

# How to Adopt an “Inclusion as Process” Approach and Navigate Ethical Challenges in Research

Contributors: Mary Quirke, Conor Mc Guckin & Patricia McCarthy

Pub. Date: 2022

Product: SAGE Research Methods Cases

Methods: Research ethics, Research design, Case study research

Disciplines: Education

Access Date: April 6, 2022

Academic Level: Postgraduate

Publishing Company: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

City: London

Online ISBN: 9781529605341

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781529605341>

© 2022 SAGE Publications, Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

This PDF has been generated from SAGE Research Methods Cases.

## Abstract

This case study explores how Mary Quirke aimed to engage in Inclusionary Research for her doctoral research project and how her “Inclusion as Process” approach depended on and related to an “Ethics as Process” approach. The case study explains “Inclusion as Process” as an approach to research and discusses ethical implications of particular relevance to educational and other researchers in current times. In particular, it examines the application of Universal Design (UD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) thinking in research and how these approaches relate to these individual yet interdependent themes. Finally, the case study outlines an “Inclusion as Process” framework to guide inclusive research.

Mary Quirke is currently engaged in doctoral research exploring UDL, Inclusion and Career Guidance and developed these guidelines over the course of her project. Dr Patricia McCarthy, whose ontological position as a disabled researcher and whose experience in the field led the development of her own inclusive research agenda, contributed to the philosophy, inclusive practices and most importantly the necessary but subtle difference between inclusive researcher and inclusive research espoused in the guidelines. These “Inclusion as Process” guidelines enabled the doctoral research programme to continue its engagement in an inclusive manner despite of challenges of the pandemic and moreover to realize outcomes associated with sustainable development goals.

## Learning Outcomes

By the end of this case study students, should be able to:

- Demonstrate the value of “Inclusion as Process” as an ethical consideration in designing and conducting contemporary research methodology
- Understand the terms Universal Design (UD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
- Assess how UD and UDL can be applied as inclusive methodological approaches
- Describe the key stages involved in an inclusive research planning process
- Demonstrate an understanding of the bidirectional relationships between “Inclusion as Process” and “Ethics as Process”—and how an “Inclusion as Process” approach frames inclusive research

## Project Overview and Context

This case study explores the relationship between “inclusion” and “educational research” and how “inclusive methods” can be ethically utilized. In my doctoral research, I adopted the Universal Design (UD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) approaches as a way to engage in inclusive research that facilitates the voices of people with disabilities in education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. UD originated from architectural thinking and encourages the consideration of inclusion at the design stage. It was adopted for learning environments in several theories, including the better known UDL pillars developed by CAST (i.e., 1)

the why (engagement), (2) what (representation), and (3) how (assessment)).

The focus of my research project is the development of a more inclusive approach to Career Guidance that works within the UD and UDL framework and remains cognizant of the UN sustainable development goals (SDGs). My project seeks to engage with graduates and successful people with disabilities to explore what worked in terms of inclusion in the career guidance relationship for them. However, the issue that becomes the focus of this case study is how I resolved a perceived ethical barrier to my research: I developed a set of guidelines for using an “Inclusion as Process” approach for similar research in education. I felt these guidelines were necessary to take into account ethical considerations, UD, and UDL thinking in my research and future research projects.

### **The Need for an “Ethics as Process” and “Inclusion as Process” Approach**

Research design has evolved from well-established traditions that have stood the test of time. Part of any research process is the application for ethical approval. Ethics, while important, are often considered a milestone in and of themselves. Ethics have the ultimate objective—“do no harm”—and ensure all research activities, including engagement and outputs, are regulated and respectful of society. I, like all researchers, aimed to conduct my research in line with university regulations, professional standards, and a principled approach to best practice that has been defined over the ages.

Ethics is traditionally considered throughout the research process and should contemporary research seek to adopt an “Ethics as Process” approach, I argue that it cannot achieve it without also adopting an “Inclusion as Process” approach. Inclusive research is ethical research—the challenge is in rethinking and redesigning our research practices for inclusion. If research activities are to be truly relevant for future generations, researchers will have to adjust their research design and methods to incorporate multiple perspectives and needs and accommodate diverse goals.

An added challenge for research that seeks to be aligned with values of inclusion is often one of tradition and past experience: what we, as researchers, know and believe to be best for vulnerable and excluded communities influences our decisions. Moreover, the general understanding of “what is right,” “how to be safe,” and “who is vulnerable” can affect research design and practice.

Having explored concepts of UD and UDL and how they reframe an appreciation of inclusion, I wished to frame my research in light of the inclusive agenda that permeates such thinking and the UN’s SDGs.

The move toward sustainability necessitates a shared and collaborative approach—the need to include all people. Research activity is a key factor in developing and shaping new ways of living and thinking. Engaging with new audiences in an ethical and inclusive manner, demands the need to redesign our research and research activities from the very beginning. The alternative is “lost voices” and populations excluded, from not just research but also outputs that shape our future world.

What both UD and UDL do is ultimately advocate for a more considered design approach to inclusion so that

a greater variety of needs, methods, and goals are met. This is contrary to the traditional approach, where design focuses on a majority and differences are considered as an afterthought. Both UD and UDL appreciate difference (e.g., disability, second language learners, non-traditional students) as they design from the very beginning (Quirke & Mc Guckin, 2019), and most importantly, minimize but never negate, the need for add-on support or change. The UN SDGs also encompass inclusive principles as they espouse activities to help create a more sustainable world for future generations. Allowing this thinking to frame everything research involves (i.e., the great diversity of people and their experience and knowledge), as opposed to identifying it as a goal of research, will ensure that future research is sustainable, ethical, and inclusive.

## Section Summary

Research has developed from traditional and considered approaches with ethics central to the process.

- Inclusionary values espoused in UD, UDL, and the SDG's can enable a shift from traditional research approaches to approaches that are more contemporary, ethical, sustainable, and inclusive.
- UD is an approach to architectural thinking that promotes inclusion as a concept from the earliest stages of designing an idea.
- UD has been adopted in several theories and approaches in the learning environment, including the better known UDL.
- UD and UDL thinking, together with values espoused in the SDGs, identify "Inclusion" as a key theme.
- Sustainable and ethically inclusive research becomes easier when it adopts the values of UD, UDL, and the SDGs.

## Research Design

In my research, I chose to frame "inclusion" in the context of the models of disability. While the concept of inclusion is not exclusive to disability; disability theory and practice since the 1950's were very useful to us. Disability, once framed in the context of a medical approach where the emphasis was on "fixing" the individual has changed to a more social model approach; one that places the emphasis on society to make changes for inclusion. UD and UDL shifted the thinking even further from a reactionary social model to a more proactive design approach for inclusion.

UD and UDL were instrumental in influencing my research design. These approaches demand we design for inclusion—and to be able to design for inclusion also implies we understand and appreciate inclusion. Drawing on those principles, I went through a process of exploration that ultimately led to the recognition of "Inclusion as Process," and the subsequent development of guidelines so that my research, and the research of others, could be designed to be inclusive, sustainable, and ethical. My research design went through several key stages:

## Stage 1

My (Mary's) doctoral research project explores the issue of inclusion within career guidance, using a UDL approach and focused on the issue of disability. As with any research project, the first step in the process was to explore past learning about these concepts and how they define inclusion. At the outset, the *a priori* research question was “How can Career Guidance become more Inclusive for People with a Disability?”

## Stage 2

I chose to adopt a bio-ecological view of inclusion for my doctoral research project. This view was guided by the work of [Bronfenbrenner \(1979\)](#) and [Sidell et al. \(1996\)](#). Previous research generally focused on the bio-ecological experiences of the research participant, but I set out to argue that it is impossible to disentangle the researcher and the research participants from their own unique and also dyadic relationships in the research process. Thus, I decided to design my research to advocate for an active inclusion approach to research. This led to a deeper consideration of what inclusion means for research thinking and practice—especially as one seeks to explore “inclusion in context” and inclusion as an ongoing reciprocal process. I was continually challenged to move away from the notion of “researcher as expert” through an ongoing process of reflexive practice. Without that practice, my research would have been more closely aligned with the medical and traditional model of inclusion and could exclude valuable learning.

## Stage 3

While Stage 2 advocated for “Inclusive Research Practice”, Stage 3 shifted from the aspirations of Stage 2 to the reality of how to implement “Inclusion in Process” in the fieldwork. However, this yielded to three problems very early in my project.

The reality of planning the fieldwork became evident in two different but interrelated issues. First, what do you do when your research participants—from both an insider and an outsider perspective—are more expert than you in the wider topic area, yet are perceived by an ethical approach that focuses on their disability and sees them as vulnerable participants? The reality of this from an insider perspective is that Dr. Patricia McCarthy's ontological position as a disabled researcher conflicted with her outsider position as a “Doctor of Philosophy in Education” for the ethics committee, as their view of people with disabilities demanded approaches that would see Patricia as vulnerable and at risk. The consequence of this would be that rather than providing consent for herself to engage with the research, a guardian or “responsible adult” would be required to provide consent on her behalf.

The second dilemma was the issue of accessing research participants would impact on the method for the research project. Many researchers find it easier to redesign their project to overcome the hurdle of ensuring accessibility for a wide diversity of people. In choosing how to recruit and engage with participants, I considered the following questions:

- What does inclusion and inclusive practice look like in a research project?

- What needed to be considered in terms of ethics and ethical approval?

My project was seeking to engage with graduates and successful people with disabilities to explore what worked in terms of inclusion in the career guidance relationship for them.

The consideration of these questions led to the identification of a third dilemma—the relationship between the researcher and the ethics committee. The membership of an ethics committee in a School of Education is interesting largely because they are not single discipline schools. Rather, Schools of Education are broad in perspective and generally contain staff drawn from disparate disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, philosophy, languages, and professional practice areas). When we think about who is available for membership of the ethics committee, they very often represent a practice perspective in the discipline rather than a research-oriented perspective. In addition, some of these members may not be a member of a professional representative body. This point becomes important because if you are a member for professional representative body, you must voluntarily agree to abide by a code of ethics for that society to retain membership. This means you have knowledge of ethical principles and practice. In addition, the membership is likely somewhat representative of the different disciplinary backgrounds, each with different ideas of what represents knowledge and inclusion. Furthermore, I recognized the process of the Ethics Committee generally follows a university-wide ethics approach, where there is little opportunity to be responsive or deviate from this process.

The experience of many researchers is that ethics committees seem to operate from a defensive position—often perceived to be a combative process and less than supportive to the applicant. A significant point is that quite often, the applicant for ethical approval in a School of Education is someone who is a significant professional in their area of research with longstanding knowledge of the intricacies of the field. I have more than 20 years of experience as a professional career guidance counselor, with significant policy and research experience in a senior role in a non-government organization and am also a registered healthcare professional. Thus, the applicant may in fact be more skilled and knowledgeable in this particular area than members of the Ethics Committee. These are issues that need to be understood in relation to this case example of my research and Dr. Patricia McCarthy's position, and moreover, the evolving shift toward more inclusive research.

#### **Stage 4**

Instrumental in this research design process were my discussions with Dr Patricia McCarthy, an academic whose past-experience was dominated by the segregationist and institutional education policies that were the norm in Ireland up to the 1990s. In order to engage in education, Patricia (age 7) had to move over 250 km away from family to attend the “School for the Blind.” A decade after leaving compulsory education, Patricia commenced third level education and, with the assistance of many inclusive practices and technologies was empowered to graduate with a Doctorate. What is notable is that there was a shift from exclusion to inclusion happening in the education setting. This directly impacted on Patricia's own learning and research experience. As a researcher, Patricia's lived experience brought much to our discourse around “inclusive

practice.” By considering Patricia’s unique combination of experiences together with her research project work, I gleaned a wide breadth of both knowledge and experience to guide the ongoing design of my research. For example, I engaged in ongoing reflections on positionality and relationships and how they influence inclusionary approaches.

## Stage 5

Another step in the research design was to disseminate and discuss this thinking with the academic community—seeking opinion and consensus on approaches being taken. Presentations were made at three consecutive European education conferences ([Quirke & Mc Guckin, 2018, 2019](#); [Quirke & McCarthy, 2020](#)), explicitly discussing and exploring themes of ethics, inclusion and exclusion, and shared thinking across theories, disciplines, and research activities. This discourse confirmed and validated the emerging thinking around ethics, research methods, and inclusion that would inform my research design.

## Section Summary

- Inclusive research design needs to consider contemporary perspectives on disability and how these should influence ethical consideration, research design, and research practice.
- The philosophy and practice of UD and UDL shift the focus from “a static and reactive” approach to inclusion to one that seeks to proactively and ethically design for inclusion from the get-go.

## Research Practicalities

To guide my project, I adopted an “Ethics as Process” approach ([Ramcharan & Cutcliffe, 2001](#)). As I worked with the ethics committee, my position as an inclusive researcher evolved, and I identified the critical difference between vulnerability and capability, informed consent, information shared and communicated, and how all this would shape my research methods, and moreover, realize authentic ethical research outputs. I recognized (and continue to recognize) that an authentic ethical approach demands ethics be considered throughout the research project, together with inclusive practice—thus identifying “Inclusion as Process” as both a philosophy and a practice during the research design phase of my project. Inclusive Research needs to be considered not just in terms of ethical quantitative and qualitative approaches, but moreover, actively, adopt inclusive thinking and practice, and so consider all accessibility in a democratic manner—online platforms, assistive technologies, language used, timing—all methods of communication, engagement, and enquiry across the research.

Adopting an “Inclusion as Process” approach was not without its challenges. My current research project, a PhD study, like other current research projects, faced unexpected challenges when the pandemic began in 2020. However, having designed the research with inclusion as a central theme, my project was able to navigate the choppy new waters of “virtual research,” at an uncertain time with ethical approval that had considered accessibility, inclusion, vulnerability, and capability from the beginning.

In my research project, I adopted several key approaches in an ethical and inclusive manner, including:

- Gaining a deeper appreciation of the challenges of both inclusionary and exclusionary practice in research.
- Recognizing the complexity of continuously having to re-evaluate research design in terms of continually recognizing that participants' circumstances can change—all while appreciating their own ongoing understanding and experience of inclusion. This need for continual “in-flight thinking” (O’Síoráin et al., 2022) was heightened due to the pandemic and the shift to online engagement.
- Demonstrating the application of a UD and UDL approach, several representations of information about my project were created using simple language, infographics, and presentations.
- Allowing consent to be obtained via a choice of doubly verified approaches (i.e., emailing forms, and recording consent, as well as respecting where the participant was and the resources they had available to them while ensuring that ethics were adhered to).
- Developing adaptability in the engagement process by way of offering participants flexibility in times and timing, supplying questions in advance and using accessible online meeting software.
- Considering language, terminology, and the deeper issue of defining “inclusive conversations.”
- Reflecting and being reflexive at all times. This included checking on “my understanding of inclusion” as a researcher. This activity recognized the researcher as data in a very real way, while it also meant checking in with any bias or assumption.
- Recognizing vulnerability as the pandemic unfolded and impacted directly on research relationships—this also meant constantly reflecting on the role and responsibility of researcher while engaged in the process of researching, as a new “vulnerable” participant emerged.
- Recognizing that for the first time, many (both academics and research participants) felt excluded due to lockdowns and lack of digital knowledge and experience. Knowledge about GDPR, Data Storage, Hacking, Teams, Zoom, and Forms all tested assumptions about inclusive and ethical practice. This further contributed to a shift in thinking about inclusion and its role in research design and practice.
- The learning evolved further when I spoke with Patricia about her unique experiences. Patricia is registered blind and an academic and this affords her a unique understanding of inclusive strategies from all positions—including that of researcher. She has a deep understanding of many of the issues and continues to actively engage in the inclusive agenda, advocating for a world where “Inclusion is everyone’s business” (McCarthy et al., 2019)

## Section Summary

- My research project explores the theme and practice of inclusion and sets out to adopt inclusion as a core value. This was not without challenges when engaging in some of the research steps, including ethics, methods, and data collection.
- Having identified potential challenges and designed the research to take an “Inclusion as Process” approach, my project was able to continue despite ongoing changes to the social world and



pandemic.

- Learning from the experience of Dr Patricia McCarthy—a researcher whose ontological position meant that she had insider knowledge about inclusion—informed my thinking and research decisions.

## Method in Action

My research project embraced inclusive approaches and set out to engage with people with a disability. This involved a deep consideration and exploration of the research project, including the design, the methodology, and the ethics. Each step of the research process involved a reflection about inclusion and inclusive practice.

Achieving ethics approval for my inclusive practice was the initial challenge and could have had the power to reframe or derail my entire project. Initially, the ethics committee decided that to include the voices of people with a disability, I would require consent from guardians or parents—in spite of the fact that the participants were educated to graduate level and engaged in society. In response, I developed guidelines for using an “Inclusion as Process” approach that enabled the ethics committee to make a more informed decision and then informed my research decisions and processes. Exploring vulnerability and capability while also designing for inclusion throughout the process was a key step in my research journey and proved to be a most valuable exercise as well.

Another challenge arises when researchers seek to be included. My conversations with Dr Patricia McCarthy helped me understand this issue. Patricia had engaged in research, including “The Educational Experience And Transition Opportunities of Blind and Visually Impaired People” (McCarthy, 2013), and developed a deep understanding of the challenges and barriers faced by the group. She was also sensitive to the experiences of blind and visually impaired people. An insider knowledge meant that she could identify with exclusionary thinking. As a blind researcher, she adopted inclusive approaches from a place of necessity, and moreover, uniquely, appreciated the position her research participants found themselves in.

Patricia shared with me that she has found that “inclusive practice” is not as easily understood, nor as common, as it is often thought. While many believe they are taking an inclusive approach, albeit unintentionally, others adopt and adapt with great intention (Quirke & McCarthy, 2020). The greater challenge is to accept that “inclusive practice” is not clear-cut, with apparent “rights and wrongs.” It is a constantly evolving approach—a reactive and proactive manner of thinking, in line with the original thinking behind Mace’s UD principles (Quirke & McCarthy, 2020).

The combination of both of our (Patricia’s and Mary’s) knowledge and experiences sparked the most useful conversations about how to define “inclusion” in research. For example, deeper exploration of terms such as “ethics,” “vulnerability,” “capability,” “inclusive practice,” and “exclusion” resulted in discourse around the role of research in contemporary society—particularly as research is to be allied to themes of the SDGs and the need for a more inclusive world. Our shared thinking ultimately informed my research project on what active inclusion should look like as I engaged with graduates and other successful people with disabilities seeking

career guidance to explore how inclusion could work for them.

Using this evolving approach demanded continuous reflection and critical analysis as “Ethics as Process” and “Inclusion as Process” both necessitated constant evaluation in an ever-changing world. The unexpected COVID-19 pandemic, with subsequent social distancing and lockdowns surprisingly resulted in little disruption for the PhD project. Notably my project design had allowed for consideration around accessibility in an ethical and inclusive manner, which allowed for the move to online platforms without difficulty. All the challenges of engagement and safety had been considered and designed for from the beginning. Designing for inclusion and learning from past experiences, combined with other extenuating factors, unexpectedly allowed for the continuation of my research project. In the new world of virtual engagement, I continued to embrace the values of active inclusion central to the UD and UDL perspective. These values, seen in elements of language, engagement, time, and emotions, supported my “inclusive practice” in a new world of research that generated new data about “inclusive thinking.”

It is hard to identify what could be done differently in the research project. Although it was a challenge to think outside the typical scope of research in these ways, it paid off because my work on my project led me to advocate for positive change to research methods and methodologies to improve inclusion. The reality is that research often engages with populations in ways that are exclusionary, thus, it is worth challenging thinking across the academy. Is it not the case that research is often carried out with a greater concern about “excluding” rather than “including”? This is ultimately what needs greater discourse.

## Section Summary

- Ethical considerations for the current research project required a deeper exploration of what vulnerability and capability meant.
- Research is often framed by a medical model approach (deficit thinking) and unconscious bias about disability—in terms of not only just the research activities but also the researcher and their position in the research ecology.
- Some research “excludes”—either consciously or unconsciously—but an active inclusion process mandates that we design to include for the full range of people and experiences.
- An inclusive approach to ethics should acknowledge the researcher’s personal and professional experience—developing the concept of “Ethics as Process” (i.e., that things ‘can’ change in fieldwork) toward an “Inclusion as Process” approach (i.e., that things “should” change in fieldwork).

## Practical Lessons Learned

Researching in an inclusive manner will always test the philosophy and boundaries of traditional ethics committees in a university setting. This becomes more acute in a traditional School of Education, where all academics have a central concern with policy practice experience and outcomes broadly understood. Unlike single discipline schools (e.g., geography, psychology), education departments generally consist of academics from across multiple disciplines (e.g., example philosophy, sociology, history, languages, and

applied practice). As a result, School of Education ethics committees are likely to be constructed of members from wide ranging disciplines, each with their own inherent assumptions about the nature of knowledge on how to develop knowledge and the ethical principles an process in that area.

I believe my problem with obtaining ethics approval arose from the fact that, while I am an inclusive researcher in the area of education and fully understand central issues relating to participation, capability, and capacity, the members of the ethics committee may have had a more outsider perspective on the significant nuances of recruiting and researching with people with disabilities. The solution I developed to enable the ethics committees to make a more informed decision was an “Ethics as process” and “Inclusion as Process” approach led by a set of clear guidelines. This framework includes key steps with points for reflection at each step, and it became very useful in guiding my research:

1. First, think about your positionality, **your own understanding of inclusion** in terms of your research topic, and how you relate to inclusive practice. This is the starting point for an active inclusion approach.

Points for reflection:

2. What do you know about inclusive practice?
3. How do you propose to engage with participants?
4. How do you hope to represent the participants?
5. **Adopt an “Ethics as Process”** approach as you design and conduct your research.

Points for reflection:

6. Design your research so that it is your relationship with participants that is central,
7. Consider terminology you are engaging with. Terminology such as:
  - “Capacity” or “capability”—does this exclude potential participants?
  - “Consent”—what do you mean by informed consent?
8. Think and **design for inclusive engagement** when planning your research method.

Points for reflection:

9. Think in terms of “deliverable” and “delivery”—how accessible is your research process? Review the physical and virtual tools you will use.
10. Do not assume you know the audience—ask them what they need to engage.
11. What is your **experience of inclusion and exclusion**—how does this make you feel **when challenged** as your research evolves?

Point for reflection:

12. How do you reflect on these experiences as your research develops?

13. Have a mindful, deeper consideration of what “vulnerable” and “excluded” means for everyone (including yourself) involved in the research and, importantly, **learn how to identify “exclusion.”** Consider how this is likely to evolve over the course of your research.

Points for reflection:

14. This is part of your reflexivity. Consider your personal and professional experience of exclusion as well as inclusion and appreciate how your ongoing experiences can influence your data
15. Appreciate there may be a need to “redesign” for inclusion—to “UD” the research process as it develops and be prepared to change
16. Recognize the influence making change has on your approach to your study
17. Seek to **continuously and ethically develop an inclusive research design approach** for your project—one that can adopt the inclusion philosophy espoused in the SDGs.

Points for reflection:

18. This will mean adopting an approach that requires researchers to constantly think ([Quirke & McGuckin, 2021](#))
19. Inclusively
20. Equitably
21. Non-discriminately
22. Flexibly
23. Intentionally
24. Evolutionarily
25. *Constantly* redesigning for inclusion
26. **Appreciate** the ecology of research being carried out—the **relationships** between the research, doing the research and being the researcher.

Points for Reflection:

27. Recognize that the relationships will continuously shift and evolve—demanding a continuous inclusionary reflexive approach.  
**Ultimately, “Inclusion as Process” is about continuously designing for inclusion in an ethical way when engaging in contemporary research (where “inclusion” remains a central theme).**

## Section Summary

- A reflective framework for incorporating “Inclusion as Process” can help researchers engage in critical reflection to support the design and conduct of research that is ultimately inclusive, ethical, and sustainable.

## Conclusions

Very often, there is some learning in our research that goes unnoticed (or even ignored)—but, in this instance, as the pandemic unfolded, it meant I had to stop and reconsider everything I once believed to be true. On taking a step back and exploring the ecology of our world of research, new data on inclusion emerged. A bit like an apple falling from a tree!

The theme of “Inclusion” is current—particularly as it is espoused in the SDGs and our ever changing world. What inclusion means will continue to evolve—it has to if it is to live up to expectations. Yet, there remains many areas of research where tradition implies that a fixed mindset is best, a checklist and standardized process designed very often with a “one size fits all” approach.

UD and UDL are concepts that embrace design and inclusion. They are an empathetic and considered way of thinking and useful to frame any approach to inclusion—they give permission to adapt and adopt, and allow both inclusive practice and the concept of inclusion to evolve in a variety of applications.

Research needs to be connected to the society it seeks to serve and be ready to evolve, particularly if it is to meet the demands of the SDGs. Thus, inclusive research methods and emerging inclusive theory also have a place in a world seeking to adapt to so much change.

Taking the time to step back and reflect on all that is happening may feel like a privilege in our busy world. *But* only by reflecting on the culmination of research events and experiences did an “Inclusion as Process” come to light for my research project. It is important that contemporary researchers take the time to frame their research thinking in light of the world and communities they seek to engage with and enable inclusionary thinking to take its place in a more sustainable way—only then can research that follows an “Inclusion as Process” approach include and involve future communities.

### Section Summary

- Applying “Inclusion as Process” allows researchers to take the time and a more considered reflexive approach when designing and planning their research method.
- UD and UDL allow the research activities not just to be designed but, moreover, redesigned to include as the research journey evolves.
- “Ethics as Process” is a parallel theme for an “Inclusion as Process” approach and both need to evolve and be designed for simultaneously.
- Taking the time to stand back and learn from the research itself leads to more inclusive research, new learning and engagement with otherwise excluded communities—this, in turn, offers benefits for future societies and academic institutions as is clearly aligned with the values espoused in the SDG’s for a more sustainable research agenda and inclusive world.

## Classroom Discussion Questions

1. How is the “Inclusion as Process” approach to research valuable in the evolving educational climate? Could the reflective framework benefit other research endeavors? Discuss.
2. UD and UDL promote inclusion as a concept that needs to be considered from the earliest stages of designing an idea. What are the benefits and challenges of employing UD and UDL approaches in research? What strategies could be used to address the challenges?
3. How does an “Inclusion as Process” approach address ethical challenges in conducting ethical qualitative research?
4. Does an “Inclusion as Process” mindset need to be adopted by both the researcher and be evident in the methods of research? If so, how?

## Further Reading

**Bracken, S., & Novak, K.** (Eds.). (2019). *Transforming higher education through universal design for learning: An international perspective*. Routledge

**Burgstahler, S. E.** (2020). *Creating inclusive learning opportunities in higher education: A universal design toolkit*. Harvard Education Press. 8 Story Street First Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138.

**Mc Guckin, C., & Minton, S. J.** (2014). From theory to practice: Two ecosystemic approaches and their applications to understanding school bullying. *Journal of Psychologists and Counselors in Schools*, 24(1), 36–48.

**Scott, S. S., McGuire, J. M., & Shaw, S. F.** (2003). Universal design for instruction: A new paradigm for adult instruction in post-secondary education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(6), 369–379. 10.1177/07419325030240060801

## Web Resources

CAST. (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

Mace, R. L. (2008). Ronald L. Mace. [https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about\\_us/usronmace.htm](https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_us/usronmace.htm)

UN General Assembly, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>

Quirke, M., & McCarthy, P. (2020). A conceptual framework of universal design for learning (udl) for the irish further education and training sector where inclusion is everybody’s business. <https://www.solas.ie/f/70398/x/b1aa8a51b6/a-conceptual-framework-of-universal-design-for-learning-udl-for-the-ir.pdf>

## References

**Bronfenbrenner, U.** (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Harvard university press.

CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2 [graphic organizer]*. Author. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

**Donoghue, C.** (2003). Challenging the authority of the medical definition of disability: An analysis of the resistance to the social constructionist paradigm. *Disability & Society*, 18(2), 199–208. 10.1080/0968759032000052833

**Finkelstein, V.** (1980). *Attitudes and disabled people: Issues for discussion (no.5)*. World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc.

**Finkelstein, V.** (2001). The social model of disability repossessed. *Manchester Coalition of Disabled People*, 1, 1–5.

**Mace, R. L.** (2008). *Ronald L. Mace*. [https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about\\_us/usronmace.htm](https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_us/usronmace.htm)

**McCarthy, P.** (2013). *Expectations you encounter: The educational experiences and transition choices/opportunities of blind/vision impaired people in the Republic of Ireland* [PhD thesis: Trinity College Dublin (Unpublished)].

**McCarthy, P., Quirke, M., & Mc Guckin, C.** (2019). *Can you see what I see... is it an exclusive model or an inclusive model?* Third Pan-Canadian Conference on Universal Design for Learning: Connecting the Dots – Sharing Promising Practices across Country, Royal Roads University, Victoria, Canada. Abstracts not published.

**O’Síoráin, C. A., Mc Guckin, C., & Carr-Fanning, K.** (2022). Well that’s another fine mess you got me into. The jargon of research (how do we translate this for the participant with additional needs). In **A.Fox, H.Busher, & C.Capewell** (Eds.), *Thinking critically and ethically about research for education* (undefined 40–53). Routledge. 10.4324/9781003094722

**Quirke, M., & Mc Guckin, C.** (2018). *Learning from the past... How career guidance might learn from inclusive education*. European Conference on Educational Research (ECER): “Inclusion and Exclusion, Resources for Educational Research”, The Free University Bozen-Bolzano, Bolzano, Italy. Abstracts not Published.

**Quirke, M., & Mc Guckin, C.** (2019). *Career guidance needs to learn from “disability” if it is to embrace an uncertain future*. European Conference on Educational Research (ECER): “Education in an Era of Risk - The Role of Educational Research for the Future”, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany. Abstracts not Published.

**Quirke, M., & Mc Guckin, C.** (2021). *The universal design discourse -time to shine a light in the dark corners*. European Conference on Educational Research (ECER): “Education and Society: expectations, prescriptions, reconciliations”, Geneva. Abstracts not published.

**Quirke, M., & McCarthy, P.** (2020). *A conceptual framework of universal design for learning (UDL) for the Irish further education and training sector where inclusion is everybody’s business*. SOLAS.

**Quirke, M., McCarthy, P., Treanor, D., & Mc Guckin, C.** (2019). Tomorrow’s disability officer - a cornerstone on the universal design campus. *Journal of Inclusive Practice in Further and Higher Education (JIPFHE)*, 11(1), 29–42. <http://www.tara.tcd.ie/handle/2262/91528>

**Ramcharan, P., & Cutcliffe, J. R.** (2001). Judging the ethics of qualitative research: The “ethics as process” model. *Health and Social Care*, 9(6), 358–367.

**Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A.** (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: universal design for learning*. association for supervision and curriculum development, 1703 n. beauregard st., undefinedalexandria, VA 22311-1714 (product no. 101042).

**Sidell, M., Jones, L., Katz, J., & Peberdy, A.** (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (Rev ed.). Continuum. 10.1007/978-1-349-25349-4

**Story, M. F., Mueller, J. L., & Mace, R. L.** (1998). *The universal design file: Designing for people of all ages and abilities*. Center for Universal Design. [http://www.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/pubs\\_p/pudfiletoc.htm](http://www.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/pubs_p/pudfiletoc.htm)

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. UN Publishing.