

AWAKENING CONSCIENCES – FOR AN ANTI-ABLEISM EDUCATION AS A PATH TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n4-001>

Submitted on: 03/02/2025

Publication date: 04/02/2025

Antonio Nacílio Sousa dos Santos¹, Edimar Fonseca da Fonseca², Peterson Ayres Cabelleira³, Uanderson da Silva Lima⁴, Rennan Alberto dos Santos Barroso⁵, Fabrício de Paula Santos⁶, Sidney Alves⁷, Marilda Moraes da Costa⁸, Dalva de Araujo Menezes⁹

¹Doctorate student in Social Sciences
Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)
Horizonte, Ceará – Brazil.

E-mail: nacilisantos23@gmail.com

²Doctor of Science Education
Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS
Caçapava do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

E-mail: fonseca.edimar@gmail.com

³Doctor of Science Education: Chemistry of Life and Health
Federal University of Pampa (UNIPAMPA).
São Borja, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil.

E-mail: petersoncabelleira@hotmail.com

⁴Master in Teaching (PPGEEnsino)
University of Vale do Taquari (UNIVATES)
Lucas do Rio Verde, Mato Grosso – Brazil.
Email: uanderson.lima@universo.univates.br

⁵Master in Inclusive Education (PROFEI)
Federal University of South and Southeast of Pará (UNIFESSPA)
Balsas, Maranhão – Brazil.
Email: rennan_barroso@hotmail.com

⁶Doctor of Education
Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP)
Conselheiro Lafaiete, Minas Gerais – Brazil.
E-mail: fabriciofps@yahoo.com.br

⁷Master's student in History Teaching (Scholarship/CAPES)
Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ)
Barra do Piraí, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
E-mail: syd.arouca@hotmail.com

⁸Doctorate student in Health and Environment
University of the Region of Joinville (UNIVILLE)
Joinville, Santa Catarina – Brazil.

Email: marilda.costa@ielusc.br

⁹Doctorate student in Education
Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC/PR)
Parnaíba, Piauí – Brazil.
E-mail: profdalva.araujophb@gmail.com

Suanny da Silva Alves¹⁰, Fábio Peron Carballo¹¹, Marcela Freire¹², Gilson de Sousa Oliveira¹³, Lilia Virginia Dias Braga¹⁴, Andressa Araújo Ferreira¹⁵ and Carlos Daniel da Silva Mousinho¹⁶

ABSTRACT

The present research proposes a critical reflection on the urgency of consolidating an anti-ableism education as an ethical, political and pedagogical foundation for the construction of truly inclusive educational practices. The study problematizes the limits of inclusion policies that, although they advance in legal terms, still reproduce an integrationist logic, marked by normative tolerance and the denial of difference. In view of this, we ask: How can the anti-ableism perspective contribute to the overcoming of integrationist school practices and to the effectiveness of an inclusive education that recognizes and values differences as constitutive of the educational process? Theoretically, we used the repertoire of Barton (1989; 1996; 2001; 2018), Diniz (2007), Erevelles (2011), Freire (1996), Garland-Thomson (1997), Guerra (2021), Kazumi Sassaki (1997), Linton (1998), Mitchell and Snyder (2014), Riddle (n.d.), Shakespeare (1996; 2006; 2018), Skliar (1997; 2020), Werneck (1997), among others. Methodologically, the research is qualitative (Minayo, 2007), descriptive and bibliographic (Gil, 2008) and analyzed from a comprehensive perspective (Weber, 1949). The results of the research defend a pedagogy of adaptation and framing as an indispensable condition for the construction of a school that recognizes human diversity as a value and not as an obstacle. By raising awareness of the symbolic and institutional violence that permeates school processes, anti-ableism education presents itself as an emancipatory horizon, capable of re-signifying the role of school, teaching and educational relations in the fight against oppression. It is, therefore, a matter of shifting the gaze from

¹⁰Master's student in Education (FAPEAM Scholarship)
Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM)
Manaus, Amazonas – Brazil.

E-mail: suhalves8@gmail.com

¹¹Doctor in Educational Sciences/Educational Psychology
State University of Minas Gerais (UEMG)
Divinópolis, Minas Gerais – Brazil.

E-mail: peronmg@hotmail.com

¹²Doctor in Museology
Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO).
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.

E-mail: dramarcelfreire@gmail.com

¹³Doctor of Education
Federal University of Ceará (UFC)
Tanguá, Ceará – Brazil.

Email gilsongili2016@gmail.com

¹⁴Doctorate student in Education
Enber University
Teresina, Piauí – Brazil.

Email: tiadogabriel@gmail.com

¹⁵Undergraduate student in Biological Sciences
State University of the Tocantina Region of Maranhão (UEMASUL)
Imperatriz, Maranhão – Brazil.

E-mail: andressaferreira.20200002263@uemasul.edu.br

¹⁶Master's student in Constitutional Procedural Law
Universidad Nacional de Lomas de Zamora (UNLZ)
Florianópolis, Piauí – Brazil.

E-mail: carlos.mousinho@outlook.com

disability as an individual deficit to understanding it as a product of an excluding social organization, reaffirming the urgency of pedagogical practices committed to social justice.

Keywords: Anti-Ableism Education. School Inclusion. Difference. Social Justice.

INTRODUCTION

BETWEEN NORMS AND DIFFERENCES: THE URGENCY OF AN ANTI-CAPACITIST IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TRANSFORMATIVE SCHOOL INCLUSION

Although inclusive education is a right guaranteed by several national and international legislations, its implementation faces cultural, political and structural resistance that permeates the school routine. As Sassaki (1997) points out, "[...] the process of inclusion has been applied in each social system" and, in the case of education, this means "[...] education for all" (p. 41). However, it is necessary to recognize that "[...] disability is not a person's problem, but rather the result of society's inability to meet the needs of that same person" (Brasil, 2022, p. 30). Thus, school inclusion needs to be understood as a transformative movement that breaks with archaic models of exclusion.

School is the beginning of everything. If it does not change its principles, goodbye inclusive society. I am referring to the principles of inclusion, which are nothing more than the principles of democracy. And there is no democracy without education, nor education without democracy. That is why it is correct to say that every child can and should be educated. And also that all learning is legitimate. It is also legitimate, and must be respected, the rhythm of the regular school teacher in the search for understanding the meaning of his or her craft in the context of an inclusive society. [...] The elementary school teacher is the main figure in the inclusive society. This is very clear to me (Werneck, 1997, p. 61-62).

As inclusion debates and policies have intensified in Brazil, especially since the 1990s, the legal scenario has advanced significantly. The enactment of the Brazilian Law of Inclusion (Law No. 13,146/2015)¹⁷ and the adoption of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (2008)¹⁸ represent important

¹⁷ Approved in 2015, the Brazilian Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Law No. 13,146/2015) represents a fundamental legal milestone in the consolidation of the rights of persons with disabilities in Brazil. Inspired by the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the LBI reaffirms the principle of equal opportunities and establishes guidelines to ensure accessibility, full participation and the exercise of citizenship in all areas of social life. In the educational field, the law reinforces the State's obligation to promote quality inclusive education, at all levels and modalities, ensuring accessibility resources, reasonable accommodations and specialized educational service. By stating that "[...] the person with disabilities has the right to equal opportunities with other people and will not suffer any kind of discrimination" (Brasil, 2015, art. 4), the LBI shifts the view of disability as an individual limitation to understand it as a result of the social and attitudinal barriers imposed on difference. Thus, legislation becomes an essential instrument in the fight against ableism and in the promotion of social justice. See: Brasil. (2015). *Law No. 13,146, of July 6, 2015 (Brazilian Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities)*. Brasília, DF: Presidency of the Republic. Retrieved http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm, 2015.

¹⁸ The National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, instituted in 2008 by the Ministry of Education, represents a significant milestone in the promotion of inclusive education in Brazil. This policy guides education systems to ensure the access, participation and learning of students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders and high abilities/giftedness in regular education classes. To

achievements. As the Ministry of Education (MEC) reaffirms, this policy "[...] reaffirmed the option for a fully inclusive educational system" (Brasil, 2022, p. 34). At the same time, the LBI¹⁹ guarantees that education must ensure "[...] access, permanence, participation and learning" based on the needs of each student (Brasil, 2022, p. 15).

However, even with such normative advances, ableist practices²⁰ continue to be naturalized within schools. Even if the discourse of inclusion is strengthened, the integrationist model remains alive. Werneck (1997) clarifies that "[...] When we use the word integration, we want to give the idea that insertion is partial and conditioned to the possibilities of each person" (p. 54). In addition, it is criticized that "[...] schools understand that the expression 'preferentially' can be translated as an option", which serves as a justification for refusing students with disabilities, says Werneck (1997, p. 83).

Integration was widely promoted as the response to historical injustices, but in practice it often entailed only the physical placement of students with disabilities in mainstream schools, without significant changes in attitudes, curricula, or pedagogical practices. What is often observed is the demand that students with disabilities adjust to existing structures, instead of adapting these structures to accommodate differences. This approach reflects a conception of normative

this end, it proposes the transversality of special education at all levels, stages and modalities of education, the offer of Specialized Educational Service (SES), the training of teachers for SEA and other education professionals for inclusion, in addition to the guarantee of architectural accessibility, in transport, furniture, communications and information. By emphasizing the elimination of barriers that prevent students' full participation, the policy reinforces the commitment to an education that recognizes and values human diversity. See: Brazil. Ministry of Education. Secretariat of Special Education. *National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education*. Brasília: MEC. Retrieved <https://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/politica.pdf>, 2008.

¹⁹ The Brazilian Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (LBI), sanctioned on July 6, 2015 as Law No. 13,146, is a legal framework for the promotion of citizenship and dignity of people with disabilities in Brazil. Based on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the LBI reaffirms disability as a result of the interaction between social, attitudinal and institutional impediments and barriers. In the educational field, the LBI determines that education is everyone's right, and must be offered "[...] without discrimination and on equal terms with other people" (Brasil, 2015, art. 27), ensuring access to regular education, specialized educational service, teacher training and accessibility in a broad sense. With this, the law strengthens the commitment to an inclusive school and the elimination of structural ableism, promoting an education that respects and values difference as a right and not as a concession. See: Brazil. *Law No. 13,146, of July 6, 2015 – Brazilian Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Statute of Persons with Disabilities)*. Brasília, DF: Presidency of the Republic. Retrieved http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm, 2015.

²⁰ Ableist practices in schools manifest themselves in a subtle and structural way, normalizing the exclusion of students with disabilities under the discourse of individual adaptation, meritocracy and the supposed lack of institutional preparation. These practices operate through the delegitimization of bodies that do not conform to the norm, the invisibility of non-hegemonic knowledge, and the constant pressure for students with disabilities to "adapt" to the rhythm and pattern of others. As Itxi Guerra (2021) states, "[...] ableism is an ideology that establishes who is the ideal, fit, autonomous, productive subject – and who is the other, the maladjuster, the 'problem'" (p. 39). By perpetuating itself in exclusionary curricula, standardized assessments and teaching attitudes based on piety or welfare, school ableism reinforces inequalities and compromises the right to education as a democratic and liberating experience. See: War, I. *Struggle against ableism: anarchism and ableism*. São Paulo: Editora Terra Sem Amos, 2021.

normality, in which difference is tolerated only under the condition of assimilation (Barton, 2001, p. 49).

However, for education to be, in fact, inclusive, it is necessary to overcome the integrative logic²¹, which tolerates the presence of difference only under the condition of adaptation to the dominant pattern. As highlighted in the publication "Inclusive Education – What the teacher has to do with it" (2022): "[...] the Inclusive School and the Inclusion model are here to stay because they are based on theoretical and practical concepts developed by the best educators" (p. 30). In the same way, it is necessary to abandon the "[...] organizational model of cascades", associated with integration, and adhering to the proposal of the "kaleidoscope", which symbolizes inclusion as a plural process in constant transformation (Werneck, 1997, p. 54).

Thus, although the legal and pedagogical discourse advances, many schools still operate based on a logic of standardization. Inclusion is accepted as long as the child "[...] follow the class", "[...] do not delay the content" or "[...] don't cause trouble." This model still hierarchizes bodies and minds. As Guerra (2021) analyzes: "[...] the decision to grant or not a disability card is subject to economic terms", which demonstrates how the system defines who is or is not worthy of inclusion (p. 17). She adds: "[...] forgetting or making ableism invisible means erasing them from history and denying our anti-ableism struggle" (Guerra, 2021, p. 18).

The emphasis on individual performance, ability, and productivity within the education system continues to marginalize students whose bodies and minds do not conform to normative standards. While education policies now speak the language of inclusion, their implementation is often filtered through ableist assumptions about what constitutes legitimate knowledge and acceptable behavior. Consequently, students with disabilities are often included conditionally – only if they do not disturb the classroom, only if they 'keep up', and only if their presence does not require fundamental changes in curriculum or pedagogy²² (Erevelles, 2011, p. 45).

²¹ Overcoming the integrative logic in the educational field means breaking with practices that, although presented under the discourse of inclusion, still keep difference subordinated to the norm. Integration presupposes that the student with disabilities adapts to the current school model, without it being structurally transformed. Inclusive education, on the other hand, in its critical perspective, requires a reconstruction of pedagogical, curricular and institutional relations so that everyone can participate equally in the educational process. As Nirmala Erevelles (2011) states, "[...] integration is based on the idea that the student with disabilities should fit into the school as it is; inclusion, on the contrary, stems from the need to reinvent the school, questioning its normative assumptions" (p. 47). Therefore, overcoming the integrative logic implies shifting the focus from disability as an individual problem and recognizing the exclusionary character of traditional school structures. See: Erevelles, N. *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

²² Our translation.

That is why it is necessary to introduce the concept of ableism as a structure that organizes inequalities and prevents inclusion from being fully realized. As Sassaki (1997) explains, "[...] the development of people with disabilities must occur within the process of inclusion and not as a prerequisite for integrating into society" (p. 40). In addition, Guerra (2021) denounces that "[...] The idea of disability goes beyond illness – it has to do with the way capitalist society is constructed and how it reads us as people" (p. 19).

For inclusion to take place, it is essential to propose an anti-ableism education, which addresses the historical and cultural roots of exclusion. This implies questioning the very foundations of the traditional school. As Werneck (1997) reflects: "[...] inclusion requires a transformation of the school, as it defends the insertion in regular education of students with any deficits and needs" (p. 54). Anti-ableism education must recognize that "[...] mental disability is the nerve center of inclusion" and that "[...] the problem is not always in the student, but in his family, school and social context" (1997, p. 65).

There is a certain hypocrisy when all the responsibility for the failure of special education is attributed precisely to special students. Failure is the result of a complex mechanism that brings together social, political, linguistic, historical and cultural factors, and that comes from those professionals who, whether they realize it or not, voluntarily or not, represent and reproduce the idea of a homogeneous, compact world, without variations, without fissures. To the continuity between the negative meaning of special education, the obsessive predominance of a clinical conception, and a circle of low pedagogical expectations, there is another very problematic issue: the lack of educational reflection on special education (Skliar, 1997, p. 51).

Now, since the school can reproduce or face inequalities, its role is central in the construction of a fairer society. According to Barton (2001), "[...] social exclusion is maintained by attitudes that are based on prejudiced ideas and that are reflected in institutional practices" (p. 45). In addition, Garland-Thomson (1997) proposes that "[...] bodily difference must be understood as a legitimate variation of human experience and not as an aberration to be corrected" (p. 20).

As we rethink the role of the school, the originality and relevance of this research stands out. After all, as Erevelles (2011) argues, "[...] disability needs to be understood from an intersectional perspective²³, which takes into account the structures of oppression"

²³ To understand disability from an intersectional perspective is to recognize that it cannot be analyzed in isolation from other categories such as race, gender, class, sexuality, and colonialism. Intersectionality reveals how multiple forms of oppression intertwine and produce unique experiences of exclusion. In the case of people with disabilities, especially those belonging to racialized or impoverished groups, barriers are intensified by structural inequalities that exceed the biomedical field. As Nirmala Erevelles (2011) states, "[...] disability cannot be separated from the relations of class, race and nation; these categories interact to

(p. 112). Similarly, Linton (1998) states that "[...] the study of disability is, above all, a political field, as it questions the dominant notions of normality, competence and humanity" (p. 12).

The radical model considers disability as a social construct and, therefore, as a system of oppression. It states that disability is defined by the oppressor group, that is, people without disabilities. In turn, it links it to other oppressions, creating an intersectional idea of disability. It states that all oppressions (sex, race, sexual orientation...) at some point in history have also been considered disabilities. It is very much focused on the deconstruction of the idea of normality, as well as on the claim for justice, which is called 'disability justice'. It supposes one of the first differences with the social model. While one claims for rights, the other claims for justice. The novelty of this model is that it calls for a political response (Guerra, 2021, p. 15).

The overall objective of this research is to critically reflect on how anti-ableism education can contribute to truly inclusive educational practices. To this end, three specific objectives are proposed: (1) to understand the concept of ableism and its manifestation in the school routine; (2) critically analyze the integrationist model of inclusion; (3) to point out pedagogical and political paths for an anti-ableist education. As Skliar (1997) explains: "[...] the school that only includes without modifying its structure remains exclusionary" (p. 38). Thus, Barton (1996) also warns: "[...] it is not enough to put the child in school; it is necessary to change the school" (p. 21).

Thus, the question that guides this investigation is: How can the anti-ableism perspective contribute to the overcoming of integrationist school practices and to the effectiveness of an inclusive education that recognizes and values differences as constitutive of the educational process? The research is based on the hypothesis that, only by challenging the normative foundations of the traditional school, it will be possible to build a truly plural and welcoming educational space. As Shakespeare (2006) concludes: "[...] disability is not in the person's body, but in the barriers imposed by society" (p. 55).

constitute marginalized bodies as surplus and disposable" (p. 26). The intersectional approach, therefore, displaces disability from a merely clinical place to insert it into a critical analysis of power relations, fundamental for the construction of truly transformative inclusive policies. See: Erevelles, N. *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

METHODOLOGICAL PATHS FOR AN UNDERSTANDING OF INCLUSION: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH AS A TOOL FOR UNVEILING CAPACITIES MO IN EDUCATION

To investigate the meanings attributed to school practices around disability and inclusion, a qualitative approach was adopted, according to the methodological principles formulated by Minayo (2007), who understands social research as an interpretative and historical process. The analysis of the educational phenomenon, in this context, required understanding the subjects in their complexity and historicity, respecting the singularity of their experiences and the intentionality of their actions. "Social research is done by approximation, but, as it progresses, it develops increasingly precise orientation criteria. [...] The scientific procedure is, at the same time, the acquisition of knowledge, the improvement of a methodology, the elaboration of a norm" (Minayo, 2007, p. 11).

Unlike art and poetry that are based on inspiration, research is an artisanal work that does not dispense with creativity, it is fundamentally carried out by a language based on concepts, propositions, hypotheses, methods and techniques, a language that is built with its own particular rhythm. At this rate, we call the Research Cycle, that is, a peculiar spiral work process that begins with a question and ends with an answer or product that, in turn, gives rise to new questions. [...] The third stage, summarized in the title Analysis and treatment of empirical and documentary material, concerns the set of procedures to value, understand, interpret empirical data, articulate them with the theory on which the project was based or with other theoretical and interpretative readings whose need was given by the fieldwork (Minayo, 2007, p. 25-26).

In order to capture the meanings constructed in the school routine, a comprehensive approach was used, based on the Weberian tradition. For Weber (1949), social science should seek the subjective interpretation of social actions, analyzing their meanings. This means not reducing the subject to an object of research, but understanding it as an agent of meaning. As the author points out: "[...] It includes all human behavior as the actor assigns subjective meaning to it. [...] Comprehension refers to the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity" (Weber, 1949, p. 110).

In this perspective, a bibliographic and descriptive research was chosen, along the lines proposed by Gil (2008), whose objective is a critical and in-depth examination of the existing theoretical production on disability, ableism and inclusion. According to the author, "[...] The bibliographic research is developed based on material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles. [...] It aims to provide an analytical survey on a given theme or problem" (2008, p. 50).

The bibliographic research is developed from material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles. Although in almost all studies some type of work of this nature is required, there are studies developed exclusively from bibliographic sources. Part of the exploratory studies can be defined as bibliographic research, as well as a certain number of researches developed from the technique of content analysis. [...] The main advantage of bibliographic research lies in the fact that it allows the researcher to cover a much wider range of phenomena than that which he could research directly (Gil, 2008, p. 50).

The theoretical corpus of the analysis was composed of a robust set of classic and contemporary works in Disability Studies²⁴ and Critical Education, which include authors such as Erevelles (2011), Barton (1989; 1996; 2001; 2018), Mitchell and Snyder (2014), Garland-Thomson (1997), Linton (1998), Freire (1996), Guerra (2021), Sassaki (1997), among others. These works provided the conceptual basis for understanding disability not as a deficit, but as a historical and political construction. As Linton states: "[...] disability, instead of being a biological attribute, can be understood as a cultural construction, whose interpretations vary historically and are rooted in social relations of power and exclusion" (1998, p. 65).

Thus, the criterion for selecting the theoretical material took into account its contribution to the deconstruction of normative models of inclusion and to the formulation of an anti-ableist perspective, based on social justice. This choice was guided by the research's ethical-political commitment to giving visibility to the narratives and epistemologies produced by historically silenced subjects. According to Mitchell and Snyder (2014), "[...] Normative discourses tend to present disability as a deviation, pathologizing bodies and subjectivities. [...] It is necessary to think of disability as a constitutive element of human experience and not as a failure" (p. 69).

The analysis was guided by comprehensive principles, articulating key concepts such as difference, oppression, normality, corporeality, and justice. Such categories were extracted from the texts and interpreted in their relationship with school practices, aiming to capture not only contents, but meanings attributed by the authors to the educational reality.

²⁴ Disability Studies is a critical interdisciplinary field that questions traditional approaches to disability, especially those anchored in the medical model, which reduces the subject with disabilities to their bodily or functional condition. Emerging from the struggles of movements of people with disabilities, this field proposes a socio-political understanding of disability, analyzing how social, cultural and institutional structures produce exclusion. According to Barton (1996), "[...] Disability Studies arise from the need to denaturalize ideas about disability, demonstrating that it does not reside in bodies, but in social relations that marginalize certain subjects" (p. 3). Thus, this field has contributed to repositioning disability as a matter of human rights, social justice and recognition of diversity. See: Barton, L. *Disability and society: Emerging issues and insights*. London: Longman, 1996.

As Barton (2001) states: "[...] The fight against exclusion cannot be waged only through public policies. It is necessary to break with the individualistic paradigm and recognize disability as an expression of unequal social structures" (p. 103).

Thus, the texts were analyzed from a comprehensive and dialogical reading, seeking to identify analytical and discursive categories that highlight the limits of the so-called "inclusive" practices and the paths to an anti-ableist pedagogy. This pedagogy is based on listening, on the recognition of non-normative bodies and on the decolonization of school knowledge. "Ableism operates as a technology of control that defines who is a legitimate body and who is a subject of law. [...] the school must be a space for subverting these borders", says Guerra (2021, p. 42).

Consequently, the analyses sought to highlight the way in which the integrationist and normalizing logic still sustains a good part of educational policies and practices, even under the discourse of inclusion. The criticism formulated by Erevelles (2011) was central in this aspect: "[...] Inclusion cannot be reduced to physical presence. [...] What is at stake is the dispute over the ways of signifying and inhabiting the school space" (p. 96).

In addition, the bibliographic data revealed how the disability category is mobilized in order to reproduce patterns of productivity, autonomy and efficiency. According to Garland-Thomson (1997): "[...] The normativity of bodies is an ideological construct that serves to legitimize exclusions. [...] the school should be a place of celebration of difference, not of its domestication" (p. 45).

Finally, the central objective of the analysis was to propose an epistemological turn in the ways of thinking about inclusion: a passage from adaptation to transformation. The research showed that anti-ableism education is not only a political guideline, but an ethical project for society. "The difference is not limitation, but possibility. [...] a school that welcomes diversity as a wealth is a school committed to the emancipation of all" (Diniz, 2007, p. 84).

AWAKENING CONSCIENCES: FOR AN ANTI-ABLEISM EDUCATION AS A PATH TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

Although often reduced to individual attitudes of prejudice, ableism is, above all, a social structure that organizes power relations, hierarchies and exclusions. As stated by Guerra (2021): "[...] ableism is the oppression that we, disabled people, face, and arises from the ableist system, which is the social, political and economic system that

discriminates, violates, marginalizes and murders disabled people because they are disabled" (p. 27). This means that ableism is not restricted to name-calling or the absence of physical accessibility, but manifests itself in the organization of society itself, which defines who is "normal", who is "capable" and who deserves to be in public spaces, such as school. As Diniz (2007) points out: "[...] disability: disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by contemporary social organization, which considers little or nothing of people who have injuries and excludes them from the main activities of social life" (p. 19).

As soon as one observes the functioning of educational institutions, one realizes that the school is one of the main spaces for the reproduction of ableism. Now, the discourse of normality, so present in curricula, in evaluation practices and in ways of teaching, produces a logic of adaptation to the standard. As Itxi Guerra (2021) argues: "[...] Our worth is measured in terms of our usefulness to other people. Anyone who deviates from this idea because they cannot work or supposedly cannot do so is discriminated against and disabled, no longer considered as a 'person' and loses all their rights" (p. 28). In this sense, the school – by standardizing times, contents and rhythms – not only ignores difference, but transforms it into a defect. As Débora Diniz (2007) summarizes, "[...] the ideology of normalization was, for a long period, the foundation of biomedical intervention actions in the individual with lesions" (p. 17).

The medical model aims to medicalize people so that they get as close as possible to the idea of normality (normality being understood as those bodies and minds that are capable of producing the greatest economic profit for the system). The goal is that they can be useful (understood from the capitalist perspective) and produce the maximum economic profit (through wage labor) for capitalism and the State. [...] Disability comes to be understood as a social construct, that is, it is society that creates the idea of disability. *One is not born disabled, one becomes* (emphasis added) (Guerra, 2021, p. 13).

That is why it must be recognized that the school environment often legitimizes discriminatory practices disguised as meritocracy or neutrality. The naturalization of the exclusion of students with disabilities through standardized tests, inflexible curricula and pedagogical models centered on performance reinforces school failure as a destination. As stated by the MEC (2022), "[...] the culture of school failure combines failure, age-grade distortion and school dropout, under arguments of lack of skills and merits" (p. 26). In addition, this same pedagogical logic considers only certain types of intelligence or abilities as legitimate, making different forms of learning invisible. As Skliar (1997) points out: "[...] the predominant evaluative practice considers as one of the main factors [...] the person's

intelligence conditions", which feeds "[...] a discriminative pedagogical (and also psychological) position" (p. 52).

Although the school proclaims inclusion as a principle, it often conditions it to the adaptation of subjects with disabilities to the existing model, not modifying its bases to accommodate differences. In this way, ableism operates as a selective filter: those who come close to the norm are tolerated; those who defy it, excluded. Guerra (2021) is blunt in stating that "[...] disability results from the denial of a normative model of body and mind [...] there is no category that defines the oppressor group. It is considered that not being disabled is normal" (p. 26). Likewise, Sassaki (2022) highlights that "[...] attitudinal, communicational and methodological barriers still prevent learning and coexistence for all in conditions of equality" (p. 20), which demonstrates how ableism is not accidental, but foundational of the hegemonic school logic. For Len Barton (2001, p. 88):

The mere physical placement of students with disabilities in mainstream schools, without a fundamental change in curriculum, pedagogy, and institutional values, amounts to make-believe. Inclusion, in this context, becomes conditional – dependent on the ability of the student with a disability to 'fit in', rather than the school's willingness to adapt. These conditions reflect a deeper ideological commitment to ableist norms, in which difference is tolerated only when it does not disrupt the status quo. Thus, the apparent acceptance of difference is actually regulated by a logic of normalization that marginalizes rather than integrates.

However, the meritocratic discourse that structures a large part of school practices is anchored precisely in the illusion of neutrality. The school claims to treat everyone "equal", but ignores that the starting points are different and that the ways of learning vary radically among the subjects. As Mitchell and Snyder (2014) state: "[...] disability becomes the terrain on which narratives of overcoming or failure are founded, always centered on the individual subject and never on the structure that produces exclusion" (p. 46). Similarly, Linton (1998) observes that "[...] the language of disability has been colonized by clinical discourse, which transforms social and political issues into individual medical problems" (p. 13). This epistemological colonization deepens exclusion, as it shifts the problem from structure to the body of the person with disabilities.

Although many teachers say they are open to diversity, daily pedagogical practices reveal how much ableism is rooted. When a student with disabilities is constantly removed from the classroom for "adapted activities", or when his participation is restricted to decorative tasks in school projects, we are faced with sophisticated mechanisms of exclusion. As Claudia Werneck (1997) states: "[...] School is the beginning of everything. If

it does not change its principles, goodbye inclusive society" (p. 61). Likewise, Barton (1996) warns that "[...] true inclusion requires structural changes in the policies, practices and values of school institutions, and not simple physical insertion" (p. 58).

The notion of inclusion should be understood as something that goes beyond the mere physical insertion of students with disabilities in regular schools. True inclusion implies substantial changes in institutional policies, in the values that sustain pedagogical practice and in the forms of organization of teaching. The maintenance of structures that only tolerate the presence of these students, without transforming the material and symbolic conditions of schooling, constitutes a disguised form of exclusion. This practice reaffirms the dominant models of normality and competence, ignoring the needs and rights of historically marginalized subjects (Barton, 1996, p. 74).

As one analyzes the school from the inside, it is possible to identify how the traditional curriculum is guided by homogeneity, silencing the multiplicities that make up the student body. Students who do not fit this model are treated as exceptions to be remedied. As Sassaki (1997) points out: "[...] the equalization of opportunities requires the transformation of social systems, and not the adaptation of individuals" (p. 39). At the same time, Erevelles (2011) points out that "[...] the categories of disability are constructed in such a way as to justify inequalities and legitimize the exclusion of those who do not correspond to the ideal of cognitive competence" (p. 54). Therefore, both the curriculum and the pedagogical structure operate in favor of maintaining a normativity that inferiorizes what escapes the standard.

In such a way that, even in the forms of evaluation, ableism manifests itself with rigidity and subtlety. Standardized assessments, for example, do not recognize the different ways of learning and expressing knowledge, and end up sanctioning exclusion under the pretext of objectivity. Skliar (1997) criticizes this model by stating that "[...] evaluation must abandon its classificatory function to assume an interpretative, investigative and comprehensive function of diversity" (p. 40). By reinforcing fixed performance standards, the school disregards unique learning processes. As Barton (2001) reinforces: "[...] education based on models of normality is a form of social control, which regulates and disciplines bodies and minds according to ableist criteria" (p. 112).

The predominant evaluative practice considers as one of the main factors in the 'division of waters' disabled individual/non-disabled individual, the person's intelligence conditions. [...] Intelligence has traditionally (and historically) been measured through IQ tests, a way of operationalizing the intelligence construct that has lately been strongly criticized. [...] There are, however, strong criticisms of the evaluation based on the concept of interindividual differences, where the individual conditions of development, recovery and potentiation of latent abilities are

disregarded in favor of a discriminative pedagogical (and also psychological) position (Skliar, 1997, p. 52).

When the school adopts a posture indifferent to the social, cultural and physical conditions of the subjects, it reinforces a pedagogical model that operates through symbolic and material exclusion. The apparent neutrality of educational practices hides mechanisms of control and silencing. As stated by Mitchell and Snyder (2014), "[...] disability works as a silent metaphor that structures the pedagogical narrative: difference must be overcome, corrected or erased" (p. 59). That is why Linton (1998) argues that "[...] the refusal to name ableism as a structure is, in itself, a form of epistemic violence" (p. 16). By not problematizing the system that marginalizes, the school perpetuates the logic of normality as a single horizon.

Even if there is talk of inclusion, the school space continues to be structured according to productivist and competitive standards that measure the value of the student by his or her cognitive, physical and behavioral performance. When a student does not meet expectations, he is labeled as "backward", "limited" or "unfit", which places him on the margins of the school experience. As Sassaki (1997) warns: "[...] it is not enough to allow the person with disabilities to be present; it is necessary to guarantee their active participation and their belonging to the group" (p. 50). In addition, Erevelles (2011) observes that "[...] disability is often constructed at the intersection of race, class, and gender, serving as a tool for controlling marginalized populations" (p. 96).

The culture of school failure combines failure, age-grade distortion and school dropout, under arguments of lack of skills and merits. It seems to fall more heavily on more vulnerable groups, such as students with disabilities, assuming that they are incapable of learning and naturalizing their failure. According to UNICEF, the organization of education systems into grades and curriculum conceptions contribute to the culture of failure and disproportionately burden children and adolescents, making them fully responsible for their learning condition and ignoring that Education is a collective process (Brasil, 2022, p. 26).

Since ableism is more than an individual prejudice, it is necessary to see it as the founding logic of a modern rationality that defines who is the subject of rights and who can be considered educable. As Guerra (2021) analyzes: "[...] we are obliged to be grateful for any crumb of access, as if living with dignity were a privilege and not a right" (p. 32). This logic of favor, and not of right, operates in the school routine, in decisions such as denying a Libras interpreter, omitting accessibility resources, or transferring the responsibility for

failure to the student with disabilities. As Sassaki (1997) warns: "[...] society, by creating barriers, converts difference into disadvantage" (p. 28).

Thus, as ableism is recognized as a structure, a critical review of the school practices that sustain it becomes urgent. Transformation requires listening, continuous teacher training, curricular flexibility and a break with the criteria of normality that sustain the school failure of people with disabilities. As Skliar (1997) summarizes: "[...] the school must be conceived as a territory of the different, and not as a space of homogenization" (p. 62). That is why Guerra (2021) emphasizes that "[...] Fighting against ableism is also rethinking what we call education and asking: who does it serve?" (p. 38). Len Barton (2001, p. 112) states:

The continued exclusion of people with disabilities from mainstream education is not simply the result of personal prejudices or ignorance, but a consequence of deep-rooted structural and cultural practices. The education system must be interrogated in its entirety: its policies, values, and practices need to be challenged if inclusion is to be meaningful. True inclusion is not about integrating individuals into an immutable system, but rather about transforming that system to embrace diversity. This requires not only political change, but also a fundamental cultural reorientation that values all learners equally.

That said, although the discourse of inclusion is increasingly present in legal documents and pedagogical projects, what is verified in the daily life of many schools is the maintenance of practices that belong to the integrationist logic, says Santos, et. al. (2024). This logic operates from the idea that the subject with disabilities must be prepared to enter the regular school space – a space that, in turn, remains unchanged in its bases. Thus, the rhetoric of inclusion often masks a model in which the presence of the student with disabilities is tolerated, as long as he molds himself to what is already structured. Inclusion, in this sense, does not transform the school; it only covers it with a new language.

That is why it is necessary to distinguish inclusion from integration. Integration is often understood as a policy of assimilation, where students with disabilities are invited to adapt to a school norm that was not designed for them. It is not about ensuring belonging, but about allowing access under implicit conditions of performance, behavior and adaptation. The school declares itself inclusive, but requires the student to make an effort to adjust to his or her ways of teaching and evaluating. Thus, the burden of inclusion falls on the subject with disabilities, and not on the structure of the school. As Sassaki (1997) explains: "[...] true inclusion requires modifications in social systems and not in individuals who are different" (p. 42). In addition, Erevelles (2011) warns that "[...] educational

institutions reproduce social hierarchies by demanding normalization of those who are already marginalized" (p. 71).

The inclusion questions the concept of cascades in its proposal for the inclusion of people with special educational needs in education. The objection is that the cascade system tends toward segregation of these people. [...] Because a system that admits such a diversification of opportunities for students who cannot keep up with the class in regular education does not force the school to restructure itself to keep them (Sassaki, 1997, p. 52).

However, the criticism of this model needs to go beyond punctual denunciation. It is necessary to question the very underlying logic that sustains the idea of adaptation as a synonym for inclusion. When the school starts from the principle that the student needs to be "prepared" to be in it, a conception of normality is reproduced that hierarchizes bodies and knowledge. This logic reiterates the "place of the other" as peripheral, as the one who enters the school scene only as an exception – never as a reference or starting point for transformation. The discourse of adaptation, then, is a trap: it promises inclusion, but delivers domestication. As Garland-Thomson (1997) emphasizes: "[...] the disabled body is represented as a deviant identity, a violated version of a mythical norm" (p. 43). And as Guerra (2021) reinforces: "[...] normalization is the system by which one determines who belongs and who must be corrected, adapted or discarded" (p. 29).

As soon as one accepts the challenge of thinking about the school from the point of view of difference, one understands that inclusion cannot be a movement from the outside in, but from the inside out. In other words, it is not a matter of including the "different" in what is posed, but of reinventing what is posed from the presence of the different. This means rethinking curricula, forms of evaluation, the organization of school times and spaces. As Skliar (2010) points out: "[...] normative tolerance means accepting the other only to the extent that he does not threaten what is already established as the legitimate standard" (p. 41). Likewise, Barton (1996) states that "[...] inclusive education is not just about location, but about participation, transformation and social justice" (p. 102).

Inclusion requires a transformation of the school, as it defends the insertion in regular education of students with any deficits and needs. The inclusive school criticizes the partial way in which the cascade system proposes the inclusion of students with special educational needs. It questions both special and regular education, as they are currently presented. And he justifies: there is only one education, so it is not appropriate to divide teaching into modalities. Educating adults and children is one thing, because educating is an interactive and dynamic process. Educating servants and principals of a given school is also one thing. It is the permanent education of the human. Inclusion does not exclude anyone from the

infinite meaning of the concept of educating. Hence it is an education for all (Sasaki, 1997, p. 54-55).

Although this criticism may seem harsh, it is necessary to destabilize the hegemonic model of school that we continue to reproduce. The "inclusion" that only adds students with disabilities to the school routine without rethinking pedagogical practices and values is, in fact, an exclusionary inclusion. The integrationist model fails because it does not recognize difference as a structuring principle of education. On the contrary, it sees difference as a problem to be managed, compensated, minimized – and, when possible, made invisible. As Linton (1998) observes: "[...] disability is not a defect or a problem to be solved; it is a social and political category shaped by institutional practices" (p. 24). Barton (1989) points out that "[...] to genuinely include students with disabilities, it is not the individual who must change, but the system in which he or she is inserted" (p. 17).

Thus, the maintenance of the current school structure under the cloak of inclusion exposes the inability of the school to rethink itself. Instead of creating other ways of teaching, evaluating and living together, it seeks to keep its functioning untouched. And when something goes wrong, the blame falls on the student: he "didn't learn", he "didn't keep up", he "wasn't ready". The integrationist model²⁵ thus produces the school failure of people with disabilities as something naturalized, when in fact it is produced by the school structure itself. As Tom Shakespeare (2006) reinforces: "[...] we must observe how social structures and practices make people disabled, and not just focus on individual limitation" (p. 56). For Freire (1996): "[...] No one ignores everything, no one knows everything. That is why we always learn from each other" (p. 25), which requires a flexible and dialogical school environment, incompatible with the logic of normalizing exclusion. For Carlos Skliar (1997: 9):

There is no need to blush if one affirms that, in reality, failure is the result of a metaphysical pressure that is exerted on special subjects: they are trapped by a false ideological/pedagogical conception, they are conditioned to breathe through false social representations, regulated by means of medieval norms and habits,

²⁵ The integrationist model in school is based on the idea that students with disabilities should be inserted into the regular educational system without it undergoing substantial transformations. This logic presupposes that the student adapts to previously established school norms, disregarding their singularities and denying the right to difference. Such a model maintains the centrality of the norm and treats the presence of disability as a tolerated exception, and not as a legitimate part of human diversity. As Romeu Kazumi Sasaki (1997) states, "[...] educational integration is often seen as a privilege granted to students with disabilities, conditioning their permanence to the ability to adjust to the demands of the regular school" (p. 41). In this sense, the integrationist model distances itself from a truly inclusive proposal, as it does not promote the transformation of pedagogical practices or break with the exclusionary mechanisms that structure school daily life. See: Sasaki, R. K. *Inclusion: Building a society for all*. Rio de Janeiro: WVA, 1997.

they cannot communicate because they have to learn how to overcome their disability and be equal to others – where are they and who are the others? – instead of playing, they repeat; instead of moving, they exercise.

In order to move beyond integration, it is necessary to assume that difference is not an obstacle to teaching, but an epistemological possibility. The presence of students with disabilities can – and should – force us to invent new forms of knowledge, language, and pedagogical relationships. However, this requires a profound change in the ways we think about the school and the subjects who circulate in it. It is not a matter of welcoming the student with disabilities "despite" their difference, but precisely "because" of it. Its difference is what makes the school a more powerful, more human, more real place. As Riddle (n.d.) argues: "[...] inclusive education requires that we value diversity as essential to democratic life, and not as an obstacle to be managed" (p. 7). Mitchell and Snyder (2014) add: "[...] disability should be considered central to rethinking the production of knowledge in educational systems" (p. 98).

Even though the term "inclusion" is widely accepted and used, its use must be constantly stressed. If inclusion serves only to reaffirm the norm, it is not emancipatory. If it serves only to decorate institutional documents with slogans, but without producing real ruptures, it is an accomplice of exclusion. For this reason, the criticism of the integrationist model is, at the same time, an ethical and political call for us to engage in the construction of a school that is, in fact, for everyone – and not just for those who can adapt. As Barton (2018) states: "[...] inclusion without transformation is just a form of containment – a way of managing difference without addressing the causes of inequality" (p. 64). In consonance, Erevelles (2011) argues that "[...] inclusion that does not question structural inequalities ends up reinforcing the same hierarchies that it claims to combat" (p. 122).

Inclusion can be used as a linguistic device that masks the persistence of exclusions. Making institutions accessible without transforming their normative assumptions may serve more to maintain the status quo than to question it. Mere physical presence does not mean epistemological access, nor does it mean a rupture of power hierarchies (Linton, 1998, p. 139).

Since, the logic of normative adaptation places the school at a crossroads: either it continues to reproduce mechanisms of conditional inclusion, or it opens itself to the challenge of transforming itself based on difference. The second option is more difficult, slower, more laborious – but it is the only one that breaks the cycle of failure and exclusion. Reinventing the school is not a simple task, but it is what is required of an institution that

wants to be truly democratic. As Sassaki (1997) points out: "[...] it is not just about opening the doors of the school, but about changing its structures so that everyone can remain and participate actively" (p. 51). Shakespeare (2018) reinforces: "[...] An inclusive society is not just about access, but about full participation, belonging and respect for difference" (p. 103).

Therefore, instead of thinking about how to include the "other", it is urgent to ask: what school do we want to build from the encounter with the other? What pedagogies can be born from the recognition of the multiple ways of existing, learning, and communicating? This inversion of perspective is what marks the passage from the integrationist model to the paradigm of critical inclusive education, which does not seek to fit the different, but to continuously remake itself from it. Skliar (2020) invites us to this ethical and pedagogical gesture when he says that "[...] it is not a matter of integrating, but of listening to the other as an other who transforms us" (p. 29). In turn, Linton (1998) states: "[...] inclusive education is not only about access, but about reframing the terms of participation and challenging dominant narratives about skill" (p. 35).

As soon as the urgency of rethinking the school from the ethics of difference is understood, anti-ableism education presents itself as an imperative that goes beyond the discourses of symbolic inclusion. It challenges the normative bases of school practices, demanding the deconstruction of the foundations on which exclusion is built. According to Erevelles (2011), "[...] disability is constantly evoked as a symbol of individual failure, thus concealing the profoundly political and structural nature of educational exclusion" (p. 43). Likewise, Silva (2020) warns that "[...] Thinking about inclusion without reviewing the systems of power that sustain ableism is like trying to put out a fire with gasoline" (p. 87).

The struggle for inclusive education is, above all, a struggle for social justice. It is about recognizing that exclusion is not an individual or technical failure, but the result of systems that produce structural inequalities. True inclusion requires challenging the prevailing assumptions about normalcy, competence, and value. It requires us to radically rethink the organization of the school, the curriculum, the pedagogical relations and the evaluation systems. It is not a matter of fitting some 'different' students into pre-existing structures, but of transforming these structures in order to welcome diversity as constitutive of education (Barton, 2001, p. 62).

Given how ableism structures the school routine in an invisible and naturalized way, it is necessary to affirm that anti-ableism education is not content with including deviant bodies, but claims the profound reorganization of the educational space itself. For this reason, Erevelles (2011) emphasizes that "[...] hidden curricula operate quietly to exclude

students with disabilities, even when policies say otherwise" (p. 112). And as Itxi Guerra (2021) warns, "[...] the ableist system is the one that discriminates, violates, marginalizes and murders disabled people because they are disabled" (p. 27).

In such a way that anti-ableism education emerges as a rupture with the schooling models that privilege performance, productivity and standardization, it proposes an ethical displacement that repositions all the subjects of education in the face of power relations. In this sense, Simi Linton (1998) states that "[...] mere physical presence does not mean epistemological access, nor does it mean a rupture of power hierarchies" (p. 139). And as Sassaki (1997) reinforces, "[...] educating is an interactive and dynamic process [...] it is the permanent education of the human" (p. 55).

It is not possible for the ethical subject to live without being permanently exposed to the transgression of ethics. One of our fights in History, for this very reason, is exactly this: to do everything we can in favor of ethics, without falling into hypocritical moralism. [...] When, however, I speak of the universal ethics of the human being, I am speaking of ethics as a mark of human nature, as something absolutely indispensable to human coexistence. [...] The human being has become a Presence in the world, with the world and with others. Presence that, recognizing the other presence as a 'not-I', recognizes itself as 'itself'. A presence that thinks of itself, that knows itself to be a presence, that intervenes, that transforms, that speaks of what it does but also of what it dreams, that verifies, compares, evaluates, values, decides, that breaks. And it is in the domain of decision, evaluation, freedom, rupture, and option, that the need for ethics is established and responsibility is imposed (Freire, 1996, p. 12).

Even if the school insists on homogenizing practices, it is necessary to collectively construct other ways of teaching, evaluating and living together, having diversity as a starting point and not the norm. As Mitchell and Snyder (2014) write: "[...] disability has served as a prosthetic narrative, glued to the discourses of normality to hide its own instability" (p. 6). Similarly, Garland-Thomson (1997) states that "[...] disability should be understood as a form of cultural difference and not as a personal tragedy" (p. 25).

Even if managers and teachers still reproduce ableist practices under the discourse of inclusion, it is urgent to recognize that true curricular transformation also requires reviewing the way knowledge and evaluation are conceived. According to Skliar (2020), "[...] methodologies need to dialogue with otherness, and not just tolerate it" (p. 61). And for Barton (1996), "[...] inclusive education is not just about location, but about participation, transformation and social justice" (p. 102).

Educational evaluation – as a vertical, unilateral, decontextualized, powerful, timeless, conservative system – can produce negative influences on the development of a subject's life. It can even divert their social, institutional, cognitive,

affective destiny – in relation to the greatest of existential darkness. [...] When pointing out the existence of inappropriate or irregular situations, those circumstances in which the referral to specialized pedagogical care is fair and adequate are certainly not excluded. However, there are several cases where the evaluation and referral to specialized school care take place under the wrong conditions (Skliar, 1997, p. 50).

As soon as the school shifts its gaze from disability to the power of diversity, it stops naming subjects by absence and begins to recognize the richness of difference. As Riddle (n.d.) observes, "[...] the recognition of difference must be accompanied by a commitment to the redistribution of power" (p. 41). As disability is recognized as a political construct, it is perceived that there is no way to defend inclusive educational practices without dismantling the mechanisms that reproduce inequalities. For Erevelles (2011), "[...] a radical pedagogy of disability requires that we locate the roots of exclusion in historical and material inequalities" (p. 88). And as Guerra (2021) states, "[...] ableism is the social, political and economic system that values bodies and minds according to the standard of normality and utility" (p. 28).

Although the school produces subjectivities marked by failure, inadequacy and pathologization on a daily basis, it is possible to reverse this situation based on pedagogical practices that affirm belonging. As Sasaki (1997) points out, "[...] inclusion does not exclude anyone from the infinite meaning of the concept of educating" (p. 55). And Linton (1998) adds: "[...] it is necessary to create conditions for the voices of people with disabilities to be heard as legitimate producers of knowledge" (p. 81).

Sometimes, one can hardly imagine what a simple gesture by the teacher can come to represent in the life of a student. [...] I was then being an insecure teenager, seeing myself as an angular and ugly body, perceiving myself less capable than the others, strongly uncertain of my possibilities. [...] The teacher's gesture was worth more than the very ten he gave to my essay. The teacher's gesture brought me a confidence that was still obviously suspicious that it was possible to work and produce. [...] This knowledge, that of the importance of these gestures that multiply daily in the plots of the school space, is something that we would have to seriously reflect on (Freire, 1996, p. 24).

That is why the anti-ableism struggle demands a school where the plurality of bodies and ways of learning is not only tolerated, but celebrated. As Mitchell and Snyder (2014) teach, "[...] disability has been used to give cohesion to the narratives of normality, and it is necessary to break with this logic" (p. 47). And Garland-Thomson (1997) observes that "[...] by insisting on narratives of overcoming, we erase the criticism of the structures that produce exclusion" (p. 58).

Despite this, many school spaces still operate from the logic of integration, requiring students to adapt to what is already in place. As Skliar (1997) points out, "in reality, failure is the result of a metaphysical pressure that is exerted on special subjects [...] regulated by means of medieval norms and habits" (p. 9). In consonance, Shakespeare (2018) states that "[...] it is not only about guaranteeing access, but about transforming the school so that it belongs to everyone" (p. 101). Paulo Freire (1996) is perfectly aligned with the critique of the logic of adaptation to the structure already established by the school.

The fatalistic, immobilizing ideology that animates the neoliberal discourse is loose in the world. With an air of post-modernity, it insists on convincing us that we can do nothing against the social reality that, from historical and cultural, becomes or becomes 'almost natural'. [...] From the point of view of such an ideology, there is only one way out for educational practice: to adapt the student to this reality that cannot be changed. What is needed, therefore, is the technical training that is indispensable for the adaptation of the student, for his survival. The book with which I return to the readers is a decisive no to this ideology that denies and belittles us as people (p. 10).

As soon as it is admitted that disability is produced in relation to the norm, it becomes possible to build a school where the common does not exclude the different. As Riddle (n.d.) states, "[...] social justice requires that we move from the idea of access to the idea of belonging" (p. 55). And as Itxi Guerra (2021) warns, "[...] By naming the invisible oppressions, we are able to put them in the foreground and begin their deconstruction" (p. 19).

Thus, although inclusion has been consolidated as a legal and political principle in the Brazilian educational scenario, its implementation faces profound obstacles, especially with regard to teacher training. The absence of critical debates on disability, social justice and anti-ableism in undergraduate courses has contributed to the reproduction of exclusionary school practices. As highlighted in the MEC report (2022): "[...] in 2020, those who have continuing education (minimum of 80 hours) in the area of Special Education are the minority" (p. 23). In the same sense, Claudia Werneck (1997) observes that "[...] As long as the courses and universities that train teachers do not have as a point of honor to make them aware that students with disabilities are the responsibility of all educators [...], we will walk like turtles" (p. 62).

At a time of discouragement and devaluation of the teacher's work at all levels, the pedagogy of autonomy presents us with constitutive elements of the understanding of teaching practice as a social dimension of human formation. In addition to the reduction to the strictly pedagogical aspect and marked by the political nature of his thought, Freire warns us of the need to take a vigilant stance against all practices of

dehumanization. To this end, the know-how of critical self-reflection and the know-how of wisdom exercised permanently can help us to make the necessary critical reading of the true causes of human degradation and the reason for the existence of the fatalistic discourse of globalization (Freire, 1996, p. 4).

That is why thinking about an anti-ableism education requires facing the challenge of restructuring the formative processes of educators. It is not enough to offer punctual or superficial courses: it is necessary to promote a critical literacy that denaturalizes the medical, meritocratic and normative discourses that have historically shaped education. As Itxi Guerra (2021) states, "[...] disability is a social construction, and as can happen with the idea of 'woman', defining it is, to say the least, complicated" (p. 11).

However, what is observed is that many teachers still enter the profession without ever having had contact with broader discussions about accessibility, intersectionality and the rights of people with disabilities. Since initial training remains anchored in normative paradigms, it is urgent to build training proposals that value the difference and plurality of bodies. As reported by Itxi Guerra (2021): "[...] we grew up believing that disability was a disease, that it was an individual matter and that it did not fit into the political sphere" (p. 9). And according to the MEC (2022), "[...] it is not possible to know which perspective is adopted in these courses: whether their approach would be focused on the subjects' impediments [...] or whether it is inclusive, aiming at the elimination of barriers" (p. 23).

Initial teacher training needs to be aligned with the inclusive perspective and, for this, it is necessary that there are disciplines focused on Inclusive Education. In addition, it is important to promote better working conditions, invest in continuing education, and strengthen career plans. [...] The training has the mission of providing tools and reducing attitudinal barriers to the learning of students who are the target audience of Special Education and improving the quality of education for each and every one. [...] The inclusive perspective must be incorporated from initial training so that it is possible to deconstruct the culture of school failure and seriously face the challenges posed by diversity (MEC, 2022, p. 48).

Although the legislation advances in recognizing the right to inclusion, many teachers have not yet been equipped to materialize this right in the classroom. Continuing education, in this sense, needs to be strengthened, not as a palliative, but as a space for critical reflection on school practices and their effects on the production of inequalities. As the MEC document (2022) points out: "[...] 40% of the teachers have never had access to training on the theme of inclusion of students who are the target audience of Special Education" (p. 22). For Débora Diniz (2007), "[...] there are inequalities of power in the field of disability that will not be resolved by architectural adjustments" (p. 30).

Thus, the challenges of teacher training also involve facing the institutional culture of ableism, still rooted in schools and pedagogical materials. To break with this logic, it is necessary to invest in training processes that problematize evaluation practices, the hidden curriculum and the pedagogy of normality. As Sassaki (2020) proposes: "[...] there are six dimensions of barriers that need to be overcome: architectural, communicational, methodological, instrumental, programmatic and attitudinal" (p. 22). And according to Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (1997) argues that "[...] disability, like all forms of bodily difference, acquires cultural significance within the power relations that shape social institutions" (p. 25).

Thus, the evaluation process, when inadequately conducted, can result in the emergence of labels such as: 'That student is from the special class or school, must have some disability!', which causes evident damage to the child with regard to the binomial school performance – self-esteem. [...] The critical point lies, rather, in the way in which the identification process is conducted, especially with regard to the system of classification of disabilities. The greatest fear coupled with this issue is related to the risk of the formation of social prejudices towards people with disabilities (Skliar, 1997, p. 50).

As soon as ableism is recognized as a structure of oppression, it is perceived that it is not only manifested in interpersonal relationships, but above all in school organization. Therefore, teacher training must expand its political dimension, allowing educators to take a critical position in the face of the norms of the body and mind. As the MEC (2022) emphasizes: "[...] it is necessary that, from the initial training of teachers, there are disciplines focused on Inclusive Education" (p. 48). Tom Shakespeare (2018) reinforces: "[...] teacher training cannot be limited to technique; it needs to question the structures that maintain exclusion and enable the teacher to face them critically" (p. 88).

Even though some teaching degree courses have curricular components aimed at inclusion, it is common for the theme of disability to be treated in a secondary way or limited to the technical aspect. For a truly critical education, it is necessary to break with the idea that inclusion is the task of specialists and assume that it must cross the entire teacher training. According to the book "Inclusive Education – What does the teacher have to do with it?": "[...] specialized teachers have an important role to play, helping to train other teachers to adequately serve students with disabilities in the inclusive school" (p. 95). And as the MEC (2022) warns, "[...] teachers in the regular classroom need to have the

sensitivity and the necessary pedagogical tools and resources to offer the contents of the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC)²⁶ in an inclusive way" (p. 24).

Training education professionals has great potential both for the removal of attitudinal barriers and for the expansion of accessible and anti-discriminatory strategies, methodologies and practices aimed at the entire class, without exception. On the other hand, its lack cannot be used as an argument for not receiving any student with quality, regardless of their physical, sensory, mental characteristics, among others. [...] The training has the mission of providing tools and reducing attitudinal barriers to the learning of students who are the target audience of Special Education and improving the quality of education for each and every one (MEC, 2022, p. 23-24).

In order for teacher training to be not only normative, but effectively transformative, it is essential to strengthen collaborative and dialogical training practices. The sharing of experiences, case studies and interdisciplinary work can favor the development of a critical awareness among educators. As MEC (2022) observes: "[...] continuing education courses have the important role of contributing to the increase in the quality of Education for all" (p. 24). And according to the same document, "[...] the absence of training cannot be alleged to deny the inclusion of any students with quality" (p. 24).

However, as training actions are expanded, it is also necessary to guarantee material and institutional conditions so that teachers can put into practice the knowledge acquired. There is no point in promoting courses without ensuring adequate time, support and infrastructure for the exercise of an inclusive pedagogy. As MEC (2022) highlights: "[...] conditions must be given for the development of collaborative work between the teacher of the Specialized Educational Service (AEE)²⁷ and the teacher of the common room" (p. 24).

²⁶ The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), approved in 2017, establishes a set of competencies and skills that all students in Brazilian basic education must develop throughout their school life. Although the BNCC has as its guiding principle the guarantee of the right to learning for all, it has been criticized for its normative structure that tends to standardize knowledge, which can reinforce inequalities, especially with regard to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Despite providing for adaptation to specific needs and respect for diversity, the way the BNCC is operationalized in schools often disregards singularities and different times and ways of learning. As a regulatory document, it needs to be reinterpreted from a critical and anti-ableist perspective, so that it does not perpetuate exclusion under the logic of homogenization. See: Brazil. Ministry of Education. *National Common Curricular Base*. Brasília, DF: MEC. Retrieved <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/>, 2017.

²⁷ Specialized Educational Service (SES) is a teaching modality provided for in Brazilian legislation that aims to complement or supplement the training of students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities/giftedness. This service must occur in an articulated way with regular education, respecting the singularities of the students and promoting the development of their potential through resources, strategies and specialized services. According to the *National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education*, "[...] the SEA organizes pedagogical and accessibility resources to eliminate barriers that may obstruct the schooling process of students who are the target audience of special education" (Brasil, 2008, p. 15). Thus, SEA represents a fundamental pedagogical action to ensure the realization of the right to inclusive education, as long as it is anchored in practices that value difference and break with welfare and

And according to the same report, "[...] the selection of professionals to compose the teaching career needs to consider inclusion as a relevant theme" (p. 24).

The challenge is not only to train teachers with theoretical knowledge about inclusion, but to ensure that they have real working conditions that allow them to apply this knowledge in a critical and creative way. [...] Training, by itself, does not solve the structural contradictions of the school system. It is also necessary to transform the institutional culture and invest in material resources, planning time, pedagogical support and collaborative practices so that the discourse of inclusion is not reduced to a formality (Barton, 2001, p. 74).

As soon as teacher training is understood as a political space for the dispute over meanings, it becomes possible to build a new educational ethic, based on justice and the recognition of difference. The inclusive school we want depends on teachers who are prepared but also committed to transformation. For Itxi Guerra (2021), "[...] when it comes to analyzing the words we use when we talk about ableism [...] it serves us as a first tool of deconstruction" (p. 19). And as the MEC (2022) reinforces: "[...] training education professionals has great potential both for the removal of attitudinal barriers and for the expansion of accessible and anti-discriminatory strategies, methodologies and practices aimed at the entire class, without exception" (p. 22).

Thus, although inclusion has become a widely disseminated principle in contemporary educational discourses, it often remains restricted to operational and normative aspects. The mere physical presence of students with disabilities at school, although important, does not ensure full participation, symbolic recognition or appreciation of difference. As Werneck (1997, p. 65) points out, "[...] including is not a favor, but an exchange", because "[...] Living with human differences is the right of the little citizen, disabled or not". In addition to presence, it is necessary to transform the school structure into a space for symbolic sharing and ethical reconstruction of bonds. After all, "[...] the transforming school is the seed of this Brazil-of-the-exact-size-of-our-ideas" (1997, p. 65). Paulo Freire (1996) substantiates the assertion that the school needs to be a space for symbolic sharing, ethical reconstruction and collective transformation so that inclusion is fully achieved:

This knowledge, that of the importance of these gestures that multiply daily in the plots of the school space, is something that we would have to reflect on seriously. It is a pity that the socializing character of the school, what is informal in the

medicalization. See: Brazil. Ministry of Education. Secretariat of Special Education. *National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education*. Brasília, DF: MEC. Retrieved <https://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/politica.pdf>, 2008.

experience that is lived in it, of formation or deformation, is neglected. [...] If it had been clear to us that it was by learning that we realized that it was possible to teach, we would have easily understood the importance of informal experiences in the streets, in the squares, at work, in school classrooms, in playgrounds, in which various gestures of students, administrative staff, teaching staff intersect full of meaning. There is a testimonial nature in the spaces so regrettably relegated to schools.

Going beyond the logic of architectural and instrumental accessibility requires understanding that true inclusion is linked to the transformation of the school into a space for the production of subjectivities, knowledge and rights. This requires a review of the very values that guide social coexistence. As Sasaki (1997, p. 164) states: "[...] inclusion will only be fully realized when society is willing to transform itself." It is a matter of recognizing that diversity is not an obstacle, but "a common good" (Sasaki, 1997, p. 164).

Inclusion, then, must be assumed as part of a political project of human emancipation. This implies recognizing education as an ethical and social practice, permeated by power relations. The school cannot be a space that only "[...] welcomes the other", but rather a common territory of collective production of knowledge. As Freire (1996, p. 69) points out, "[...] the democratic, coherent, competent teacher [...] knows more and more the value she has for the modification of reality". However, this transformative role is not realized in rigid and sterile formulas, because, according to the author, "[...] the freedom to move, to take risks has been subjected to a certain standardization of formulas" (1996, p. 70).

Since inclusion is still, in many contexts, subordinated to assistentialist and medicalizing models, it is necessary to destabilize these structures that neutralize the political power of difference. The inclusive school must be constituted as a space of social justice, not of concessions. As Werneck (1997, p. 64) observes: "[...] By depriving normal children of living with their disabled peers, we take away from everyone the chance to exercise themselves in the construction of their citizenship". And this will only be possible if we adopt "[...] another conception of education and another way of looking at the subjects", as defended by Sasaki (1997, p. 162).

Disability is no longer a simple expression of an injury that imposes restrictions on a person's social participation. Disability is a complex concept that recognizes the injured body, but also denounces the social structure that oppresses the disabled person. As with other forms of oppression by the body, such as sexism or racism, studies on disability have revealed one of the most oppressive ideologies in our social life: the one that humiliates and segregates the disabled body (Diniz, 2007, p. 17).

However, this break will only be possible if we rethink what it means to teach and learn from a critical and relational perspective. It is about reinventing the forms of knowledge construction, refusing standardization as a criterion. As Freire (1996, p. 60) argues, "[...] the pedagogical space is a text to be constantly read, interpreted, written and rewritten", and "the more solidarity there is between educator and students, the more possibilities for democratic learning open up". Therefore, as Werneck (1997, p. 64) reinforces, "[...] Inclusion preaches specialized teaching in the student and the experience of the special education professional will be decisive in this process".

The discourse of inclusion, if it is not anchored in critical practices, runs the risk of being emptied of its transformative power. The assimilation of difference in the molds of the norm reinforces exclusion. In this sense, it is necessary to rebuild the school based on sensitive listening and the appreciation of silenced knowledge. Freire (1996, p. 17) argues that "[...] indocile curiosity is a condition for criticality and for the reinvention of the world", and that "[...] progressive educational practice must develop critical curiosity". Likewise, Sassaki (1997, p. 145) reminds us that "[...] Inclusive schools are not institutions that welcome the other, but spaces in which everyone builds meanings and learns together on an equal footing".

It is necessary to show the student that the naïve use of curiosity alters his ability to find and hinders the accuracy of the find. [...] On the other hand, and above all, it is necessary that the learner assumes the role of subject of the production of his intelligence of the world and not only that of the recipient of what is transferred to him by the teacher. [...] My role as a progressive teacher is not only to teach mathematics or biology but [...] to help him recognize himself as the architect of his own cognitive practice (Freire, 1996, p. 77).

For the school to become a space of emancipation, it is necessary to dispute meanings and reposition the concept of inclusion as a political practice. Many projects only manage the difference, instead of recognizing it as a power of transformation. As Werneck (1997, p. 64) points out: "[...] interactionist currents give a place of honor to everyday experiences, where legitimate interaction resides". It is from this interaction that significant learning is forged. And, as Freire (1996, p. 60) points out: "[...] education is always a form of intervention in the world, which can reproduce or transform the dominant ideology".

Recognizing that subjects are constituted in language, history and school experiences, the construction of an emancipated school requires a new ethics of coexistence. An ethics that celebrates plural bodies, deviant knowledges and non-normative ways of being. Sassaki (1997, p. 149) emphasizes that "[...] the recognition of

difference requires the abandonment of all forms of hierarchization and silencing", because "[...] The school needs to learn to listen to other voices." This listening, as Freire (1996, p. 70) explains, is only possible when "[...] the educator who listens learns the difficult lesson of transforming his speech, sometimes necessary, to the student, into a speech with him".

Accepting and respecting difference is one of these virtues, without which listening cannot take place. If I discriminate against the poor boy or girl, the black girl or boy, the Indian boy, the rich girl; if I discriminate against women, peasants, workers, I obviously cannot listen to them, and if I do not listen to them, I cannot speak to them, but to them from top to bottom. Above all, I forbid myself to understand them. If I feel superior to the different, no matter who it is, I refuse to listen to him or her. The different is not the other who deserves respect: it is a this or that, detractable or despicable (Freire, 1996, p. 75).

Now, this requires courage: courage to break with common sense, with the structures that sustain exclusion, and with the fears that surround the unpredictable. But it is this courage that inaugurates the new. May the school be this space of reinvention where dignity, belonging and plurality can flourish. As Werneck (1997, p. 63) states: "[...] ethics, ethics, ethics – this is the foundation of the school [...] our educational system reproduces injustice when it does not provide social justice to students". And as Freire (1996, p. 69) adds: "[...] To educate is to assume the political-pedagogical task of demonstrating that it is possible to change".

Thus, to affirm inclusion as an emancipatory horizon is to affirm the school as a political, affective and collective space. A school that listens, that recognizes, that transforms itself with and from its subjects. There is no real inclusion without transforming the structures that produce inequalities. And there is no emancipation possible without the radical recognition of difference as power. As Werneck (1997, p. 66) argues, "[...] there will only be a fair school when it is built as a collective space of belonging, and not as a space of adaptation to the norm". After all, "[...] difference is power, not limitation [...] schools should celebrate difference and support learning in all its forms" (Sassaki, 1997, p. 119).

CONCLUSION

Rethinking the school from the perspective of social justice requires recognizing that the mere presence of students with disabilities in regular classrooms does not, in itself, constitute an inclusive practice. When the school remains structured by normative criteria of performance, productivity and conduct, it continues to operate under exclusionary logics,

even if it declares itself inclusive. Difference, in this context, is tolerated only if it does not disturb the current order, revealing a logic of assimilation and not of transformation.

Throughout this research, it was demonstrated that the permanence of the integrationist model in school practices prevents inclusion from being carried out effectively. Such a model, by conditioning the acceptance of students with disabilities to their ability to adapt to the system, reproduces historical inequalities under new languages. The school that demands from the subject the effort to fit in, but is not willing to change its structures, does not welcome diversity – only manages it. Therefore, it is not a matter of adjusting the student to school norms, but of restructuring the school to recognize and value the multiple ways of existing, learning and teaching.

This restructuring is only possible when it breaks with the logic of standardization, which positions the subject with disabilities as "the other" to be included. On the contrary, critical education points out that difference is a constitutive element of human experience and, therefore, of educational practice itself. The necessary displacement lies in understanding that there is no neutral teaching: every pedagogical practice is crossed by power relations and, therefore, needs to be questioned in its foundations. The school, then, becomes a space for the production of meanings and subjectivities, and not just for the transmission of content.

The theoretical path of this research, anchored in Disability Studies and Critical Education, showed that disability is a social and political construction, and that ableist practices are devices that produce exclusion through the normalization of bodies and knowledge. The authors analyzed – such as Barton, Erevelles, Freire, Garland-Thomson, Guerra, Linton, Mitchell and Snyder, among others – reinforce the need to overcome the biomedical and integrative model to institute a pedagogy that not only tolerates, but celebrates difference.

Thus, what is proposed is more than the inclusion of subjects with disabilities in the school space: it proposes the transformation of the school space itself into a territory of collective belonging. Such a transformation requires curriculum review, change in evaluation practices, attentive listening and teacher training committed to the deconstruction of ableism. It means, above all, shifting the gaze from disability as a limitation to understanding it as a power of pedagogical and epistemological reinvention.

The challenge, therefore, is not only pedagogical, but ethical and political. It implies recognizing that inclusion is not achieved with the maintenance of the same structures that

have historically marginalized subjects. A school truly committed to diversity needs to be able to welcome the complexity of human experiences and promote belonging as an educational horizon. This will only be possible if difference is no longer seen as a problem and starts to be recognized as a formative value.

It is in this sense that anti-ableism education reveals itself as an emancipatory horizon. By tensioning the normative assumptions of the modern school, it invites us to construct new meanings for teaching, learning and coexistence. The school that wants to be democratic and inclusive needs to abandon the place of concession and assume collective responsibility for ensuring the full participation of all its subjects. And this requires courage, listening, willingness to conflict, and commitment to transformation.

It is not, therefore, a matter of making students with disabilities "follow" the school – but of making the school follow the diversity of the world. This will only be possible if educators position themselves as agents of rupture and reconstruction, reinventing practices that still operate in the name of homogeneity. Difference, in this context, ceases to be an obstacle and becomes the engine that moves the school towards a fairer, plural and more humane education.

Consolidating this project requires a constant struggle against the erasure of historically silenced voices. It also requires teacher training that goes beyond technique and immerses itself in criticism. The school of the future begins with the courage to deny the logic of exclusion disguised as inclusion, and with the ethical commitment to recognize that no one learns alone – and that no one should be left behind.

REFERENCES

1. Barton, L. (1989). Disability and dependency. London, UK: Falmer Press.
2. Barton, L. (1996). Disability and society: Emerging issues and insights. London, UK: Longman.
3. Barton, L. (2001). Disability, politics & the struggle for change. London, UK: David Fulton Publishers.
4. Barton, L. (2018). Superar las barreras de la discapacidad. Madrid, Spain: Ediciones Morata.
5. Brasil. (2015). Lei nº 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015 – Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). Brasília, DF: Presidência da República. Recuperado de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm
6. Brasil. (2017). Base Nacional Comum Curricular. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Educação. Recuperado de <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/>
7. Brasil. Ministério da Educação. (2008). Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva. Brasília, DF: MEC/SEESP. Recuperado de <https://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/politica.pdf>
8. Diniz, D. (2007). O que é deficiência. São Paulo, SP: Brasiliense.
9. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2025). Educação inclusiva e direito – políticas públicas como responsabilidade do estado para estudantes com transtorno do espectro autista. Aracê, 7(2), 9392–9425. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-278>
10. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2025). Blended learning: Strategies for teaching skills, room organization, and assessment. Aracê, 7(3), 11112–11142. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n3-060>
11. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2025). Entre palavras e ações – os saberes da “pedagogia da autonomia” de Paulo Freire para transformar o ensino em prática viva. Aracê, 7(2), 6812–6841. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-135>
12. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2025). Da aflição e aceitação às teias de afetos – TEA e laços familiares na construção de pontes para a inclusão e o desenvolvimento infantil. Aracê, 7(1), 1799–1821. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-107>
13. Erevelles, N. (2011). Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
14. Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa. São Paulo, SP: Paz e Terra.

15. Garland-Thomson, R. (1997). *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
16. Gil, A. C. (2008). *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social* (6ª ed.). São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
17. Guerra, I. (2021). *Luta contra o capacitismo: Anarquismo e capacitismo*. São Paulo, SP: Editora Terra Sem Amos.
18. Linton, S. (1998). *Claiming disability: Knowledge and identity*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
19. Minayo, M. C. S. (2007). *O desafio do conhecimento: Pesquisa qualitativa em saúde* (10ª ed.). São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.
20. Mitchell, D. T., & Snyder, S. L. (2014). *Narrative prosthesis: Disability and the dependencies of discourse*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
21. Riddle, C. A. (s.d.). *From disability theory to practice*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
22. Sassaki, R. K. (1997). *Inclusão: Construindo uma sociedade para todos*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: WVA.
23. Shakespeare, T. (1996). *The sexual politics of disability: Untold desires*. London, UK: Cassell.
24. Shakespeare, T. (2006). *Disability rights and wrongs*. New York, NY: Routledge.
25. Shakespeare, T. (2018). *Disability – The basics*. London, UK: Routledge.
26. Skliar, C. (1997). *Educação & exclusão: Abordagens sócio-antropológicas em educação especial*. Porto Alegre, RS: Mediação.
27. Skliar, C. (2020). *Ensayos en lectura: Inutilidad, soledad y conversación*. Córdoba, Argentina: NEFI.
28. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). Por uma educação do afeto: Construindo “comunidades pedagógicas em sala de aula” para transpor o sensível para uma educação transformadora com bell hooks. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 22(1), e13578. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv22n1-219>
29. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). Pedagogia dialógica – desafios e potencialidades da educação como prática da liberdade em Paulo Freire. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(13), e12120. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n13-264>
30. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). Descolonizando os currículos – O protagonismo negro na transformação do conhecimento e dos currículos no processo de descolonização educacional brasileira. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(11), e7980. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n11-237>

31. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). "Entre redes e pilares": Convergência da mediação pedagógica e tecnológica no Atendimento Educacional Especializado (AEE). *Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 17(9), e10161. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.9-014>
32. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). "Semear diversidade na educação": A pedagogia de Paulo Freire como ponte da interculturalidade na educação infantil latino-americano. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(8), e6454. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n8-209>
33. dos Santos, A. N. S., & outros. (2024). "Como espelhos da alma": Refletindo a complexidade da reconfiguração da sociabilidade intrafamiliar a partir dos sujeitos com Transtorno do Espectro Autista (TEA). *Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 17(7), e8937. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.7-445>
34. Weber, M. (1949). *Ensaio de sociologia* (4ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: LTC.
35. Werneck, C. (1997). *Ninguém mais vai ser bonzinho: Na sociedade inclusiva, diferenças são inegociáveis*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: WVA.