



Storytelling Methods on the Move

The Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective

Raya Shields
MA (York University)

Stacey Easton
PhD student (York University)

Julia Gruson-Wood
Postdoctoral Fellow (University of Guelph)

Margaret F. Gibson
Assistant Professor (University of Waterloo)

Patty N. Douglas
Associate Professor (Brandon University)

Carla Rice
Professor (University of Guelph)

This manuscript has been published and is available in International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, published online 20 April 2022, <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09518398.2022.206125>

Recommended Citation:

The Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective, Raya Shields, Steacy Easton, Julia Gruson-Wood, Margaret F. Gibson, Patty N. Douglas & Carla M. Rice (2022) Storytelling methods on the move, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, DOI: [10.1080/09518398.2022.2061625](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2061625)

Storytelling Methods on the Move

The Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective:, Raya Shields, Steacy Easton, Julia Gruson-Wood, Margaret F. Gibson, Patty N. Douglas & Carla M. Rice

Abstract

This article takes up multimedia storytelling and interference as methods on the move in and beyond critical Autism studies and considers their contributions to post and qualitative studies in education. We write as a collective of Autistic and non-Autistic researchers, kin, artists, and educators. We think generatively with the tensions of trying to do anti-normative research through a multimedia storytelling project about Autism justice in education within the confines of academic spaces across differing relationalities to Autism. We situate our method within new materialist ontology, homing in on the concept of “interference” —something we believe has not been done within critical Autism studies before—considering what interference as metaphor and method might offer our analytic approach that diffraction alone might miss. Through analyzing core tensions in the research process and in three films made by Autistic participant-storytellers, we show how Autism flows together and/or collides with storytelling and other post/qualitative methods to make new story forms and modes, and with these, new patterns for understanding Autism and justice in research and education. Our aim is transformative—to open space through post/qualitative research processes for Autistic perspectives and to release multiple stories of Autism into the world. In this we lean into interference and the tangle of research and relationality, power, and possibility for more innovative, just, and critically hopeful knowledge and practice.

Is it possible to imagine developing methods that strengthen particular realities while eroding others? Is it possible to imagine social science as a system of interference? (we draw the term from Donna Haraway). (Coleman and Ringrose, 2013, p. 6-7)

This article takes up multimedia storytelling as a method on the move that can act as a generative “system of interference” (Coleman and Ringrose, 2013, p. 6-7) in and beyond critical Autism¹ studies and considers its contributions to post and qualitative studies in education. We show how the Re•Vision Centre for Art and Social Justice storytelling method moved with *bodymind*² difference labelled Autistic in a story-making workshop series about Autism and education called the Re•Storying Autism in Education project. Re•Storying is a research creation project that brings together Autistic and allistic (non-Autistic) people³ and invites educators, family members, and artists to rethink exclusionary, often violent educational research and practice in ways that desire Autistic difference—including *stimming*⁴, rocking, repetition, hums, tics, and more (Douglas et al., 2021). Re•Vision is a research creation centre at the University of Guelph that taps the power of the arts and story to advance social justice in

¹ We capitalize Autism in this article as a way to signal that we prioritize Autistic voices.

² We use the term *bodymind* to signal the inextricable inter- and intra-twining of bodies and minds (see, for example, Price, 2014).

³ We use identity-first language preferred by many Autistic self-advocates (e.g., Autism, Autistic person, etc.) to signal our understanding of Autism as a valuable and fundamental way of being in the world (see, for example <https://www.autistichoya.com/2011/08/significance-of-semantics-person-first.html>). We also use the language of “person who attracted the label of Autism” to keep Autism moving as a material-discursive identity, to recognize the exclusion of women, girls, Indigenous, Black, gender non-conforming and other groups from identity and diagnosis, and to guard against reifying Autism into a static difference or “us and them” binary (Runswick-Cole, Timimi & Mallet, 2016).

⁴ *Stimming* refers to repetitive movements that many Autistic people claim and describe as enjoyable, self-regulating, and expressive of our/their unique embodiments or way of being in the world. Yergeau (2016) suggests that *stimming* be regarded as a key element of Autistic rhetoric. This is distinct from a clinical or biomedical view, where *stimming* is described as “[s]tereotyped or repetitive motor movements, use of objects, or speech,” a disordered form of “behaviour” that is part of the diagnostic criteria for an Autism spectrum disorder diagnosis (see <https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/autism/hcp-dsm.html>).

diverse sectors, including education and health (Rice & Mündel, 2018; Rice, 2020). We use research creation, or research-based art practice, to mean “a potent pedagogical method of resistance within a university landscape that...has emerged as the enduringly neoliberal ‘university of business’” (Loveless, 2019, p. 9).

We write as a collective of Autistic and allistic co-authors, videomakers, and artist-storytellers deeply invested in disability and Autism justice. In using the term disability justice, we align our research with the collective movement by Black, brown, queer, trans, and disabled people that “vision[s] a world where we flourish, that values and celebrates us in all our myriad beauty” (Piepzna-Samarasinha, 2018, p. 21)⁵. Storytelling methods—like other research methods—are inescapably caught up in ableist and other oppressive histories and modes of knowledge production that delimit and devalue difference (Coleman and Ringrose, 2013; Kelly, et al., 2021a; Loveless, 2019; Rice et al., 2020; Rice & Mündel, 2019; Viscardis, et al., 2019). Yet we argue that our method also opens space to push back against marginalizing practices and deficit understandings, re-storying what Autism can be. This method offers enticing, if fleeting, glimpses into worlds that affirm the differences that Autism brings. We thus hold in tension the possibilities generated in creative spaces alongside the material constraints of the ableist neoliberal university and elsewhere (Rice et al., 2020; Rice & Mündel, 2019; Rice, et al., 2016). In this way, we argue that our methodological approach aligns with post-qualitative inquiry and a political ontology of possibility (St. Pierre, 2014, 2019) while it critiques post-qualitative modes of evacuating power (Gerrard, et al., 2017).

⁵ On disability justice, also see *Sins Invalid*, Alice Wong, Lydia X. Z. Brown, Mia Mingus, Eli Clare, Syrus Marcus Ware and others.

We begin with a theoretical discussion of our critical arts methodology, situating our storytelling method firmly within new materialist (agentic realist) ontology by embracing the sociomaterial difference that Autism makes. Autistic scholar Mitzi Waltz (2014) writes that the “criticality” in critical Autism studies means “investigating power dynamics that operate in discourses around autism, questioning deficit-based definitions of autism, and being willing to consider the ways in which biology and culture intersect to produce ‘disability’” (p. 1337; also see Davidson & Orsini, 2013). We analyze themes from our workshops to show how our storytelling method enacts a generative “system of interference” (Coleman and Ringrose, 2013, p. 6-7) within critical Autism studies with implications for qualitative studies-as-usual in education. Feminist and disability studies scholars have contributed to moving methods before us, including Castrodale’s (2017) mad studies critique of go-along interviews and Chaudry’s (2018) centering of disability embodiment as a valuable place to begin research among others (see, for example, Rice et al., 2015 and Rice et al., 2018). Following from Rice et al. (2021a) who argue that stories can operate as constrictive/cancelling or expansive/amplifying forces in disabled people’s lives, we explore how Autistic differences diffract the stories we make of Autism and the methods of their making. We conclude by reflecting on our analysis as a methodological movement through critical Autism studies that makes unique contributions to qualitative studies in education by centering Autistic experiences and embodiments (Fletcher-Watson, et al., 2019; Milton, 2012, 2014). While our workshops inevitably remain captured by power (Rice et al., 2021b), story-work by and with Autistic bodies, minds, and collectives also interferes with power, creating openings for more just knowledge-making with the potential to disrupt pathologizing discourses and practices.

A Methodology of Power and Possibility

We begin our exploration of how Autism moves materially and discursively in our workshop spaces by turning to new materialist theory and its analytic of interference. We borrow our axial assumptions about materialities and socialities from new materialism because this mode of thought offers a non-essentialist, non-reductive, transdisciplinary understanding of embodiment and sociality that foregrounds the material-discursive constitution of disability (Barad, 2007; Braidotti, 2013; Rice et al., 2021a; Rice, 2014, Rice et al., 2015). Following feminist theorist Rosi Braidotti's displacement of the Euro-western Cartesian instinct towards binaries—singular versus collective, body versus mind, known versus unknown—new materialist thinkers, influenced by feminist engagements with technoscientific, Deleuzian, and Indigenous thought (see Rice, 2018), recognize that everything is in flux. As Braidotti (2000) describes this in her Deleuzian feminist "Tetralogies": "Neither a sacralized inner sanctum, nor a pure socially-shaped entity, the enfolded Deleuzian subject is rather an "in-between": it is a folding-in of external influences and a simultaneous unfolding outwards of affects" (p. 159). As a collective we affirm the "in-between" of the all bodies— keeping in mind the asymmetrical power relations inherent to different articulations of in-betweenness as shaped by differing identities—and, for the purposes of our work, the Autistic and allistic body.

We turn to the new materialist or agentic realist concept and process of interference, first introduced by feminist physicist Karen Barad to theorize movements of energy and matter in relation to space and time, to explore this "in-between". Following Barad, critical researchers have used the analytic interchangeably with the inter-related concept of diffraction to show

how putting critical theory into conversation with “data” can bend old thought patterns (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) and innovate research processes that generate new knowledge about difference (Rice et al., 2021a). Barad (2007) explains that waves (sound, light, water) are not matter; rather they are displacements of matter that carry energy, which means that they can occupy the same space at the same time. This is important because it explains their unique properties/ways of acting—namely, their capacity to create new patterns as they combine (interfere with each other) or as they bend and spread when encountering an obstruction (diffract). While Barad borrows from the convention in physics that distinguishes between interference and diffraction, she also argues for using these concepts interchangeably since both refer to wave interactions, or what physicists call “superposition of waves” (2007, p. 80).

As described by Rice and colleagues (2021a), Barad draws from the work of feminist technoscience scholar Donna Haraway to build the case for diffraction (or interference) as methodology. She notes that Haraway’s turn from reflexive to diffractive methodology starts from a critique of the Cartesian idea that the human mind exists “independently of external reality and that we have more direct access to our thoughts than to the outside world” (Rice et al., 2021a, p. 3). This premise grounds the belief that researchers can produce trustworthy knowledge about the world if we can account for our bias and partialness in interpreting it. Haraway rejects the idea that we need only account for ourselves to truly grasp reality, since in assuming that our subjectivity plays the pivotal role in whether we perceive or misperceive reality, researchers elide “the effects of the whole research apparatus—understood to include the tools/measures and meaning-making systems used—on the reality that results and the knowledge generated about it.” (Rice et al., 2021a, p. 3). Haraway (2018) argues instead for

diffraction: “[w]hat we need is to make a difference in material-semiotic apparatuses, to diffract the rays of technoscience so that we get more promising interference patterns on the recording films of our lives and bodies” (p 16.).

Following Haraway, Barad approaches diffraction not merely as methodology, but as epistemology and ontology; knowing and being are mutually implicated and co-constitutive. On one level, diffractive methodology involves “reading insights [from different disciplines] through one another” (Barad, 2007, p. 25) to shake up old thought patterns and generate new knowledge. More deeply and radically, Barad argues that diffraction attends to the production of differences in and through the research process itself—to how “material-semiotic” research apparatuses (i.e., the people involved, the data collection/creation tools used, discourses informing the research, the research field, larger systems interfacing with the research and more) co-constitute, or “intra-act” to shape the phenomenon being explored (Rice et al., 2021a; Rice et al., 2021b). Thus, diffraction surfaces “the changing and contingent ontology of the world, including the ontology of knowing” (Barad, 2007, p. 73), where researchers and participants are understood as part of already entangled matter and meanings that affect and shape us and that we affect and shape in an ongoing, ever-moving way (Davies, 2014).

Building on Barad’s thinking, we draw on but also decouple concepts of diffraction and interference. In teasing these concepts apart, we explore what interference, as metaphor and methodology, might offer that a conflation of the two terms misses (Rice, et al., 2021a; Rice et al., 2021b). Whilst diffraction in physics refers to what happens when many waves encounter and bend/spread around an obstruction, interference describes the ways that waves behave when they come together to create new patterns of behaviour. For instance, when coastal

water waves rush through an opening in a breakwater, they create patterns of diffraction (the bending and spreading out of the waves through the breakwater). In contrast, when sound waves from different sources meet, they interfere with each other: “constructive” interference occurs when the peaks of sound waves interact to amplify/strengthen each other; and “subtractive” or “destructive” interference occurs when a peak and a trough of a sound wave meet, canceling each other out (this is the principle upon which noise cancelling headphones work) (See Rice et al. 2021a, p. 2).

Focussing as it does on movement and the possibility of surfacing new patterns (both liberatory and oppressive), we mobilize interference to consider how activist arts methodologies might flow through critical Autism studies, forming new patterns, and how these processes and the work produced might enhance post/qualitative studies in education. Our use of interference within critical Autism studies seeks to challenge qualitative and storytelling research practices and assumptions that remain tied to the “Autism clinic”. By “Autism clinic” we mean the dispersed assemblage of knowledge, practices, tools, and techniques generated through the psy-disciplines (psychology, psychiatry, social work) that govern what Autism is across institutional and intimate spaces such as the school, the university lab, and the family (Yergeau, 2018). This assemblage of deficit-laden, westernized, and biomedicalized understandings of Autism and remedial practices presumes that Autistic modes of sociality, movement, and communication are undesirable and bad (e.g., see Gruson-Wood, 2016; Gibson & Douglas, 2018; Yergeau, 2018). The net of pathologizing knowledge and practice results in exclusion and violence to Autistic people (Milton, 2012, 2014; Yergeau,

2018). As we analyze how ongoing ableist⁶ histories appear in selected digital stories, we invite our reader to care for themselves in whatever way they need. We also share affirmative, playful, whimsical, surprising, and expansive stories, as well as stories that generatively interfere with the practices of the Autism clinic. We turn now to describe our project and methods more concretely.

Methods on the Move

In this section, we provide a description of our project and workshop process and analyze how generative interference operated in and through the research apparatus and process. We discuss the collective that formed through our work together, and home in on dissonances and resonances that emerged as part of our methodology and how these operated as interference. Taken together, our methodological commitments to disability justice and co-research compose our interference methodology.

The Re•Storying Autism in Education Project: Methods on the Move

Patty Douglas initiated the Re•Storying Autism in Education project in 2016 in collaboration with the Re•Vision Centre for Art and Social Justice and its director and founder, Carla Rice. Autistic and allistic participant-storytellers⁷, researchers, and Re•Vision facilitators who took part in the initial 2016 workshop series were foundational to the project's development and

⁶ Ableism is a form of systemic oppression that values and privileges able-bodiedness/mindedness as it has come to be understood under neoliberal and colonial material and discursive configurations (see, for example, Campbell, 2009; Goodley, 2014).

⁷ We use the term participant-storyteller to signal our collective desire and effort to break down participant-researcher-artist hierarchies within the academy (see Rice et al., 2020).

moving methods, and many remain involved. During the development phase (entitled *Enacting Critical Disability Communities in Education, 2016-2019*), research team members together determined that we would invite participant-storytellers who identified as members of, or allied with, critical Autistic communities; this aligned with the project’s aim to release new and multiple affirming stories of Autism and intervene in exclusionary systems. We used our personal and professional networks in education and disability communities to recruit storytellers who shared our belief that Autism is a valuable way of being and access to education a matter of disability justice. In keeping with this politic, Douglas and Rice prioritized mentoring Autistic individuals and critical allies (e.g., graduate students, artists, emerging scholars) in the method (see Douglas et al., 2021). The strength of these connections moved the method and project, galvanizing the formation of a co-researcher collective⁸ in 2020, wherein Autistic members take the lead shaping research creation directions. The co-researcher collective comprises an innovation that centers disability justice (The Re•Storying Autism Collective, under review; also see www.restoryingautism.com for more detail) and insists on “Nothing about us, without us.”

Briefly, the Re•Vision story-making method animating Re•Storying Autism workshops brings participant-storytellers together in 3-5 day in person workshops and/or 4–5-week online workshops to create first-person multimedia stories (short films) about experiences of bodymind difference (Rice & Mündel, 2018; 2019). On Re•Storying, this means bringing

⁸ The co-researcher collective meets monthly to initiate, develop, and facilitate research creation. For example, the co-researcher collective recently developed and facilitated an online zine-making workshop series entitled *Autistic, Surviving and Thriving Under COVID-19: Imagining Inclusive Autistic Futures*. Membership in the collective is open and fluid. Some co-authors on this paper also regularly attend co-researcher collective meetings.

together Autistic and allistic individuals, family members and educators to make short videos about experiences of Autism and inclusion in education (Douglas et al., 2021). Multimedia stories made in Re•Vision workshops combine audio recordings with visuals, soundscapes and more (e.g., photos, video clips, artwork, music, utterances, gestures). Workshops provide participant-storytellers with access to computers and cameras, filmmaking software, video, and photography support and so on. The stages involved in making these short films include:

1. An in-depth framing of themes or issues (co-led by researchers and community members) that bring participant-storytellers together;
2. A story space where participant-storytellers share initial ideas around the experience or moment they would like to develop into a film;
3. Writing exercises to help participant-storytellers develop scripts or storyboards;
4. An orientation to audio, video, and editing software and hardware;
5. Other supports (e.g., 1-1 or small group technical and artistic support) to help participant-storytellers from development to finished video;
6. A film screening with participant-storytellers who wish to take part; and
7. Post-workshop follow-up including post-production (e.g., credits, editing support), and opportunities to join the co-researcher collective, co-author academic papers and talks, and more.

<<Insert Figure 1>>

Although we present a list that appears static, the method is iterative and processional, both moved by and co-constitutive of the diverse bodyminds of each group of participant-storytellers and researchers in our workshops (e.g., rural, urban, Trans, queer, non-binary,

women-identified, Indigenous, racialized; see Douglas et al., 2021; Rice et al., 2018; Rice, et al., 2017; Rice, et al., 2022; Rice & Mündel, 2018, 2019; Rice, 2020)⁹. The emergence of the Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective, which we describe below, is one such iteration.

The Re•Storying Autism Collective

A pivotal aspect of our moving methodology is the Re•Storying Autism collective. After a challenge made by Autistic co-authors and tense discussions about how to recognize different contributions to the paper, Douglas suggested authoring collectively. While Re•Storying has co-authored articles previously, this is the first time that Re•Storying has claimed collective authorship as methodology. We did not intend this new structure to smooth over the messiness of our process or the power asymmetries among us (e.g., tenured/untentured, academic/community member, Autistic/allistic, mother/sibling/practitioner). Rather, we decided to adopt Douglas' idea to resist neoliberal ableist metrics in the academy that value conventional academic contributions more highly than Autistic experiential knowledge (e.g., listing, repetition; see Douglas et al., 2021; Rodas, 2018; Woods, et al., 2018; Woods & Waldock, 2020; Yergeau, 2018). A collective approach provisionally and strategically challenges hierarchies in academic research and writing (Rice et al., 2021b).

To our knowledge, very little work has been done within critical Autism studies on co-researcher and writing collectives as moving methods pushing back against neurotypical power in qualitative studies in education. One prominent related exception is the UK-based Participatory Autism Research Collective (PARC), a group that builds infrastructure “to bring

⁹ To give an example, given the history of Autism as a white, global North diagnostic label (Inman, 2019; Lindblom, 2014), a current initiative on the project is storywork with Indigenous organizations in Manitoba and Aotearoa wishing to decolonize Autism.

Autistic people, including scholars and activists, together with researchers and practitioners...to build a community network, where those who wish to see more significant involvement of autistic people in autism research can share knowledge and expertise” (Fletcher-Watson et al., 2019, p. 947). Our methodological provocations around the analytic of interference are also new, grounded in new materialist ontology, an innovation within critical Autism studies that understands subjectivity and sociality as relational, non-reductive, non-essentialist and always becoming in context (Braidotti, 2013).

Our collective research and writing process was not easy. Often, co-writing was turbulent, marked by both conflict and generativity, both “constructive” (amplifying) and “destructive” (diminishing, cancelling out) interference. As Easton and Gibson articulated:

We recognize that the academy itself is implicated in the Autism clinic and its ongoing power, and that the members of our research and writing collective are differentially positioned in relation to the academy and the clinic. Processes of co-research and co-writing are fraught and authors of this paper have grappled with significant moments of disagreement. Those of us who are Autistic, and those at the periphery of the academy (e.g., graduate students, non-students, current or past supervisees) feel the precarious recognition of our contributions. Some of these internalized and explicit tensions occurred around ways in which standard academic form excludes Autistic ways of thinking and writing.

We do not resolve these tensions. Instead, we collectively affirm difference in writing and research as a methodological process, which includes:

- Working between clashing social identity categories (allistic/Autistic) in relation to Autism. Rather than seeking to *know* Autism (see Orsini, this issue) through the authority of research or lived experience, we instead centre multiple Autistic voicings and artistic creations to keep the meaning of Autism moving and becoming in relation. We indicate these voicings and clashes with the use of an unsettled, multiple “we”, and fold in the third person to highlight individual contributions and perspectives;
- Working between different styles of communication (e.g., list/prose, bluntness/subtlety) in a process of multiple analyses, writings, deletions, and rewritings often provoked by Autistic co-authors and our preferred writing styles (e.g., listing, repetition). We forward collective research and writing as a moving process rather than a finished, tidy, product;
- Taking up and working through contentious problematics of how to value different types of contributions (e.g., unpaid labour, project vision and leadership, writing leadership, sheer time, methodological innovation, artistic creations, lived experience, rhetorical forms) within the crosscurrents of neoliberal ableist academic metrics, the devaluing of lived experience in the academy and the exclusion of Autistic perspectives in post/qualitative studies in education. The emergence of the Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective is one provisional response to these problematics;
- Grappling with our inevitable failure to subvert historical and present-day hierarchies and binaries (e.g., academic/student, researcher/participant) despite our collective desire and emancipatory aim (Rice & Mündel, 2019; Rice et al., 2020). Rather than “fixing”, we call for a “moving together with failure” as methodological criticality, creativity, and resistance;

- Coming to terms with emancipatory research as always implicated in power. The Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective is our way of making this power explicit.

The turbulence we experienced seemed inevitable given these complex crosscurrents of power at play in research. What we share is a deep commitment to anti-oppressive research and disability justice and a politics of solidarity within what can often be a fractious educational landscape and divided Autism politics pitting parents/ mothers/ caregivers/ teachers/ practitioners and Autistic people against one another (Douglas et al., 2021; Runswick-Cole, Mallet & Timimi, 2016; Woods et al., 2018; Woods & Waldock, 2020). A methodology that tracks interference opens space for failure, difference, irreducible alterity, and messiness.

Our analysis deliberately fuses what might traditionally be separate “Results” and “Discussions” sections. We view such deliberate shifts in form as ways to critique how neurotypical¹⁰ research/writing forms subsume circularity and openness in favour of concise, finite, and tidy linearity (Easton, 2013; Yergeau, 2018). Our frequent lists parody the clinical checklist and affirm self-identified (and clinically pathologized) practices of ordering and repetition (Easton, 2013; Yergeau, 2016, 2018). Using the list form apart from a clinical context disrupts so-called objective expertise, and asserts knowledge as situated, political, and partial (Haraway, 2018; Yergeau, 2018).

Interfering with Autism Clinic Logics

¹⁰ By ‘neurotypical’ we mean bodyminds considered normative and desirable (e.g., talking, walking, disciplined, ordered, rational, autonomous, productive). These presumed normativities enfold into academic and research domains. We refer to this as ‘neurotypical research’. We use ‘neurodivergent’ to mean a form of identity including Autism that diverges from and disrupts neurotypicality. For further reading see Walker (2014) and Yergeau (2016, 2018).

This section explores key tensions from the project where different energetic flows, displacements, and histories could be seen to interfere in each other's trajectories, showing how ableist power and Autism clinic logics reverberate throughout research settings and practices in education. We focus on ways the workshop ran destructive interference with clinic logics through our affirmative approach to re-storying difference, one that sought to "cancel out" the noisy and pathologizing effects of the clinic. We also show how "constructive" or amplifying interference that aimed to increase possibilities beyond the clinic's pull moved through our methodology. Our use of the collective "we" in this section remains provisional and is interfered with by Autistic collective members at times.

We analyzed:

- several films made in the workshops;
- summary notes of an insider/outsider viewing event;
- non-normative relations with objects and movement as they appear in the films;
- story-making space;
- written reflections by Autistic story-makers about participating in the workshop series.

Three interrelated themes were distilled from our analysis of these materials: the pull of the clinic; pushing back/confounding expectations; and resisting the clinic.

The Pull of the Autism Clinic

Interference as metaphor and methodology invites us to consider its range of meanings—its denotations and connotations in everyday speech and in the specialist language of physics—and how these might operate in the lives of Autistic people and in research. As co-authors we talked about the troubling colloquial uses of the term: in its everyday usage, interference

denotes interfering with someone's body/autonomy. Interference is also commonly used as a euphemism for sexually abusing or assaulting a person who is positioned as less powerful (See Rice, et al., 2021a). We are conscious of the denotative weight it carries. In choosing the word interference, we wish to jar our readers into awareness of the harsh and routine bodily and psychic harm and material oppression Autistic people experience (See Rice et al., 2021a for a detailed discussion; also Dawson, 2004; Gibson & Douglas, 2018).

Attending to interference in this sense allows us to focus on how the "pull" of the Autism clinic continued to be felt in the project's workshops. Attending to this pull reveals the clinic's presence in practices and spaces where it is not anticipated to be. We therefore consider some of the ways that the pull of the clinic moved through our workshops, at times interfering with researchers' and participant-storytellers' efforts and desire to go beyond its reach. We approach this analysis with caution, not wishing to reproduce an "us and them" in critical Autism research (Runswick-Cole, 2014). We acknowledge that experience is always partial and incomplete even as we remain intensely aware of the authoritative position that allistic people and university-based researchers occupy to set the terms of research from project creation to dissemination. We (and here the "we" means primarily Autistic co-authors) describe how clinic(al) and ableist power surfaced in our workshops as an undertow that pulled at our attempts to amplify new possibilities and run "destructive" interference into ableism in qualitative studies in education research.

The clinic as location/space

Shields asserts we must not only address "how" we think about Autism in research but also where (physically) and with what tools and objects. Where and with what we conceptualize

Autism can be understood concretely and abstractly, through metaphor and affective experiences. We list below a brief history of the “where” and “with what” of the Autism clinic,¹¹ noting the inextricability of the clinic from the academy in even the most critical research. The clinic and the academy have a close, mutually reinforcing relationship wherein the university functions to legitimize and sanction both the labels assigned to disabled people and the places that contain them/us (i.e., the asylum, the institution, the clinic) (Radford, 1994). Historically, we can observe the university-clinic connection where Autism—or the neurotypical idea of Autism—and the bodies of Autistic people were (and still are) interfered with, contained, experimented on, and examined, their/our bodily autonomy stripped away, oftentimes violently, at the hands of professionals and researchers.

Here, we list just a few with an accessibility note that (following Kafer, 2016) alerts readers to the kinds of examples it outlines. These can be distressing, particularly to people who have experienced anti-Autistic violence:

- Clinician and researcher Hans Asperger took part in the Aktion T4 program during Nazi Germany, labeling some Autistic children “unworthy of life” (those deemed incapable of “improvement”) and referring them to the Am Spielgrund clinic, where they were experimented on or murdered (Sheffer, 2018).
- Psychologist Bruno Bettelheim, director of the Orthogenic school 1944-1973, at University of Chicago, separated children from their families to treat them at his school

¹¹ The histories we list reflect Autism as a disproportionately white, male, bourgeois, global North diagnosis. Black, Indigenous, global South and Other bodies have often been labelled with diagnoses understood as less ‘improvable’, subjecting these Others to racialized, colonial, classed and other forms of surveillance (see, for example, Ineese-Nash, 2020; Inman, 2019; Lindblom, 2014; Rice, et al., 2021c).

(in particular, isolating them from their mothers, whose love was understood to be damaging, see Douglas, 2013). Physical and sexual abuse was reported by his former students after his death in 1990 (Pollak, 1998).

- Psychologist Ole Ivar Lovaas at the University of California, Los Angeles used electric shock and other “aversives” in his operant conditioning experiments on Autistic children in the Young Autism Project, eventually creating what is now known as Applied Behavioral Analysis (Broderick, 2011; Broderick and Roscigno, 2021; Gibson & Douglas, 2018; Roscigno, 2020; Yergeau, 2018).
- Electric skin shock is used as part of the “treatment” program for neurodivergent and, primarily for racialized children, youth, and adults at the Judge Rotenberg Education Center in Canton, Massachusetts (Brown, 2021; Davies, 2014; Shields, 2019).
- The Autism clinic was extended, through Lovaas’ work, into the home, where mothers in particular were/are tasked with retraining their/our practices of love and care to become their/our Autistic child’s 24/7 home therapist (Douglas, 2013; Eyal 2010; Gruson-Wood, 2016, 2018; Zucker & Donovan, 2016).
- The Autism clinic, in the form of applied behaviour therapies, has systemically been extended into schools, adult group homes, and elsewhere in North America (Gibson & Douglas, 2018; Gruson-Wood, 2016, 2018; Roscigno, 2020).

The Autism clinic, then, is an entanglement of the psy disciplines, researchers, educators, professionals, and parents within dispersed pedagogic institutional and intimate spaces and places. It reaches into our very interiority—our identities, bodies, and spirits—and influences us in even the most critical or creative research (Douglas et al., 2021a).

For example, we note connections between the Autism clinic, institutional spaces, and the university in the list above. Each clinical space was intimately tied to the university: Asperger's clinic was connected to the University of Vienna; Bettelheim's institution to the University of Chicago; Lovaas's clinic was located within the University of California, Los Angeles; and the former director of the Judge Rotenberg Centre, Matthew Israel studied under B. F. Skinner at Harvard University. One way the clinic moved through our storytelling workshops was in the location of the workshops within a university. As we re-storied experiences of education (often traumatic and inaccessible) for Autistic people, parallel histories of confinement were at play (Kelly et al., 2021a; Kelly et al., 2021b; Rice, et al., 2021c): we gathered together in a classroom space at a university named after a principal figure in the design of the genocidal residential school system in Canada that removed Indigenous children from their families and cultures to assimilate them into white supremacist colonial society (see Inman, 2019; Ineese-Nash, 2020). The clinic was also amplified through the research interviews, even as they took place outside the university. Interviews were also conducted by a researcher who has not attracted or claimed the label of Autism. Despite efforts to reclaim the interview in emancipatory ways—in alignment with narrative, feminist and other critical and creative research methods that seek to disrupt power and centre individuals as the authors of their/our own stories (Leavy, 2018)—echoes of the definitional power of the clinical interview/case study reverberated for Autistic participant-storytellers on this paper. The clinic(al) and its attempts to control and contain deviant, unruly bodies, “pulled” at storytellers.

The clinic as/and Autistic objects

During our workshops, we used various objects and tools to support the storytelling process. Perhaps inevitably, certain elements of clinical settings where Autism is diagnosed, *treated*, and studied were reproduced through constituents of the space and the tools and objects we brought:

- cameras;
- recording devices;
- offices;
- desks;
- toys;
- hand dryers;
- questionnaires;
- consent forms;
- tasks (despite the stated acceptance of failure);
- linoleum floors;
- fluorescent lights.

Autistic people's relationships with the nonhuman, particularly with objects, have been pathologized, rendered meaningless, and conceptualized as a barrier to developing relationships. Frances Tustin, a child psychoanalyst, coined the term "autistic object" to refer to what she considered a pathological use of objects which "prevented the [autistic] child from relating to the actual human mother in a normal way" (1986, p. 173). By autistic objects Tustin meant things her clients brought into or used in therapy sessions, including matchbox cars,

keys, and stuffed animals. She saw such objects as preventing “authentic” human connection between the child and other people. Asperger (1991), too, noted the fetishistic, “abnormal fixations” toward “soulless possessions” (meaning inanimate objects) exhibited by the children he assessed (p. 82). Leo Kanner (1943) also remarked on Autistic children in his study, and their imagination and affection in relation to objects while negating these qualities in the children’s interaction with people. While objects were often used ironically to speak back to their clinical origin in the workshops and the videos that emerged, their very presence also amplified the pull of the clinic for some Autistic storytellers on this paper.

The clinic as performing Autism in research

Against the backdrop of the ways in which the clinic is inescapably intertwined with research, during the videomaking workshops and the writing/presentations that emerged from them, co-author Shields described the feeling of “performing Autism” for the allistic beholder. She explores this theme in her Untitled film (<https://vimeo.com/371981354/c17d62758d>). After making the video, Shields has reflected on her possible ongoing entanglements with clinic logics and how self-reflexive questions about whether she was performing Autism in her film challenged her as an Autistic participant-storyteller and co-author. Contemplating Yergeau’s (2018) anecdote about being placed in a social skills “book club” that asked Autistic participants to read *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*—a book infamous within Autistic communities for its stereotypical depiction of its Autistic protagonist, Christopher—amplified this concern. Yergeau describes the expectation that Autistic group members see themselves as “little Christophers.” According to Yergeau, participants were asked if they wished they lived

¹² This description was authored by.

without other humans so that they could “pursue [their] Autistic interest and not be bullied” (p. 90). They recount that one participant responds to the loaded question with the simple yet eloquent: “Fuck Christopher. Fuck you!” (p. 90). This vignette, though different than her workshop experience, speaks to conflicts that arose for her during processes of making and writing, which she understands to be intricately tied up in what we have collectively termed the pull of the clinic. The inescapable, saturating presence of the clinic—the university space where the workshops took place, the objects present, the research consent forms and so on— influenced her expectations and, to some extent, her experience of our work.

The clinic emerged, for Shields, as a conflict about what “kind” of Autistic she was to be for the project. On the one hand, she desired to be the good, helpful, compliant Autistic subject who is understanding of neurotypical processes: the Autistic who masks difficult, unpalatable aspects of her Autistic-ness (her meltdowns, wrist-biting, head-hitting, sensory overload etc.) in order to participate and be seen as a productive Autistic willing to work within the confines of a project initially conceived of and directed by researchers who have not attracted or claimed the label of Autism, biting back her “fuck yous” to represent the “best” of Autism. The familiar scenario of the various clinical spaces that have missed, documented, categorized, and defined her Autism followed her into the workshop and provided the backdrop of the experience for her.

We collectively call on critical Autism and post/qualitative researchers in education to take account of the ways the pull of the clinic— materially, affectively, bodily—may interfere with efforts to amplify “new” possibilities in research.

Pushing Back/Confounding Clinical Expectations

At times, our collective attempt to create workshops that interfered with the clinic inadvertently reinscribed it by incorporating clinical objects and spaces, and complexly replicating pathologizing practices of Autistic/clinician subjectivity. Shields, a co-author on this paper, pointed out, for example, that the process by which we analyzed the stories that the workshops elicited involved:

- watching;
- re-watching;
- pausing;
- rewinding;
- fast-forwarding moments (e.g. a brief clip);
- repetition.

Interestingly, this same behaviour is considered symptomatic of Autism within clinical settings and pathologized as “perseveration,” “obsession,” “stereotypy” and as “meaningless” (Yergeau, 2018). Yet when researchers do this in the research context, it is in the service of knowledge generation and is understood as meaningful.

We turn now to our descriptive analysis of two films made in the workshops that we argue interfere in productive ways with the clinic’s pull. We note that the video makers did not write about their films but instead gave collective members consent to do so. As participant-storyteller Nami Yang put it in a personal correspondence to Douglas, “I believe the author’s dead when work gets published...A story is for anyone to retell.” Both filmmakers read and liked what we wrote. We also include their comments back to us as requested by them. In keeping

with our desire to subvert researcher/participant binaries, we list these video makers as contributing members of the Re•Storying Autism Writing Collective.

Leaving the clinic behind in the film “Habitat”

The short film “Habitat” made by Autistic activist of colour G.P. (she/they) depicts the quiet spaces that they require to recover from the sensory onslaught of the city (go to: <https://vimeo.com/439323450/e45a367f54>). The film features video footage of water, fish, paths, and plants inside a botanical garden in Toronto, Ontario, Canada as well as a fidget toy, the storyteller’s cat, an empty library, and a downtown church beside the university where the storytelling workshop took place. G.P. asked us to note the cat in their film has since passed (in 2018), and that a new cat has since chosen them. G.P. tells their story with visuals, voice-over, and the ambient sound of the downtown core, and explains to the viewer that they and their cat (another source of comfort) need quiet spaces to “regroup.” Within the urban landscape, G.P. tells that these quiet spaces are rapidly vanishing. G.P. refers to this as “losing my habitat.”

G.P.’s film demonstrates some of the ways our moving method facilitated storytellers to push back against pathologizing narratives and conventional qualitative research in education. In their film, G.P. leaves the university space and moves through the city with a camera focusing on spaces where they find needed quiet. We understand this act of leaving the university workshop space as a form of resistance against the clinic: spaces of nature, sanctuary, and the storyteller’s home. G.P. focuses the viewer on nature (plants, water) and non-human animals (fish, cat)—spaces and actors antithetical to the spaces and objects through which Autism is often researched and violently categorized. G.P.’s film, like many of the films made by Autistic

storytellers, is abstract and never directly refers to education. Rather, it can be understood as a form of storytelling about education that resists the pull of the clinic by leaving it behind.

Pushing against clinical narratives in the film “Perception: Wa[l]king Sync”¹³

In their film “Perception: Wa[l]king Sync,” Autistic trans storyteller of colour Nami Yang (they/them) also leaves the university workshop space. Without addressing the clinic or conventional research directly, Yang powerfully subverts its pull. They invite viewers into a perceptual medley and sensory playground of visuals, ambient sound, and unexpected camera angles as they “walk sync,” camera in hand, beyond the workshop space ([link](#)). The film opens onto staticky noise and metallic surfaces reflecting what appear to be streaks and splotches of bright light. A humming noise overlaid by rhythmic, staccato stomping replaces the static. With the repeated squeal, beep, and sound of mechanical rolling, and visuals of heavy metallic doors opening and closing, the viewer gradually *sees* Yang exiting an elevator, on their way out of an institutional space and onto the street. In a personal correspondence about our description, Yang reflected, “I recorded this excerpt to portray my short-lived attention span. How a waiting elevator door transforms into an ominous grin staring me down with intimidation. I am ever lone looking up, it mocks me so.” In contrast to the disorienting, mechanical images and sounds of the university that open the film, an assemblage of outdoor images and ambient sound follow. This series of shifting scenes entails:

- orange, brown, and gold leaves;

¹³ In a personal correspondence, Yang described their intention to play on the words waking/walking in their film and its title. We capture that in our notation of the title as “wa[l]king” and in our description.

- bare tree branches and twigs;
- patches of bright sky glimpsed through a tangle of leaves and branches;
- ambient sound including birds, voices, and traffic;
- cityscapes reflected in storefront windows—buildings, fencing, plants, trees, restaurants, cars, trucks, bicycles, passers-by, a person with camera in hand;
- a still display of miniature figures atop wooden steps wearing pirate costumes;
- overlaid images of fenced residential buildings, an escalator and a domed ceiling.

The final frame of the film spotlights a bright yellow banner with a question that reads “Trust?”

In the same personal correspondence, Yang reflected, “Dangling on by a leaf in a forest of leaves, we rush past one another, ever so distracted from our own ways. I watch through reflected similes, adjacent from a mixed reality. Do I watch? Do you see? Do I trust what I see?”

On our viewing, Yang’s film resists dominant expectations of what “story” is. There are no words in their film until the final visual, and the viewer is not given a definitive narrative arc to follow. Yang portrays people as reflections, overlaid and out of focus, with the greatest direct focus being bestowed on elevator doors, a leaf, and a paper pirate figure on wooden stairs. The maker themselves appears through stomps, footsteps, and reflections, but primarily they are the director of our attention, and creator of moments that we can explore without explicit dictation. This lack of words simultaneously opens space for questions and alternatives. What are the possibilities of story, communication, Autism, education, perception, and “wa(l)king sync”? What are ways to be alert and in rhythm with another or others? What does it mean to be “wa(l)king sync” with a leaf? With an elevator door? With a miniature stage set? With the people and places we see in reflection? With lines that overlap, angles that move, lights that

reflect, and colours that blur? Instead of a story of Autistic *deficit, isolation, or sensory overload*, the film opens to beauty, curiosity, uncertainty, (in)attentiveness, rhythm, and points of convergence.

The final image of “Trust?” offers us a question to take away: what, who, and how do we, as viewers, trust? Are we, as researchers, trustworthy? What do Autism and education have to do with each other beyond the university or research space? On our viewing, Yang’s film asked us to re-examine what we think we know and how by gesturing toward the variety of ways to experience, know, and be in relation with the world around us. In all, through methods that move beyond the university space, expected narrative conventions, pathologizing understandings of Autism and conventional researcher/participant hierarchies, their story interferes with qualitative education research-as-usual, both muffling the noise of the clinic(al) and constructively amplifying new possibilities. We turn now to our final theme.

Resisting the Clinic

Interference methodology has given us pause to consider some of the discourses of post-qualitative inquiry, especially those where the subject tends to disappear into abstraction. Many post-qualitative researchers adopting a diffractive approach do not set out to represent objects and subjects that pre-exist their research; instead, they shift their research optics from “difference as categorical to difference as an emergent process, in which subjects and objects are thought to become different in the encounters through which they emerge and go on emerging differently” (Davies, 2014, p. 740). Diffractive research is thus understood to “break up linear thought” (p. 740) where one subject acts on another in a causal relationship and to

open a space for analysis in which it is possible to see the multidirectional, emergent, and mutual intra-actions that continuously make subjects and worlds. While we embraced post-qualitative inquiry's present and future orientation to the emerging and "not yet," we are mindful of how the pull of the clinic has created categorical (being labelled Autistic) and not just emergent difference, and thus materially interferes with people's lifeways and possibilities of becoming.

Further, in severing from the methodological *old* and emphasizing the *new*, Gerrard et al. (2017) consider post-qualitative inquiry as prone to reanimating the "colonial impulse in which progress is positioned along a development trajectory of linear time" (p. 388). Hence, the post-qualitative "infatuation with the new" may fail to link history to the present (Gerrard et al., 2017, p. 387). Our methodology of interference and political goal of disability justice requires engaging with continuous forms of oppression that persist despite efforts to resist.

Anthropologists of becoming, Biehl and Locke (2017), view social change as occurring when the "interplay between the motions of becoming different" happen through the "moments of impasse or plateaus of stabilization" (2017, p. 5). Rather than seeking out newness, one of the ways we created interference is by entrenching ourselves in the old. We thus focus on the dense interstitial space of resistance and replication to consider how reliving the pull of the clinic can be a potent site and aesthetic resource for resisting it. We provide a close analysis of Steacy Easton's film "Weschler." We note that Easton, though a co-author, opted not to lead the writing about their film but approved this interpretation.

Resisting the clinic in the film: “Weschler”

“Weschler” resists the clinic’s pull by hyperbolically reanimating clinical subjectification. As the film begins, we see hands up close against a white background with red and white Weschler cubes. The Weschler scale of intelligence uses tasks, including pattern making, to evaluate, classify, and order “intelligence.” The Weschler scale is a common assessment used in education to identify so-called intellectual disabilities¹⁴. The assessment is thus an autobiographical life-event and self-making exercise that leaves a mark, tying subjectivity to clinical modes of meaning-making and ordering.

“Geometry of Circles” by Phillip Glass provides the film’s soundscape. The classical music and presence of a chorus gesture to the sacred, expressing the operatic stakes of clinical tests. As the music continues it becomes—like much of Glass’ work—urgent, repetitive, menacing. The minimalist visuals mirror the minimalist soundscape. Sonic minimalism, as adopted by Glass, is “based on the conflict between violence and repetition” intentionally culminating in the “creation of pure tragedy” (Mathieu-Lissard, 2014, para 2).

The person moving the blocks slowly tries to place them in patterns yet repetitively disassembles the patterns, beginning again. Other hands are introduced across the table, holding a pencil and making marks on a page, manipulating the blocks. At one point, the person completing the test holds the pencil and erases a mark. The marks and erasures operate as a haunting, signifying that which is “neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive” yet shapes and governs (Davis, 2005, p. 373). These *other* hands symbolize the clinician and

¹⁴ <https://www.pearsonassessments.com/store/usassessments/en/Store/Professional-Assessments/Cognition-%26-Neuro/Gifted-%26-Talented/Wechsler-Intelligence-Scale-for-Children-%7C-Fifth-Edition-/p/100000771.html>

psychiatric governance writ large. As across from each other, clinician/subject are opposing forces yet connected in their mutual disembodiment. The film's minimalism captures the sterility of the psychometric process where context is expunged, and all that matters is the correct performance of the task. Inherent to the clinical diagnosis machine is the reduction of people into parts: person becomes hand, hand becomes object, object becomes fact, fact becomes classification, classification orders lives.

About two minutes into "Weschler," rhythmic shakers and an organ are introduced, indicating climax. Yet the hands keep working on the task, and instead of a climax, there is a circular return to the chanting. The music serves as a narrative voice readying the audience for progress, success, or at least, change, and when this doesn't happen the narrator becomes a malevolent force marking time and the failure to meet it, antagonistic to the hands working so hard to pattern. The chorus seems central to the process of "disindividuation" embodying the "violent loss of individuality" (Mathieu-Lessard, 2014, para 6).

The disembodied hands paired with urgent, holy, repetitive music, do not just re-present clinical sterility but engage a camp aesthetic of hyperbolic mimicry. The film comprises an ironic burlesque of the psychometrist's office and of what Autistic people are supposed to be good at (pattern making). Drag exaggerates painful archetypes so viewers might notice the ludicrous and harmful normed construction of bodies. Evoking classical music through a camp aesthetic is a means of resisting the symbolic capital of purity and the colonial masculinist fantasy of disembodied transcendence attached to it (McClary, 2002, p. 57). Classical music could be thought to embody the supposed universalism and impartiality of biomedicine, yet the use of *Geometry of Circles* strategically queers both symbolic associations. In "Weschler," the musical

repetition matches the task-repetition, and both work to silence and assimilate the Autistic person. Yet the final moment of the film is triumph via the completion of the block-pattern, and when this happens the music abruptly cuts, and the film ends.

Both the soundscape and cinematography of “Weschler” insist on the “need for deep engagement with the traditions of the past” and its “continuing effects” (Gerrard, et al., 2017, p. 389). Hence, “discharging over and over again” is a way of “rendering tolerable an otherwise insufferable violence” (Mathieu-Lessard, 2014, para 8). Repetition, rather than a radical break or hopeful utopic occupying of the new, is a way of “rendering violence livable” (Mathieu-Lessard, 2014, para 14). Returning to the ensnarement of the clinic shakes the pain loose. Repetition and resistance are not antagonistic political projects: they can be a singular force.

Concluding Thoughts: Storytelling Methods on the Move

So what do Re•Storying Autism and Re•Vision storytelling methods mean to the project of innovating a critical Autism studies methodology that intervenes in qualitative studies in education by pursuing social science as a system of interference? It means that cracks and openings in social transformation through research are not static or total; and that leaning into multivocality, messiness, and repetition might offer a more faithful pathway to change than yearning for the political purity myths of goodness, newness, and clarity. This necessitates acknowledging that we are each embedded in systems of inequality even as we collectively harbor “the potential for things to be otherwise” (Biehl & Locke, 2017, p. 3) and knowing that working together to create a world otherwise may involve perpetuating some aspects of the

world that is. Interference belongs as much to the hopeful and utopian as it does to the recursive, partial, painful, pessimistic, and elegiac.

Our research and process as co-authors are also part of an “open system” in which our “unfathomable complexity of layered entanglements” meet to “produce a more humble, tentative social science, keeping theory more multirealistic and sensible and our modes of expression less figurative and more readily available for swerves, breaks and new paths” (Biehl & Locke, 2017, p. 7). The writing of this paper involved a protracted series of negotiations, ruptures, and repairs. As we continue to write and knowledge-create, we exist in a “unfinished proximity with one another, retreating and reemerging, engendering unanticipated connections and reconfigurations, never definitively closed off nor decisively transformational” (Biehl & Locke, 2017, p. 32). We become in kinship asymmetrically and within the bounds of politics, power, and real material constraints, yet with a shared commitment to undoing oppressive, inequitable systems. Recalling Yergeau’s “Fuck Christopher! Fuck you!” we acknowledge the undertow of the clinic(al) and our collective effort to resist it even as we cannot escape it. Still, we work to create openings through which we can resist, can escape.

It is in the above ways that our storytelling methods (including interviews, films, co-analysis, co-writing and co-presenting) are methods on the move, made alive and disruptive by allistic/Autistic collaborations that *moved with* our bodyminds. Methods on the move remain inevitably entangled with power while simultaneously interfering with any essence or finality of what Autism is or can be. The method offers ways to engage with exclusions in post/ qualitative research and qualitative educational studies and provokes critical Autism studies to innovate methodologically. Our storytelling method, too, is fundamentally relational, and thus resists

ableist understandings of the Autist as lacking empathy (Yergeau, 2018). In this, we lean into interference and the tangle of research and relationality, power, and possibility for more innovative, just, and critically hopeful knowledge and practice. Interference also, importantly, opens needed space for Autistic perspectives in research. We recognize the inevitable messiness and failures this collective method brings but also hope that it offers a path to move forward collaboratively.

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge Autistic and allistic participant-storytellers, co-researchers, and technical and artist facilitators from the Re•Storying Autism project and Re•Vision Centre for Art and Social Justice who have contributed to our methodology of interference that is always on the move. Learn more about our project here www.restoryingautism.com @ReStorying.

This work was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant (430-2016-00050) and Grant (435-2019-0129).

References

- Asperger, H. (1991). 'Autistic psychopathy' in childhood. (U. Frith, Trans.). In U. Frith (Ed.), *Autism and asperger syndrome* (pp. 37–92). Cambridge University Press.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), 801-31.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/345321>
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke.
- Biehl, J. & Lock, P. (2017). Introduction: Ethnographic sensorium. In J. Biehl and P. Locke (Eds.). *Unfinished: The anthropology of becoming* (pp. 1-38). Duke.

- Braidotti R. (2000). Teratologies. In I. Buchanan and C. Colebrook (Eds.). *Deleuze and Feminist Theory* (pp. 156–72). Edinburgh University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic theory: The portable Rosi Braidotti*. Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity.
- Broderick, A. (2011). Autism as rhetoric: Exploring watershed rhetorical moments in applied behavior analysis discourse. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 31(3). <https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1674>
- Broderick, A. & Roscigno, R. (2022). Autism inc.: The autism industrial complex. *Journal of Disability Studies in Education*, 2, 77-101.
- Brown, L. X. Z. (2021, July 15). *Bearing witness, demanding freedom: Judge Rotenberg Center living archive*. Lydia X. Z. Brown Labouring for disability justice and liberation. <https://autistichoya.net/judge-rotenberg-center/>
- Castrodale, M. (2017). Mobilizing dis/ability research: A critical discussion of qualitative go-along interviews in practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(1), 45-55.
- Chaudhry, V. (2018). Centering embodiment in disability research through performance ethnography. *Qualitative Social Work*, 18(5), 754-771.
- Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (2013). *Deleuze and research methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Davidson, J. & Orsini, M. (2013). *Worlds of autism: Across the spectrum of neurological difference*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Davis, C. (2005). Hauntology, spectres, phantom. *French Studies*, 59(3), 373-379. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/kni143>

- Davies, B. (2014). Reading anger in early childhood intra-actions: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 734-741. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800414530256>
- Dawson, M. (2004). The misbehavior of behaviorists: Ethical challenges to the Autism-ABA industry. http://www.sentex.net/~nexus23/naa_aba.html
- Douglas, P. N. (2013.) As if you have a choice: Autism mothers and the remaking of the human. *Health, Culture and Society*, 5, 167-81. doi: [10.5195/hcs.2013.137](https://doi.org/10.5195/hcs.2013.137)
- Douglas, P., Rice, C., Runswick-Cole, K., Easton, A., Gibson, M. F., Gruson-Wood, J., Klar, E. & R. Shields. (2021). Re-storying autism: A body becoming disability studies in education approach. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(5), 605-622. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1563835>
- Douglas, P., Runswick-Cole, K., Ryan, S. & Fogg, P. (2021a). Mad mothering: Learning from the intersections of madness, mothering and disability. *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*, 15(1), 39-56. <https://doi.org/10.3828/jlclds.2021.3>
- Easton, S. (2013). Autism: An anecdotal abecedarium. *Kadar Koli*, 8, 98-107
- Eyal, G., Hart, B., Onculer, E., Oren, N., & Rossi, N. (2010). *The autism matrix*. Polity Press.
- Fletcher-Watson, S., Adams, J., Brook, K., Charman, T., Crane, L., Cusack, J., Leekam, S., Milton, D., Parr, J. R. & Pellicano, E. (2019). Making the future together: Shaping autism research through meaningful participation. *Autism*, 23(4), 943-953. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318786721>
- Gerrard, J., Rudolph, S., & Sriprakash, A. (2017). The politics of post-qualitative inquiry: History and power. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(5), 384-394. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800416672694>

- Gibson, M. F. & Douglas, P. (2018). Disturbing behaviours: O Ivar Lovaas and the queer history of autism science. *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, 4(2).
<https://doi.org/10.28968/cftt.v4i2.29579>
- Gruson-Wood, J. (2016). Autism, expert discourses, and subjectification: A critical examination of applied behavioural therapies. *Studies in Social Justice*, 10(1), 38-58.
- Gruson-Wood, J. (2018). 'I'm A Juggling Robot:' An Ethnography of the Organization and Culture of Autism-Based Applied Behaviour Therapies in Ontario, Canada. *Doctoral Dissertation, York University*.
- Haraway, D. (2018). *Modest_witness@ second_millennium. FemaleMan_meets_oncomouse: Feminism and technoscience*. 2nd Edition. Routledge.
- Ineese-Nash, N. (2020). Disability as a colonial construct: The missing discourse of culture in conceptualizations of disabled Indigenous children. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 9(3), 26-51.
- Inman, C.E. (2019). Absence and epidemic: Autism and fetal alcohol spectrum disorder in Indigenous peoples in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 8(4).
<https://doi.org/10.15353/cjds.v8i4.531>
- Jackson, A. & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.
- Kanner, L. (1943). Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child*, 2, 217-50.
- Kafer, A. (2016). Un/safe disclosures: Scenes of disability and trauma. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 10(1), 1-20.

- Kelly, E., Manning, D., Boye, S., Rice, C., Owen, D., Stonefish, S., & Stonefish, M. (2021a). Elements of a counter-exhibition: Excavating and countering a Canadian history and legacy of eugenics. *Journal for the History of Behavioural Sciences*. 57(1), 12–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhbs.22081>
- Kelly, E., Boye, S., & Rice, C. (2021b). Projecting eugenics and performing knowledges. In Blanchette, S., & Brooks, N. (Eds.). *Narrative Art and the Politics of Health* (pp. 37-62). Anthem Press.
- Leavy, P. 2018. (Ed.). *Handbook of arts-based research*. Guilford.
- Lindblom, A. (2014). Under-detection of autism among First Nations children in British Columbia, Canada. *Disability & Society*, 29, 8, 1248-1259.
- Loveless, N. (2019). *How to make art at the end of the world: A manifesto for research-creation*. Duke.
- Mathieu-Lessard, J. (2014). Knock, knock! Who's there? Violence and repetition from attic tragedy to Philip Glass. *Trans*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.4000/trans.1062>
- McClary, S. (2002). *Feminine endings: Music, gender, and sexuality*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Milton, D.E. (2012). On the ontological status of autism: The 'double empathy problem'. *Disability & Society*, 27(6), 883-887, DOI: [10.1080/09687599.2012.710008](https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.710008)
- Milton, D. (2014). Autistic expertise: A critical reflection on the production of knowledge in autism studies. *Autism*, 18(7), 794-802. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362361314525281>
- Piepzna-Samarasinha, L. L. (2018). *Care work: Dreaming disability justice*. Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Pollak, R. (1998). *The creation of Dr. B: A biography of Bruno Bettelheim*. Simon & Schuster.

- Price, M. (2014). The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain. *Hypatia*, 30(1), 268-284.
- Radford, J. (1994). Disability and the heritage of modernity. In M. Rioux & M. Bach (Eds.), *Disability is not measles: New research paradigms in disability* (pp. 9-27). Roeher Institute.
- Rice, C. (2015). *Becoming women: The embodied self in image culture*. University of Toronto Press.
- Rice, C. (2018). The spectacle of the child woman: Troubling girls in/and the science of early puberty. *Feminist Studies*, 44 (3), 535-566.
<https://doi.org/10.15767/feministstudies.44.3.0535>
- Rice, C. (2020). Digital/ multi-media storytelling. In Crawford, P., Brown, B., & Charise, A., (Eds.). *Companion for Health Humanities* (pp. 341-346). Taylor & Francis.
- Rice, C., Dion, S., Fowlie, H., & Breen, A. (2022) Identifying and working through settler ignorance, *Critical Studies in Education*, 63 (1), 15-30, DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2020.1830818
- Rice, C., Bailey, A., & Cook, K. A. (2021a). Mobilizing interference as methodology and metaphor in disability arts inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 28(3-4), 287-299.
- Rice, C., Cook, K., & Bailey, K. A. (2021b). Difference-attuned witnessing: Risks and potentialities of arts-based research. *Feminism & Psychology*. 31(3), 345–365.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353520955142>
- Rice, C., Dion, S., & Chandler, E. (2021). Decolonizing disability and activist arts. *Disability Studies Quarterly*. 41(2). doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v41i2.7130.

- Rice, C., LaMarre, A., Changfoot, N., & Douglas, P. (2020). Making spaces: Multimedia storytelling as reflexive, creative praxis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 17(2), 222-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2018.1442694>
- Rice, C. & Mündel, I. (2018). Storymaking as methodology: Disrupting dominant stories through multimedia storytelling. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 55(2), 211-231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12190>
- Rice, C., & Mündel, I. (2019). Multimedia storytelling methodology: Notes on access and inclusion in neoliberal times. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 8(2), 118-146. <https://doi.org/10.15353/cjds.v8i1.473>
- Rice, C., Chandler, E., Liddiard, K., Rinaldi, J., & Harrison, E. (2018). The pedagogical possibilities for unruly bodies. *Gender & Education*, 30(5), 663-682. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1247947>
- Rice, C., Chandler, E., Rinaldi, J., Liddiard, K., Changfoot, N., Mykitiuk, R., & Mündel, I. (2017). Imagining disability futurities. *Hypatia*, 32(2), 213-229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12321>
- Rice, C., Chandler, E., & Changfoot, N. (2016). Imagining otherwise: The ephemeral spaces of envisioning new meanings. C. Kelly & M. Orsini (Eds.). *Mobilizing Metaphor: Art, culture, and disability activism in Canada*. (pp. 54-75). UBC Press.
- Rice, C., Chandler, E., Harrison, E. Ferrari, M., & Liddiard, K. (2015). Project Re•Vision: Disability at the edges of representation. *Disability & Society*, 30(4), 513-527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2015.1037950>

- Rodas, J. M. (2018). *Autistic disturbances: Theorizing autism poetics from the DSM to Robinson Crusoe*. University of Michigan Press.
- Roscigno, R. (2020). Semiotic stalemate: Resisting restraint and seclusion through Guattari's micropolitics of desire. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 9(5), 155-184.
- Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). 'Us' and 'them': The limits of a 'politics of neurodiversity' in neoliberal times. *Disability & Society*, 29 (7), 1117-1129.
- Runswick-Cole, K., S. Timimi & R. Mallett. (2016). *Re-thinking autism: Diagnosis, identity and equality*. Jessica Kingsley.
- Sheffer, E. (2018). *Asperger's children: The origins of autism in Nazi Vienna*. W.W. Norton and Company.
- Shields, R. (2019). *"The carpet felt five inches thick!": A socio-spatial analysis of the Judge Rotenberg Centre* [Unpublished major research paper]. York University.
- St. Pierre, E. (2014). A brief and personal history of post qualitative research: Toward "post inquiry." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30(2), 2–19.
- St. Pierre, E. (2019). Post qualitative inquiry, the refusal of method, and the risk of the new. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication. doi:1077800419863005
- Tustin, F. (1986). *Autistic barriers in neurotic patients*. Karnac Books.
- Walker, N. (2014). *Neurodiversity: Some basic terms & definitions*.
<https://neuroqueer.com/neurodiversity-terms-and-definitions/>
- Waltz, M. (2014). Worlds of autism: Across the spectrum of neurological difference. *Disability & Society*, 29(8), 1337-1338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2014.934064>

Woods, R., Milton, D., Arnold, L., & Graby, S. (2018). Redefining critical autism studies: A more inclusive approach. *Disability & Society*, 33(6), 974-979.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1454380>

Woods, R., & Waldock, K. E. (2020). Critical autism studies. In F.R. Volkmar (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of autism spectrum disorders* (pp. 1-9). Springer.

Yergeau R. (2016) Occupying autism: Rhetoric, involuntarity, and the meaning of Autistic lives.

In P. Block, D. Kasnitz, A. Nishida & N. Pollard. (Eds.), *Occupying disability: Critical approaches to community, justice, and decolonizing disability* (pp. 83-95). Springer.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_6

Yergeau, R. (2018). *Authoring autism: On rhetoric and neurological queerness*. Duke.

Viscardis, K., Rice, C., Pileggi, V., Underhill, A., Changfoot, N., & Chandler, E. (2019). Difference within and without. *Qualitative Health Research*. 29(9), 1287-1298.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318808252>

Zucker, C., & Donovan J. (2016). *In a different key: The story of autism*. Penguin/Random House.

Appendix 1

Figure 1. Autism & Inclusion Workshop Agenda (Abridged), October 28-30, 2016

Fri Oct 28	DAY 1: TELLING STORIES	Facilitators
9 – 9:45am	Welcome & Introductions (+ breakfast snack) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each person will then introduce themselves in their own way (speaking, writing, text to speech, etc.). 	-[lead researcher] welcomes the group
9:45 – 10:45am	Digital Storytelling Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A brief overview of the research project on autism and inclusion and the storytelling method will be provided 	-Previous storytellers to speak, share films
	Break (with snack)	
11-12	Story and/or Script Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work on developing your story or script in groups, alone or 1-1 and do a writing prompt exercise 	-All facilitators available to help
12 - 1pm	LUNCH (will be provided on site)	
1- 3 pm	Story Circle/Scatter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each person can share their story idea with the group, or if its more comfortable, in a small group or 1-1 	All facilitators will be available
	Break (with snack)	
3:15- 3:45 pm	Story development/ script development time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be time to work in small groups, alone, or 1-1 with facilitators to finalize story idea/scripts 	All facilitators
	Check-out	[Name] will lead
Sat Oct 29	DAY 2: RECORDING & EDITING YOUR STORIES	
9-12pm	Script development/storyboarding/ recording (+ breakfast) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish your story, record your script or other audio (songs or sounds you want to record) and capture visuals 	All facilitators will help
	LUNCH (will be provided on site)	
1-2 pm	Final Cut Pro X Tutorial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be a visual tutorial of the video editing software we will use to make our stories 	[Name] will give the tutorial

	Break (with snack)	
2:15-4pm	Open Studio (editing, image & video production) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a time to work alone or 1-1 with a facilitator to capture video, images, and begin to edit 	All facilitators
Sun Oct 30	DAY 3: SHARING YOUR STORIES	
9am – 12pm	Open Studio (editing and finalizing stories) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a time to work alone or 1-1 to edit your video 	All facilitators
	LUNCH (will be provided on site)	
1 – 2pm	Finalizing stories and adding credits/ titles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A facilitator will help you to add a title and credits 	All facilitators
2 – 2:30pm	Exporting Stories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitators will upload your video to a storage device so that it is saved for later 	All facilitators
	Break (as needed + with snack)	
2:30-3:30pm	Screening Final Stories/ Videos <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will have a screening to celebrate our stories! 	All storytellers + facilitators
3:30-4pm	Debrief & closing circle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will come together as a group, or in small groups or 1-1 to debrief and close our storytelling circle 	[Facilitator] will lead us