

Please cite the Published Version

Frigerio, Alessandra, Benozzo, Angelo, Holmes, Rachel and Runswick-Cole, Katherine (2018) The Doing and Undoing of the "Autistic Child": Cutting Together and Apart Interview-Based Empirical Materials. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24 (6). pp. 390-402. ISSN 1077-8004

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417735132>

Publisher: SAGE Publications

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/619478/>

Usage rights: © In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript (confirmed) of a paper accepted for publication in *Qualitative Inquiry*, published by SAGE Publications and copyright The Authors.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

Qualitative Inquiry

The Doing and Undoing of the “Autistic Child”: Cutting Together and Apart Interview-based Empirical Materials

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Inquiry</i>
Manuscript ID	QI-17-070.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	FRIGERIO, ALESSANDRA; Universita degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca Dipartimento di Psicologia, Department of Psychology Benozzo, Angelo; University of Valle d'Aosta, Humanities and Social Sciences Holmes, Rachel; Manchester Metropolitan University Education and Social Research Institute Ruswick-Cole, Katherine; Manchester Metropolitan University Faculty of Health Psychology and Social Care, The Research Centre for Social Change: Community Wellbeing
Keywords:	autism, posthuman, new-materialism, cutting together-apart, Interviewing < Methodologies
Abstract:	This paper discusses how posthuman and new materialist theories afford us opportunities to re-think the production of the “autistic child”, drawing on a qualitative research project on parenthood in the context of childhood disability in Italy. We will put some Baradian’s key concepts (intra-action, agential cut and cutting together-apart) to work in glancing at the complexities we keep encountering when a mother, Arianna, describes her relationship with her daughter Laura. The aim of this paper is two-fold: firstly, to methodologically re-turn the production of the “autistic child”; and secondly, to rethink and unsettle the dichotomies that constitute some children as “disabled human beings”, abnormal and undesirable.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

The Doing and Undoing of the “Autistic Child”:

Cutting Together and Apart Interview-based Empirical Materials

Alessandra Frigerio¹, Angelo Benozzo², Rachel Holmes³, and Katherine Runswick-Cole³

¹University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

²University of Aosta, Aosta, Italy

³Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom

Author note

Alessandra Frigerio, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Milan Bicocca;
Angelo Benozzo, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Aosta; Rachel Holmes, BE
(Hons), MA (Hons), PhD, Education and Social Research Institute, Manchester Metropolitan
University; Katherine Runswick-Cole, BSc (Hons), MA (Hons), PGCE, PhD, Research Institute for
Health and Social Change, Manchester Metropolitan University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alessandra Frigerio,
Department of Psychology, University of Milan Bicocca, Piazza dell’Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126,
Milan (MI), Italy. Email: alessandra.frigerio@unimib.it; tel.: +39 0264483839.

Biographical Statements

Alessandra Frigerio is a Postdoctoral Fellow. Her research interests include post-structural theories, qualitative methods, and their application to the field of childhood and parenting.

Angelo Benozzo is Senior Lecturer in work and organizational psychology and qualitative research methods. His current research interests include gender and sexual identities.

Rachel Holmes is Professor of Cultural Studies of Childhood. Her research activities appreciate the complexity of the contemporary worlds that young children, families and communities occupy.

Katherine Runswick-Cole is Professor of Critical Disability Studies & Psychology. She has a particular interest in the cultural production of impairment labels.

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

Abstract

This paper discusses how posthuman and new materialist theories afford us opportunities to re-think the production of the “autistic child”, drawing on a qualitative research project on parenthood in the context of childhood disability in Italy. We will put some Baradian’s key concepts (intra-action, agential cut and cutting together-apart) to work in glancing at the complexities we keep encountering when a mother, Arianna, describes her relationship with her daughter Laura. The aim of this paper is two-fold: firstly, to methodologically re-turn the production of the “autistic child”; and secondly, to rethink and unsettle the dichotomies that constitute some children as “disabled human beings”, abnormal and undesirable.

Key words: autism, posthuman, new-materialism, cutting together-apart, interview

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

The Doing and Undoing of the “Autistic Child”:

Cutting Together and Apart Interview-based Empirical Materials

We begin in the middle of things by asking ourselves what do the empirical materials below do... produce... generate... fabricate... create...and...and...? Resisting the temptation to think about what a text means, what it represents, or reflects, we would like to imagine a different life for *this text*, a life where, what is full of meaning is no more relevant than what appears to be meaningless; where there are no absolute separations between the researcher and the phenomena s/he is integral to.

Actually, we arrived at the diagnosis after a whole series of observations - actually it was me who had been making these observations since she was born, because I immediately realized that she was a child who was learning differently ... I can consider myself, quote, “a lucky person” because I was able to make this comparison, for the very reason that I’d seen so many little children of her age and so realised that she wasn’t reacting like the others, because I worked for ten years in a crèche and for more than ten years in nursery schools. However, I realised that she was very unusual - I kept saying to myself “This little girl is too unusual,” definitely very, very sensitive to anything that was ... hmm ... anything to do with the senses, and that was the first sign... in other words, in my opinion she over-reacted to everything. I was saying to myself ... perhaps it’s because it’s a time when I’m alone, it’s just me and her, her dad was far away for work so there was a lot of silence at home. I was finishing a university course at the time and I was studying for a lot of exams; and so my mother used to say: “Yes, there is too much silence here.” She was four rooms away from me [in the house] and if a message arrived on my mobile she would wake up and call out to me, and when I used the mobile she would already want to look at what was ringing... But I can assure you that this sensation became reality ... you could say that by the time she was a year old she already knew all the colours, she recognised the letters on the

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 *laptop... I mean, she had an exaggerated attraction for anything that was new, so an*
4 *insatiable desire to learn, by which I mean not only to look around, like other children*
5 *do, and then to experiment with their body, I mean she really wanted to know the names*
6 *of things... Yes, I think she said “Mum” at about four months, or something like that,*
7 *but... she tried to give a name to everything she saw and I can absolutely guarantee that*
8 *it wasn't me who was pushing her because I didn't have much time and to be honest, at*
9 *the time I didn't much feel like talking (she smiles), it was a very tiring time for me ... and*
10 *still she had this desire to learn words.*

11 *When she was one year old, sitting in front of the computer, she would see the letters and*
12 *name them. At one year and a half, she could read numbers, letters and words, I mean*
13 *she would put the syllables together and try to read the short words; so much so that*
14 *when she was nearly three, or maybe even earlier, together with the paediatrician we*
15 *decided to take away everything, I mean everything. I took away everything, I mean*
16 *books, newspapers, the clock, everything. Because the only thing that caught her*
17 *attention was things to do with numbers and letters.*

18 *So I wondered... this little girl who always and everywhere finds letters and numbers,*
19 *and all the rest, that is, playing, or relationships, she puts in the background, or rather,*
20 *she didn't even notice them, she didn't...she didn't try to experience a relationship except*
21 *for when she was trying to reach her goal... she really loved hearing letters and numbers*
22 *repeated, so she kept asking for that, she kept asking... so this thing started to cause me*
23 *anxiety and worry because, I mean, it was an obvious way of ... basically, it was all too*
24 *clear, in my opinion, that at that moment, she was different from other children of her*
25 *age.*

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The above empirical materials are drawn from fieldwork conducted for a wider research project (Frigerio and Montali, 2016) focusing on parenthood in the context of childhood disability and mental health issues in Italy (1). In particular, the “data” we discuss comes from an interview with

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 Arianna, the mother of Laura, a 7-year-old girl diagnosed when she was 3 years old with
4
5 “Asperger’s Syndrome” (Mayes, Calhoun & Crites, 2001). Over the following pages we discuss
6
7 some of the key issues/dynamics/intra-actions that prompt a mother (Arianna) to recognize her
8
9 daughter’s (Laura) “diversity” and eventually led to her diagnosis as an “autistic child”. The aim of
10
11 this paper is two-fold: firstly, to methodologically re-turn (2) the production of the ‘autistic child’ as
12
13 we take up some theoretical affordances offered by posthumanism and new materialist theories; and
14
15 secondly, to rethink the dichotomies that constitute some children as disabled human beings,
16
17 abnormal and undesirable (De Schauwer et al., 2017). This is important because being consigned to
18
19 the category of undesirable renders disabled human beings vulnerable and abject, experiencing
20
21 systemic and cultural violence and abuse in their everyday worlds (Goodley and Runswick-Cole,
22
23 2011). Posthumanism’s problematization of the human subject (Braidotti, 2013) resonates with an
24
25 approach to disability studies that challenges humanist conceptualizations, which traditionally
26
27 define disabled people in terms of deficit or excess. Posthuman and new materialist theories (3)
28
29 allow phenomena to be approached as connected entities, emerging from cuts that can never
30
31 ‘produce absolute separations’ (Barad, 2014, p. 168) of one person or of one thing from another.
32
33
34
35

36 In particular, the inspiration for writing this paper emerged from our mutual interests in the
37
38 potentialities of Barad’s ideas of intra-action and cutting together-apart. Barad (2007) proposed the
39
40 neologism intra-action to highlight:
41

42 ...the mutual constitution of entangled agencies. That is, in contrast to the usual
43
44 “interaction”, which assumes that there are separate individual agencies that precede
45
46 their interaction, the notion of intra-action recognizes that distinct agencies do not
47
48 precede, but rather emerge through, their intra-action. (p. 33)
49
50

51 Interaction would presuppose distinct agencies/individual beings (for example, the mother and her
52
53 daughter), while *intra*-action conceives subjectivities as emergent and entangled. Moreover,
54
55 following Barad (2007), situated subjectivities are performative effects of specific agential cuts:
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 A specific intra-action ... enacts an agential cut (in contrast to the Cartesian cut —
4 an inherent distinction — between subject and object) effecting a separation between
5 “subject” and “object”. That is, the agential cut enacts a local resolution within the
6
7
8
9
10 phenomenon of the inherent ontological indeterminacy. (Barad, 2003, p. 815)

11
12 In other words, agential cuts do not produce absolute separations (not cutting into two), but rather
13 cutting together-apart, that is, material-discursive interventions that delineate phenomena, enacting
14 boundaries, properties, meanings and categories, such as in this case the “autistic child”. Following
15
16 Barad (2007), the term “autistic child” is not a mirror/representation of the world, but an
17
18 intervention in the world: cuttings are always practices/doings/actions disturbing and intervening in
19
20 reality. Intra-actions create inclusion and exclusion and according to Barad we are responsible for
21
22 the cuts that we help enact: ‘It’s all a matter of where we place the cut.... what is at stake is
23
24 accountability to marks on bodies in their specificity by attending to how different cuts produce
25
26 differences that matter’ (Barad, 2007, p. 348).
27
28
29
30
31

32 Throughout this article we will try to put these Baradian’s key concepts to work to address
33
34 the process of ~~doing, transcribing, translating and analysing an interview extract~~ (4). Barad’s
35
36 agential realism offers us a different way to approach an extract of ‘interview-data’ as a form of
37
38 ‘boundary-drawing practice’ (Barad, 2007, p. 140). The extract is itself a textual demarcation, a text
39
40 bounded by the edges and constraints of the paper, simultaneously documenting an interview
41
42 (arguably another bounded entity) that records a series of other bounded entities (child, mother,
43
44 objects etc.). We have tried to perform the idea of cutting together-apart and see what
45
46 methodologically happens: what is produced, what is created, what is separated but, yet connected,
47
48 within an assemblage where matter and meaning are intertwined? Starting from those words, we
49
50 will also ask ourselves if different cuttings (together and apart) of “autism” might be possible.
51
52
53 As we have re-turned over and over again our encounters with Arianna and Laura, we have become
54
55 interested in the production of Laura (a situated individual) as “autistic”. This interest, as Højgaard
56
57 and Søndergaard (2011) underline, ‘includes a focus on how normativities of socio-cultural
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

categories work on, in, and through human beings; as well as how matter or materialities and technologies enact and are enacted in these processes’ (p. 339-340). By cutting together-apart an interview excerpt, we are interested in exploring the co-constitution of the “autistic child”, highlighting and problematizing how forces, intensities, ideas, objects, technologies and institutions may produce a view of difference, now called Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD), that can be understood as an assemblage, in which everything contributes to the production of, and is produced by, other entangled agencies.

Over the next pages we will discuss the following cuts:

- Re-turning the interview technique and interview-based data
- Cutting disability anew
- Cutting together and apart data analysis or re-turning a piece of data
- Discursive cuttings across data
- Objects-Technologies-Affects: Cutting together-apart the Production of Laura, Arianna and the Interviewer
- Cutting together-apart an (in)conclusion

Re-turning the interview technique and interview-based data

What do posthuman theories do in the context of the interview? The writing that constitutes the ‘data’ is *cut* from a larger collection of empirical materials. The verb *to cut* here does not infer a severing or disconnection, but evokes a simultaneous ‘cutting together-apart’ (Barad, 2007, p. 176), where this child emerges at the intersection of particular ‘apparatus of bodily production’ (Haraway, 1991, p. 200), including the politics of data analysis; the models and practices of disability; the reception of particular vibrations of voices in the interview; the circulation of expectations, shame and desires, discomfort and disappointments; the metaphors, narratives and discourses drenched in history and culture and entangled in punctuation, grammar, semantics and other language traditions.

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 A posthuman approach to research necessitates the de-centring of the human researcher in a
4 more distributed process of data “collection”. If we are de-centring the human, who is ‘collecting’
5 data? From a posthuman perspective the researcher is merely ‘part of and the result of the ongoing
6 intra-actions of the world’ (Nordstrom, 2015, p. 394) together with all the non-human, material and
7 other ‘participants’, including the research questions, tools, techniques, and recording devices. The
8 data extract above is not conceived only as a transcription of the interviewee’s utterances generated
9 by a particular research question; but rather, it is a phenomenon already connected and entangled
10 with forces (like discourses and policies) that dictate and justify what is legitimated and allowed to
11 be re-searched. The interview is the result of different and flattened forces that the research(er) has
12 no control over (Benozzo, Bell & Koro-Ljungberg, 2013; Kuntz & Presnall, 2012; Nordstrom,
13 2015; St. Pierre, 2011). Becoming researching bodies is an effect of forces that play beyond the
14 intention of the self-sufficient speaking subject-researcher. Moreover, the analysis does not focus
15 on the individual, essentialist subject but relies on what is produced in the ‘enactment among
16 research-data-participants-theory-analysis’ (Mazzei, 2013, p. 733).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The interview makes agential cuts; however, resolutions or boundaries in Barad’s view are
35 not fixed, but are spaces to make further agential cuts. In our case, these agential cuts concern also
36 ordinary research practices such as the transcribing of the recording, the choosing of an excerpt for
37 the paper, and the translations of the excerpt from Italian to English. The act of translating from a
38 language to another, including the final editing made by a native English speaker, is another
39 agential cut in which other cuts are reignited. From a humanist position, translation is always a
40 betrayal of the “original” text, even when it is the only way to share it (Bonazzi, 1999). However,
41 coming from a posthuman position, we conceive the transcriptions and translations as provisional
42 boundaries, provisional cutting together-apart made by the intra-action between researchers,
43 interviewees, translators, languages, readers, culture and discourses. Thus, the transcription-
44 translation constitutes (rather than exactly represents) realities and meanings and, necessarily, it is a
45 betrayal of any sense of “original” meaning. Here, the possibility to betray a text does not matter,
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 because the preoccupation for betraying is seen as the opening up of discourses of fidelity and
4
5 truthfulness. The translation, the (re)reading and the analysis of that words are multi-layered
6
7 processes of cutting together and apart, that is, of re-turning:

8
9 as a multiplicity of processes, such as the kinds of earthworms revel in while helping to make
10
11 compost or otherwise being busy at work and at play: turning the soil over and over or
12
13 otherwise being busy at work and at play: turning the soil over and over – ingesting and
14
15 excreting it, tunnelling through it, burrowing, all means of aerating the soil, allowing oxygen
16
17 in, opening it up and breathing new life into it. (Barad, 2014, p. 168).

18
19
20 Cutting together-apart implies a transformation of the interactions with both the topic of interest and
21
22 the “data”. No longer is there a separate and confined “topic” or area of investigation that excludes
23
24 from its boundaries other themes and aspects that don’t matter. If everything is caught up with other
25
26 entangled entities, then the focus is “distributed”, pluralized in multiple lines of flight (Deleuze &
27
28 Guattari, 1987). In our case for example, re-turning the phenomenon “autism” necessarily entails an
29
30 openness to intra-actions with motherhood, objects, fatherhood, silence and psy-complex’s theories
31
32 and medical practices and and and...in a metonymical cross reference (Lacan, 2003). This
33
34 metonymical cross reference never finds a point of stability or a definitive conclusion, but can be
35
36 anchored in relevant streams through the practice of cutting together-apart, operating provisional
37
38 and partial cuts within the messy entanglement of our lives. On the other hand, we argue that data
39
40 are not anymore something to be collected or to be read in the light of specific theories or
41
42 epistemological paradigms (Holmes, 2014). Instead together with Koro-Ljungberg, Löytönen and
43
44 Tesar (forthcoming), data become part of a fluid methodological space, where paradigms, theories,
45
46 methods, research questions and research design, analysis and... and... and... ‘melt, transform,
47
48 circumvent, infiltrate, appear, and disappear’ (p. 3).

53 54 **Cutting disability anew**

55
56 Traditionally, ASD is described as a range of neurological disorders usually diagnosed in early
57
58 childhood which involves a persistent deficit in social communication and social interaction, and
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 restricted, repetitive patterns of behaviour, interests or activities (APA, 2013). ASD has been at the
4
5 center of debates regarding the ambiguity of its construction as a spectrum and the implications of
6
7 this in relation to the boundaries of the diagnosis; a particular topic of discussion concerns the
8
9 removal of the category of Asperger’s Syndrome from the DSM V, in which the “subtypes of
10
11 autism” have been incorporated into one category, ASD (Vivanti et al., 2013). Milton (2014)
12
13 documents how ASD had gone through various psychoanalytic, psychological, medical, and
14
15 sociological constructions, which reflect broader trends in shifting professional bodies of
16
17 knowledge.
18
19

20
21 More recently, posthuman and new materialist approaches to rethinking ASD have emerged
22
23 in disability studies (Vanderkinderen & Roets, 2015). These theoretical and methodological
24
25 perspectives work to de-centre the role of the human, unsettling the privileged position held by
26
27 discursive approaches and language in understanding the worlds we inhabit, suggesting that the role
28
29 of matter and material forces are underestimated when encountering the world (Price-Robertson &
30
31 Duff, 2016). In this section we will examine how posthuman/new materialist approaches can
32
33 provide a relevant and important range of conceptual devices for understanding ASD and the
34
35 production of the “autistic child” differently.
36
37

38
39 Posthuman disability scholars (Goodley & Runswick-Cole, 2016) propose *the theory of*
40
41 *dishuman studies*. They describe a dishuman reality as:

42
43 one which ... simultaneously acknowledges the possibilities offered by disability to
44
45 trouble, re-shape and re-fashion traditional conceptions of the human (to ‘dis’
46
47 typical understandings of personhood) while simultaneously asserting disabled
48
49 people’s humanity (to assert normative, often traditional, understandings of
50
51 personhood) (Goodley and Runswick-Cole, 2016: 2).
52
53

54
55 Dishuman studies offer a way to refuse normative and often constraining notions of humanity – for
56
57 example, that there is a notion of a ‘normal’ life through which all lives should be judged liveable.
58
59 In this way, it is possible to recognize the inner humanity of disabled people’s lives and to think
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

again about the disabled body as *the site of possibility* for a reconfiguration of the concept of humanity. A DisHuman perspective adds something distinctive to recent new materialist and posthuman philosophical writings (e.g. Braidotti, 2013), as a critical disability studies lens exposes humanism’s ‘convenient relationship with’ medicalisation and pathologisation of the body (Goodley Lawthom & Runswick-Cole, 2014, p. 343). A critical disability studies approach shows that by deconstructing existing frames of humanity it is possible to promote an affirmative positionality.

Otherness that is represented by disabled people is constructed as a pervasive worry in capitalistic societies; disability, indeed, challenges and problematizes the very idea of the human. Those who are not aligned with whatever or whoever is constructed as the norm are often characterized as Other, denied their humanity and considered as ontologically deviant with respect to the binary categorization normal/abnormal (Vandekinderen & Roets, 2016). The impaired body has traditionally been understood as deficit, lack, limit or excess (Goodley, 2012), and disability has historically been linked to fear, monstrosity and freakiness (Goodley, Runswick-Cole & Liddiard, 2015).

Among the plethora and complexities of disability, a person understood as having ASD is often socially represented simultaneously as an object of interest and anxiety that evokes both threat and mystery (Rocque, 2010), monstrosity and freakiness; it is considered a “zeitgeist condition” (Murray, 2012, p. 72). ASD has been branded as both a lack and an excess with respect to normative notions of humanness; as Collins (2004) says ‘autism is *an ability and a disability*: it is as much about what is abundant as what is missing, an overexpression of the very traits that make our species unique’ (p. 161). This idea of simultaneous excess (abundance) and lack (something missing) calls into question the boundaries related to the definitions of identity and subjectivity and recall what Elisabeth Grosz (1996) has described as the *freak* and Margrit Shildrick (2002) as the *monster*. The freak is an ambiguous being that we cannot include in dominant social categories, but whose presence intimates the contradictions and incoherencies at the core of those categories (5).

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 Shildrick (2002) claims that the *monster* (or the monstrous) is a concept that has a disruptive force.
4
5 Since *monsters* are not completely recognizable, understandable and contained by the binary
6
7 structure (self and other), they remain the absolute others, the not-me. However, we could instead
8
9 recognize how the monster can reflect back aspects of ourselves, which are removed and repressed,
10
11 and then its status – not completely self or other – can become unsettling. The otherness
12
13 represented by ASD is especially frightening, it is a monstrosity. Rocque (2010) argues that the
14
15 depiction of ASD as mystery and threat support the autism industry; indeed, families, and especially
16
17 mothers of “autistic” children, are pushed towards an idea of normality that is frequently presented
18
19 by psy-professionals as the only solutions to the monstrosity of the child (Jensen, 2012).
20
21

22
23 Thinking disability differently, and through difference, may permit a reconsideration of the
24
25 disabled body as possibility and a reconfiguration of the concept of humanity, which we would
26
27 argue is now needed in the area of children’s development, family and politics. A posthuman
28
29 perspective highlights that human beings’ lives are a continuous becoming, which is produced by
30
31 the intertwined relations between nature and society, technology and culture (Braidotti, 2013). This
32
33 position considers humans as part of a complex assemblage that embrace all entities in an
34
35 environment and aims to produce an alternative vision/version of disability that celebrates its
36
37 difference, relationality, potentialities and possibilities. A new materialist perspective goes beyond
38
39 a poststructural reading of disability and works with the materiality of existence (Vandekinderen
40
41 and Roets, 2016), because it focuses on the embodiment of impairment and not only on the
42
43 discursive and social construction of disability (Palen, 2014). A posthumanist perspective does not
44
45 deny the role of social discourses, but assumes that they should be conceptualized as something that
46
47 do not act on a given and stable matter, but intra-act with the vital structure of materiality; this
48
49 perspective ‘rejects dualism, especially the opposition nature-culture and stresses instead the self-
50
51 organizing (or auto-poietic) force of living matter’ (Braidotti, 2013, p. 3). Posthumanism questions
52
53 the humanist view of the subject – a unified, rational and self-conscious individual that creates a
54
55 distinction between man and animal or man and technology. Humans instead are mutually
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 articulated with objects, animals and technology, as they are never delimited: everything does
4
5 something to something else. According to Massumi (2002) prostheses and the body are mutually
6
7 connected: ‘The thing, the object, can be considered *prostheses* of the body – provided that it is
8
9 remembered that the body is equally a prosthesis of the thing ... if bodies and objects are implicated
10
11 in each other ... it is not clear who is used by whom’ (p. 95-96). The common notion of prosthesis
12
13 is utility-oriented and belongs to the realm of substitution. Massumi (2002) offers a different idea of
14
15 prosthesis other than an object designed for the replacement of an organ, trying to make evident that
16
17 prosthesis can belong to the order of *extension*. Within posthumanism, technological tools are not
18
19 conceived as (re)habilitation devices, but as a form of superposition where body and technology
20
21 augment each other in reciprocity: prosthesis is the exteriority that extends interiority, which in turn
22
23 expands exteriority again and again.
24
25
26

27
28 Authors working with a posthumanist perspective have approached ASD as an assemblage,
29
30 a lived, material, embodied and everyday reality that emphasizes the multiple relations in which
31
32 every human being is positioned. In this respect, ASD and disability are ‘the quintessential
33
34 posthuman position’ (Goodley, 2014, p. 846). It must be acknowledged, however, that ASD has
35
36 been associated with a stereotypical and restricted understanding of posthumanism in ways that
37
38 depict a future in which humans privilege virtual and mediated communication at the expense of
39
40 “real” relation to others. Vice versa, “the child with autism” may be considered a figure of the
41
42 posthuman because s/he shows that our existence is always dependent on, and in relationship with,
43
44 a whole range of technologies that, in the case of ASD, may be letterboard, electronic devices, and
45
46 text materials (Sharon, 2014).
47
48

49 50 **Cutting together and apart ~~data analysis~~ or re-turning a piece of data**

51
52 The piece of interview data above constitutes a cutting, which is connected to broader ways
53
54 of thinking about disabilities as well as policies. We aim to examine the ways cultural and material
55
56 forces intersect in open-ended intra-actions, producing the phenomena associated with physical and
57
58 social expressions of ASD.
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 As qualitative researchers trying to understand this data, we could orient ourselves to all the
4 separate entities that we already know and seem to offer themselves up for analysis (the child; the
5 objects; the mother; the paediatrician; the (absent) father; the researcher/interviewer), things that we
6 would argue have become solidified through what Barad (2007) would write of as repetition of
7 boundary-making practices or material configurations of the world.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Coming from a posthuman position, we want to re-think data as a less definitive series of
15 phenomena. We would argue that a process of cutting together-apart of separate (human) entities,
16 enables matter to be understood more complexly. Such a process invites the data to ask new
17 questions of us, re-turning different problems and forcing re-considerations of the specific intra-
18 actions between the authors of this paper (invested in academia); the interviewer; discourses of
19 child development; the child and the materiality of her environment (books, magazines, clocks,
20 numbers, letters); her mother (with her body, the things she knows about, her past professional
21 experiences, her fears, and her contingent priorities); and the spaces we all move through.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 We would like to pursue two threads of thinking contributing to an entangled analytical
33 context of past and future, space and time, bodies and objects, discourse and politics as we re-turn
34 this data: 1) the discursive haunting of psychology and methodology; and 2) objects-technologies-
35 affects: the production of Laura, Arianna and the interviewer.
36
37
38
39

40 **Discursive cuttings across data**

41
42
43 A plethora of powerful discursive resources haunt this text; for example discourses related to
44 observation, research and inquiry, but also to pedagogy and education. Here we would like to return
45 to one, in our opinion, most powerful discourse that infuse this data: the discourse of development
46 psychology. Re-turning to Bowlby (1951), we can trace how traditional attachment theory still
47 haunts conceptualizations of maternal deprivation, leaving us with a legacy that nowadays still
48 orients the worries and concerns of parents, especially mothers. Erica Burman (2008) argues that
49 according to attachment theory and, on a broader level, traditional developmental psychology,
50 mothers are ‘positioned as the objects and sources of children’s affections’ (p. 129), and are often
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 perceived as the person responsible for children’s achievements or failure in development.
4
5 Attachment theory can be seen as a point of reference around which mothers are evaluated and
6
7 regulated. The popularization of Bowlby’s ideas continues to have radical implications for
8
9 women’s self-blame and sense of guilt, for example as Arianna intimates in the data, *I didn’t have*
10
11 *much time and to be honest, at the time I didn’t much feel like talking (she smiles), it was a very*
12
13 *tiring time for me.* Bowlby’s ideas have not only had an impact on mothers doubting themselves,
14
15 perceiving themselves at “fault” for failing to be constantly available for their child and able to
16
17 nurture a secure attachment, they also position the mother as a completion of the child’s nervous
18
19 system and affective/relational organization (Burman, 2008). In this regard, traditional theories
20
21 reproduce a simultaneous division, and fusion, between the mother and the child, according to
22
23 which the mother should function as a constantly present figure and the child should be thought as
24
25 completely dependent on the dedication of his/her mother.
26
27
28

29
30 Arianna could be cut from the data as a discrete entity, self-contained and separate from her
31
32 daughter who she seems able to perceive with a scientific, clinical eye. Her judgments about
33
34 Laura’s development seem based on another discrete entity, a body of knowledge about traditional
35
36 stages of development, driving Arianna’s attention to the child’s interactions with other bodies and
37
38 things. Her concluding comment, *she was different from other children of her age*, could be
39
40 analyzed as an example and product of dualist logic or binary thinking coming out of traditional
41
42 developmental theory that conceptualizes a clear sense of what is ab/normal and identity as essence
43
44 or fixed. Laura’s specific interest in objects and material things is described in terms of a normative
45
46 discourse about a child’s learning and development: in this way, the child becomes a subject with
47
48 no (or very limited) interest in human relationships, rendering her “different”. Arianna is able to
49
50 stand back and discuss a world to which she seems to be contributing, but is also able to remain
51
52 separate from, secures this sense of bounded and discrete entities at work. However, if we pursue
53
54 ‘a way of understanding the world from within and as part of it’ (Barad, 2007, p. 88), we must re-
55
56 turn Arianna and Laura as inseparable mother-daughter entanglements of intra-acting agencies
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

(Barad, 2007). These entangled elements are less discrete, becoming far more complex and intra-active systems of flowing matter, dispersed and interfered with by memories, child development theories, politics, objects, ideas, methodological practices, familial relations, affects, educational and disability discourses, feelings of hope, guilt, inadequacy, anxiety and worry.

Across such intra-actions and in pursuit of thinking about Laura’s “difference” differently, we are interested in how Arianna’s comments might challenge absolute boundaries between bodies and between ‘here and there, now and then, this and that...as the effects of enacted cuts in a radical reworking of cause/effect’” (Barad, 2014, p. 174). The materiality of spaces and environments that Arianna and Laura are inhabiting over time (the past as Arianna remembers the events; the present time of the interview; and into the future as we engage with the interview data now) are always becoming in intra-action with the forces of shifting material-discursive practices, politics, bodies, materials and matter, naturecultures. If ‘the self originates in a body that interacts with its environment’ and that ‘depends on chance rather than on any unfolding principle or essence of the self’ (Stagoll, 2010, p. 25-27), what does this entail for our understandings of the child’s and the mother’s entangled and flowing subjectivities? Lowe, Lee and MacVarish (2015) suggest that new work in children’s brain development, for example, is shaping the contemporary policy context and that traditional child development theories are becoming imbued with more recent shifts to neuroculture. Following Haraway (2003, p. 5), the concept of naturecultures challenges traditional oppositions and gesture to the necessary entanglement of the natural and the cultural, the bodily and the mind, the material and the semiotic that offers a much more intricate and complex perspective on anthropocentric exceptionalism, sole maternal responsibility for a child’s growth and development, and the ability of language. Potentially, these ideas allow us all (human, non-human and more-than-human entities) to become fully immersed in a constantly changing reality. Folded into this entanglement of intra-acting agencies, are differing patterns of what is considered pathological/abnormal in childhood and as parenting practices across and through what Barad refers

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

to as ‘the making of new temporalities (spacetime-matterings), new diffraction patterns’ (2014, p.168).

Objects-Technologies-Affects:

Cutting together apart the production of Laura, Arianna and the interviewer

The attraction to everything sensorial and the intra-actions with technological artifacts is documented as alarm, worry and anxiety for the mother and the pediatrician. The ways in which Laura and the material world intra-act produces a keen interest in the materiality and symbolic value of certain objects, a desire to encounter, experience, and get to know the world with her body and senses. Interestingly, this comes to be read as a symptom of the fact that *something isn't working here*, which results in an event that suddenly deprives the child of her objects of interest and pleasure. These objects are the particular parts of the world she seems to be attracted to and perhaps the means by which she produces (self) and other knowledge. The child's corporeal enthusiasm for learning intra-acts with the mother's need and search for silence, a silence related to the fatigue and stress resulting from the contingent work/study situation. The child's desire to know and learn comes up against a desire for silence that ends up producing the child herself as a weird, eccentric subject. Thus, the child's relationship with the world is severely conditioned by the materiality of the environment, which takes the form of restriction and constraint. The materiality of the world is both part of and results from intra-action in agential realism: the materiality of the world provoked something, provoked a reaction.

One of the more-than-human things in play in the data includes silence. We would argue that the removal of material objects blocks the becoming of the child: deprived of what was able to catch her interest and mediate between her and the (human and non-human) world, the child is reduced to silence. This sanctioning enactment materializes a net of discourses (medical, psychological, and family) that produces a weird, different, even disturbing subject. This subject, deprived of the possibility of bodily intra-action with objects and symbols, simply becomes different from other “normal” infants of the same age, a subject out of step with her proper stage of

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 development. Following Brickman’s (2014, p. 724) cue, we must ask ourselves whether, as a
4
5 bounded entity, the child’s “disability” produces her different-ness or whether her different-ness is
6
7 produced within an entanglement that includes the availability of the diagnostic category, her
8
9 mother’s codified knowledge, the pediatrician’s power, the desire for silence expressed by the
10
11 mother, the father’s material absence, and the child’s idiosyncratic way of playing with objects.
12
13

14 In the interview with her mother, this apparatus could be understood as producing a
15
16 ‘disabled’ subject. Indeed, the child’s singular intra-action with objects and technologies would be
17
18 later codified as her primary symptoms, that is, rigidity and inflexibility (APA, 2013). The label of
19
20 autism expresses the intra-actions between the material and the discursive dimensions: being a
21
22 label, the word *autism* evokes a representational dimension that encompasses all the images
23
24 associated with this particular (psychiatric - medical - disability) category. In this case, autism is
25
26 produced starting not from some kind of deficit but from a kind of surplus, from showing too much
27
28 interest and precociousness in the concreteness and symbolism of the world: in colors and names, in
29
30 numbers and letters, in words and technological artifacts. In this sense, the productive desire that
31
32 circulates in the assemblage is transformed as a form of lack. As Barad (2007) puts it, the label
33
34 becomes material: in this case, the label of autism produces a fixed reality and makes im/possible a
35
36 whole range of interventions and acts. We would argue that attention is drawn to particular ‘use-
37
38 ful’ apparatus, producing the child’s body as out of kilter with the anticipated body ‘proper’
39
40 (MacLure, Jones, Holmes, & MacRae, 2011), simultaneously in excess and in deficit. The weight
41
42 of traditional developmental, as well as more recent neuroscientific discourses of child development
43
44 along with the history of play, the politics of inclusion, mothering and attachment, medical and
45
46 sociocultural narratives of ASD enact an agential cut, which produces the autistic child, marking a
47
48 boundary within the infinitive variety of the life. The researcher, the interview, the documentation
49
50 all produce agential cuts that produce certain phenomena and reality in which the concept of autism
51
52 becomes intelligible: they “enact what matters and what is excluded from mattering” (Barad, 2007,
53
54 p. 148).
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 In intra-acting with these data and attempting to understand the actions of the mother in
4 relationship with the child, how do we resist falling back into what Deleuze and Guattari identify as
5 “strata” (1987), that is, social requirements that aim at producing bodily-organized, self-
6 interpreting, singular and clearly defined identities. Both the mother and child could keep being
7 produced in ~~analysis~~ as stratified in ways that do not consider their desires as productive, but as a
8 concerned, yet desperate mother and an autistic child rather than becoming subjects. In this kind of
9 ~~analysis~~, we are not relying on the mother’s nor the child’s potential by falling back into ‘grand
10 narratives’ and available discourses that lead bounded individual lives to be territorialized and
11 everyday experiences to be overcoded and ordered. Somehow the capability of the child to connect
12 with her environment encounters a barrier that tends to reinstall binaries and imposes normalized
13 forms over a flux of intensities and forces. The vitality of the child is constrained by the imposition
14 of a combination of disablement, neoliberal motherhood, assessment, and categorization that
15 produce a governance of the child in a way that block her flows of desire and limits the potential of
16 the interconnected nature of human becomings. We could read the child’s relational and embodied
17 self that joins the extended possibilities of becoming deriving from intra-action with space, multiple
18 actors, objects and technologies, as forced into practices of normalization directed by a unitarian
19 and humanist vision of the subject. As Goodley and Runswick-Cole (2010) have highlighted, play
20 has been categorized according to the stages of typical developmental trajectories. The child in our
21 example is considered as engaged in non age-appropriate play, as her behavior is valued as too
22 precocious and fast. This peculiar form of “disdevelopment” produces the child as displaying.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 If ‘listening is about being open to being affected’ (Davies, 2014, p. XI), in the case we have
48 presented, the assemblage seems to not listen to the child: the not-yet thinkable, the unexpected is
49 reduced to regulation, and no space is given for joy of movement, experimentation and difference.
50 Dominance of predictability and manipulation, directed at preventing non-predetermined outcomes,
51 precludes the expansion of capacity for thought and action for the child and the whole assemblage.
52 Indeed, questions of identity and normativity prevails on becoming. The fact that the child is fixed
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 as an object of observation and her experimentation is disqualified affects the entire entanglement,
4
5 preventing the development of difference and inhibiting the not-yet known to emerge. The child is
6
7 misrecognized, and thus her possibilities and potentialities are affected. Indeed, what it is possible
8
9 for one ‘to be depends on what kind of subject is recognizable in this context, and on what that
10
11 context affords him - how it positions him, what modes of enunciations it draws on, and what it
12
13 values’ (Davies, 2014, p. 42). Given that the mind is embodied, the body schema for example
14
15 expands in taking up tools and objects (Palen, 2014). In the case of our example, the creative
16
17 exploration of the relations between the body and the space was not allowed - affecting child’s
18
19 psychological investment in her physical relations - and the mobility of life was substituted by
20
21 foreclosure. Adopting the terminology of Davies (2014) lines of descent, with their power to fix,
22
23 categorize and predict, prevail on lines of ascent, which open new modes of thought and ways of
24
25 being. In the case of our analysis, the child’s engagement with her body and the material reality of
26
27 life is paralleled with a lack in her ability to feel empathy and relate with other human beings,
28
29 implying an implicit attribution of inhumanity (Palen, 2014, p. 23). In contrast with this vision, the
30
31 autistic child clearly shows the multiple relationships in which every human is inserted and
32
33 expresses the self. The child’s openness to the entirety of the environment is subjected to
34
35 agential cuts that may have a disempowering effect.
36
37
38
39

40 41 **Cutting together and apart: (in)conclusion**

42
43 (In)conclusion, we want to re-cut and re-turn a number of texts, thoughts and images to keep
44
45 addressing the production of the “autistic child”. Erin Manning points out that method can be ‘a
46
47 static organization of preformed categories... an apparatus of capture... [which] stops potential on
48
49 its way’ (2016, p. 31). However, inspired by MacLure’s (2006) call for a baroque method in
50
51 qualitative research, our attempt is to explore the potentialities of method(ology) itself by re-turning
52
53 to the idea of cutting together-apart and the substantive issue at hand, ‘to spark more complicating
54
55 connections ... around research’ (p. 738), creating an assemblage with fragments of ~~data~~, art
56
57 images, research notes, and theoretical comments, ‘attempting to set these in motion with and
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 against each other’ (p. 738). We are not guided by the logic of analytical rigor but by the impulse to
4
5 juxtapose, to pull together(apart) fragments coming from - only apparently - different worlds. It is
6
7 the logic of *wunderkammern*, that is, of marvel and magnificence: “The wondrous is a meta-
8
9 historical category that has been defined all along the eighteenth century, didactically first and
10
11 foremost, as a form of knowledge, that is, a very special half-way stage, a kind of mental
12
13 suspension that lies between ignorance and knowledge, which marks the end of ignorance and the
14
15 beginning of knowledge” (6) (Lugli, 2006, p. 126, authors’ translation).
16
17
18
19

20
21 The complexity of the pages of this article is to keep together diverse folds/streams that are
22
23 only apparently distant from each other - methodology and topic, interview technique and autism,
24
25 data and disability – to avoid the re-production of the couple “autistic child/mother of the autistic
26
27 child”. The impaired body, “autistic” or not, has traditionally been understood as occupying the
28
29 borderlands of humanity, a space between monstrosity and freak. A posthuman analysis allows us,
30
31 instead, a moment to reconsider the disabled body as a site of possibility that demands us to
32
33 reconfigure the concept of humanity. In a time of global crisis, there is an urgent need to refuse
34
35 normative and constraining notions of humanity and to recognize, at the same time, the inner
36
37 humaneness of disabled people lives (Goodley & Runswick-Cole, 2015; 2016). Laura and Arianna
38
39 find themselves entangled with psy-professionals and in the grip of the “autism industry” (Mallett
40
41 & Runswick-Cole, 2016a), which seeks to treat the excesses and lack of the “disordered body”
42
43 while maintaining dominant cultural values of dis/ability and associated exclusionary practices
44
45
46
47 (Lester & Paulus, 2012).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”



Tell My Mother Not To Worry (viii), 2014 (Ryan Gander)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

However, something continues to escape from our thinking and writing, something slippery, something (im)possible to grasp. Indeed, in writing this paper, we have been constantly worried about judging the mother because we wanted to resist the mother-blame discourse that has underpinned so much psychological literature. However the complexity of this blame-story is enhanced and made even more seductive by the materiality of the data. Every time we read and read again the data, and we digest and then regurgitate the mother-paediatrician’s decision to remove objects, technologies, books, newspaper, clocks and so on, from Laura, our stomachs churned. How many possibilities or potential (not only for the daughter, but also for the mother) have been stopped on its way? What lines of flight have been closed down by this separation/deprivation? Perhaps here we are in the middle of one of those knot/tangles of research where something else begins to glow:

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”


1
2
3 [S]ome detail ... starts to glimmer, gathering our attention. Things both slow down
4
5 and speed up at this point. On the one hand, the detail arrests the listless traverse of
6
7 our attention across the surface of the screen or page that holds the data, intensifying
8
9 our gaze and making us pause to burrow inside it, mining it for meaning. On the
10
11 other hand, connections start to fire up: the conversation gets faster and more
12
13 animated as we begin to recall other incidents and details (Maclure, 2013, p. 661).
14
15
16
17

18
19 In a posthuman approach, the myth of normality is exposed, as all lives are valued as a continuous
20
21 becoming, and parents, like Arianna, are released from the burden of enforcing normalcy (Davis,
22
23 1995). By thinking about agency as not being attributed solely to a supposed intentional subject,
24
25 conscious and in charge of him/herself, this changes not only how we think about the ‘autistic child’
26
27 but also the mother of an ‘autistic child’. It becomes clear that *blame* cannot possibly reside within
28
29 an individual, gendered body and mind but is produced, instead, through assemblages.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

What other data are

possible?



The Secret Museum (Joanna Ebenstein)

And then letters and
numbers have
multiplied
clocks, computers,
books and cell phones
and all sorts of things
entered the house.
Objects started to
circulate,
they populated the
silence of the house

Addressing autism, again

We know, of course, that many parents, like Arianna, embrace the label of autism. This is not surprising in contexts in the global North where this label seems to offer families and children explanations, new understandings, interventions and resources to support the child's inclusion in school and the wider community. By offering information about difference, labels seem to offer a way of containing and normalizing 'abnormal bodies' and minds and managing uncertainty (Mallett & Runswick-Cole, 2016a, 2016b). Parents embrace labels that seem to have an explanatory power, which allows them to understand their 'disordered child'. And yet, the promise of the label is simultaneously so often disappointing and unfulfilled in children's and families' lives - understanding, interventions and resources remain elusive. The autism industry sells the label as a medical truth that offers a prognosis, or certainty, in uncertain times.

This is our home beyond nowhere
where shadows' footsteps fall,

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

where memory echoes from the future,
and comfort flows back from the past,
where smiles have no need for faces.

Beatrice Han (Kia-Ki), ‘Deligny et les cartes’ p.188, in Manning, 2011, p. 92

Addressing methodology, again

Our attempt to create a space for transversal methodology, cutting across time, entities (human and non-human etc) allows us to resist / remove the need for the fixity of methods, the “...methodologies which may begin anywhere, anytime, but by doing so can create a sense of uncertainty” (Koro-Ljungberg, 2016, p.1). We have re-turned over and over a series of encounters with the label “autism” with the data where different propositions fold and unfold. No child, including Laura, conforms exactly to the diagnostic category, so the relief the label offers is always and only temporary. Every child, including Laura, becomes a diffraction, an abnormal version of the abnormal impairment category the label seems to offer (Mallett & Runswick-Cole, 2016a, 2016b).

Prime numbers are what is left when you have taken all the patterns away.

I think prime numbers are like life.

They are very logical but you could never work out the rules,

even if you spent all your time thinking about them

(Mark Haddon, *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*, 2003).

When labels are understood as being produced in an assemblage, they are constantly re-negotiated, shifting and complex. The label becomes diffracted anew, ‘an iterative (re)configuring of patterns of differentiating-entangling’ (Barad, 2014, p. 168) bodies, discourses, objects, technologies and institutions and it becomes impossible to contain and normalize difference through the imposition of a label. So what do we offer Arianna and Laura? We offer an alternative vision/version of disability that celebrates its difference, relationality, potentialities and possibilities.

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 This paper has afforded us opportunities to think about data as assemblage, a complex
4 mixture of dynamic entities under continuous reconfigurations, not as fixed structures, but always
5 uncertain, in movement. As all the real and potential entities change and flow inside and outside to
6 re-form other assemblages, the human researcher/observer remains displaced from her/his central
7 position (Fox and Alldred, 2015). Within such an assemblage, ‘expert’ knowledge becomes one
8 among many forms of knowledge and the psy-professions begin to lose their hold.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 The room is now open to what is uncertain, marginal, ineffable and at the edges.
16
17
18
19
20



21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 The White Library (Wilfredo Prieto) (MONA – Hobart’s Museum of old and New Arts)
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th edn.* Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs*, 28, 801-831. doi:10.1086/345321
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2014). Diffracting diffraction: Cutting together-apart. *Parallax*, 20(3), 168–187. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2014.927623>.
- Benozzo, A. (forthcoming). Poststructuralism. In C. Cassell, A. Cunliffe and G. Grandy (eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research methods in business and management.* London: Sage.
- Benozzo, A., Bell, H., & Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2013). Moving between nuisance, secrets, and splinters as data. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, 13(3), 309-315. doi: 10.1177/1532708613487878
- Bettelheim, B. (1967). *The Empty fortress: Infantile autism and the birth of the self.* New York: Free Press.
- Bonazzi, T. (1999). Tradurre/tradire: The declaration of independence in the Italian context. *The Journal of American History*, 95(4), 1350-1361.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health.* Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman.* London: Polity.
- Brinkmann, S. (2014). Doing without data. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 720-725. doi: 10.1177/1077800414530254.
- Burman, E. (2008). *Deconstructing developmental psychology* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.
- Collins, P. (2004). *Not even wrong: A Father's journey into the lost history of autism.* Bloomsbury USA.
- Clough, P.T. (2009). The new empiricism: Affect and sociological method. *European Journal of*

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

Social Theory, 12(1), 43–61.

Davies, B. (2014). *Listening to children. Being and becoming*. London: Routledge.

Davis, L. J. (2006). Constructing normalcy: The bell curve, the novel, and the invention of the disabled body in the Nineteenth Century. In L. J. Davis (ed.), *The Disability Studies Reader* (2nd Edition) (pp. 3-16). New York: Routledge.

Davis, L. J. (1995) *Enforcing Normalcy: Deafness, Disability & the Body*. London: Verso.

De Schauwer, E., Van de Putte, I., Van Goidsenhove, L., Blockmans, I., Vandecasteele, M., & Davies, B. (2017) Animating disability differently: Mobilizing a heterotopian imagination. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(4), 276-286. doi: 10.1177/1077800416684871.

Deleuze, G. (2004). *The logic of sense*. London: Continuum.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Continuum. □

Fox, N. J. & Alldred, P. (2015a) New materialist social inquiry: designs, methods and the research-assemblage, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 18:4, 399-414.

Frigerio, A., & Montali, L. (2016). An ethnographic-discursive approach to parental self-help groups: The case of ADHD. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(7), 935–950. doi: 10.1177/1049732315586553

Goodley, D. (2012). Dis/Entangling critical disability studies. *Disability & Society* 27(6). doi: 10.1080/09687599.2012.717884.

Goodley, D. (2014). The posthuman. *Disability & Society*, 29(5), 844-846. doi: 10.1080/09687599.2014.889416

Goodley, D., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2010). *Emancipating play: Dis/abled children, development and deconstruction*. *Disability & Society*, 25(4), 499-512. doi: 10.1080/09687591003755914

Goodley, D., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2011). The violence of disablism. *Journal of Sociology of Health and Illness*, 33(4), 602-17. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2010.01302.x

Goodley, D., & Runswick Cole, K. (2015). Critical psychologies of disability: Boundaries, borders

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 and bodies in the lives of disabled children. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 20(1),
4 51-63. doi: 10.1080/13632752.2014.947096

5
6
7 Goodley, D., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2016). Becoming dishuman: Thinking about the human
8 through dis/ability. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(1), 1-15.
9 doi: 10.1080/01596306.2014.930021.

10
11
12
13 Goodley, D., Runswick-Cole, K., & Liddiard, K. (2015). The DisHuman child. *Discourse: Studies*
14 *in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 37(5), 770-784. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2015.1075731

15
16
17 Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2014) Posthuman disability studies.
18
19
20
21 *Subjectivity*, 7 (1): 342-361

22
23 Grosz, E. (1996). *Intolerable ambiguity: Freaks as/at the limit*. In R. Garland Thomas (ed.) (1996)
24 *Freakery: Cultural spectacles of the extraordinary body*. London: New York University
25 Press.
26
27

28
29 Haraway, D. (1991). *Simions, cyborgs and women*. New York: Free Association Books.

30
31
32 Haraway, D. (2003). *The Companion species manifesto: Dogs, people and significant otherness*.
33
34 Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

35
36 Holmes, R. (2014). Fresh kills: The spectacle of (de)composing data. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6),
37 781-789. doi: 10.1177/1077800414530262.

38
39
40 Højgaard, L., & Søndergaard, D. M. (2011). Theorizing the complexities of discursive and material
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
subjectivity: Agential realism and poststructural analyses. *Theory & Psychology*, 21(3), 338-
354. doi: 10.1177/0959354309359965.

Jensen, T. (2012). Tough love in tough times. *Studies in the Maternal*, 4(2), 1–26. doi:
<http://doi.org/10.16995/sim.35>.

Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2016). *Reconceptualizing qualitative research: Methodologies without
methodology*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage. □

Koro-Ljungberg, M., Löytönen, T. & Tesar, M. (forthcoming). *Data encounters*. New York: Peter
Lang.

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 Kuntz, A.M., Presnall, M.M. (2012). Wandering the tactical: From interview to intraview.

4
5 *Qualitative Inquiry* 18(9) 732–744. doi: 10.1177/1077800412453016

6
7 Lacan, J. (2003). *Il Seminario, Libro V, Le formazioni dell'inconscio (1957-1958)*. Torino: Einaudi.

8
9 Lester, J.N., & Paulus T. M. (2012). Performative acts of autism. *Discourse and Society*, 23, 259.

10
11 doi: 10.1177/0957926511433457.

12
13
14 Lowe, P., Lee, E. and Macvarish, J. (2015), Biologising parenting: Neuroscience discourse, English

15
16 social and public health policy and understandings of the child. *Sociology of Health and*

17
18 *Illness*, 37, 198–211. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12223

19
20
21 Lugli, A. (2006). *Arte e meraviglia. Scritti sparsi 1974-1995*. Torino: Umberto Allemandi & C.

22
23 MacLure, M. (2006). The bone in the throat: Some uncertain thoughts on baroque method.

24
25 *International journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6): 729-745. doi:

26
27 10.1080/09518390600975958

28
29
30 MacLure, M. (2013). Researching without representation? Language and the materiality in post-

31
32 qualitative research. *International journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6): 658 -

33
34 667. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2013.788755

35
36
37 MacLure, M., Jones, L., Homes R., & MacRae C. (2011). Becoming a problem: Behaviour and

38
39 reputation in the early years classroom. *British Educational Research Journal* 37(1), 1–25.

40
41 doi: 10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

42
43 Mallett, R., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2016a). The commodification of autism: What's at stake?, in K.

44
45 Runswick-Cole, R. Mallett & S. Timimi (eds), *Re-thinking autism, disability, equality,*

46
47 *identity* (p. 110-). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishing.

48
49
50 Mallett, R., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2016b). The “urge to know” normal: Theorising how

51
52 impairment labels function. In R. Mallett, C. Ogden J. & Slater (eds) (2016), *Theorising*

53
54 *Normalcy and the Mundane: Precarious Positions*. Chester: The University of Chester

55
56 Press.

57
58
59 Manning, E. (2011). The shape of enthusiasm. *Parallax* 17(2): 84:109. Doi:

60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

1
2
3 10.1080/13534645.2011.559358
4

5 Manning, E. (2016). *The Minor Gesture*. Durham, SC: Duke University Press.

6
7 Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual*. Durham, SC: Duke University Press.

8
9
10 Mayes, S.D., Calhoun, S.L., & Crites, D.L. (2001). Does DSM-IV Asperger’s disorder exist?
11
12 *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 29(3), 263–75. □

13
14 Mazzei, L. A. (2013). A voice without organs: Interviewing in posthumanist research, *International*
15
16 *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 732-740. doi:
17
18 10.1080/09518398.2013.788761.
19

20
21 Milton, D. (2014). Autism: A social and medical history. *Disability & Society*, 29(6), 991-992. doi:
22
23 10.1080/09687599.2014.905281

24
25 Murray, S. (2012). *Autism*. New York: Routledge.

26
27 Nordstrom, S. N. (2015). Not so innocent anymore: Making recording devices matter. *Qualitative*
28
29 *Interviews*, 21(4) 388–401. doi: 10.1177/1077800414563804
30

31
32 Palen, T. van der. (2014). *A Cyborg autobiography: Autism & the posthuman*. Master thesis,
33
34 Utrecht University.

35
36 Price-Robertson, R., & Duff, C. (2016). Realism, materialism, and the assemblage: Thinking
37
38 psychologically with Manuel DeLanda. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(1), 58–76. doi:
39
40 10.1177/0959354315622570.
41

42
43 Rocque, B. (2010). Science fictions: Figuring autism as threat and mystery in medico-therapeutic
44
45 literature. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 30(1). Retrieved from [http://dsq-](http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1064/1231)
46
47 [sds.org/article/view/1064/1231](http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1064/1231).
48

49
50 Shildrick, M. (2002). *Embodying the monster. Encounters with the vulnerable self*. London: Sage.

51
52 Sharon, T. (2014). *Human nature in an age of biotechnology: The case for mediated posthumanism*.
53
54 Dordrecht: Springer.

55
56 Shotter, J. (2014). Agential realism, social constructionism, and our living relations to our
57
58 surroundings: Sensing similarities rather than seeing patterns. *Theory & Psychology*, 24(3),
59
60

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

305–325. doi: 10.1177/0959354313514144

Spivak, G.C. (1974). Translator’s preface. In J. Derrida *Of Grammatology* (G.C. Spivack, Trans.) (pp. ix-xc). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Stagoll, C. (2010). Becoming. In A. Parr (ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary* (p. 25-27). Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

St. Pierre, E. (2011). Post qualitative research the critique and coming after. In N.K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 611-626). London: Sage.

Vandekinderen, C., & Roets, G. (2016): The post(hu)man always rings twice: Theorising the difference of impairment in the lives of people with “mental health problems.” *Disability & Society*, 31(1), 33-46. doi: 10.1080/09687599.2015.1119037.

Vivanti, G., Hudry, K., Trembath, D., Barbaro, J., Richdale, A., Dissanayake, C. (2013). Towards the DSM 5 criteria for autism: Clinical, cultural and research implications. *Australian Psychologist*, 48(4), 258-261. doi: 10.1111/ap.12008.

Footnotes

(1) The paper draws on a qualitative research project involving parents with children diagnosed with “Autistic Spectrum Disorder” (ASD) (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013).

(2) Here ‘re-turn’ is used in baradian’s way; see on page 7.

(3) Post-humanism and new materialism group a wide range of approaches, such as new empiricism, agential realism, affect theory, actor network theory and ontological turn, which have been mobilized by theorists and philosophers such as Deleuze (2004), Massumi (2002), Braidotti (2013), and Clough (2009).

(4) Here intentionally we literally are putting a structure under erasure (*sous rature*), that is we write ‘a word, cross it out, and then print both word and deletion... In this sense, we continue to use categories ... because they seem necessary, but at the same we cross them out because we think they are inadequate’ (Benozzo, forthcoming; see also Spivack, 1974, p. xiv).

(5) Grosz is clear in describing freaks as human beings ‘who exist outside and in defiance of the structure of binary oppositions that govern our basic concepts and mode of self-definition. They occupy the impossible middle ground between the opposition dividing the human from the animal ..., one being from another..., nature from culture..., one sex from the other..., humans and gods..., and the living and the dead’ (Grosz, 1996, p. 57).

Running head: THE DOING AND UNDOING OF THE “AUTISTIC CHILD”

- 1
2
3 (6) “La meraviglia è una categoria metastorica che si definisce fino a tutto il Settecento, didatticamente prima di tutto,
4 come una forma di conoscenza, cioè uno stadio intermedio e particolarissimo, una specie di sospensione mentale
5 che sta tra l’ignoranza e il sapere, che determina la fine dell’ignoranza e l’inizio del sapere” (Lugli, 2006, p. 126).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review