned as being close to a hospital in case of emergency. Tomás presented a problematic health situation (e.g., this interview was postponed twice due to medical situations with Tomás). The first option Oscar and his ex-wife considered was private schools. However, and despite not lacking economic resources for affording such options, Tomás was immediately rejected from these schools due to a lack of sufficient communication skills. The private schools' staff recommended that Tomás "go back" to a "special school". Oscar and his ex-wife, however, were convinced that the best thing for his child was to be included in a school with an "integration programme," as they felt Tomás had enough skills to attend a conventional school. In this sense, the ideal school for his son, Oscar commented, was not a "different school"; instead, "*Tomás needs what all children need: a school that teaches them from their needs, from his interests to his future, and does not fill his head with a quantity of academic material that ultimately does not help in life.*" Hence, Oscar tried to fight the "culture of normality" or ableist normativity (Campbell, 2008) that sought to classify his son as unique or different. In this fight, searching for an adequate school was hard work, a form of fighting against 'culture of normality'. From our theoretical approach, this is a fight against the un-recognition of Oscar's son.

In general terms, the "culture of the normal" denies possibilities of recognition for children like Tomás, who do not fit into the "normal" category. However, Oscar mentioned that what is an ideal school for Tomás is also suitable for every child, pointing out that the "culture of the normal" does not have the capability to recognise the variety of childhoods.

In terms of justice as recognition, the new admission system (SAS) does not make the longer process visible, like the one we showed here, that families, like Oscar's, must undergo to find educational spaces for their children. Not operating at "the normal" standard of learning and, ultimately, not being "normal children" forces children with special needs and their families to move continuously through the regular educational system. Therefore, while SAS increases the distributive justice for families to choose the school of their preference. The particularities, concerns, and expectations of these families are still to be achieved.

### **Associativity (in)justice requirements**

Associativity, as the political aspect of justice, was related to Oscar's possibilities to understand the medical and educational processes his son Tomás was undergoing in the hands of doctors and teachers. This was also associated with the real option of choosing the school he wanted for his son. Real options that do not depend on monetary resources, as we showed previously in the recognition justice section, only fit in "normal" and expected developmental parameters. In both cases, Oscar was allowed to participate actively in the different institutional processes lived by his son. In this sense, although the medical situation in Oscar's narratives was chaotic, he commented that he had everything under control, that he knew his son's diagnosis as he always asked for second opinions.

Concerning the latter, Oscar mentioned the importance of parental networks in his educational and medical journey. Association as a political aspect of justice is understood in the literature, and principally by Fraser (2006) and Gewirtz (2009) as the possibility to be part of a network that gives you the power to information and valuable opinion. Information on where to ask for second opinions and where to bring his child for "development" aid was, in a context of diffuse information, crucial knowledge only available from other parents in a similar situation. Oscar's high level of commitment to his Tomás' childhood was projected to other parents' experiences, and it determined the high grade of associativity they needed to cope with multiple diagnoses, comments, and recommendations from doctors, teachers, and other parents. Therefore, associativity also protected parents as well as their children from being discriminated and stereotyped.

In particular, concerning education, Oscar deployed all his social capital to seek educational options and understand the school market, which, as shown by this

father, has more than redistributed complexities. He felt the need to do this because he observed schools that, on paper, offered Integration Programmes<sup>6</sup>, but, in real terms, lacked inclusive tools, and such information was more assertively given by the network of parents. Although he tried first the formal channel, he had no luck.

*I contacted the people in charge of the integration projects of the municipal corporation [of education]. I went to talk to them. I brought Tomás: 'This is my son. Where do you think it could be good for him to go? A school that works focused on him'.*

In this regard, educational systems informally expect parents of children with disabilities to have high levels of commitment and autonomy to understand the policy, especially in this context of reform and the new admission system (SAS):

*Because, as I say, we think like a hive. Then, it's like, 'Hey, I found this doctor.' Well... and we started to recommend: 'The school is good.' And we start to bring others ... And the same: one leaves school and explains to the other dad why, and they all go away ... So, that's how we work, then. We build these contact networks.*

In this case, Oscar is compelled to find informal paths to ensure that a school has a proper integration programme<sup>7</sup> to "show" and expose their children in a way that other parents do not need to consider. Ultimately, he still needs to deploy strategies that were supposed to be avoided because of the centralised system of the SAS. Oscar had to demonstrate Tomás' level of development and skills to the municipal officers in charge of the education system<sup>8</sup>. Because of requirements like this one, parents of children with disabilities must constantly struggle to overcome obstacles in their children's educational paths.

---

6. Integration Programmes means that school have the appropriate facilities and professionals for incorporate student with special needs. Educational Inclusion Policies regarding children with special needs have evolutioned since the early 80s until the present, particularly through a number of official decrees that regulate the different types of disabilities from a medical approach, and the different professional and educational responses towards these students. During the decade of 2000, there was a strengthening of the Educational Integration Projects (PIE from its Spanish initials), as the mode and the professional team in charge of including students with transitory and permanent special needs to the regular schools. Parallel to the PIEs in regular schools, there are special schools exclusive for children with severe special needs. Since 2019, these special schools also have to follow the guidelines of the national curriculum.

7. We refer to informal paths because the new admission system does not include any school visit process.

8. In Chile, educational services are managed by each municipality. Since 2018, and as part of the reform, this is progressively changing by central managing services that depend directly from the State.

## Multi-spatiality and multi-temporality

The above analysis opens the opportunity to add two new dimensions to the reflection of educational justice. The first of these is multi-spatiality, and the second is multi-temporality.

Regarding multi-spatiality, distribution as an (in)justice in the case of families of children with disabilities allows us to understand experiences of economic detriment. For instance, in Oscar's case, the fact that his child did not fit the "normal" pattern of development went beyond the educational system. It also influences labour opportunities for Oscar, as discussed previously. The analysis illuminates tensions regarding (in)justice in different spaces. Although different learning timings exist in different education methods (e.g., special education in comparison with regular schools), several spaces beyond education (e.g. labour, health, public services, etc.) are unfair for Oscar and his child. For example, if we think in recognition (in)justice as a cultural discrimination, public spaces are potentially exclusionary. For example, in parks, mothers told their children not to play with Tomás, illustrating how Tomás' medical diagnosis and body features defined what and when he would be able to learn and do.

In this regard, notions of normalisation and disabilities are not given; instead, they are produced in different spaces, with particular consequences for each space, but there are all critical for telling the story of this family and for understanding injustices lived by them. The production of what disabilities mean (e.g., an obstacle preventing Oscar from deploying his professional abilities, or an indicator of a different nationality, as in the case of the mothers in the park questioning Tomás' eyes shape) does not necessarily come with a disability. Still, it is instead based on the ideas and comprehensions produced around the disability. In this regard, "An analysis of disability requires us to expand the scope of democratic institutions: not only in public and higher education but also in the wider community. In making sense of the challenges facing the disabled learner we need, therefore, to acknowledge the market" (Goodley, 2007, p. 320).

The introduction of market mechanisms in education as a neoliberal influence, in the sense of Goodley (2007), concerns the cultural tendency of the school system to reinforce the discourse of students' abilities to reach the "individualistic personhood valued by the neoliberal marketized society" (Goodley, 2007, p.322), enhancing skills, productivity, and development within learning. These discourses and practices exclude students with disabilities, "who require the support of others" (Goodley, 2007, p.321). Indeed, Oscar described his son as follows, also underscoring the aspect of autonomy:

*And he was never an overprotected child; on the contrary, we, at the beginning—me more than the mother, because the mother had this fear that he would die ... From being independent, as autonomous as possible, so Tomás is extremely autonomous.*

Ultimately, the production of disability in an educational space clashes with the total invisibility of learning differences. Which, at the same time, places students in disabled conditions in an underestimated position and reinforces impairment or difference. These productions clash against tenets of socially just pedagogies.

Oscar, as a father of a child with a disability and a teacher, shifts his reflections towards these ideas of socially just pedagogies.

*I entered the university thinking the same thing, so I had this vision in which the good students were not the most... those who had the best grades, so, of course, I attended them all equally. I was very concerned about their social needs, but when I met a "silly student," or that being able... no, I do not know, had this elitist vision of the intelligence, (...) then, in a way or the other, I fall in the same game, (...), but we fall into the same dynamic of the good guys and the bad guys...*

On the other hand, the multi-temporalities of justice are embodied in the cases of families of children with disabilities, in the strong sense of "present time" reflected in Oscar's narratives. Recurrent narratives found in school choice literature on parents choosing schools for their children are related to future possibilities, as aspirations of higher education or academic paths may lead to better living conditions (Rojas et al., 2016). However, these narratives about the future were blurred for Oscar when he talked about choosing a school for his son. In this sense, educational justice theory, especially the distributive dimension, focuses on future possibilities, often neglecting the present. Generally, justice theory suggests that education should give each student a minimum level of educational options to develop as a productive citizen. Goodley (2007) criticised this view but understood it as part of a neoliberal system that considers students' future to be an "entrepreneurial" subject, implying the need for an autonomous and productive self. However, we claim that the recognition and associative dimensions of justice in education relate to justice not only in terms of lives projected towards the future but also in terms of the conditions under which children with disabilities are living today. Therefore, educational justice should integrate multiple temporalities, focusing on both the future and the present. We do not want to simplify the analysis of the present by reducing the argument only to families with children with disabilities. On the contrary, while Oscar's narrative helps us understand, we want to extend this argument to families in general, including those that have addressed their social, cultural, and economic conditions.

The journey Oscar and his family had to follow in searching for Tomas' education-focused principally on what made sense regarding past experiences, the present situation and future perspectives, without clear distinctions among the temporalities: "Yet, this present is a present interwoven with the past, and with the future" (Leibowitz & Naidoo, 2017, p. 156). Oscar's narrative did not consider a fixed future, or even a

future at all, as we understand it. For this reason, it was indispensable to recall the entire Oscar's narrative, although the primary interview question was about school choice. Recalling the whole story that Oscar wanted to tell, allowed us to understand the importance of temporalities in the justice analysis.

In the same sense, variables regarding the future, in the choice of his child's school, were not part of Oscar's narrative. Having a child with a disability transformed Oscar's expectations and ideas of the plans he had for his son. His tales were more related to constant becomings than to strategizing to reach a planned future.

*When Tomás was born, it was a real shock because I realised that "the head" is not everything. As I told you, we had planned for Tomás: the pregnancy process, career, future. We would fight with the mother if he was going to be an archaeologist, a physicist.*

Socially just pedagogies work with endless temporalities because of what is reflected in Oscar's narrative. In the ultimate sense, this is embodied in Oscar's experience of searching for Tomás' place in education.

## **Conclusion**

This article has discussed the implications of conceptualised justice for a family with a child with disabilities, complementing the exclusive compensatory role of education (distributive) through the consideration of cultural (recognition) and political (associativity) aspects. It also reflects, through tools drawn from the theory of socially just pedagogies, on the problematic elements of traditional justice theory in such cases. We propose that the multiple dimensions of justice in education and the concept of socially just pedagogies, especially for minority groups, encourage reflection on multi-spatiality and multi-temporality trajectories to analyse justice in education.

The Chilean educational reform, specifically the SAS and Oscar's and Tomás's experience, help us to make a philosophical and theoretical point regarding the importance of considering other life dimensions, spaces, and temporalities when analysing justice in the educational field. Oscar's narrative shows that, although the new system removed all barriers that schools had installed in the past for families, the journey involving the school choice before the actual application is beyond the scope of the SAS and continues to produce deeply unequal experiences in our standardised educational system. In this sense, the theoretical consideration that we propose here (dimensions, spaces, and temporalities), can open lines of action for the design and application of educational policy reform, such as the SAS. Therefore, our main claim is towards those philosophical and educational justice standpoints that only considers one dimension -e.g. the distribution of resources-, perspectives that have practical consequences in policy and social actors.



We intend to do a similar analytical exercise to Gewirtz's, using a specific case, which made explicit the systematic need to critically observe an educational system through three dimensions of justice, considering spaces and temporalities. This type of justice analysis could also be extended to every family experiencing a child's school admission process, which now we understand could start at the moment of birth, or other, as Tomás's case. Children are constantly categorised by a system of labelling (e.g., dichotomies like able/disable; priority/non-priority students; part of the integration program/not part of the integration program; national/not national), that challenges the justice analysis, mainly, nowadays, in those policy solutions that only consider redistribution as the primary response for contemporary social and cultural problems. Therefore, the challenge is not to translate this into an external clustering and segmentation of students; instead, we should "(...) work politically alongside the disabled people's movement as key contributors to rethinking pedagogy" (Goodley, 2007, p. 320).

Finally, what we intended to do is to propose to the philosophical justice analysis, a broader approach applied to real-life cases. In this article, we focus on a family -a parent in particular- with a child with a disability. However, we think that a multidimensional, multi-spatiality and multi-temporality kind of analysis could reveal different types of injustices experienced by all families in the sphere of education and beyond. With this kind of analysis, we sustain that education paths and experiences, like the school choice, are intertwined with other areas and experiences, involving different members of a family and a diverse range of institutions.

This work received financial support from the National Research and Development Agency (ANID): ANID/FONDECYT/INICIACIÓN/N°11200428 and by the Associative Research Programme under Grant ANID PIA CIE160007.


## Referencias


- Barad, K. (2014). Diffracting diffraction: Cutting together-apart. *Parallax*, 20(3), 168–187.
- Bozalek, V. (2018). Socially just pedagogies. In R. Braidotti & M. Hlavajova (Eds.), *Posthuman glossary* (pp. 396–398). London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Bozalek, V., Bayat, A., Motala, S., Mitchell, V., & Gachago, D. (2016). Diffracting socially just pedagogies through stained glass. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(3), 201–218.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Cambridge UK: Polity.
- Brighouse, H. (2007). Educational justice and socioeconomic segregation in school. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 41(4), 575–590.

- Brighouse, H. (2010). Educational equality and school reform. In G. Haydon (Ed.), *Educational equality* (pp. 15–68). London, England: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Campbell, F. (2008). Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism. *M/C Journal*, 11(3). <http://journal.mediaculture.org.au/index.php/mcjjournal/article/view/46%2C>.
- Elacqua, G. (2012). The impact of school choice and public policy on segregation: Evidence from Chile. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(3), 444–453.
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in globalizing world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Gewirtz, S. (2006). Towards a contextualized analysis of social justice in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(1), 69–81.
- Goodley, D. (2007). Towards socially just pedagogies: Deleuzoguattarian critical disability studies. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3), 17–334.
- Leibowitz, B., & Naidoo, K. (2017). The potential for posthuman insights to effect socially just pedagogies. *Education as Change*, 21(2), 149–164.
- Leibowitz, B., Naidoo, K., & Mayet, R. (2017). Teaching in and for social justice. In R. Osman & D. Hornsby (Eds.), *Transforming higher education: Towards a socially just pedagogy* (pp. 79–98). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave.
- Lingard, B., & Keddie, A. (2013). Redistribution, recognition and representation: Working against pedagogies of indifference. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 21(3), 427–447.
- Lingard, B. (2005). Socially just pedagogies in changing times. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 15(2), 165–186.
- Postma, D. (2016). The ethics of becoming in a pedagogy for social justice. A posthumanist perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(3), 310–326.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rojas, M., Falabella, A., & Leyton, D. (2016). Mothers of middle classes against the educational market in Chile: decisions and dilemmas. In J. Corvalán, A. Carrasco, & J. E. García-Huidobro (Eds.), *School market and educational opportunity. Freedom, diversity, and inequality* (pp. 231–265). Santiago, Chile: Ediciones UC.
- Schouten, G. (2012). Fair educational opportunity and the distribution of natural ability: Toward a prioritarian principle of educational justice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 46(3), 472–491.

- Valenzuela, J. P., Bellei, C., & De los Ríos, D. (2010). School Segregation in Chile. In S. Martinic & G. Elacqua (Eds.), *Changes in the governance of the Chilean education system* (pp. 257–284). Santiago, Chile: UNESCO, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Madrid, Spain: Ediciones Cátedra.
- Young, I. M. (2007). *Global challenges, war, self-determination, and responsibility for justice*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

### Sobre los autores

CAMILA MOYANO DÁVILA is Ph.D. in Social Science from the University of Lausanne at the LIVES Research Centre, Switzerland. In her previous work, she has followed a biographical approach with a focus on subjectivity. She has developed research on vulnerable children and minorities in the Chilean education system. She edited a book about educational justice in Chile. Currently, she is working on educational technologies and the production of stereotypes at school. Correo Electrónico: cmoyano@uft.cl.  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6357-3469>

JUAN DE DIOS OYARZÚN is Ph.D. in Education Policy Studies from the Institute of Education, University College London. Currently, he is Assistant Professor at the Universidad Católica de Valparaíso. Juan de Dios examines Educational Policy and Sociology of Education from critical theoretical perspectives. His current research is related to the articulations between schools and industries from a territorial standpoint, and the opportunities structures offered to students in such contexts. Correo Electrónico: juan.oyarzun.m@pucv.cl.  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8168-076X>

## CUHSO

Fundada en 1984, la revista CUHSO es una de las publicaciones periódicas más antiguas en ciencias sociales y humanidades del sur de Chile. Con una periodicidad semestral, recibe todo el año trabajos inéditos de las distintas disciplinas de las ciencias sociales y las humanidades especializadas en el estudio y comprensión de la diversidad sociocultural, especialmente de las sociedades latinoamericanas y sus tensiones producto de la herencia colonial, la modernidad y la globalización. En este sentido, la revista valora tanto el rigor como la pluralidad teórica, epistemológica y metodológica de los trabajos.

### EDITOR

Matthias Gloël

### COORDINADORA EDITORIAL

Claudia Campos Letelier

### CORRECTOR DE ESTILO Y DISEÑADOR

Ediciones Silsag

### TRADUCTOR, CORRECTOR LENGUA INGLESA

Alejandra Zegpi Pons

### SITIO WEB

[cuhso.uct.cl](http://cuhso.uct.cl)

### E-MAIL

[cuhso@uct.cl](mailto:cuhso@uct.cl)

### LICENCIA DE ESTE ARTÍCULO

Creative Commons Atribución Compartir Igual 4.0 Internacional