



**Precarious Inclusion: A Collaborative Account of  
Casualisation and Teaching Leadership Challenges at the  
Post-pandemic University**

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Research Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	QRJ-12-2022-0160.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Inclusion, Dis/ability, Casualisation, Freire, Dialogue, Race, Minoritisation

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 ***Precarious Inclusion: A Collaborative Account of Casualisation and Teaching***  
4 ***Leadership Challenges at the Post-pandemic University***  
5  
6  
7

8 **Abstract**  
9

10 **Purpose** – This paper emerged from the challenges encountered by both authors as  
11 academics during the Covid-19 pandemic and beyond. Based on their subsequent reflections  
12 on inclusion in education for minoritised academics in pandemic-affected institutional  
13 contexts, they argue that beyond student-centred foci for inclusion, equity in the field, is  
14 equally significant for diverse teachers. Working as tempered radicals, they contend that  
15 anything less, is exclusionary.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 **Design/methodology/approach** – Using a reciprocal interview method and drawing on  
21 Freirean ideals of dialogue and education as freedom from oppression, the authors offer dual  
22 perspectives from specific positionings as a non-tenured woman academic of colour and a  
23 tenured staff member with a disability.  
24  
25  
26

27 **Findings** – In framing this work dialogically and through Freirean ideals of conscientização,  
28 the authors' collective discussions politicise personal experiences of marginalisation in the  
29 teaching and researching of inclusion in education for preservice teachers, or more pointedly,  
30 in demonstrating the responsibility of all to orientate towards context-dependent inclusive  
31 practices. They assert that to enable educators to develop inclusion-oriented practice, the  
32 contextual frameworks need to ensure that they question their own experiences of inclusion  
33 as potentially precarious to enable meaningful teaching practice.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 **Research limitations/implications** –It offers perspectives drawing on race, dis/ability and  
40 gender drawing on two voices. The bivocal perspective is in itself limitation. It is also located  
41 within a very Australian context. However, it does have the scope to be applied globally and  
42 there is opportunity to further develop the argument using more intersectional variables.  
43  
44  
45

46 **Practical implications** –The paper clearly highlights that universities require a sharper  
47 understanding of diversity, and minoritised staff's quotidian negotiations of marginalisations.  
48 Concomitantly inclusion and valuing of the epistemologies of minoritised groups facilitates  
49 meaningful participation of these groups in higher education contexts.  
50  
51  
52

53 **Social implications** –This article calls for a more nuanced, empathetic, and critical  
54 understanding of issues related to race and disability within Australian and global academe.  
55 This is much required given rapidly shifting demographics within Australian and other higher  
56 education contexts, as well as the global migration trajectories.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Originality/value** – This is an original research submission which contributes to debates  
4 around race and disability in HE. It has the potential to provoke further conversations and  
5 incorporates both hope and realism while stressing collaboration within the academic  
6 ecosystem to build metaphorical spaces of inclusion for the minoritised.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Keywords** Inclusion, Dis/ability, Casualisation, Freire, Dialogue, Race, Minoritisation  
13  
14

15  
16 **Paper type** Research paper  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **Introduction**

21  
22 Presented in this paper is a provocation for framing inclusive education as a matter of equity  
23 for students as well as teachers. Put differently, we wonder if educational marginalisation  
24 need be considered only relevant to students with disabilities or diverse cultural backgrounds,  
25 as we grapple with our experiences as scholars of inclusive education, whose sense of  
26 precarity in higher education became particularly pronounced due to the onset of the COVID-  
27 19 pandemic and its lingering aftereffects. More than 20 years ago, inclusive education was  
28 advanced as an approach for “increasing participation for children and adults in learning and  
29 teaching activities, relationships, and communities of local schools” (Booth and Ainscow,  
30 2011, p.12). In the ensuing years, focus has remained largely fixed on addressing barriers to  
31 participation in learning for students with disabilities across educational sectors—an  
32 approach underscored by knowing otherness. However, this fleeting reference to the  
33 involvement of adults in education is suggestive of Booth and Ainscow's concern that  
34 educational inclusion is more holistic than the parameters in which it is frequently framed. It  
35 must be noted that Inclusive Education is a complex ecosystem/assemblage that includes a  
36 wide range of actors and interactions affecting everyone (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
37 Broad discussions in public and policy education discourse centrally shape how equitable  
38 inclusive education can be. Certainly, those who perform the role of educators for training  
39 inclusive education teachers are also part of the inclusive education ecosystem (Naraian,  
40 2021), and this is where our focus lies.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 We draw on White *et al.*'s (2021) argument that despite the field of teacher education  
57 undergoing seismic shifts, “the best ways to prepare “quality” teachers remain central in  
58 global conversations about “quality education” (p. 566) and therefore the onus of  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 responsibility and attention focus now rests on “those who prepare teachers: teacher  
4 educators and teacher education programmes” (ibid). To this end, situated in the field of  
5 teacher training in a large Australian higher education provider, and offering the shared  
6 experiences of two minoritised academics, this contribution attempts to broaden inclusive  
7 education scholarship both epistemologically, as it has recurrently been, and ontologically, as  
8 we acknowledge it is duly becoming (Naraian, 2021; Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Watt and Richardson (2020) indicate the ongoing stress experienced by academics globally as  
16 they, “increasingly contend with competing demands and performance pressures that reduce  
17 work engagement and wellbeing and may undermine motivations or obstruct their  
18 achievement” (p.2). Nonetheless, the unprecedented impact of COVID-19 on the Australian  
19 higher education sector further destabilised higher education for teaching and research staff,  
20 which have already been subject to over two decades of neoliberal shifts within policy  
21 (Bottrell and Manathunga, 2019; Nzinga-Johnson, 2020). Major shifts felt in the sector since  
22 the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic included staff redundancies, an emphasis on online  
23 teaching/learning, and reduced hours for sessional staff, leading to a lack of certainty for  
24 many—tenured and non-tenured alike (Bellini *et al.*, 2021; Harris *et al.*, 2022). To best  
25 clarify our positionalities, we assert that within an already complicated scenario, further  
26 layers of complexity have affected the experiences of ‘non-ideal bodies’ in the academic  
27 workspace (Anderson *et al.*, 2019), with exclusionary effects. We have stepped into this  
28 perilous arena to prompt for a critically reflective approach to education as an “empowerment  
29 tool” to redress coercion. Collaboratively reflecting through shared writing on what inclusion  
30 in education means in the troubled present, we draw on these experiences to highlight that  
31 beyond student-centred foci for inclusion, equity in the field is a matter that touches  
32 everyone, being inherently significant for diverse students, teachers, and researchers alike.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Structured in four parts, this paper first sets the scene for this discussion regarding the breadth  
48 of marginalisation that currently occurs in higher education, despite increased ideals for  
49 inclusivity. In the second, we frame the study. Using dialogue as a framework we emphasise  
50 our collaborative research and teaching in inclusive education scholarship to create a culture  
51 of collegial support and care (Anderson *et al.* 2019). In outlining how teaching and  
52 researching through the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond affected our  
53 experiences, in Part Three we further highlight the precarity of our inclusion in education.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 Finally, the conclusion frames our exposition on why we provoke others in our positions to  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 take up the role of ‘tempered radicals’ (Meyerson and Scully, 1995). Here we emphasise the  
4 need for collaboration within the academic environment as a Freirean ideal, which is of  
5 particular necessity to the project of inclusive education across the sectors as the crisis slowly  
6 ebbs. But within this discussion we are mindful of exacerbating an existing discourse of  
7 “burn out and despair” (Kiyama *et al.*, 2022, p.453) and attempt to “balance stark realism and  
8 necessary hope” (ibid).  
9

### 14 **The life and times of minoritised academics**

16 While efforts are made to be inclusive of a diverse cadre of students, the higher education  
17 sector also seeks to be more inclusive of a diverse workforce (Coates, 2013). Yet at the same  
18 time, it functions under conditions of neoliberalist managerialism, which is “predicated on a  
19 business model, [whereby] people should be treated as consumers, and capital as the only  
20 subject...” (Giroux, 2015, p.118). Within neoliberalised universities across most nations of  
21 the global North, the ideal teacher, learner, and researcher remains “white, male, straight and  
22 able-bodied” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.3). Although diversity discourses are frequently  
23 referenced to attract equity-oriented projects, in the main, the knowledge produced in higher  
24 education remains tethered to these dominant identity positions while minority-driven  
25 knowledges continue to occupy the periphery. Similarly, marginalisation is also levelled  
26 towards so-called 'soft subjects' such as liberal arts and social sciences, which are considered  
27 less suitable for career preparation (Lipton, 2017).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 An ongoing adherence to dominant identities and neoliberalist ideals creates hierarchical  
38 structures within higher education. In this context, scholars from minority backgrounds such  
39 as women of colour and those with disabilities are placed at a secondary status, and their  
40 contribution to knowledge considered liminal (Dolmage, 2017; Mirza, 2018; Anderson *et al.*,  
41 2019). The subsequent necessity to push back at these conditions to achieve in higher  
42 education can be likened to “headwinds” that academics from minoritised and  
43 underrepresented groups must constantly battle against (Moore and Nash, 2017 as cited in  
44 Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.5). As academics working at an Australian university through the  
45 period of COVID-19 (2020-2021), we advance this paper having experiential familiarity with  
46 these conditions. Given the adverse financial impact of the pandemic on the Australian higher  
47 education sector (Noble *et al.*, 2020), despite its lessening virulence, the ongoing situation is  
48 one of prolonged stress and uncertainty for people working in the sector. Thus, as academics  
49 we feel precariously included as we struggle to ensure that our teaching and research  
50 collaborations are ethically grounded and not subject to neoliberal academe’s “increasing  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 divide between the tenured ‘core’ and the precarious ‘periphery’” (Kimber, 2003 as cited in  
4  
5 Smithers *et al.*, 2022, p.39).  
6  
7  
8

9 Author 1 identifies as a non-tenured female academic of colour while Author 2 is a white  
10 male who lives with a disability and has academic tenure. Both work in the same academic  
11 field, concerned with matters of social justice and minority identities in education, with  
12 Author 1 till recently reporting to Author 2 who convened a suite of postgraduate subjects in  
13 which she teaches for pre- and in-service school-based educators. Prior to relocating  
14 overseas, Author 2 was also the principal supervisor for her second PhD which she has taken  
15 up as a measure to forge a permanent space within academia for herself. Both are keenly  
16 aware of “our less than ideal bodies in the academic space” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.2) and  
17 our subsequent divergence from dominant norms. For example, we are both cognisant of how  
18 dominant epistemologies position disability as pejorative (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
19 Furthermore, Author 1’s current doctoral research focusing on inclusion on ethnic migrant  
20 women in academia draws on the conundrum of colour to describe the headwinds battering  
21 this particular minoritised group. This paper contributes to extant literature that places  
22 scholars of diverging power positions in conversation with one another (Musselin, 2013; Co-  
23 author *et al.*, 2022) to inform higher education how systemic barriers to inclusion are further  
24 exacerbated within the context of the institutional response to the COVID-19 crisis. In the  
25 process, both authors also highlight the distinction between head/tailwinds, through this  
26 ethnographic collaboration (Anderson *et al.*, 2019; Anderson and Henry, 2020), stressing the  
27 Freirean ideal of empowerment in so doing, to advance the significance of framing inclusive  
28 education as a concern that affects the field in different and perhaps unexpected ways.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 The ongoing uncertainty that has been sprung upon us include financial repercussions, as  
45 Australian universities, like others worldwide, cope with the fallout of COVID-19 along with  
46 shifts in teaching and learning systems, cohort demographics as well as cuts in government  
47 funding (Melian and Meneses, 2022; Horne, 2020). In the previous 15 years, academics have  
48 been burdened with continually increasing workloads (Miller, 2019; Watt and Richardson,  
49 2020) which due to the pandemic was further compounded by the rapid shift to online-only  
50 teaching. Despite the easing of pandemic related restrictions, many units have been converted  
51 to online modes as cost cutting measures. Online teaching often requires substantial changes  
52 to unit structures. This typically involves extensive time commitments, which combine with  
53 anxiety and confusion due to uncertainty of jobs and the future of academia (Bottrell and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Manathunga, 2019; Duffy and Sas, 2020) to amplify the pressure on academics. While  
4 reflecting on this situation, we were highly aware of the precarity of our professional roles, as  
5 fully online teaching transitions into hybrid modes, entailing further changes and implications  
6 for accessibility and safety.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Amidst these uncertainties, the role of the academic, whether tenured or otherwise, has  
12 become that of a pastoral caregiver, in response to the additional stresses on students and  
13 colleagues. Enacting this role and building meaningful relationships with students and  
14 colleagues requires time. A paucity of time is a feature of neoliberal universities, given  
15 excess workloads and pressures to publish. This element of performativity in the professional  
16 sphere (Giroux, 2015; Ball, 2016) presents headwinds when academics endeavour to commit  
17 time to students and colleagues, while suffering burnout themselves and risk of automatic  
18 marginalisation from the field. Within the context of the pandemic, the shift of the location  
19 for sustained knowledge work from the workplace to the home affected academics unevenly,  
20 with disproportionate negative impacts on women (Peetz *et al.*, 2022).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Dialogue as Collaboration and Methodology: ‘Doing’ Our Research (and Researching** 32 **Our Doings)** 33

34  
35 The isolation embedded with teaching as a profession has been often reiterated (Stewart &  
36 McClure 2013, Jandric 2022), but Freire (1972) reminds us that genuine academics cannot  
37 undertake a passive existence. Being true to their professional identity necessitates  
38 engagement with the world they inhabit. Academic isolation is an undeniable professional  
39 risk which co-writing with a fellow academic one respects and trusts can help avert. The co-  
40 writing process commences with relationship building accompanied by meaningful dialogue.  
41 As supervisor and student as well as fellow educators, we too commenced on this co-writing  
42 journey based on a developing relationship of trust and respect, followed by humorous  
43 exchanges of thoughts on academe, life, and diversities. During the pandemic stress we  
44 realised we were dialoguing with freedom and safety; and Author 1 approached Author 2 to  
45 convert this dialogue into a formal co-writing project resulting in a research paper. This  
46 dialogic relationality helped bridge the neoliberal “divide between the tenured ‘core’ and the  
47 precarious ‘periphery’” (Kimber, 2003 as cited in Smithers *et al.*, 2022, p.39).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our dialogic methodological approach allowed us to act as checks and balances on each  
4 other. While Tolich (2010) asserts that autoethnographers at times use their research as  
5 therapy and risk violating confidentiality of others involved, damaging the  
6 autoethnographer's own academic credibility; we clearly assert that we ran no such risk. The  
7 ethics of using the self in research in our cases was aimed at seeking voice for those such as  
8 us who are marginalised. The ethical challenges posed by autoethnography are minimal as we  
9 collaboratively dialogued on our personal challenges without naming others. Our discussions  
10 signpost the generic yet systemic marginalisations in HE, exacerbated by the pandemic.  
11 Attempting to police our voices through use of the ethical baton in autoethnography risks  
12 wreaking epistemic violence on those such as us who already identify as marginalised (Grant  
13 and Young 2022). In dialoguing on that which affects our quotidian experiences as academics  
14 and researchers as a part of the ongoing tensions within neoliberal academia we have been  
15 vigilant in maintaining the "delicate balancing act involved in getting this right" while  
16 acknowledging that "The challenges arising from the tension between the relational ethic and  
17 the ethic of the self in autoethnography are real and ongoing (Edwards 2021, p.5).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 As neither of us embody the typical scholar in the contemporary Australian higher education  
32 environment (Anderson *et al.*, 2019), we drew on Socratic dialogue traditions to frame  
33 particular probing questions which we could mutually ask each other, to facilitate the crafting  
34 of this paper. This helped us to collaboratively obtain effective information based on our  
35 rapport (Adams, 2010). Our mutual trust and an ongoing non-hierarchical friendship allowed  
36 us to find a thematic coherence among our plurality of ideas, while "repudiating the superior  
37 tone and omniscience" (Diaconu, 2008, p.86).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Our dialogues were inspired by personal experiences of the marginalising conditions of  
45 contemporary higher education and the collective elucidation of the negative impact of the  
46 same; this in turn helped us to actively trigger audience reactions, with the intent of drawing  
47 attention to and confronting such barriers. In effect, we drew on our own bivocality to  
48 highlight the need to frame inclusive education as a matter affecting those embodying the  
49 academic 'non-ideal'. We use our non-ideal scholar embodiments to raise queries on the  
50 precarious inclusion of researcher-educators. Being a non-tenured employed woman of  
51 colour and a white male with a disability affords us a unique combined positioning from  
52 which to advance these concerns. Our personal diversities of race, gender, disability, and the  
53 associated experiences we have encountered help us build bridges of understanding. Given  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 our workloads, shifting life circumstances which included in Author 1's case illness and  
4 death of a parent, and in Author 2's change in place of residence and employment and the  
5 ongoing practical challenges posed by the pandemic's fallout; we found it difficult at points  
6 to coordinate the writing. But we persevered as we considered that our non-ideal  
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

embodiments need to be inserted into the academic space to further the process of tempered radicalism (Meyerson and Scully, 1995) for illuminating the stresses of precarious inclusion. Being both scholars and members of an institutional social structure, we follow the social hegemony of finding 'socially acceptable outlets' (Von Der Haar, 2005, p.52) through research. However, in doing so, we may be empowered to cause a certain level of disruption in traditional research practice by drawing on the personal and using insider knowledge. Dialogue affords us the opportunity to describe the confusion, anger, uncertainty, and compromise we experience as members of different minority groups through seeking "reciprocity between speaker and public, generating verbal action, communication" (Diaconu, 2008, p.74).

In dialoguing with one another through a question-answer format we occasionally found that some queries could not be resolved. Reading over our own responses we found that some of the thoughts appeared more structured in the paper than they were. In reality, we are still working through some of these thoughts and find they keep mobilising us in different directions. The questions chosen by us facilitated the dialogue, providing aim and direction to our discussion while not excluding the depth and emotionality of dialogue (Freire, 1970 as cited in Delong, 2020, p.73). "The ontological importance of dialogue in relationships informs this approach to educational conversations as a research method" (DeLong, 2020, p.81). We further concur with Delong, drawing on the Bakhtinian notion of "an inclusive space of dialogue" (p.73), which highlights the relationality between diverse voices stressing that "For each participant in a dialogue the voice of the other is an outside perspective that includes them with it" (ibid).

### **A Discussion Based on Critical Bivocality**

*"What are we doing that is ordinary in academic practice and yet is out of the ordinary?  
How has the pandemic affected this work?"*

**Author 1:** Life as a non-tenured academic embodies precarious inclusion, which was further intensified through the pandemic, with the subsequent losses of international students and

1  
2  
3 downsizing of work opportunities. These changes paradoxically added to the workload.  
4 Students needed far more attention in terms of pastoral care. As a non-tenured academic, I  
5 was never sure where to draw the line as the caring educator, mother, and researcher; I have  
6 occasionally battled with the fact that a lot of this was unpaid work with pay codes not  
7 accounting for these changes. I am experienced in blended units but during the pandemic was  
8 ensconced behind a screen daily. I tweaked pedagogies and put in interventions (Allen,  
9 Rowan and Singh, 2020) to engage a score of learners digitally, some of whom often emailed  
10 to express their yearning for the physical classroom. This process of engagement came at a  
11 price as my student ratings which are usually very high, veered between people wanting to  
12 present me awards and accolades while others designated me as tangential and not satisfying  
13 their needs. Interestingly, my research flourished in this period as I had more opportunity to  
14 connect virtually with research colleagues, work on my ongoing thesis instead of battling  
15 road traffic.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 **Author 2:** Ordinary, perhaps, but I was made to disclose my impairment through my  
27 interactions with the quotidian irrespective of will. Reliant on a screen reader and braille to  
28 access resources, I was frequently beset by inaccessible digital environments, albeit student  
29 management systems, spreadsheets, electronic forms, or audio-visual materials; physical  
30 access too is frequently impeded. These encounters are demonstrative of what Dolmage  
31 (2017) refers to as the ableism that is entrenched in higher education, wherein disability is a  
32 source for research knowledge rather than a departure point from which we might learn about  
33 humanity. Indeed, in the pursuit for inclusion in higher education, mechanisms might be put  
34 in place that alleviate the necessity for disclosure—neither student nor staff member need  
35 disclose anything to a university to participate in higher education. Non-disclosure, though, is  
36 generally an option reserved for those who can conform (be apparently included) without  
37 additional support. Importantly, it is less ordinary for institutions to have their attention  
38 drawn to these matters, much less to address them. It is in this interstice in which my work is  
39 located by necessity. Leading teacher training in inclusive education spans both the  
40 compulsory sectors for preservice teachers and perhaps unexpectedly, for my peers and  
41 managers. Working through the pandemic changed little for me. Yet, during the lockdowns,  
42 placing all interactions with the teaching and research environment behind screens in some  
43 ways brought everyone closer to the restrictions I have always had to work through and  
44 against.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59 *“How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect our sense of inclusion and impact our teaching?”*

1  
2  
3 **Author 1:** Inclusion has many facets to it, and the pandemic challenged educators in many  
4 ways, especially those constantly struggling on the fringes of academia (Co-author and  
5 Author 1). Working within pre-service teacher education, I daily battle the headwinds of  
6 being a minoritised body in academia (Anderson *et al.*, 2019) while striving to ensure that I  
7 convey the concepts of inclusive education to diverse target audiences. I find pedagogy of  
8 discomfort (Boler and Zembylas, 2003) a practice that resonates with me as I help students  
9 unpack their unlearning of the notions of privilege and marginalisation. This process becomes  
10 reflexive and inclusive as I concomitantly undergo unlearning with my students (Author 1 *et*  
11 *al.*). But focusing on inclusion for students during a pandemic which further exacerbated  
12 precarities, such as whether I would be able to continue teaching in these spheres, led me to  
13 more critically consider whether I was/am included, and if so where and how? This  
14 positionality of uncertainty regularly underscores my non-tenured academic identity.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 **Author 2:** Carrying forward with my previous point, individual and institutional values that  
25 persist exclusion from education for various groups often go by uncritically questioned. For  
26 example, the ways inclusion is rendered, or made sense of, for people with disabilities as a  
27 resource-dependent undertaking, draws on institutional perceptions of disability as an  
28 excludable presence (Titchkosky, 2019). Further, though we hear references frequently made  
29 to inclusion in education as a universal human right for all children and people with  
30 disabilities, how we orientate our actions to this goal is not simple to delineate (Zembylas,  
31 2021). Positioning the responsibility for context-dependent enactment of inclusion with  
32 preservice teachers who enrol into the programs I lead necessarily requires an emphasis on  
33 ontological scrutiny, and relational engagement (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019). This is to  
34 remove focus on student or teacher-centred pedagogies, and instead instil in graduates  
35 advanced understandings about the simultaneous application of theory, policy, curriculum  
36 design, resources, and diverse pedagogies to differentiate their teaching programs in ways  
37 that account for diverse ways of being and knowing. To that end they—and indeed we all—  
38 should anticipate challenging conditions of resistance to inclusion. Indeed, with the onset of  
39 the pandemic and its resultant fallout, all of us in higher education, whether from minority or  
40 privileged groups, are precariously included. The contractual agreements to a tenured  
41 position can be easily unravelled as institutions race to claw in funds. While we may not be  
42 able to argue effectively with those holding the purse strings, perhaps of more importance is  
43 to have the conviction to work in and against these conditions through orientations to  
44 pluralism over centeredness, to contribute to a university's relevance to their communities  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 when the pandemic is finally fully brought back under control. Admittedly, we have  
4 undergone and to some extent are still undergoing a crisis, but that does not foreclose the  
5 possibility of a creative institutional response (Van Dermijnsbrugge and Chatelier, 2022).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 *“How do we view our own minoritisation and how did it affect our academic lives, especially*  
11 *during the pandemic?”*  
12  
13

14  
15 **Author 1:** As a middle-aged woman of colour who is precariously positioned within the  
16 neoliberal university, these headwinds of minoritisation underline quotidian experiences of  
17 my academic practice. The ongoing policy shifts within academia (Ball, 2016; Watt and  
18 Richardson, 2020) ensure that the glass ceiling rises higher and higher. The pandemic further  
19 tautened this edgy uncertainty as I tried to achieve research goals while remaining fearful of  
20 loss of work and income. Combined with this pressure was the stress of simultaneously  
21 watching students face greater uncertainties as career plans, exchange programs and many  
22 other hopes and dreams were suddenly jeopardised in a rapidly shifting world of closed  
23 borders, lost jobs, and incomes. There is also the omnipresent marginalisation of hierarchical  
24 structuring where, as a non-tenured academic, the voicelessness at times tends to be  
25 overwhelming (Author 1, 2021). In academe, most of the teaching is carried out by non-  
26 tenured staff. But in decision-making on allocation and strategic direction, non-tenured staff  
27 are completely marginalised. The majority (tenured workforce) become the minority (voice),  
28 and the group of staff who do the least teaching have ‘say’ unlike the minoritised non-  
29 tenured.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 However, I endeavour to resist this exclusion through engaging with a community of  
43 researchers, be they the supervisors for my second PhD, other colleagues, and drawing on the  
44 individual relationships within the wilderness of academia to build a meaningful academic  
45 identity for myself. As Smithers *et al.* (2022) observes, “Social relations are at the heart of  
46 care ethics, guiding practice and shaping everyday realities (p.45), in managerial  
47 relationships.” With Author 2 and some other manager colleagues, I have been able to  
48 develop my dialogic way of being (DeLong, 2020) based on collaborative writing and work.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 **Author 2:** That I was a white, cisgender scholar at an Australian institution is certainly not  
56 unusual. Yet, minoritised status for me is mediated based on a diagnosed impairment and the  
57 socioeconomic background of my family, and the inconspicuous barriers preventing access  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and participation that can easily be disregarded. Like I have stated previously, the  
4  
5 inaccessibility of many of the software and hardware platforms in use in higher education  
6  
7 continually present what Anderson *et al.* (2019) call ‘headwinds’, which I encounter to  
8  
9 achieve in everyday teaching, research, and service-related activities. For people living with  
10  
11 disabilities, these headwinds are frequently procedural and social, described by Olsen *et al.*  
12  
13 (2020) as shadow barriers, which “Employers and others are often unaware of or do not  
14  
15 recognise ..., despite them greatly impacting disabled people’s abilities to meet established  
16  
17 policies and social norms” (p.266). Ensuring the institution holds accessibility as a core value  
18  
19 to overcome these barriers for staff and students alike, has underpinned my work for a long  
20  
21 time. I find that I must justify support needs to others based on inaccessibility counting into  
22  
23 dozens of times per week. While this was not heightened for me through the response to the  
24  
25 COVID-19 pandemic, my sense of precarity increased. Institutional commitment to diversity  
26  
27 and accessibility can easily be overshadowed by other fiscal priorities, particularly as  
28  
29 universities seek to automate processes further to save labour costs.

30  
31 And finally – *“How do we negotiate minoritisation through our collaborative research?”*

32  
33 **Author 1:** One of the ways we combat minoritisation is by exploring our ontologies and  
34  
35 ensuring that entrenchment of the ‘we’ within the teaching process, keeping in mind that our  
36  
37 actions and beliefs have an impact on the context we operate in (Rook, 2019). Rook (2019)  
38  
39 advocates that this further aids our understanding of our institution’s culture and the impacts  
40  
41 on the students. Negotiation of minoritisation through research collaborations has been one of  
42  
43 the most positive aspects of my academic experience. It has been a space where the  
44  
45 voicelessness mentioned earlier becomes a space where stories can be told, and voices heard  
46  
47 (Mirza, 2018). It also provides scope to further understandings beyond conundrums of colour  
48  
49 and other barriers and foster a critical understanding of social and other structures driven by  
50  
51 hegemonies based on consensual control (Gramsci, 1971).

52  
53 **Author 2:** Underpinning research with critical disability perspectives is to reject any  
54  
55 supposed deficits with a disability label, and to concentrate instead on the affordances of  
56  
57 interconnection. That is, to account for different ways of being in collectivity to challenge  
58  
59 dominant epistemologies—knowing—difference, to disrupt narratives of otherness and  
60  
marginalisation. This is to emphasise the theoretical, political, and personal affordances that  
relationalities between people, technologies, and animals can bring to the development of  
equitable participation. With respect to disability studies that starts from this position, as

1  
2  
3 Goodley (2013) argues, research may always start with disability, but it never ends with it:  
4 “disability is the space from which to think through a host of political, theoretical and  
5 practical issues that are relevant to all” (p.632). The imperative when contributing  
6 knowledge through research with the intent of increasing the inclusiveness of education, then,  
7 albeit for teachers or students from any minoritised position, is to acknowledge the ripple  
8 effects of this work opening apertures through which conventions can be interrogated. In  
9 many instances, this commences with informal (but always ethically approved) discussions  
10 with people who have experienced minoritisation in their day-to-day lives. Following Freire  
11 (2005), the task of the researcher, then, is not to draw on the details shared to feather their  
12 own nests, but to provide hope for how things might be otherwise, while acknowledging the  
13 messiness of inquiry as it is being undertaken (Lather, 1997).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Reflecting upon our Discussion**

24  
25 Drawing from the questions and responses that we have presented in the previous section  
26 helped us to take stock: to understand the impact of the ongoing shifts within academia on  
27 both our practice/s and our academic identities, and our sense of inclusion in education.  
28 Creating a safe space to foster a culture of inquiry and voice our vulnerabilities (DeLong,  
29 2020), it leads us to use the Freirean ideal of *conscientização* to highlight the need for  
30 broadening the terms by which inclusion in education is generally understood. Freire argues  
31 that educators have a vital role in bringing about social change and freedom of thought  
32 through cultivating what he termed *conscientização*, among the populace (1972). Freire’s  
33 ideas remain crucial in the present for educators who strive to construct a more socially just  
34 world (Bhattacharya, 2020). One of the key features of Freire’s concept of *conscientização* is  
35 the capacity of those oppressed to comprehend the unnaturalness of this situation, and to  
36 recognise oppression as the outcome of vested interest groups who are sanctioned to further  
37 their own interests. Dismantling oppressive structures using education through dialogical  
38 action as an empowerment tool is what forms Freire’s response. He asserts that “the object of  
39 dialogical action is to make it possible for the oppressed, by perceiving their adhesion, to opt  
40 to transform an unjust reality” (1993, p.174). Here, Freire emphasises the purpose of human  
41 activity, consisting of action and reflection, which together form praxis. We draw from this  
42 concept in two interconnected ways.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 In the first, touching upon the role and relevance of context as a source of oppression,  
58 Freirean pedagogy through consciousness raising (*conscientização*) aims to extricate both the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 oppressors and those oppressed, as he considers both groups to be victims of oppressive  
4 systems designed to benefit those in power. We believe that querying dominant  
5 epistemologies is crucial to structuring a more equitable and just society. Bringing students  
6 to the point of asking *Cui Bono?* (Who benefits?) at critical junctures in their learning  
7 process is one of the critical aspects of our pedagogy in teaching about inclusive educational  
8 theory, policy, and practice. Secondly, in relation to our own sense of precarious inclusion in  
9 higher education, we query why and how power and privilege repose where they do. We  
10 continually draw on these positions to reiterate to students that as future teachers, this  
11 empowerment process should be replicated by them in their contexts. This cannot be done by  
12 them unless they unpack the source of their own oppressions and acknowledge the impact of  
13 the same on their notions of social justice and inclusion, thereby giving form to  
14 *conscientização*. Without this, we argue, graduate educators are themselves put at risk of  
15 exclusion from the education systems they seek to serve.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 For Freire, education ought to be centred on dialogue: on that which is continually created  
29 and recreated through shared interaction, whose regenerative qualities will transform their  
30 realities (Freire, 2005). The significance of this idea is perhaps never so starkly clear as in the  
31 scholarship of inclusive education at a time of crisis, wherein the objective is to transform  
32 how by virtue of individualistic characteristics, either on purpose or inadvertently, various  
33 groups are rendered excludable from education. Slee (2018) asserts that inclusive education  
34 is the responsibility of everyone. As educators we move to immerse preservice teachers in  
35 this thinking, to produce conditions for learning that invite them to critically reflect on their  
36 roles to this end; to acknowledge the tensions to educational cohesion within the contexts in  
37 which they will work. Equipping preservice teachers to question how inclusion is enacted in  
38 ways that do not promote, above all, conformity, is to engage them in dialogue about how  
39 power is exercised in education that are not antithetical to equity and diverse ways of being  
40 and knowing. It is during this process that we also begin querying these oppressive structures  
41 which wherein concentrations on inclusive education are themselves condensed into limited  
42 time-bound components of mere weeks of teacher education training programs (Co-author  
43 and Author 2, 2019). Then we begin to note that these dialogues must be introduced early,  
44 and it is incumbent upon us to practice what we preach. But we notice context becomes a  
45 barrier as we confront the structural sources of our own oppressions and the fragility of our  
46 inclusions as cogs in vast educational machinery.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 As educators, our individual and collective ways of engaging with each other and our  
4 learners, sharing and disseminating knowledge, and concomitantly learning, is an intrinsic  
5 aspect of the artisanship (Campbell, 2018) inherent in our practice facilitated by critical  
6 bivocality. This bivocality also leaves scope for polyvocality allowing for ongoing  
7 transformative dialogue (Freire, 1993). This transformative dialogue leads to us functioning  
8 as tempered radicals (Meyerson and Scully, 1995) within academic contexts. Such  
9 individuals are those “who identify with and are committed to their organizations and also to  
10 a cause, community or ideology that is fundamentally different from, and possibly at odds  
11 with, the dominant culture of their organization” (p.585). As tempered radicals we consider  
12 ourselves as committed to academia and the university, but also loyal to Freirean ideals of  
13 education as empowerment for the minoritised and the power of dialogue in transcending  
14 barriers and providing voice to those usually silenced. Through collaboration and care within  
15 the managerial relationship in teaching and research (Smithers *et al.*, 2022) we tackle  
16 hegemonies of entrenched status quos and subvert our precarious inclusion. However, we  
17 stress our temperedness as it “reflects the way they have been toughened by challenges,  
18 angered by what they see as injustices or ineffectiveness, and inclined to seek moderation in  
19 their interactions with members closer to the centre of organizational values and orientations”  
20 (Meyerson and Scully, 1995, p.585). We move forward with a belief in the university’s  
21 capacity to be “a site of creative reimagining of what has happened in the past and what is  
22 possible in the future” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.8). As we use what is at hand, namely  
23 ourselves, and enact ‘joint labour’ in our care for each other through collaboration rather than  
24 competition and strive to ensure that we do not disempower those in our care including our  
25 own selves.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Conclusion**

44  
45 For this paper we came together in the lingering shadows of the COVID-19 pandemic in  
46 Victoria Australia, weaving our experiences and narratives as divergently minoritised  
47 scholars to emphasise how through research and teaching we battled the headwinds of  
48 precarious inclusion to support values of inclusion and equity in higher education. Our  
49 contribution takes institutional responses to the COVID-19 pandemic as a point of departure  
50 to consider changing precarity through casualisation, feminisation, race, disability, pastoral  
51 care, accessibility, and collaborative leadership, building on instructive collaborative  
52 reflections between scholars in the production of knowledge about the significance of  
53 learning from minoritised positions (Anderson *et al.*, 2019; Boveda and Bhattacharya, 2019;  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Author 2 and Co-author, 2019; Anderson and Henry, 2020). In framing this work dialogically  
4 and through Freirean ideals of *conscientização*, our collective discussions politicise personal  
5 experiences of marginalisation in the teaching and researching of inclusion in education for  
6 preservice teachers, or more pointedly, in demonstrating the responsibility of all to orientate  
7 towards context-dependent inclusive practices. We assert that to enable educators to develop  
8 inclusive-oriented practice, the contextual frameworks need to ensure that they question their  
9 own experiences of inclusion as potentially precarious to enable them to teach meaningfully.

10  
11 Some might regard this work as indulgent at worst, or as unnecessarily critical of the higher  
12 education sector at best. Yet, operating with a unifying idea and openness towards revisiting  
13 these ideas (Diaconu, 2008, p. 86) we are working against the ‘headwinds’ through our  
14 structured dialogues with one another that acknowledges the complexities of the presence on  
15 both of us, as a way of demonstrating that *conscientização* is a principle that is incumbent on  
16 all of us to adopt through education. In the contemporary neoliberalised institutions of higher  
17 education, diversity amongst staff and students provides an attractive prospect for  
18 demonstrating the capacity of the sector for widening participation to all. Yet, marginalisation  
19 of the knowledge and expertises of minoritised groups is generally exacerbated, while  
20 structures that impede equitable participation and contribution remain (Anderson *et al.*,  
21 2019). By offering our experiences with these conditions as they are further threatened  
22 through the pandemic’s resultant fallout, working the ruins, as Lather (1997) argues,  
23 demonstrates to readers, students, and other scholars alike that the problems of inquiry  
24 commence at the very moment we connect with the personal. We can only urge others to  
25 adopt their own form of critically reflective dialogue to speak back to institutional  
26 marginalisation as long-term responses to the pandemic and its fall out set in.

27  
28 Acknowledgement is needed that “in relation to economies, mental health, social connection,  
29 and the concomitant impact on actual human lives is real and devastating” (Van  
30 Dermijnsbrugge and Chatelier, 2022, p.35). Therefore, these dialogues, the collaboration, and  
31 the care need to be ongoing, and a responsibility and requirement of such relationships is an  
32 inclusive space for all voices where none are silenced based on any non-conformity  
33 whatsoever. As Kiyama *et al.* (2022) observe, “With the sudden structural shifts in HE during  
34 the pandemic and after many institutions have somehow managed to make our lives and work  
35 even more difficult than if they took no action during the pandemic at all” (p. 454).  
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

1  
2  
3 Co-Author, Author 1 and Co-Author (2022) stress ‘co-caring’ as being vital to academic  
4 existence as relationality is deeply embedded in the daily ‘doing’ of academic work. This co-  
5 caring needs to be extended not just to relations between academics and students but also  
6 between universities and the academics who form the backbone of all functioning HE  
7 institutions. Amongst these academics, those deemed ‘non-ideal’ need to feel that they too  
8 are just as valued as those belonging to the mainstream space. Most importantly, to be at their  
9 best as educators they must experience that diversity is not just supported and valued only in  
10 case of students but that academics with diversities similarly enrich educational spheres.  
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

## References

- Adams, E. (2010), "The joys and challenges of semi-structured interviewing", *Community practitioner: the journal of the Community Practitioners' & Health Visitors' Association*, Vol. 83 No.7, pp. 18–21.
- Allen, L. R. and Singh, P. (2020), "Teaching and Teacher Education in the Time of COVID-19", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 48 No.3, pp. 233-236. doi: [10.1080/1359866X.2020.1752051](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1752051)
- Anderson, C. and Henry, M. (2020), "Listen and Let It Flow: A Researcher and Participant Reflect on the Qualitative Research Experience", *The Qualitative Report*, Vol.25 No.5, pp. 1145-1195.
- Anderson, L., Gatwiri, K. and Townsend-Cross, M. (2019), "Battling the 'Headwinds': The Experiences of Minoritised Academics in the Neoliberal Australian University", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 33 No.2, pp.1-15. doi: [10.1080/09518398.2019.1693068](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1693068).
- Ball, S. J. (2016), "Neoliberal Education? Confronting the Slouching Beast", *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 14 No. 8, pp.1046–1059. doi: [10.1177/1478210316664259](https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316664259).
- Co-author., and Author 1 (2018), "XXXXXXXXXXXX", *Women's Studies International Forum* xxxxxx.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2020), "Education as Empowerment", *Journal of Political Science Education*, Vol.16, p.3, pp. 403-406. doi: [10.1080/15512169.2019.1632715](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2019.1632715).
- Boler, M. and Zembylas, M. (2003), "Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Differences", Tryfonas P. (Ed.), *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Justice*, Routledge, NY, New York, pp.110-136.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (2011), *Index for Inclusion Developing Learning and Participation in Schools*, Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education, Bristol, UK.
- Bottrell, D. and Manathunga, C. (Ed.s), (2019), *Resisting Neoliberalism in Higher Education Volume II: Prising Open the Cracks*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Boveda, M. and Bhattacharya, K. (2019), "Love as De/colonial Onto-epistemology: A Post-oppositional Approach to Contextualized Research Ethics", *The Urban Review*, Vol. 51 No.1, pp.5-25.
- Diaconu, M. (2008), "The structure of the dialogical method and role of teacher in the dialogical method and the study of Philosophy", *Neue Didaktik*, Vol.1 No. S, pp. 74-86. DOI: [10.25656/01:7331](https://doi.org/10.25656/01:7331).
- Dolmage, J. T. (2017), "Disability on Campus, on Film: Framing the Failures of Higher Education", *Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education*, University of Michigan Press Ann Arbor, MI, pp.153-184.
- Duffy, C. and Sas, N. (2020), "Australia's University Sector Hit by Job Losses, Fall in International Students and Federal Government Reform — So What's Next?", ABC News,

(October 3), [www.abc.net.au/news/2020-10-02/university-sector-new-era-as-international-students-reform-hit/12654828](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-10-02/university-sector-new-era-as-international-students-reform-hit/12654828), (accessed November 2, 2022).

Edwards, J. (2021). Ethical autoethnography: Is it possible? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921995306>

Freire, P. (1970, 2005), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th anniversary edition, Continuum, New York, NY.

Freire, P. (1972), *Conscientization: A Research*, INODEP, Paris.

Giroux, H. (2015), *Dangerous Thinking in the Age of the New Authoritarianism*, Paradigm Publishers, Boulder, CO.

Goodley, D. (2013), “Dis/entangling Critical Disability Studies”, *Disability & Society*, Vol. 28 No.5, pp.631-644, doi: 10.1080/09687599.2012.717884.

Gramsci, A. (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, International Publishers, New York, NY.

Grant, A. and Young, S. (2022) Troubling tolichism in several voices: resisting epistemic violence in creative analytical and critical autoethnographic practices. *Journal of Autoethnography*, 3,1, 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.1525/joae.2022.3.1.103>

Horne, J. (2020), “How Universities Came to Rely on International Students”, available at <https://theconversation.com/how-universities-came-to-rely-on-international-students-138796> (accessed Oct 25, 2022).

Jandrić, P. (2022), “Alone-Time and Loneliness in the Academia.” *Postdigital Science and Education*. Vol. 4, pp. 633-644. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00294-4>.

Co-author., Author 1. and Co-author, (2022), “XXXXXXXXXXXX.” *Qualitative Research Journal*, xxxxxxxx.

Kiyama, J. M., Minthorn, R., Museus, S.D. and Quaye, S.J. (2022), “A letter to future scholars in the struggle for justice”, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 35 No.5, pp. 453-455. DOI: [10.1080/09518398.2022.2042615](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2042615).

Author 1. (2021), “XXXXXXXXXXXX”, *Asian Women, Identity and Migration: Experiences of Transnational Women of Indian Origin/Heritage* (1st ed.), Belford, N. and Lahiri-Roy, R. (Ed.s), Routledge: UK.

Author 1., Co-author. and Co-author. (2021), “XXXXXXXXXXXX”, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, xxxxxxxx.

Lather, P. (1997), “Drawing the Line at Angels: Working the Ruins of Feminist Ethnography”, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol.10 No. 3, pp. 285-304.

Lipton, B. (2017), “Measures of Success: Cruel Optimism and the Paradox of Academic Women’s Participation in Australian Higher Education”, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 36 No.3, pp. 486–497. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2017.1290053.

1  
2  
3 Melián, E. and Meneses, J. (2022), “Getting ahead in the online university: Disclosure  
4 experiences of students with apparent and hidden disabilities”, *International Journal of*  
5 *Educational Research*, Vol.114 No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101991>.

7  
8 Meyerson, D. E. and Scully, M. A. (1995), “Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of  
9 Ambivalence and Change”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 6 No. 5, pp. 585-600.  
10 doi: [10.1287/orsc.6.5.585](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.5.585).

11  
12 Miller, J. (2019), “Where Does the Time Go? An Academic Workload Case Study at an  
13 Australian University”, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 41 No.6,  
14 pp. 633-645. doi: [10.1080/1360080X.2019.1635328](https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1635328).

15  
16 Mirza, H. S. (2018), “Racism in Higher Education: ‘What Then, Can Be Done?’”, Arday, J.  
17 and Mirza, H.S. (Ed.s.), *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and*  
18 *Decolonising the Academy*, Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, pp. 3–26.

19  
20 Musselin, C. (2013), “Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their  
21 university”, *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and*  
22 *Educational Planning*, Vol. 65, pp. 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9579-3>

23  
24 Naraian, S. (2021), “Making inclusion matter: critical disability studies and teacher  
25 education”, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 298-313. DOI:  
26 [10.1080/00220272.2021.1882579](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1882579)

27  
28 Noble, K., Hurley, P. and Macklin, S. (2020), *COVID-19, Employment Stress and Student*  
29 *Vulnerability in Australia*, Mitchell Institute for Education and Health Policy, Victoria  
30 University, available at: [https://www.vu.edu.au/mitchell-institute/schooling/covid-19-](https://www.vu.edu.au/mitchell-institute/schooling/covid-19-employment-stress-student-vulnerability)  
31 [employment-stress-student-vulnerability](https://www.vu.edu.au/mitchell-institute/schooling/covid-19-employment-stress-student-vulnerability) (accessed October 19, 2022)

32  
33 Nzinga, S. M. (2020), *Lean Semesters: How Higher Education Reproduces Inequity*, John  
34 Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

35  
36 Olsen, J., Griffiths, M., Soorenian, A. and Porter, R. (2020), “Reporting from the Margins:  
37 Disabled Academics Reflections on Higher Education”, *Scandinavian Journal of Disability*  
38 *Research*, Vol. 22 No.1, pp. 265-274.

39  
40 Peetz, et. al. (2022), “Sustained knowledge work and thinking time amongst academics:  
41 gender and working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic”, *Labour and Industry*, Vol.  
42 32 No.1, pp. 72-92. DOI: [10.1080/10301763.2022.2034092](https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2022.2034092).

43  
44 Rook, L. (2019), “Engaging postgraduate international students online: An autoethnographic  
45 reflection revealing lessons learned as an Early Career Academic”, *e-Journal of Business*  
46 *Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, Vol. 13 No.2, pp. 55-72.

47  
48 Slee, R. (2018), *Inclusive Education Isn't Dead, It Just Smells Funny*, Routledge: Abingdon.

49  
50 Smithers, K., Harris, J., Goff, M., Spina, N. and Bailey, S. (2022), “Ethical responsibilities of  
51 tenured academics supervising non-tenured researchers in times of neoliberalism and  
52 precarity”, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, Vol. 54 No.1, pp.37-53. DOI:  
53 [10.1080/00220620.2021.1881458](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2021.1881458).

1  
2  
3 Stewart, T. T. and McClure, G. (2013). “Freire, Bakhtin, and collaborative pedagogy: A  
4 dialogue with students and mentors.” *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, Vol. 7  
5 No. 1, pp. 91-108.  
6

7  
8 Co-author. & Author 2 (2019), “XXXXXX” *British Journal of*  
9 *Sociology of Education*, xxxxxxxxx.  
10

11 Titchkosky, T. (2019), “The Educated Sensorium and the Inclusion of Disabled People as  
12 Excludable”, *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 282-290. doi:  
13 10.16993/sjdr.596.  
14

15  
16 Tolich, M. (2010). A Critique of Current Practice: Ten Foundational Guidelines for  
17 Autoethnographers. *Qualitative Health Research*. Vol. 20 No. 12, pp.1599-1610.  
18 doi:[10.1177/1049732310376076](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310376076)  
19

20  
21 Van Dermijnsbrugge, E. and Chatelier, S. (2022), “Utopia as method: a response to education  
22 in crisis?”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, Vol. 42 Sup.1, pp. 6 -19.  
23 DOI: [10.1080/02188791.2022.2031870](https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2031870).  
24

25  
26 Von der Haar, C. M. (2005), *Social Psychology: A Sociological Perspective*, Pearson  
27 Education: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

28  
29 Watt, H. M. and Richardson, P. W. (2020), “Motivation of higher education faculty: (How) it  
30 matters”, *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 100.  
31 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101533>.  
32

33  
34 Author 2. and Co-author. (2019), “XXXXXXXXXX.” *Global Perspectives on Inclusive*  
35 *Teacher Education*, Rice, B.M. (Ed.), IGI Global, Hershey, PA, xxx.

36  
37 Author 2. & Co-author. (2019), “XXXXXXXXXX”, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*,  
38 xxxx.  
39

40  
41 White, S., Murray, J., Lin Goodwin, A., Kosnik, C. and Beck, C. (2021), “On the shoulder of  
42 giants: advice for beginning teacher educators”, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher*  
43 *Education*, Vol. 49 No. 5, pp. 566-579. DOI: [10.1080/1359866X.2020.1756223](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1756223)  
44

45  
46 Zembylas, M. (2021), “A Posthumanist Critique of Human Rights: Towards an Agonistic  
47 Account of Rights in Inclusive Education”, Thomas, M.K.E, Heng, L. and Walker, P. (Ed.s.),  
48 *Inclusive Education is a Right, Right?*, Brill Leiden, Netherlands, pp. 9-20.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Precarious Inclusion: A Collaborative Account of Casualisation and Teaching***  
4 ***Leadership Challenges at the Post-pandemic University***  
5  
6  
7

8 **Abstract**  
9

10 **Purpose** – This paper emerged from the challenges encountered by both authors as  
11 academics during the Covid-19 pandemic and beyond. Based on their subsequent reflections  
12 on inclusion in education for minoritised academics in pandemic-affected institutional  
13 contexts, they argue that beyond student-centred foci for inclusion, equity in the field, is  
14 equally significant for diverse teachers. Working as tempered radicals, they contend that  
15 anything less, is exclusionary.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 **Design/methodology/approach** – Using a reciprocal interview method and drawing on  
21 Freirean ideals of dialogue and education as freedom from oppression, the authors offer dual  
22 perspectives from specific positionings as a non-tenured woman academic of colour and a  
23 tenured staff member with a disability.  
24  
25  
26

27 **Findings** – In framing this work dialogically and through Freirean ideals of conscientização,  
28 the authors' collective discussions politicise personal experiences of marginalisation in the  
29 teaching and researching of inclusion in education for preservice teachers, or more pointedly,  
30 in demonstrating the responsibility of all to orientate towards context-dependent inclusive  
31 practices. They assert that to enable educators to develop inclusion-oriented practice, the  
32 contextual frameworks need to ensure that they question their own experiences of inclusion  
33 as potentially precarious to enable meaningful teaching practice.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 **Research limitations/implications** –It offers perspectives drawing on race, dis/ability and  
40 gender drawing on two voices. The bivocal perspective is in itself limitation. It is also located  
41 within a very Australian context. However, it does have the scope to be applied globally and  
42 there is opportunity to further develop the argument using more intersectional variables.  
43  
44  
45

46 **Practical implications** –The paper clearly highlights that universities require a sharper  
47 understanding of diversity, and minoritised staff's quotidian negotiations of marginalisations.  
48 Concomitantly inclusion and valuing of the epistemologies of minoritised groups facilitates  
49 meaningful participation of these groups in higher education contexts.  
50  
51  
52

53 **Social implications** –This article calls for a more nuanced, empathetic, and critical  
54 understanding of issues related to race and disability within Australian and global academe.  
55 This is much required given rapidly shifting demographics within Australian and other higher  
56 education contexts, as well as the global migration trajectories.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Originality/value** – This is an original research submission which contributes to debates  
4 around race and disability in HE. It has the potential to provoke further conversations and  
5 incorporates both hope and realism while stressing collaboration within the academic  
6 ecosystem to build metaphorical spaces of inclusion for the minoritised.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Keywords** Inclusion, Dis/ability, Casualisation, Freire, Dialogue, Race, Minoritisation  
13  
14

15  
16 **Paper type** Research paper  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **Introduction**

21  
22 Presented in this paper is a provocation for framing inclusive education as a matter of equity  
23 for students as well as teachers. Put differently, we wonder if educational marginalisation  
24 need be considered only relevant to students with disabilities or diverse cultural backgrounds,  
25 as we grapple with our experiences as scholars of inclusive education, whose sense of  
26 precarity in higher education became particularly pronounced due to the onset of the COVID-  
27 19 pandemic and its lingering aftereffects. More than 20 years ago, inclusive education was  
28 advanced as an approach for “increasing participation for children and adults in learning and  
29 teaching activities, relationships, and communities of local schools” (Booth and Ainscow,  
30 2011, p.12). In the ensuing years, focus has remained largely fixed on addressing barriers to  
31 participation in learning for students with disabilities across educational sectors—an  
32 approach underscored by knowing otherness. However, this fleeting reference to the  
33 involvement of adults in education is suggestive of Booth and Ainscow's concern that  
34 educational inclusion is more holistic than the parameters in which it is frequently framed. It  
35 must be noted that Inclusive Education is a complex ecosystem/assemblage that includes a  
36 wide range of actors and interactions affecting everyone (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
37 Broad discussions in public and policy education discourse centrally shape how equitable  
38 inclusive education can be. Certainly, those who perform the role of educators for training  
39 inclusive education teachers are also part of the inclusive education ecosystem (Naraian,  
40 2021), and this is where our focus lies.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 We draw on White *et al.*'s (2021) argument that despite the field of teacher education  
57 undergoing seismic shifts, “the best ways to prepare “quality” teachers remain central in  
58 global conversations about “quality education” (p. 566) and therefore the onus of  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 responsibility and attention focus now rests on “those who prepare teachers: teacher  
4 educators and teacher education programmes” (ibid). To this end, situated in the field of  
5 teacher training in a large Australian higher education provider, and offering the shared  
6 experiences of two minoritised academics, this contribution attempts to broaden inclusive  
7 education scholarship both epistemologically, as it has recurrently been, and ontologically, as  
8 we acknowledge it is duly becoming (Naraian, 2021; Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Watt and Richardson (2020) indicate the ongoing stress experienced by academics globally as  
16 they, “increasingly contend with competing demands and performance pressures that reduce  
17 work engagement and wellbeing and may undermine motivations or obstruct their  
18 achievement” (p.2). Nonetheless, the unprecedented impact of COVID-19 on the Australian  
19 higher education sector further destabilised higher education for teaching and research staff,  
20 which have already been subject to over two decades of neoliberal shifts within policy  
21 (Bottrell and Manathunga, 2019; Nzinga-Johnson, 2020). Major shifts felt in the sector since  
22 the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic included staff redundancies, an emphasis on online  
23 teaching/learning, and reduced hours for sessional staff, leading to a lack of certainty for  
24 many—tenured and non-tenured alike (Bellini *et al.*, 2021; Harris *et al.*, 2022). To best  
25 clarify our positionalities, we assert that within an already complicated scenario, further  
26 layers of complexity have affected the experiences of ‘non-ideal bodies’ in the academic  
27 workspace (Anderson *et al.*, 2019), with exclusionary effects. We have stepped into this  
28 perilous arena to prompt for a critically reflective approach to education as an “empowerment  
29 tool” to redress coercion. Collaboratively reflecting through shared writing on what inclusion  
30 in education means in the troubled present, we draw on these experiences to highlight that  
31 beyond student-centred foci for inclusion, equity in the field is a matter that touches  
32 everyone, being inherently significant for diverse students, teachers, and researchers alike.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Structured in four parts, this paper first sets the scene for this discussion regarding the breadth  
48 of marginalisation that currently occurs in higher education, despite increased ideals for  
49 inclusivity. In the second, we frame the study. Using dialogue as a framework we emphasise  
50 our collaborative research and teaching in inclusive education scholarship to create a culture  
51 of collegial support and care (Anderson *et al.* 2019). In outlining how teaching and  
52 researching through the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond affected our  
53 experiences, in Part Three we further highlight the precarity of our inclusion in education.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 Finally, the conclusion frames our exposition on why we provoke others in our positions to  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 take up the role of ‘tempered radicals’ (Meyerson and Scully, 1995). Here we emphasise the  
4 need for collaboration within the academic environment as a Freirean ideal, which is of  
5 particular necessity to the project of inclusive education across the sectors as the crisis slowly  
6 ebbs. But within this discussion we are mindful of exacerbating an existing discourse of  
7 “burn out and despair” (Kiyama *et al.*, 2022, p.453) and attempt to “balance stark realism and  
8 necessary hope” (ibid).  
9

### 14 **The life and times of minoritised academics**

16 While efforts are made to be inclusive of a diverse cadre of students, the higher education  
17 sector also seeks to be more inclusive of a diverse workforce (Coates, 2013). Yet at the same  
18 time, it functions under conditions of neoliberalist managerialism, which is “predicated on a  
19 business model, [whereby] people should be treated as consumers, and capital as the only  
20 subject...” (Giroux, 2015, p.118). Within neoliberalised universities across most nations of  
21 the global North, the ideal teacher, learner, and researcher remains “white, male, straight and  
22 able-bodied” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.3). Although diversity discourses are frequently  
23 referenced to attract equity-oriented projects, in the main, the knowledge produced in higher  
24 education remains tethered to these dominant identity positions while minority-driven  
25 knowledges continue to occupy the periphery. Similarly, marginalisation is also levelled  
26 towards so-called 'soft subjects' such as liberal arts and social sciences, which are considered  
27 less suitable for career preparation (Lipton, 2017).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 An ongoing adherence to dominant identities and neoliberalist ideals creates hierarchical  
38 structures within higher education. In this context, scholars from minority backgrounds such  
39 as women of colour and those with disabilities are placed at a secondary status, and their  
40 contribution to knowledge considered liminal (Dolmage, 2017; Mirza, 2018; Anderson *et al.*,  
41 2019). The subsequent necessity to push back at these conditions to achieve in higher  
42 education can be likened to “headwinds” that academics from minoritised and  
43 underrepresented groups must constantly battle against (Moore and Nash, 2017 as cited in  
44 Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.5). As academics working at an Australian university through the  
45 period of COVID-19 (2020-2021), we advance this paper having experiential familiarity with  
46 these conditions. Given the adverse financial impact of the pandemic on the Australian higher  
47 education sector (Noble *et al.*, 2020), despite its lessening virulence, the ongoing situation is  
48 one of prolonged stress and uncertainty for people working in the sector. Thus, as academics  
49 we feel precariously included as we struggle to ensure that our teaching and research  
50 collaborations are ethically grounded and not subject to neoliberal academe’s “increasing  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 divide between the tenured ‘core’ and the precarious ‘periphery’” (Kimber, 2003 as cited in  
4  
5 Smithers *et al.*, 2022, p.39).  
6  
7  
8

9 Author 1 identifies as a non-tenured female academic of colour while Author 2 is a white  
10 male who lives with a disability and has academic tenure. Both work in the same academic  
11 field, concerned with matters of social justice and minority identities in education, with  
12 Author 1 till recently reporting to Author 2 who convened a suite of postgraduate subjects in  
13 which she teaches for pre- and in-service school-based educators. Prior to relocating  
14 overseas, Author 2 was also the principal supervisor for her second PhD which she has taken  
15 up as a measure to forge a permanent space within academia for herself. Both are keenly  
16 aware of “our less than ideal bodies in the academic space” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.2) and  
17 our subsequent divergence from dominant norms. For example, we are both cognisant of how  
18 dominant epistemologies position disability as pejorative (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019).  
19 Furthermore, Author 1’s current doctoral research focusing on inclusion on ethnic migrant  
20 women in academia draws on the conundrum of colour to describe the headwinds battering  
21 this particular minoritised group. This paper contributes to extant literature that places  
22 scholars of diverging power positions in conversation with one another (Musselin, 2013; Co-  
23 author *et al.*, 2022) to inform higher education how systemic barriers to inclusion are further  
24 exacerbated within the context of the institutional response to the COVID-19 crisis. In the  
25 process, both authors also highlight the distinction between head/tailwinds, through this  
26 ethnographic collaboration (Anderson *et al.*, 2019; Anderson and Henry, 2020), stressing the  
27 Freirean ideal of empowerment in so doing, to advance the significance of framing inclusive  
28 education as a concern that affects the field in different and perhaps unexpected ways.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 The ongoing uncertainty that has been sprung upon us include financial repercussions, as  
45 Australian universities, like others worldwide, cope with the fallout of COVID-19 along with  
46 shifts in teaching and learning systems, cohort demographics as well as cuts in government  
47 funding (Melian and Meneses, 2022; Horne, 2020). In the previous 15 years, academics have  
48 been burdened with continually increasing workloads (Miller, 2019; Watt and Richardson,  
49 2020) which due to the pandemic was further compounded by the rapid shift to online-only  
50 teaching. Despite the easing of pandemic related restrictions, many units have been converted  
51 to online modes as cost cutting measures. Online teaching often requires substantial changes  
52 to unit structures. This typically involves extensive time commitments, which combine with  
53 anxiety and confusion due to uncertainty of jobs and the future of academia (Bottrell and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Manathunga, 2019; Duffy and Sas, 2020) to amplify the pressure on academics. While  
4 reflecting on this situation, we were highly aware of the precarity of our professional roles, as  
5 fully online teaching transitions into hybrid modes, entailing further changes and implications  
6 for accessibility and safety.  
7  
8  
9

10 Amidst these uncertainties, the role of the academic, whether tenured or otherwise, has  
11 become that of a pastoral caregiver, in response to the additional stresses on students and  
12 colleagues. Enacting this role and building meaningful relationships with students and  
13 colleagues requires time. A paucity of time is a feature of neoliberal universities, given  
14 excess workloads and pressures to publish. This element of performativity in the professional  
15 sphere (Giroux, 2015; Ball, 2016) presents headwinds when academics endeavour to commit  
16 time to students and colleagues, while suffering burnout themselves and risk of automatic  
17 marginalisation from the field. Within the context of the pandemic, the shift of the location  
18 for sustained knowledge work from the workplace to the home affected academics unevenly,  
19 with disproportionate negative impacts on women (Peetz *et al.*, 2022).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Dialogue as Collaboration and Methodology: ‘Doing’ Our Research (and Researching** 32 **Our Doings)** 33

34  
35 The isolation embedded with teaching as a profession has been often reiterated (Stewart &  
36 McClure 2013, Jandric 2022), but Freire (1972) reminds us that genuine academics cannot  
37 undertake a passive existence. Being true to their professional identity necessitates  
38 engagement with the world they inhabit. Academic isolation is an undeniable professional  
39 risk which co-writing with a fellow academic one respects and trusts can help avert. The co-  
40 writing process commences with relationship building accompanied by meaningful dialogue.  
41 As supervisor and student as well as fellow educators, we too commenced on this co-writing  
42 journey based on a developing relationship of trust and respect, followed by humorous  
43 exchanges of thoughts on academe, life, and diversities. During the pandemic stress we  
44 realised we were dialoguing with freedom and safety; and Author 1 approached Author 2 to  
45 convert this dialogue into a formal co-writing project resulting in a research paper. This  
46 dialogic relationality helped bridge the neoliberal “divide between the tenured ‘core’ and the  
47 precarious ‘periphery’” (Kimber, 2003 as cited in Smithers *et al.*, 2022, p.39).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our dialogic methodological approach allowed us to act as checks and balances on each  
4 other. While Tolich (2010) asserts that autoethnographers at times use their research as  
5 therapy and risk violating confidentiality of others involved, damaging the  
6 autoethnographer's own academic credibility; we clearly assert that we ran no such risk. The  
7 ethics of using the self in research in our cases was aimed at seeking voice for those such as  
8 us who are marginalised. The ethical challenges posed by autoethnography are minimal as we  
9 collaboratively dialogued on our personal challenges without naming others. Our discussions  
10 signpost the generic yet systemic marginalisations in HE, exacerbated by the pandemic.  
11 Attempting to police our voices through use of the ethical baton in autoethnography risks  
12 wreaking epistemic violence on those such as us who already identify as marginalised (Grant  
13 and Young 2022). In dialoguing on that which affects our quotidian experiences as academics  
14 and researchers as a part of the ongoing tensions within neoliberal academia we have been  
15 vigilant in maintaining the "delicate balancing act involved in getting this right" while  
16 acknowledging that "The challenges arising from the tension between the relational ethic and  
17 the ethic of the self in autoethnography are real and ongoing (Edwards 2021, p.5).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 As neither of us embody the typical scholar in the contemporary Australian higher education  
32 environment (Anderson *et al.*, 2019), we drew on Socratic dialogue traditions to frame  
33 particular probing questions which we could mutually ask each other, to facilitate the crafting  
34 of this paper. This helped us to collaboratively obtain effective information based on our  
35 rapport (Adams, 2010). Our mutual trust and an ongoing non-hierarchical friendship allowed  
36 us to find a thematic coherence among our plurality of ideas, while "repudiating the superior  
37 tone and omniscience" (Diaconu, 2008, p.86).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Our dialogues were inspired by personal experiences of the marginalising conditions of  
45 contemporary higher education and the collective elucidation of the negative impact of the  
46 same; this in turn helped us to actively trigger audience reactions, with the intent of drawing  
47 attention to and confronting such barriers. In effect, we drew on our own bivocality to  
48 highlight the need to frame inclusive education as a matter affecting those embodying the  
49 academic 'non-ideal'. We use our non-ideal scholar embodiments to raise queries on the  
50 precarious inclusion of researcher-educators. Being a non-tenured employed woman of  
51 colour and a white male with a disability affords us a unique combined positioning from  
52 which to advance these concerns. Our personal diversities of race, gender, disability, and the  
53 associated experiences we have encountered help us build bridges of understanding. Given  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 our workloads, shifting life circumstances which included in Author 1's case illness and  
4 death of a parent, and in Author 2's change in place of residence and employment and the  
5 ongoing practical challenges posed by the pandemic's fallout; we found it difficult at points  
6 to coordinate the writing. But we persevered as we considered that our non-ideal  
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

embodiments need to be inserted into the academic space to further the process of tempered radicalism (Meyerson and Scully, 1995) for illuminating the stresses of precarious inclusion. Being both scholars and members of an institutional social structure, we follow the social hegemony of finding 'socially acceptable outlets' (Von Der Haar, 2005, p.52) through research. However, in doing so, we may be empowered to cause a certain level of disruption in traditional research practice by drawing on the personal and using insider knowledge. Dialogue affords us the opportunity to describe the confusion, anger, uncertainty, and compromise we experience as members of different minority groups through seeking "reciprocity between speaker and public, generating verbal action, communication" (Diaconu, 2008, p.74).

In dialoguing with one another through a question-answer format we occasionally found that some queries could not be resolved. Reading over our own responses we found that some of the thoughts appeared more structured in the paper than they were. In reality, we are still working through some of these thoughts and find they keep mobilising us in different directions. The questions chosen by us facilitated the dialogue, providing aim and direction to our discussion while not excluding the depth and emotionality of dialogue (Freire, 1970 as cited in Delong, 2020, p.73). "The ontological importance of dialogue in relationships informs this approach to educational conversations as a research method" (DeLong, 2020, p.81). We further concur with Delong, drawing on the Bakhtinian notion of "an inclusive space of dialogue" (p.73), which highlights the relationality between diverse voices stressing that "For each participant in a dialogue the voice of the other is an outside perspective that includes them with it" (ibid).

### **A Discussion Based on Critical Bivocality**

*"What are we doing that is ordinary in academic practice and yet is out of the ordinary?  
How has the pandemic affected this work?"*

**Author 1:** Life as a non-tenured academic embodies precarious inclusion, which was further intensified through the pandemic, with the subsequent losses of international students and

1  
2  
3 downsizing of work opportunities. These changes paradoxically added to the workload.  
4  
5 Students needed far more attention in terms of pastoral care. As a non-tenured academic, I  
6  
7 was never sure where to draw the line as the caring educator, mother, and researcher; I have  
8  
9 occasionally battled with the fact that a lot of this was unpaid work with pay codes not  
10  
11 accounting for these changes. I am experienced in blended units but during the pandemic was  
12  
13 ensconced behind a screen daily. I tweaked pedagogies and put in interventions (Allen,  
14  
15 Rowan and Singh, 2020) to engage a score of learners digitally, some of whom often emailed  
16  
17 to express their yearning for the physical classroom. This process of engagement came at a  
18  
19 price as my student ratings which are usually very high, veered between people wanting to  
20  
21 present me awards and accolades while others designated me as tangential and not satisfying  
22  
23 their needs. Interestingly, my research flourished in this period as I had more opportunity to  
24  
25 connect virtually with research colleagues, work on my ongoing thesis instead of battling  
26  
27 road traffic.

28  
29 **Author 2:** Ordinary, perhaps, but I was made to disclose my impairment through my  
30  
31 interactions with the quotidian irrespective of will. Reliant on a screen reader and braille to  
32  
33 access resources, I was frequently beset by inaccessible digital environments, albeit student  
34  
35 management systems, spreadsheets, electronic forms, or audio-visual materials; physical  
36  
37 access too is frequently impeded. These encounters are demonstrative of what Dolmage  
38  
39 (2017) refers to as the ableism that is entrenched in higher education, wherein disability is a  
40  
41 source for research knowledge rather than a departure point from which we might learn about  
42  
43 humanity. Indeed, in the pursuit for inclusion in higher education, mechanisms might be put  
44  
45 in place that alleviate the necessity for disclosure—neither student nor staff member need  
46  
47 disclose anything to a university to participate in higher education. Non-disclosure, though, is  
48  
49 generally an option reserved for those who can conform (be apparently included) without  
50  
51 additional support. Importantly, it is less ordinary for institutions to have their attention  
52  
53 drawn to these matters, much less to address them. It is in this interstice in which my work is  
54  
55 located by necessity. Leading teacher training in inclusive education spans both the  
56  
57 compulsory sectors for preservice teachers and perhaps unexpectedly, for my peers and  
58  
59 managers. Working through the pandemic changed little for me. Yet, during the lockdowns,  
60  
61 placing all interactions with the teaching and research environment behind screens in some  
62  
63 ways brought everyone closer to the restrictions I have always had to work through and  
64  
65 against.

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
*“How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect our sense of inclusion and impact our teaching?”*

1  
2  
3 **Author 1:** Inclusion has many facets to it, and the pandemic challenged educators in many  
4 ways, especially those constantly struggling on the fringes of academia (Co-author and  
5 Author 1). Working within pre-service teacher education, I daily battle the headwinds of  
6 being a minoritised body in academia (Anderson *et al.*, 2019) while striving to ensure that I  
7 convey the concepts of inclusive education to diverse target audiences. I find pedagogy of  
8 discomfort (Boler and Zembylas, 2003) a practice that resonates with me as I help students  
9 unpack their unlearning of the notions of privilege and marginalisation. This process becomes  
10 reflexive and inclusive as I concomitantly undergo unlearning with my students (Author 1 *et*  
11 *al.*). But focusing on inclusion for students during a pandemic which further exacerbated  
12 precarities, such as whether I would be able to continue teaching in these spheres, led me to  
13 more critically consider whether I was/am included, and if so where and how? This  
14 positionality of uncertainty regularly underscores my non-tenured academic identity.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 **Author 2:** Carrying forward with my previous point, individual and institutional values that  
25 persist exclusion from education for various groups often go by uncritically questioned. For  
26 example, the ways inclusion is rendered, or made sense of, for people with disabilities as a  
27 resource-dependent undertaking, draws on institutional perceptions of disability as an  
28 excludable presence (Titchkosky, 2019). Further, though we hear references frequently made  
29 to inclusion in education as a universal human right for all children and people with  
30 disabilities, how we orientate our actions to this goal is not simple to delineate (Zembylas,  
31 2021). Positioning the responsibility for context-dependent enactment of inclusion with  
32 preservice teachers who enrol into the programs I lead necessarily requires an emphasis on  
33 ontological scrutiny, and relational engagement (Author 2 and Co-author, 2019). This is to  
34 remove focus on student or teacher-centred pedagogies, and instead instil in graduates  
35 advanced understandings about the simultaneous application of theory, policy, curriculum  
36 design, resources, and diverse pedagogies to differentiate their teaching programs in ways  
37 that account for diverse ways of being and knowing. To that end they—and indeed we all—  
38 should anticipate challenging conditions of resistance to inclusion. Indeed, with the onset of  
39 the pandemic and its resultant fallout, all of us in higher education, whether from minority or  
40 privileged groups, are precariously included. The contractual agreements to a tenured  
41 position can be easily unravelled as institutions race to claw in funds. While we may not be  
42 able to argue effectively with those holding the purse strings, perhaps of more importance is  
43 to have the conviction to work in and against these conditions through orientations to  
44 pluralism over centeredness, to contribute to a university's relevance to their communities  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 when the pandemic is finally fully brought back under control. Admittedly, we have  
4 undergone and to some extent are still undergoing a crisis, but that does not foreclose the  
5 possibility of a creative institutional response (Van Dermijnsbrugge and Chatelier, 2022).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 *“How do we view our own minoritisation and how did it affect our academic lives, especially*  
11 *during the pandemic?”*  
12  
13

14  
15 **Author 1:** As a middle-aged woman of colour who is precariously positioned within the  
16 neoliberal university, these headwinds of minoritisation underline quotidian experiences of  
17 my academic practice. The ongoing policy shifts within academia (Ball, 2016; Watt and  
18 Richardson, 2020) ensure that the glass ceiling rises higher and higher. The pandemic further  
19 tautened this edgy uncertainty as I tried to achieve research goals while remaining fearful of  
20 loss of work and income. Combined with this pressure was the stress of simultaneously  
21 watching students face greater uncertainties as career plans, exchange programs and many  
22 other hopes and dreams were suddenly jeopardised in a rapidly shifting world of closed  
23 borders, lost jobs, and incomes. There is also the omnipresent marginalisation of hierarchical  
24 structuring where, as a non-tenured academic, the voicelessness at times tends to be  
25 overwhelming (Author 1, 2021). In academe, most of the teaching is carried out by non-  
26 tenured staff. But in decision-making on allocation and strategic direction, non-tenured staff  
27 are completely marginalised. The majority (tenured workforce) become the minority (voice),  
28 and the group of staff who do the least teaching have ‘say’ unlike the minoritised non-  
29 tenured.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 However, I endeavour to resist this exclusion through engaging with a community of  
43 researchers, be they the supervisors for my second PhD, other colleagues, and drawing on the  
44 individual relationships within the wilderness of academia to build a meaningful academic  
45 identity for myself. As Smithers *et al.* (2022) observes, “Social relations are at the heart of  
46 care ethics, guiding practice and shaping everyday realities (p.45), in managerial  
47 relationships.” With Author 2 and some other manager colleagues, I have been able to  
48 develop my dialogic way of being (DeLong, 2020) based on collaborative writing and work.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 **Author 2:** That I was a white, cisgender scholar at an Australian institution is certainly not  
56 unusual. Yet, minoritised status for me is mediated based on a diagnosed impairment and the  
57 socioeconomic background of my family, and the inconspicuous barriers preventing access  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and participation that can easily be disregarded. Like I have stated previously, the  
4 inaccessibility of many of the software and hardware platforms in use in higher education  
5 continually present what Anderson *et al.* (2019) call ‘headwinds’, which I encounter to  
6 achieve in everyday teaching, research, and service-related activities. For people living with  
7 disabilities, these headwinds are frequently procedural and social, described by Olsen *et al.*  
8 (2020) as shadow barriers, which “Employers and others are often unaware of or do not  
9 recognise ..., despite them greatly impacting disabled people’s abilities to meet established  
10 policies and social norms” (p.266). Ensuring the institution holds accessibility as a core value  
11 to overcome these barriers for staff and students alike, has underpinned my work for a long  
12 time. I find that I must justify support needs to others based on inaccessibility counting into  
13 dozens of times per week. While this was not heightened for me through the response to the  
14 COVID-19 pandemic, my sense of precarity increased. Institutional commitment to diversity  
15 and accessibility can easily be overshadowed by other fiscal priorities, particularly as  
16 universities seek to automate processes further to save labour costs.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 And finally – *“How do we negotiate minoritisation through our collaborative research?”*

29  
30  
31 **Author 1:** One of the ways we combat minoritisation is by exploring our ontologies and  
32 ensuring that entrenchment of the ‘we’ within the teaching process, keeping in mind that our  
33 actions and beliefs have an impact on the context we operate in (Rook, 2019). Rook (2019)  
34 advocates that this further aids our understanding of our institution’s culture and the impacts  
35 on the students. Negotiation of minoritisation through research collaborations has been one of  
36 the most positive aspects of my academic experience. It has been a space where the  
37 voicelessness mentioned earlier becomes a space where stories can be told, and voices heard  
38 (Mirza, 2018). It also provides scope to further understandings beyond conundrums of colour  
39 and other barriers and foster a critical understanding of social and other structures driven by  
40 hegemonies based on consensual control (Gramsci, 1971).

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 **Author 2:** Underpinning research with critical disability perspectives is to reject any  
50 supposed deficits with a disability label, and to concentrate instead on the affordances of  
51 interconnection. That is, to account for different ways of being in collectivity to challenge  
52 dominant epistemologies—knowing—difference, to disrupt narratives of otherness and  
53 marginalisation. This is to emphasise the theoretical, political, and personal affordances that  
54 relationalities between people, technologies, and animals can bring to the development of  
55 equitable participation. With respect to disability studies that starts from this position, as  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Goodley (2013) argues, research may always start with disability, but it never ends with it:  
4 “disability is the space from which to think through a host of political, theoretical and  
5 practical issues that are relevant to all” (p.632). The imperative when contributing  
6 knowledge through research with the intent of increasing the inclusiveness of education, then,  
7 albeit for teachers or students from any minoritised position, is to acknowledge the ripple  
8 effects of this work opening apertures through which conventions can be interrogated. In  
9 many instances, this commences with informal (but always ethically approved) discussions  
10 with people who have experienced minoritisation in their day-to-day lives. Following Freire  
11 (2005), the task of the researcher, then, is not to draw on the details shared to feather their  
12 own nests, but to provide hope for how things might be otherwise, while acknowledging the  
13 messiness of inquiry as it is being undertaken (Lather, 1997).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Reflecting upon our Discussion**

24  
25 Drawing from the questions and responses that we have presented in the previous section  
26 helped us to take stock: to understand the impact of the ongoing shifts within academia on  
27 both our practice/s and our academic identities, and our sense of inclusion in education.  
28 Creating a safe space to foster a culture of inquiry and voice our vulnerabilities (DeLong,  
29 2020), it leads us to use the Freirean ideal of *conscientização* to highlight the need for  
30 broadening the terms by which inclusion in education is generally understood. Freire argues  
31 that educators have a vital role in bringing about social change and freedom of thought  
32 through cultivating what he termed *conscientização*, among the populace (1972). Freire’s  
33 ideas remain crucial in the present for educators who strive to construct a more socially just  
34 world (Bhattacharya, 2020). One of the key features of Freire’s concept of *conscientização* is  
35 the capacity of those oppressed to comprehend the unnaturalness of this situation, and to  
36 recognise oppression as the outcome of vested interest groups who are sanctioned to further  
37 their own interests. Dismantling oppressive structures using education through dialogical  
38 action as an empowerment tool is what forms Freire’s response. He asserts that “the object of  
39 dialogical action is to make it possible for the oppressed, by perceiving their adhesion, to opt  
40 to transform an unjust reality” (1993, p.174). Here, Freire emphasises the purpose of human  
41 activity, consisting of action and reflection, which together form praxis. We draw from this  
42 concept in two interconnected ways.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 In the first, touching upon the role and relevance of context as a source of oppression,  
58 Freirean pedagogy through consciousness raising (*conscientização*) aims to extricate both the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 oppressors and those oppressed, as he considers both groups to be victims of oppressive  
4 systems designed to benefit those in power. We believe that querying dominant  
5 epistemologies is crucial to structuring a more equitable and just society. Bringing students  
6 to the point of asking *Cui Bono?* (Who benefits?) at critical junctures in their learning  
7 process is one of the critical aspects of our pedagogy in teaching about inclusive educational  
8 theory, policy, and practice. Secondly, in relation to our own sense of precarious inclusion in  
9 higher education, we query why and how power and privilege repose where they do. We  
10 continually draw on these positions to reiterate to students that as future teachers, this  
11 empowerment process should be replicated by them in their contexts. This cannot be done by  
12 them unless they unpack the source of their own oppressions and acknowledge the impact of  
13 the same on their notions of social justice and inclusion, thereby giving form to  
14 *conscientização*. Without this, we argue, graduate educators are themselves put at risk of  
15 exclusion from the education systems they seek to serve.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 For Freire, education ought to be centred on dialogue: on that which is continually created  
29 and recreated through shared interaction, whose regenerative qualities will transform their  
30 realities (Freire, 2005). The significance of this idea is perhaps never so starkly clear as in the  
31 scholarship of inclusive education at a time of crisis, wherein the objective is to transform  
32 how by virtue of individualistic characteristics, either on purpose or inadvertently, various  
33 groups are rendered excludable from education. Slee (2018) asserts that inclusive education  
34 is the responsibility of everyone. As educators we move to immerse preservice teachers in  
35 this thinking, to produce conditions for learning that invite them to critically reflect on their  
36 roles to this end; to acknowledge the tensions to educational cohesion within the contexts in  
37 which they will work. Equipping preservice teachers to question how inclusion is enacted in  
38 ways that do not promote, above all, conformity, is to engage them in dialogue about how  
39 power is exercised in education that are not antithetical to equity and diverse ways of being  
40 and knowing. It is during this process that we also begin querying these oppressive structures  
41 which wherein concentrations on inclusive education are themselves condensed into limited  
42 time-bound components of mere weeks of teacher education training programs (Co-author  
43 and Author 2, 2019). Then we begin to note that these dialogues must be introduced early,  
44 and it is incumbent upon us to practice what we preach. But we notice context becomes a  
45 barrier as we confront the structural sources of our own oppressions and the fragility of our  
46 inclusions as cogs in vast educational machinery.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 As educators, our individual and collective ways of engaging with each other and our  
4 learners, sharing and disseminating knowledge, and concomitantly learning, is an intrinsic  
5 aspect of the artisanship (Campbell, 2018) inherent in our practice facilitated by critical  
6 bivocality. This bivocality also leaves scope for polyvocality allowing for ongoing  
7 transformative dialogue (Freire, 1993). This transformative dialogue leads to us functioning  
8 as tempered radicals (Meyerson and Scully, 1995) within academic contexts. Such  
9 individuals are those “who identify with and are committed to their organizations and also to  
10 a cause, community or ideology that is fundamentally different from, and possibly at odds  
11 with, the dominant culture of their organization” (p.585). As tempered radicals we consider  
12 ourselves as committed to academia and the university, but also loyal to Freirean ideals of  
13 education as empowerment for the minoritised and the power of dialogue in transcending  
14 barriers and providing voice to those usually silenced. Through collaboration and care within  
15 the managerial relationship in teaching and research (Smithers *et al.*, 2022) we tackle  
16 hegemonies of entrenched status quos and subvert our precarious inclusion. However, we  
17 stress our temperedness as it “reflects the way they have been toughened by challenges,  
18 angered by what they see as injustices or ineffectiveness, and inclined to seek moderation in  
19 their interactions with members closer to the centre of organizational values and orientations”  
20 (Meyerson and Scully, 1995, p.585). We move forward with a belief in the university’s  
21 capacity to be “a site of creative reimagining of what has happened in the past and what is  
22 possible in the future” (Anderson *et al.*, 2019, p.8). As we use what is at hand, namely  
23 ourselves, and enact ‘joint labour’ in our care for each other through collaboration rather than  
24 competition and strive to ensure that we do not disempower those in our care including our  
25 own selves.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Conclusion**

44  
45 For this paper we came together in the lingering shadows of the COVID-19 pandemic in  
46 Victoria Australia, weaving our experiences and narratives as divergently minoritised  
47 scholars to emphasise how through research and teaching we battled the headwinds of  
48 precarious inclusion to support values of inclusion and equity in higher education. Our  
49 contribution takes institutional responses to the COVID-19 pandemic as a point of departure  
50 to consider changing precarity through casualisation, feminisation, race, disability, pastoral  
51 care, accessibility, and collaborative leadership, building on instructive collaborative  
52 reflections between scholars in the production of knowledge about the significance of  
53 learning from minoritised positions (Anderson *et al.*, 2019; Boveda and Bhattacharya, 2019;  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Author 2 and Co-author, 2019; Anderson and Henry, 2020). In framing this work dialogically  
4 and through Freirean ideals of *conscientização*, our collective discussions politicise personal  
5 experiences of marginalisation in the teaching and researching of inclusion in education for  
6 preservice teachers, or more pointedly, in demonstrating the responsibility of all to orientate  
7 towards context-dependent inclusive practices. We assert that to enable educators to develop  
8 inclusive-oriented practice, the contextual frameworks need to ensure that they question their  
9 own experiences of inclusion as potentially precarious to enable them to teach meaningfully.

10  
11  
12 Some might regard this work as indulgent at worst, or as unnecessarily critical of the higher  
13 education sector at best. Yet, operating with a unifying idea and openness towards revisiting  
14 these ideas (Diaconu, 2008, p. 86) we are working against the ‘headwinds’ through our  
15 structured dialogues with one another that acknowledges the complexities of the presence on  
16 both of us, as a way of demonstrating that *conscientização* is a principle that is incumbent on  
17 all of us to adopt through education. In the contemporary neoliberalised institutions of higher  
18 education, diversity amongst staff and students provides an attractive prospect for  
19 demonstrating the capacity of the sector for widening participation to all. Yet, marginalisation  
20 of the knowledge and expertises of minoritised groups is generally exacerbated, while  
21 structures that impede equitable participation and contribution remain (Anderson *et al.*,  
22 2019). By offering our experiences with these conditions as they are further threatened  
23 through the pandemic’s resultant fallout, working the ruins, as Lather (1997) argues,  
24 demonstrates to readers, students, and other scholars alike that the problems of inquiry  
25 commence at the very moment we connect with the personal. We can only urge others to  
26 adopt their own form of critically reflective dialogue to speak back to institutional  
27 marginalisation as long-term responses to the pandemic and its fall out set in.

28  
29  
30 Acknowledgement is needed that “in relation to economies, mental health, social connection,  
31 and the concomitant impact on actual human lives is real and devastating” (Van  
32 Dermijnsbrugge and Chatelier, 2022, p.35). Therefore, these dialogues, the collaboration, and  
33 the care need to be ongoing, and a responsibility and requirement of such relationships is an  
34 inclusive space for all voices where none are silenced based on any non-conformity  
35 whatsoever. As Kiyama *et al.* (2022) observe, “With the sudden structural shifts in HE during  
36 the pandemic and after many institutions have somehow managed to make our lives and work  
37 even more difficult than if they took no action during the pandemic at all” (p. 454).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Co-Author, Author 1 and Co-Author (2022) stress ‘co-caring’ as being vital to academic  
4 existence as relationality is deeply embedded in the daily ‘doing’ of academic work. This co-  
5 caring needs to be extended not just to relations between academics and students but also  
6  
7 between universities and the academics who form the backbone of all functioning HE  
8  
9 institutions. Amongst these academics, those deemed ‘non-ideal’ need to feel that they too  
10  
11 are just as valued as those belonging to the mainstream space. Most importantly, to be at their  
12  
13 best as educators they must experience that diversity is not just supported and valued only in  
14  
15 case of students but that academics with diversities similarly enrich educational spheres.  
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

## References

- Adams, E. (2010), "The joys and challenges of semi-structured interviewing", *Community practitioner: the journal of the Community Practitioners' & Health Visitors' Association*, Vol. 83 No.7, pp. 18–21.
- Allen, L. R. and Singh, P. (2020), "Teaching and Teacher Education in the Time of COVID-19", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 48 No.3, pp. 233-236. doi: [10.1080/1359866X.2020.1752051](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1752051)
- Anderson, C. and Henry, M. (2020), "Listen and Let It Flow: A Researcher and Participant Reflect on the Qualitative Research Experience", *The Qualitative Report*, Vol.25 No.5, pp. 1145-1195.
- Anderson, L., Gatwiri, K. and Townsend-Cross, M. (2019), "Battling the 'Headwinds': The Experiences of Minoritised Academics in the Neoliberal Australian University", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 33 No.2, pp.1-15. doi: [10.1080/09518398.2019.1693068](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1693068).
- Ball, S. J. (2016), "Neoliberal Education? Confronting the Slouching Beast", *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 14 No. 8, pp.1046–1059. doi: [10.1177/1478210316664259](https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316664259).
- Co-author., and Author 1 (2018), "XXXXXXXXXXXX", *Women's Studies International Forum* xxxxx.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2020), "Education as Empowerment", *Journal of Political Science Education*, Vol.16, p.3, pp. 403-406. doi: [10.1080/15512169.2019.1632715](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2019.1632715).
- Boler, M. and Zembylas, M. (2003), "Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Differences", Tryfonas P. (Ed.), *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Justice*, Routledge, NY, New York, pp.110-136.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (2011), *Index for Inclusion Developing Learning and Participation in Schools*, Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education, Bristol, UK.
- Bottrell, D. and Manathunga, C. (Ed.s), (2019), *Resisting Neoliberalism in Higher Education Volume II: Prising Open the Cracks*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Boveda, M. and Bhattacharya, K. (2019), "Love as De/colonial Onto-epistemology: A Post-oppositional Approach to Contextualized Research Ethics", *The Urban Review*, Vol. 51 No.1, pp.5-25.
- Diaconu, M. (2008), "The structure of the dialogical method and role of teacher in the dialogical method and the study of Philosophy", *Neue Didaktik*, Vol.1 No. S, pp. 74-86. DOI: [10.25656/01:7331](https://doi.org/10.25656/01:7331).
- Dolmage, J. T. (2017), "Disability on Campus, on Film: Framing the Failures of Higher Education", *Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education*, University of Michigan Press Ann Arbor, MI, pp.153-184.
- Duffy, C. and Sas, N. (2020), "Australia's University Sector Hit by Job Losses, Fall in International Students and Federal Government Reform — So What's Next?", ABC News,



1  
2  
3 (October 3), [www.abc.net.au/news /2020-10-02/university-sector-new-era-as-international-](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-10-02/university-sector-new-era-as-international-students-reform-hit/12654828)  
4 [students-reform-hit/12654828](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-10-02/university-sector-new-era-as-international-students-reform-hit/12654828), (accessed November 2, 2022).  
5

6  
7 Edwards, J. (2021). Ethical autoethnography: Is it possible? *International Journal of*  
8 *Qualitative Methods*, 20. [https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1609406921995306](https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921995306)  
9

10 Freire, P. (1970, 2005), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th anniversary edition, Continuum,  
11 New York, NY.  
12

13  
14 Freire, P. (1972), *Conscientization: A Research*, INODEP, Paris.

15  
16 Giroux, H. (2015), *Dangerous Thinking in the Age of the New Authoritarianism*, Paradigm  
17 Publishers, Boulder, CO.

18  
19 Goodley, D. (2013), “Dis/entangling Critical Disability Studies”, *Disability & Society*, Vol.  
20 28 No.5, pp.631-644, doi: 10.1080/09687599.2012.717884.  
21

22 Gramsci, A. (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, International  
23 Publishers, New York, NY.  
24

25 Grant, A. and Young, S. (2022) Troubling tolichism in several voices: resisting epistemic  
26 violence in creative analytical and critical autoethnographic practices. *Journal of*  
27 *Autoethnography*, 3,1, 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.1525/joae.2022.3.1.103>  
28

29 Horne, J. (2020), “How Universities Came to Rely on International Students”, available at  
30 <https://theconversation.com/how-universities-came-to-rely-on-international-students-138796>  
31 (accessed Oct 25, 2022).  
32

33 Jandrić, P. (2022), “Alone-Time and Loneliness in the Academia.” *Postdigital Science and*  
34 *Education*. Vol. 4, pp. 633-644. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00294-4>.  
35

36 Co-author., Author 1. and Co-author, (2022), “XXXXXXXXXXXX.” *Qualitative Research*  
37 *Journal*, xxxxxxxx.  
38

39 Kiyama, J. M., Minthorn, R., Museus, S.D. and Quaye, S.J. (2022), “A letter to future  
40 scholars in the struggle for justice”, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in*  
41 *Education*, Vol. 35 No.5, pp. 453-455. DOI: [10.1080/09518398.2022.2042615](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2042615).  
42

43 Author 1. (2021), “XXXXXXXXXXXX”, *Asian Women, Identity and Migration: Experiences*  
44 *of Transnational Women of Indian Origin/Heritage* (1st ed.), Belford, N. and Lahiri-Roy, R.  
45 (Ed.s), Routledge: UK.  
46

47 Author 1., Co-author. and Co-author. (2021), “XXXXXXXXXXXX”, *Pedagogy, Culture &*  
48 *Society*, xxxxxxxx.  
49

50 Lather, P. (1997), “Drawing the Line at Angels: Working the Ruins of Feminist  
51 Ethnography”, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol.10 No. 3, pp.  
52 285-304.  
53

54 Lipton, B. (2017), “Measures of Success: Cruel Optimism and the Paradox of Academic  
55 Women’s Participation in Australian Higher Education”, *Higher Education Research &*  
56 *Development*, Vol. 36 No.3, pp. 486–497. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2017.1290053.  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

Melián, E. and Meneses, J. (2022), “Getting ahead in the online university: Disclosure experiences of students with apparent and hidden disabilities”, *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol.114 No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101991>.

Meyerson, D. E. and Scully, M. A. (1995), “Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 6 No. 5, pp. 585-600. doi: [10.1287/orsc.6.5.585](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.5.585).

Miller, J. (2019), “Where Does the Time Go? An Academic Workload Case Study at an Australian University”, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 41 No.6, pp. 633-645. doi: [10.1080/1360080X.2019.1635328](https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1635328).

Mirza, H. S. (2018), “Racism in Higher Education: ‘What Then, Can Be Done?’”, Arday, J. and Mirza, H.S. (Ed.s.), *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, pp. 3–26.

Musselin, C. (2013), “Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their university”, *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, Vol. 65, pp. 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9579-3>

Naraian, S. (2021), “Making inclusion matter: critical disability studies and teacher education”, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 298-313. DOI: [10.1080/00220272.2021.1882579](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1882579)

Noble, K., Hurley, P. and Macklin, S. (2020), *COVID-19, Employment Stress and Student Vulnerability in Australia*, Mitchell Institute for Education and Health Policy, Victoria University, available at: <https://www.vu.edu.au/mitchell-institute/schooling/covid-19-employment-stress-student-vulnerability> (accessed October 19, 2022)

Nzinga, S. M. (2020), *Lean Semesters: How Higher Education Reproduces Inequity*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Olsen, J., Griffiths, M., Soorenian, A. and Porter, R. (2020), “Reporting from the Margins: Disabled Academics Reflections on Higher Education”, *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, Vol. 22 No.1, pp. 265-274.

Peetz, et. al. (2022), “Sustained knowledge work and thinking time amongst academics: gender and working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic”, *Labour and Industry*, Vol. 32 No.1, pp. 72-92. DOI: [10.1080/10301763.2022.2034092](https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2022.2034092).

Rook, L. (2019), “Engaging postgraduate international students online: An autoethnographic reflection revealing lessons learned as an Early Career Academic”, *e-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, Vol. 13 No.2, pp. 55-72.

Slee, R. (2018), *Inclusive Education Isn't Dead, It Just Smells Funny*, Routledge: Abingdon.

Smithers, K., Harris, J., Goff, M., Spina, N. and Bailey, S. (2022), “Ethical responsibilities of tenured academics supervising non-tenured researchers in times of neoliberalism and precarity”, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, Vol. 54 No.1, pp.37-53. DOI: [10.1080/00220620.2021.1881458](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2021.1881458).

1  
2  
3 Stewart, T. T. and McClure, G. (2013). "Freire, Bakhtin, and collaborative pedagogy: A  
4 dialogue with students and mentors." *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, Vol. 7  
5 No. 1, pp. 91-108.  
6

7  
8 Co-author. & Author 2 (2019), "XXXXXX" *British Journal of*  
9 *Sociology of Education*, xxxxxxxxx.  
10

11 Titchkosky, T. (2019), "The Educated Sensorium and the Inclusion of Disabled People as  
12 Excludable", *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 282-290. doi:  
13 10.16993/sjdr.596.  
14

15  
16 Tolich, M. (2010). A Critique of Current Practice: Ten Foundational Guidelines for  
17 Autoethnographers. *Qualitative Health Research*. Vol. 20 No. 12, pp.1599-1610.  
18 doi:[10.1177/1049732310376076](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310376076)  
19

20  
21 Van Dermijnsbrugge, E. and Chatelier, S. (2022), "Utopia as method: a response to education  
22 in crisis?", *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, Vol. 42 Sup.1, pp. 6 -19.  
23 DOI: [10.1080/02188791.2022.2031870](https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2031870).  
24

25  
26 Von der Haar, C. M. (2005), *Social Psychology: A Sociological Perspective*, Pearson  
27 Education: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

28  
29 Watt, H. M. and Richardson, P. W. (2020), "Motivation of higher education faculty: (How) it  
30 matters", *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 100.  
31 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101533>.  
32

33  
34 Author 2. and Co-author. (2019), "XXXXXXXXXX." *Global Perspectives on Inclusive*  
35 *Teacher Education*, Rice, B.M. (Ed.), IGI Global, Hershey, PA, xxx.

36  
37 Author 2. & Co-author. (2019), "XXXXXXXXXX", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*,  
38 xxxx.  
39

40  
41 White, S., Murray, J., Lin Goodwin, A., Kosnik, C. and Beck, C. (2021), "On the shoulder of  
42 giants: advice for beginning teacher educators", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher*  
43 *Education*, Vol. 49 No. 5, pp. 566-579. DOI: [10.1080/1359866X.2020.1756223](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1756223)  
44

45  
46 Zembylas, M. (2021), "A Posthumanist Critique of Human Rights: Towards an Agonistic  
47 Account of Rights in Inclusive Education", Thomas, M.K.E, Heng, L. and Walker, P. (Ed.s.),  
48 *Inclusive Education is a Right, Right?*, Brill Leiden, Netherlands, pp. 9-20.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Authors' responses to second round of reviewer comments Manuscript ID QRJ-12-2022-0160 entitled "Precarious Inclusion: A Collaborative Account of Casualisation and Teaching Leadership Challenges at the Post-pandemic University".**

**Revisions submitted in journal portal on April 11, 2023**

Reviewer(s)' and Co-Editor Comments to Author: (April 4, 2023)

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Reviewer Comments	Authors' Responses
<p>Comments:</p> <p>An interesting paper which makes a contribution. Before publication I would like the following to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discussion of the method and associated ethical implications of using the self in research.</li> <li>2. In the discussion draw out the implications for senior managers, programme leaders, curriculum design, initial teacher education, recruitment [where relevant].</li> </ol>	<p>Points raised by the reviewer have been systematically addressed in the paper. Please see our responses (in blue) to the specific queries</p>
<p>Additional Questions:</p> <p>Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: This is an interesting paper which has adopted an innovative approach to data presentation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> </ol>	<p>We thank the reviewer for their kind comment.</p>
<p>2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: yes, the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for their kind comment.</p>
<p>3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the</p>	<p>Additions and clarifications to these points were provided in the first revision (wherein the reviewer also suggested minor revisions) submitted on March 6, 2023. However,</p>

<p>paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: I would like further discussion about the specific approach to research and the ethical implications of using the self in research.</p>	<p>these do not appear to have been read or commented on in this review. The method is dialogic and dual voices emerge. It must also be noted that the ethical challenges of autoethnography are minimal in this paper as we are collaboratively dialoguing on our personal challenges without naming others. Our comments are connected to systemic marginalisations in HE exacerbated by the pandemic. Attempting to police our voices through use of the ethical baton in autoethnography risks wreaking epistemic violence on those such as us who already identify as marginalised (Grant and Young 2022).</p>
<p>4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: yes, the results are clearly presented</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>
<p>5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The implications for higher education or teacher education could be more explicitly stated. For example, what are the implications for senior managers in universities or programme leaders? What are the implications for student teachers? What are the implication for recruitment and for curriculum design [where relevant]?</p>	<p>We believe that we have already addressed this quite cogently in the concluding section by raising the concept of co-caring (Joseph et al 2022) and collaboration in research. The notions of working together as ‘tempered radicals’ (Myerson &amp; Scully 1995) in the HE spaces and raising our voices in collaboration with an evolutionary approach to shifts in HE has also been incorporated. We consider that adding more to this section including implications for student teachers, recruitment and curriculum design is outside the scope of this paper. In our dialoguing we have raised the issues of the burden of pastoral care which again is borne by us as academics. Taking up more in this section raises the risk of overshooting both word count and scope of this paper.</p>
<p>6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The paper is clear and easy to understand. Co-Editor Comments: Please address the minor revisions from the reviewer and resubmit. Thanks!</p>	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>This has been done. Thank you for your kind consideration. We do wish to state that the word count now sits at 7906 as a consequence of the changes made.</p>

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

Qualitative Research Journal