



Editor's Introduction

Peter Hick and Gary Thomas

Special education has a long history, and in many ways inclusive education develops from that history. In developing notions of inclusion, its pioneers focused on disability and desegregation (see O'Brien and Forest, 1989). But there has been a progressively broadening compass to that original idea of inclusive education and nearly twenty years hence the focus of inclusive thinking is diversity and social justice just as much as it is mainstreaming and disability. The changes of the 1990s saw thinking about inclusion spread out from a one-dimensional plane, along which one viewed the integration and the valuing of children with disabilities and difficulties, to a three-dimensional terrain that now incorporates a more extensive spectrum of concerns and discourses – about the benefits that come from valuing diversity.

In this series of four volumes about inclusion and diversity we bring together work that represents the way that thought about inclusive education has moved forward, concerning itself now with a range of matters concerning equity, diversity, learning, community, identity and belonging. This is a view of inclusion conceived with many surfaces – disability, certainly, and social justice no less – but just as importantly other facets of life at school as well: community, equality and respect.

It is necessary to put this plea for reformulation in some more detailed historical context. How and why, in other words, have changes in views about inclusion come about in contemporary discourse, and why is a yet broader ambit needed now? The changes that occurred during the 1990s came from uncertainty about the status of conceptualizations of disability and other kinds of difficulty, foregrounding their social and discursive construction. Accompanying the uncertainty that characterized the questioning of concepts of disability was a recognition that inclusive education ought to be about more than the education of those who would formerly have attended special schools or been in receipt of special programs. So, inclusive education came to mean the inclusion of *all* learners, paying attention to *any* features of a student's experience that may create difficulties at school.

This refiguring in thinking about inclusive education was profound, and contained both constructive and deconstructive elements. In the constructive tradition, arguments have rested in the positive value of a plural, equitable



system rooted in human rights, while in the deconstructive tradition arguments have centered on the harmful consequences that may emerge from separate systems and pedagogies. Both traditions have argued for an end to separate education systems.

But there have persisted into the twenty-first century strong voices – recently, for example, Kauffman and Hallahan (2005) – arguing for the benefits of continuing separate education and specialized pedagogies. Their arguments have rested principally on the impracticability of inclusion, its ideological or values-based provenance, and the pedagogic and social benefits of special education. Counter-arguments to this genre of reasoning have been advanced on epistemological grounds (e.g. Gallagher, 2004; Reid and Valle, 2005, Volume 4), on outcomes-based grounds (e.g. Hegarty, 1993, Volume 1) and on social justice and rights-based grounds (e.g. Rustemier, 2002; Artiles, 2003, Volume 1).

The Place of Inclusive Education

One needs to understand the contemporary status of inclusive education as a product of its history, of the discourses that shaped its development during the twentieth century. In this context, it is first important to note that inclusive education is undeniably the child of special education. While inclusive educators would surely recoil from any charge that their work displays any sign of throwback to the field's roots in special education, it is clear that inclusive education has a mindset whose lineage is visibly traceable to its forebear's. It thus concerns itself predominantly with the right to integration in the least restricted environment of what are taken to be "exceptional" students (see, for example, the discussion of Hehir & Latus, 1992 and the wording of legislation¹ that guarantees the social and academic integration of *disabled* or *exceptional* citizens). Slee points out that such thinking maintained a "... misconception that disabled children are to be the sole beneficiaries of inclusion" (Slee, 2001: 120, Volume 1).

The recent thawing of rigid demarcation lines about exceptionality has done little to refigure thought about direction: little, in other words, about the viewing of the field as being about remedy, putting right, change, even if the focus in doing that has latterly moved from student to school (see Thomas and Loxley, 2007).²

Knowing this lineage to exist between special and inclusive education, what forces have shaped the growth and decline of this field? Shifting currents – in politics, in the academy, in what can loosely be called the *Zeitgeist* – were behind the varying fortunes of special education in the twentieth century, and it was out of these currents that came the field's waxing and waning.

The key move of *Zeitgeist*, at least as far as the waning of special education and the beginnings of the rise of inclusion are concerned, was one of a slow and painful shift away from separation as a taken-for-given feature of organized social life. The impulse to exclude (and the panic that sometimes

accompanies attempts to dilute separative systems) has been at the root of segregative systems of education. As Bauman (1995: 180) puts it: "Rules of admission are effective only in as far as they are complemented by the sanctions of expulsion, banishment, cashiering ... sending down." He goes on to note that ordinary education has been maintained only by the presence of "corrective institutions' awaiting the failures and the recalcitrant."

The exclusive instinct existed in the establishment of special schools in the 19th century and before, but it was given a boost in the early part of the twentieth century by the systematization of public education and by the contemporaneous growth of the eugenic and psychometric movements (ideas that hung together naturally) and the new science of psychology. Eugenics and psychometrics, until the Second World War, had been essential for the advance of segregative systems, acting in symbiosis to feed a notion that separation was best for all: best both for those who were separated and best for those remaining in the mainstream. It is now hard to believe how powerful this segregative mindset was at the time, but remember that in the early part of the century the psychometric pioneer Lewis Terman (1924: 336) had asserted that "The first task of the school would be to establish the native quality of every pupil; second, to supply the kind of instruction suited to each grade of ability." And the consensus about the good sense imagined to be embodied in eugenics is evidenced by the fact that at the end of the 1920s twenty-four American states had passed laws enabling compulsory sterilization. The common sense said that to separate was good for all, and in school systems across the world this common sense found its expression in an expansion of special education during the 1940s and 50s (see Hurt, 1988).

If Miller and Bauman are right, exclusion will be omnipresent in our institutions. Yet there have undeniably been changes of late to attitudes of exclusion. What changes can one discern in the drive to exclude that culminated in a reversal in the last quarter of the twentieth century – a reversal that involved understanding and promoting the benefits of inclusion?

The separative disposition borne of eugenics was eventually extinguished, but sadly educators had little part in its extinction. (Indeed, under the influence of psychologists such as Terman and Burt, the 1950s saw some of the largest expansions in special education in the century.) Rather, it was the *Zeitgeist* that came eventually to succeed the Second World War that dispensed with the segregative logic and a set of tacit reappraisals and reformulations emerged to replace the discourses that had before dominated. After that war, the respectability of eugenics evaporated and no one any longer dared to advocate that segregation was in anyone's best interest. People began to recognize that separation in any sphere of life is for the convenience of the majority, marginalizing, disenfranchising and often oppressing the separated minority. Key texts such as Erving Goffman's *Asylums* (1968) reinforced the move away from separation, as Goffman irreverently suggested that separative institutions acted as society's "storage dumps" (Goffman, 1968: 73). In the early 1950s, Chief Justice Warren put it neatly for the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *Brown vs. Board of Education*

(U.S. Supreme Court, 1954, Volume 1): “We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.” This was a conclusion reached because separation “... generates a feeling of inferiority as to [students’] status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.”³

Brown was an important marker in the move to inclusion, but public recognition of the reasoning embodied in the *Brown* judgment reached its climax in the USA in the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, a movement concerned mainly with “race” that gave confidence in its wake to other groups that had felt discrimination, segregation and oppression. (One such group comprised people with disability who had been compulsorily segregated from the mainstream in their youth.) In Europe there were political movements ranging from the social democracy of Scandinavia to the collectivist local government of Italy (see Johnson, 1993, Volume 4) that demanded new action to outlaw separation, discrimination and segregation. Across the world, new legislation began to be enacted to counter discrimination. A new tide had demanded a closure on segregation and separation in all spheres of life, including education.

At the same time, other ideas came together during the fifties and the sixties to liberalize and make more progressive the education system internationally. Stimulated by figures such as John Holt and Lawrence Cremin in the USA and Jean Piaget in Europe, there was a re-awakening of interest in progressive educational thinkers such as Dewey, Montessori and Froebel. In a fascinating analysis, Gardner, Torff and Hatch (1996: 29) describe how “developmental and educational traditions” came together, with an awakening interest in children as constructors of their own learning in meaningful contexts.

And the change in climate came also from other, broader shifts: from a new mistrust in science as a provider of answers to social questions; from a decline in respect for authority and a new wariness about its interests and motives; from caution about the status of professional knowledge, and from a powerful consumerism, on the back of which students and their parents felt able to challenge the decisions of authorities and professionals.

The point of this brief retrospective is to set in context the development of special and inclusive education as cultural and political phenomena: products of the general discourses – as much as the educational discourses – of the twentieth century. These new discourses continue to evolve, and as they accelerate with the speed of contemporary life they must be understood, accommodated and planned for. One must understand, for example, that the late twentieth century saw hastening fragmentation, decreasing trust and a move to what the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (2000) has called “liquid modernity”: an era in which variety, ambiguity, nomadic behavior and declining trust interplay; an era in which there is burgeoning uncertainty about the confident answers of the past.

In understanding this, one needs also to make a plea for an international consciousness about inclusive education and its place in contemporary discourse (see Sayed, 2002), for many countries of the South appear

to be imposing on themselves a form of cultural imperialism as they make presumptions about the appropriateness for them of what they take to be the cutting edge inclusive education of the West. The argument presented in these volumes is that inclusive education is meaningful only when embedded in understandings about community and society, only when seen as both reflective of, and creative of, inclusion in society. Here, far from needing to draw on Western experience, certain parts of the developing world – for example the state of Kerala in India, Costa Rica and Sri Lanka – can stand instead as exemplars to the West, much as certain parts of the developing world were identified by Paulo Freire (1972) as exemplars for moves to improved literacy.

Diagnosis and Disability Versus Progressive Education

Simultaneous with the social and political movements that have diverted education from special systems and segregation and moved it towards inclusion have been a portfolio of significant studies that have led to a questioning of where the separative instinct of special education has directed us. For this instinct has sacrificed considerations about educational purpose and community – the kinds of considerations for which Dewey (1938) and other progressive educators pleaded throughout the twentieth century – and have substituted for these considerations diagnostic, separative and help-based solutions to failure to learn at school. Special education emerged with a super-construct, disability, enfolding performance in learning, behaving and doing at school, complete with its own taxonomy of mild, moderate and severe manifestations, each with its own battery of putative syndromes. And it developed a range of mechanical and technical remedies to the difficulties that children have supposedly confronted in respect of their learning, behaving and doing. Examples abound: Doman-Delacato, teaching machines, conductive education, behavioral techniques, instrumental enrichment, Direct Instruction, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching, and an array of other putative solutions.

What has been borne of this diagnostic and remedial preoccupation? A brief review reveals that it has been less fruitful than would have been hoped. More than this, though, the deliberate distancing from wider social, cultural and educational considerations in the employment of such an approach led to unanticipated problems. Direct Instruction, for example, rested in a “teacher-proof,” hyper-rational set of ideas about teaching and learning formal skills, and its early use promised much. Later evaluation, however, as part of Follow-through (DeVault, 1977), indicated that the great benefits attributed to it may have been due as much to the generous resourcing assigned to it as to its specific pedagogic elements. Even more worryingly, recent longitudinal analysis has indicated that any immediate benefits were ultimately lost, and on leaving school those children who were part of a Direct Instruction curriculum were significantly more likely to have been



xxviii Editor's Introduction

involved in crime, were less well adjusted and engaged in fewer community activities than those who partook at an earlier age in traditional nursery activities (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1997, Volume 3). The lesson seems to be that the specific focus on deficits detracted from thought about what education is about and what it is for. If more thought had been given to how children become rounded people as part of a learning community, less credence may have been paid to the fixes that Direct Instruction and its ilk promised.

In a similar vein to that of Direct Instruction, great hopes were placed in the potential of behavioral techniques during the 1960s and 70s and while there is little doubt that these techniques provided some assistance in thinking about teaching for a very small proportion of students, there can be equal certainty that they over-simplified the nature of learning and led, in widespread practice, to curricular desertification – as sensible thinking about educational aims withered and died under the onslaught of the certainties of behavioral analysis. With the kudos that learning theory's respectability bestowed on behavioral methods, more attention was devoted to the proper application of task analysis procedures, or the correctness of behavioral objective specification, than was given to the question of what was actually wanted from an education of children for whom the procedures were devised. It was only when the protests of teachers and other critical voices reached sufficient volume (see for example, London, 1972; Reppucci and Saunders, 1974; Stenhouse, 1975; Wood and Shears, 1986) that serious questions began to be asked about the potentially damaging consequences of these interventions.

Similarly, in the diagnostic-prescriptive teaching so fashionable in the 1970s and 1980s, the appealing notion that one could assess where a child's difficulties lay and then prescribe a program of help gave forth a crop of specialized assessments (such as the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, or ITPA) and remedial programs. The promise of diagnosis and prescription is alluring, but unfortunately the evidence tells us that all of the assessment and program-writing involved in this process is an elaborate waste of time, as teachers' gut evaluations and *ad hoc* remedies proved to be as good if not better than the special methods – see Newcomer and Hammill (1975) and Arter and Jenkins (1979, Volume 3) for comprehensive appraisals. The central point, though, is not that diagnosis-prescription was ineffective. More importantly, it distracted teachers from sensible literacy activities.

What the failure of these programmatic, remedial and special education "solutions" appears to show is that it is not diagnosis and help that are important but rather the provision of the right conditions for learning in like-minded communities. This idea should not be new to educators of the late twentieth century. The ideas of Dewey, developed independently of the soviet psychologies of Vygotsky (1934/1986; 1978) and Leontiev (1978), both paved the way for a mushrooming interest as the century progressed in what has been called "sociocultural theory" – what Blackler (1995) has called encultured knowledge, or what Smith (1998) has more uncomplicatedly



called *learning in clubs*. Developments continue to escalate in such ideas about the nature of learning at school and beyond (e.g. Lave and Wenger, 1991; Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1999), developments that share an emphasis on the centrality of meaning, narrative, apprenticeship – in short, the context and culture for learning. The message is simple: if context is wrong, learning doesn't happen.

Perhaps because of special educators' isolation in a particular part of the system, these developments seem to have played little part in the development of alternative approaches for those who have not fared well at school; they have competed poorly with the programmatic and remedial approach favoured by special educators. And special education's isolation has in part been inherited by what has gone under the name of inclusive education. Special and inclusive education sometimes seem to have glanced up against these ideas and bounced off, with their resilient and palatable constructs of identification, failure, disability and help emerging with hardly a scratch from the encounter. This is despite much straightforward empirical work on learning difficulty which has supported the sociocultural turn and which ought to have caused some hefty self-reflective doubts about the validity of such "difficulty" or "disability." One does not need to look too far for examples of such work. One finds, for example, the work of Rueda and Mehan (1986), given in Volume 2 of this series, who have provided compelling evidence in uncomplicated research. They showed that it was social interchanges that made or broke learning for children at school. Children who were labeled "learning disabled" in fact managed to do all the things they weren't supposed to be able to do – checking, monitoring, evaluating and so on – but this was in everyday rather than scholastic activity. And the students were also able to demonstrate sophisticated planning – in *avoiding* tasks expected of them. Rueda and Mehan conclude that the kinds of learning skills required of children at school are in fact context bound: it is almost as though the ability to use them is switched on or switched off by the student's immediate social circumstances.

Hart (1996, Volume 3) provides similar insights on the deficit and disability perspective on failure to learn at school and an example of it is also given in Volume 3. Analyzing the actual spelling mistakes of her own students she rejects any idea of learning disability. One of her students, Adrian, made mistakes such as "afared" for "afraid," and "wrouasem" for "awesome." Hart describes how she moved from assumptions about "considerable difficulty" to the realization that Adrian's constructions represented considerable intellectual accomplishment. Far from being "difficulties" they were the "... astonishing achievements of someone who is successfully negotiating his way through a highly complex process of hypothesis testing and generalization in relation to the workings of the writing system" (Hart, 1996: 82). Alongside the insights provided by these idiographic accounts, there is also the highly detailed empirical evidence amassed by researchers such as Coles (1978, Volume 3; 1987) (and see also Senf, 1987, Volume 2), also represented in Volume 2.



Students may switch off from school, from learning. This is why they fail. In boredom, isolation or fear other systems will kick in (as we all know from personal experience) and prevent learning (or at least prevent the achievement of the objectives that are set at school). John Holt (1964, Volume 3), in his inspirational vignettes of classroom failure, described these processes with great acuity. He showed, merely through appeal to our own experiences as teachers and learners, that children who find difficulty with their work at school may encounter such difficulty for a plethora of reasons, but they need the same for learning as any other child: interest, self-respect, confidence, freedom from worry, a warm and patient teacher. In short, they need inclusion in a welcoming learning community. The legacy that one hundred years of special education has given to teachers is the belief that this isn't enough; that you need all sorts of special procedures to help you understand and help these "exceptional" children. The persistent return is to those elusive "learning disabilities" despite the power of more recent insights.

It is understandable why these views should have prospered. The promises made by special, compensatory, and now, inclusive education are the bread of life for policy-makers. Policy-makers need (and are naturally and optimistically drawn to) programmatic response that promises restoration and revival. Spend-and-cure exerts a magnetic influence on them, despite the evidence going back decades that this kind of decontextualized, programmatic "help" may not only be of little or no value, but may actively be doing damage – to learning and to social assimilation (Christoplos and Renz, 1969, Volume 2; Midwinter, 1977, Volume 4; Weatherley and Lipsky, 1977, Volume 2; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1997, Volume 3 – and see Offord et al. 1999 for a discussion of the effects of intervention more generally).

Separate Pedagogies Built on Ideas of Ability and Exceptionality

The interests of the earliest special educators in diagnosing and teaching separately had major consequences for the field as it detached itself and drifted away from mainstream education, to develop its own discrete ecology – in its separate schools, pedagogies and practices. And the ecology has to an extent been retained by inclusive educators – in a separation of thinking, if no more – from mainstream educators. That ecology was formed in the early psychologies of Wundt and Thorndike in their searches for laws about basic learning that stripped out concern for context, language and interest – stripped out, in other words, everything that makes human learning unique. It was rooted in the psychology of William James, who tried (and failed) to boost his "memory muscle" by doing memory exercises. It was rooted in the work of the early psychometricians, who sought "scientific" ways of identifying difference. It had established itself in a state of self-exile from the mainstream, where it relied on a psychology that particularized and compartmentalized learning and said that failure to learn represented some kind of disability.

The central construct on which such psychology and the pedagogy of exceptionality was built was that of ability. And it is from the construct of ability, of course, that the idea of learning *disability* found its origins. McClelland (1973), writing more than thirty years ago and referring to the 1958 *Social Science Research Council Committee on Early Identification of Talent* (McClelland et al., 1958), noted, even then, that powerful criticisms of the notion of intelligence, general ability and the testing movement were not new. The committee had, as long ago as the 1950s, recorded clear theoretical and empirical objections to the validity of the notion of ability. There is no doubt that the understandings recorded there, and subsequently, dented educators' faith in intelligence measurement and particularly IQ, but they had less evident influence on underlying beliefs about ability *per se*.

The deep-seated beliefs of which McClelland was critical posit a simple relationship between something largely constitutional, namely *ability* or *intelligence*, and its consequence, namely *attainment*. The assumptions here have, of course, been acutely critiqued by Gould (1981), Howe (1990), and Ericsson and Delaney (1999) among many others, and recently large-scale international analyses of trends in intelligence have demonstrated again how tenuous the notion of constitutional ability is: Dickens and Flynn (2001) have shown how gains of more than a whole standard deviation in IQ occurred between 1952 and 1982 in cohorts of 18-year-olds, revealing the significance of large-scale environmental effects over and above those of supposed constitutional difference. Wahlstein (1997) interestingly discusses the plasticity of IQ in findings such as this and the reasons for the significance of environment for IQ's development.

Despite such analyses (as McClelland might have predicted) the resilient beliefs about which the US committee on talent were critical nearly fifty years ago still abound today (see, for example, Spencer, 2004). These beliefs about ability have had, and continue to have, a disproportionately large influence in special education, and latterly inclusive education. The reason for the persistence in these views about ability lies in the field's reliance on a particular psychology of learning. The field has been embedded in a psychology that was on a different train line from twentieth century discussions about learning as we noted in the previous section.

Inclusive educators, while acknowledging and disavowing the mistakes of their predecessors in special education, often still share their world-view. They share a concern for seeing what's wrong, putting right, for bringing to order, for correcting, albeit that the focus has conspicuously moved from the student to the school in the reappraisals that have led to the shift toward inclusive education. The school-centered focus, though, often happens within identical curricular and learning frames. The assumption may now be that the school rather than the student has gone wrong, but this is still within a framework of exceptionality, special need, disability and help. The Volumes in this series give examples of inclusive systems that have attempted to move beyond such conceptions. The argument now and increasingly is that children's success or failure at school is due less to "learning disabilities" and

more to an array of factors around which acceptance and inclusion are constructed. Recent critiques have foregrounded the place of the school as a social institution in “constructing” learning difficulty, but have not often offered insights into general processes underlying this. Notable examples of exceptions exist in Tomlinson (1985, Volume 4), Ferguson et al. (1992, Volume 2), Artiles (2003, Volume 4) and Benjamin (2003, Volume 4) in examining factors such as race or gender in the process of construction, all of them represented in this Series.

The construction of learning difficulty is indeed made by race, gender and other discretely identifiable issues. However, race, disability and gender can become hooks on which to hang stereotypes about learning and to maintain deficit-orientated explanations of failure (see Young, 1990: 45; Meekosha and Jacobowicz, 1996). The question to be answered is how these characteristics – race, disability, gender, etc – influence learning in the school. How is difficulty in learning constructed out of these and other characteristics? It is possible to suggest that difficulty is constructed out of disruptions in learning caused by discomfort, alienation, fear, hostility, mistrust, and that if schools are not vigilant they can be breeding grounds for such phenomena. Once such phenomena have done their work in generating difference, the school can make contrastive judgments that exaggerate the differences, and this is particularly so where government edict across the world in the name of “standards” forces such alienation and mistrust.

Why has such understanding not been assimilated by the inclusive education community? It has been realized since the 1920s and Gordon’s (1923) studies of canal boat children in the UK, or Wheeler’s (1970) similar studies of, and findings about, “mountain children” in the USA, that it was cultural milieu rather than any inborn characteristic that determined a child’s success at school. As Leyden (1978, Volume 1) has pointed out, it was the endemic constructs of special education (and latterly inclusive education) that promulgated the belief that it was ability (and disability) – not poverty, difference or life experience – that was the principal force at play in determining such success or failure. Sadly, such beliefs about ability are still not only extant but thriving, propagated often by powerful vested interests.

Recent epidemiological work confirms these narratives about failure. The work of Blane, White and Morris (1996), looking at the link between school performance and deprivation showed that the relationship is so close that the two variables appear to be simply alternative measures of the same thing. In the same vein, Singer and Ryff (1997) counter the hereditarian *Bell Curve* arguments of Herrnstein and Murray (1994) by showing how ethnic and class inequalities related to differences in education, money and power define exposure to adversity, and, in turn, how a person wins or loses.

If identity, poverty, class, ethnicity and difference are so important, what has the research of recent years told of their significance in causing failure at school? This recent research has given a more sophisticated and nuanced picture of poverty’s effects, and one that stresses inequalities rather than absolute deficiencies: inequalities in status, in opportunity and in experience



as well as in capital. It appears that inequality creates a complex of factors around one's identity and self-respect that in some way deconstruct one's ability to thrive in a community of learning. It is the issue of inequality that runs through this series on inclusion and diversity.

The Volumes of this Series

Our title, *Inclusion and Diversity in Education*, reflects this development of the field of inclusive education, from an initial focus on the inclusion of learners with disabilities within mainstream educational settings, towards a broader approach, encompassing a wider range of learners who may be excluded or marginalized from educational opportunities and settings for a variety of reasons – or indeed encompassing all learners. Cummings, Dyson and Millward (2003: 63) suggest that a 'significant shift in thinking ... needs to take place when the focus moves from the politics of disablement to the politics of social and economic disadvantage'. This shift is arguably the central development in the field over the last 20 years, yet this is perhaps the first major collection that takes this process as its starting point and aims to bring together a wide range of work representing the key issues, within a selection of classic and contemporary pieces. Each of the four volumes presents writings around a particular dimension of theory, research and practice that we regard as central to the development of inclusion and diversity in education. These are *inclusive education as social justice* (Volume 1); *developing inclusive schools and school systems* (Volume 2); *inclusive pedagogy in curricula and classrooms* (Volume 3); and *learning from diverse voices in inclusive education* (Volume 4). In addition, the collection reflects three major themes that cut across each of the four volumes, and which we feel enable us to develop a more nuanced account of the field. These themes are *ideas in motion, including diverse learners*, and *learning in diverse contexts*. In the rest of this chapter, we aim to share our thinking on how the literature on inclusion and diversity in education can be understood in this way, and how these themes and dimensions relate to each other, bearing in mind that:

the suggestion of a simple linear development from one position to the next is to oversimplify... Rather... there is always a dynamic relationship between the various perspectives.

(Clough, 2000: 9; Volume 1)

Our selection aims to represent each key area of the literature on inclusion and diversity in education, and to include not only landmark writings, but also to indicate current issues of debate and possible future directions for the field. To this end we engaged many of the authors in discussion via email about where they felt their work contributed to the themes and dimensions of these volumes. We are grateful for their input and hope that this adds



something to the validity of our choices; nevertheless responsibility for any gaps and omissions is of course ours. Given the breadth of the literature, no selection can be seen as definitive, even in a series on this scale, and any selection will inevitably reflect the views of the editors – as of course ours – in addition to practical constraints of availability and balance.

Ideas in Motion

We have argued that a historical perspective on the development of thought on inclusion and diversity in education is essential to an understanding of current thinking. Peter Clough (2000, Volume 1) proposes a framework of five broad perspectives, that map the major developments in thinking around what is now referred to as inclusive education, over the past 50 years. They are particularly helpful in drawing attention to ‘the ways in which researchers’ ideas change and develop over a lifetime’ (Clough 2000: 8) and are given as follows:

- the psycho-medical legacy
- the sociological response
- curricular approaches
- school improvement strategies
- the disability studies critique

There are a number of such typologies in the literature (e.g. Lunt and Norwich, 1999) offering alternative frameworks for understanding the field. We would suggest that the ways in which many of those writing about inclusive education over the last twenty years have developed their ideas, can be seen in relation to this broader agenda for inclusion and diversity. For some this is explicitly rooted in notions of social justice and equity (e.g. Rizvi and Lingard, 1996; Artiles, Harris-Murri and Rostenberg, 2006; both in Volume 1). For others the focus has increasingly been on promoting the development of more inclusive practices at the level of schools and school systems (e.g. Skrtic, 1991; Ainscow, 2005; both in Volume 2). Equally this process is visible amongst researchers focusing on practice at the levels of curricula and the classroom, in the re-location of educational failure in the construction of schooling (e.g. Holt, 1984; Volume 3) or in a re-appraisal of traditional assumptions underpinning specialist pedagogies (Norwich and Lewis, 2007; Volume 3). This is paralleled by an increasing recognition of the significance of position and voice in perspectives on inclusion, for example in critiquing professional roles (Midwinter, 1977; Volume 4) or in listening to the views of young people who are labelled as different (Benjamin, 2003; Volume 4).

There is also a sense of circularity in the ways in which a repetition of earlier arguments for special education continually provide counterpoints to these trajectories for inclusion and diversity. It is striking how previous debates remain relevant to topical issues, and how fully addressed some of these were in earlier research. This is not to suggest that history repeats itself

in a particular form, rather than there is a tendency for old rationales for the identification and separation of difference to be re-created and re-formulated anew (Allan, 2006; Volume 1). We have previously noted how the field of special education has been characterized by a largely atheoretical approach that has provided fertile ground for a series of attempted technological 'fixes' to the social construction of difference as disability. A number of articles included in these volumes serve to remind us that a previous generation of research has provided strong – even compelling – evidence for questioning the effectiveness and indeed the purposes of special education's assessments, practices and provision (for example Dunn, 1968, Volume 1; Milofsky, 1974, Volume 3; Johnson and Pearson, 1975, Volume 3; Anderson and Pellicer, 1990, Volume 1). Indeed the sheer weight of such accumulated evidence is impressive when reviewed today. One is tempted to ask whether an element of myopia can be detected in the re-invention of moral panics about aspects of youth culture; in the re-branding of segregated special schooling as a form of inclusion; or in the application of new and emerging technologies to a uni-dimensional, medical model of learning difficulties or disabilities. The re-construction and medicalisation of difference, difficulty and dissent within a range of 'new' varieties of disability or special educational need – such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, or Oppositional Defiance Disorder – can be seen as further examples of how exclusionary pressures continue to reassert themselves in new forms and new discourses in changing circumstances.

At the same time it is possible tentatively to indicate signs of new conjectures in critical theory that may prove fruitful in taking the field forward – perhaps in new directions. Central to these developments is the increasing influence of what we have previously referred to as 'sociocultural theory', in its various strands. Few, if any, early proponents of fully inclusive education for children with disabilities, drew on sociocultural accounts of learning to support their case, tending to rely rather on advocating for inclusion as a civil right, as social justice. However the social construction of difference has long been a theme within a sociocultural tradition, located as a separate, if at times parallel, stream of discourse. For example, McDermott (1993; Volume 1) reminds us of the similarities between a social model of disability and a socio-cultural account of learning disability:

We might just as well say there is no such thing as LD [learning disability], only a social practice of displaying, noticing, documenting, remediating, and explaining it. This theoretical shift makes LD no less real to the participants of life in schools where occasions for displaying LD are so frequent, but it should at least make us wonder what we all do that makes LD so commonly sensible and ubiquitous in our experience with institutionalized learning.

McDermott (1993: 272)

More recently, a wider range of researchers in inclusive education have come to draw on sociocultural themes (Ainscow 2005; Volume 2); whilst



xxxvi Editor's Introduction

sociocultural approaches are increasingly linked with critical theory (McDermott, Goldman and Varenne, 2006; Volume 4). This points to the possibilities for productive alliances between sociocultural approaches and critical theory in education, for example in the areas of disability studies (Danforth and Gabel, 2006) and critical race⁴ theory:

The marriage of both approaches [sociocultural theory and critical theory] provides a rich foundation for examining issues of educational equity and social justice within special education.

de Valenzuela (2007: 288)

It is at the point where such developments in critical theory engage with a transformative social justice agenda (Artiles, Harris-Murri and Rostenberg, 2006; Volume 1) that they may prove most fruitful in illuminating new intersections of class, race, disability and gender. A test of such work will be its utility in informing and supporting the development of a more equitable and inclusive education system.

Including Diverse Learners

Inclusive education began with a focus on disability, and with the realization that restructuring schooling to accommodate a wider range of learners could bring significant benefits for all (Biklen, 1985, Volume 2; Miller, 1996, Volume 1; Giangreco, 2007, Volume 3). The subsequent broadening of the lens to encompass intersections of class, race, and gender, together with related issues such as sexualities equality (Rivers, 2001), has stimulated much important work. For example issues of gender in the development of childrens' identities, are addressed specifically in this collection in chapters by Daniels, Creese, Hey and Smith (2001, Volume 2), Connolly (2006, Volume 4) and Benjamin (2003, Volume 4). An agenda for 'inclusion and diversity in education' seems to have a particular resonance in current debates in the arena of race, ethnicity and cultural and linguistic diversity.

It seems clear that learners from minority ethnic communities have long been disproportionately targeted by special education (Tomlinson, 2004; Volume 3). This was first pointed out some forty years ago, both in the USA (Dunn, 1968; Volume 1) and in the UK (Coard, 1971/2005; Volume 4). Back in 1971, Bernard Coard, a Grenadan scholar, showed how children of West Indian migrants in England were being placed in special schools for the 'educationally subnormal' (moderate learning difficulties in current parlance). The publication of his pamphlet caused a furore and sparked the development of a parent-led supplementary school system. Yet a generation later it remains the case that boys described as of African-Caribbean descent are 3.5 times as likely to be subject to disciplinary exclusion as White British boys; and 1.5 times as likely to be identified as having Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties (Hick, 2005). Many of the issues affecting minority ethnic communities are more complex now than the stark racism

described by Coard in 1971; nevertheless there is continuing evidence of a range of disproportionalities in relation to various categories of special educational need, for a number of minority ethnic communities (Lyndsay, Pather and Strand, 2006).

At the same time it is possible to detect a wishing away of the issue of race, an attempt at erasure, reflected for example in a reformulation of the language of race into ethnicity, community cohesion and citizenship. This is paralleled by an apparent policy shift from accepting the need to challenge 'institutional racism' towards substituting an individualised account of 'personalizing learning'. Institutional racism became a widely recognised concept in the UK when it was endorsed by a public enquiry into police failures in the investigation of the racist murder of a London teenager, Stephen Lawrence, and was defined as:

The collective failure of an organization to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.

(Macpherson, 1999: 28, in Gillborn, 2005: 498; Volume 2)

When the issue becomes reframed as one of setting and monitoring progress towards individual learning targets, the onus to address systematic inequalities in educational outcomes for pupils from some Black and Minority Ethnic communities, is diminished. In this process the focus for concern has morphed into the achievement of 'white working class boys' – clearly a group who have been failed by an increasingly selective education system. It is crucial to understand the intersection of race and class here: the very real and tangible inequalities and disadvantages experienced by sections of white youth must equally be addressed, but they in no way invalidate the finding that black students face additional discrimination on the basis of race. The UK government commissioned in 2005 a Priority Review of the disciplinary exclusion of black students, entitled *Getting It. Getting It Right*, in recognition of the iconic status of the exclusions issue in the eyes of many black parents. The report acknowledged the significance for today of the issues raised by Coard:

Whilst overt racism (at least on the part of staff) is now unusual in schools, discrimination against the grandchildren and great grandchildren of the early Black migrants persists in the form of culturally unrepresentative curricula and low expectations for attainment and behaviour on the part of staff. Many argue that the disparity in exclusion rates for Black pupils (the "exclusions gap") is a modern manifestation of the same process that saw so many Black pupils classified as 'Educationally Sub-Normal' in the past.

(DfES 2006: 3)

However publication of the report was delayed and confined to the web, and was accompanied by a ministerial statement distancing the government

from the concept of institutional racism as ‘potentially misleading and unhelpful’ (*The Independent*, 4th March 2007). This process of de-racialization in social policy has been challenged by writers such as Gillborn (2005, Volume 2) who have turned to Critical Race Theory for support in insisting that racism is still an issue.

Learning in Diverse Contexts

Underlying the continual reproduction of exclusion in new forms are material forces of competition and selection, which define a fundamental feature of global capital. The origins of special education lie in its emergence as a historical artifact of the development of mass compulsory schooling in the late nineteenth century, rather than in response to evidence of effective specialist pedagogy. In this process ‘the problem of school failure was reframed ... in the new field of special education, which emerged as a means to remove and contain the most recalcitrant students’ (Skrtic 1991: 152; Volume 2). The sanction of separation was a necessary adjunct to the requirement to school the masses. The particular form this took was neither a historical necessity, nor the product of a ‘rational, benevolent progressive continuity’ (Armstrong, 2002: 441; Volume 1), but rather the outcome of a contested process, operating through what Copeland (1997: 711; Volume 1) describes in Foucauldian terms, as a ‘genealogy of dividing practices’.

As the need for labour with at least elementary education was largely a product of the industrial revolution, so today the influence of globalization has led to a marketization of education. Discourses of inclusion in schools become bound up in the now ubiquitous, and hence at times invisible, language of the market:

There is a tendency to speak in one breath about inclusive education, but to fail to acknowledge the policy context that presses us relentlessly towards educational exclusion in the other. Here we refer to the marketisation of schooling;

(Slee and Allan, 2001: 179; Volume 2)

Inevitably it is the disadvantaged, the minoritized, and the disempowered who are the losers in the education marketplace. Early proponents of inclusive education framed it as an essential element of democratic society (Gartner and Lipsky, 1987; Volume 4) or as a form of comprehensivism:

In England the concept of ‘inclusive education’ – that is, increasing the participation of all students in a neighbourhood in their local school – cannot sensibly be separated from ideas of community ‘comprehensive’ education.

Booth and Ainscow (1998: 3)

Competitive pressures undermining comprehensivism have been resisted by a number of writers; for example Len Barton and Roger Slee, introducing



a special issue of the *International Journal of Inclusive Education* exploring issues of marketization, comment that: 'at the core of our perspective is an unwillingness to accept a market-led approach to the planning, provision and outcomes of education' (Barton and Slee, 1999: 8; Volume 1). In the UK context for example, much of the architecture of marketization established by the Thatcher Government has been continued and extended under New Labour; from inspections, testing and league tables to tuition fees and increasing private sector involvement in public education. The impact of these pressures has continually 'entailed the generation of a more competitive, selective, and socially divisive series of policies and practices' (Barton, 2004: 64). Unsurprisingly, students identified as having special educational needs have sustained a disproportionately high rate of disciplinary exclusion throughout this period (Hick, Visser and Macnab, 2007). Ball (1993: 8; Volume 1) points out that 'excluded students have their market 'choice' taken away from them'. Indeed, Nes (2004: 122) poses the question aptly: 'what is the market value of people with special needs?' Clearly this issue is of fundamental importance in shaping and constraining forms of inclusion and diversity in education:

The processes of globalization in conjunction with neo-liberal economic theory have changed the landscape of educational thought so that social efficiency has become an overriding goal of education policy makers in many countries at a time when student populations are becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse. These policy directions, with an emphasis on production of knowledge-rich citizens who can become flexible, efficient workers in a competitive global environment, have profound implications for students with disabilities and inclusive education.

Artiles, Kozleski, Dorn and Christensen (2006: 76; Volume 2)

This process of marketization has been accompanied, in the case of the UK, by a rhetoric of inclusion that has produced a key faultline in education policy. Derrick Armstrong (2005: 149; Volume 2) has suggested that 'the meaning of inclusion has been colonized', as 'the New Labour vision of inclusion is one that reconstructs inclusion within the traditional framework of special education and in so doing reinforces its traditional purposes' (Armstrong 2005: 136). This re-location of inclusive education within the New Labour rhetoric of 'social exclusion' has involved a down-playing of the role of material inequality and disadvantage, in favour of an individualized and internalized discourse of 'poverty of aspiration' and self-esteem (Hick, Visser and Macnab 2007). It has shifted the onus of social change from the institution to the individual, so that: 'special educational needs continues to be a legitimating label for the failure of the system to address itself to the aspirations, dignity and human worth of so many young people' (Armstrong, 2005: 147). As previously noted, a further step in the developing policy rhetoric has been the rapid ascendancy of the notion of inclusion as 'personalization'. This term has its origins in the

xl Editor's Introduction

notion of 'mass customization' of public services (Campbell et al, 2007) and can be seen as an extension of the marketization of schooling, linking the notion of pupil choice to a prevailing culture of consumerism:

Personalisation takes the marketisation of education a stage further by placing it at the very heart of the pedagogical process itself, as in the phrase 'personalised learning'

Hartley (2007: 630)

The resultant tension between policy pressures to raise standards of achievement in schools, as measured by high stakes testing, and at the same time to implement more inclusive practices, has shaped an agenda for many researchers concerned with developing inclusive schools and school systems. This important stream of work is represented in this collection by Rouse and Florian, (1996, Volume 2); Avramidis, Bayliss and Burden, (2002, Volume 2); Ainscow, Howes, Farrell and Frankham (2003, Volume 3); Dyson, Gallanaugh and Millward (2003, Volume 3); Ainscow (2005, Volume 2); and Ainscow, Booth and Dyson, (2006, Volume 2).

The implications for inclusive education of an increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse student population are addressed within the field of urban education, for example in such initiatives as the National Institute for Urban School Improvement⁵ in the US context. Equally, comparative perspectives have formed an important influence on the development of thought and research on inclusive education, providing a mirror for reflection on national systems. Examples of work that draws on comparative approaches in this collection include Ball (1993; Volume 1), Johnson, M. (1993; Volume 4), Rizvi and Lingard (1996; Volume 1), Armstrong, F. (2002; Volume 1) and Allan (2006; Volume 1). Booth and Ainscow (1998), however, warn against the assumption of national monoculture in such comparisons. An earlier neo-colonial tradition of viewing education systems of the global south from the perspective of more developed economies, has given way to near universal support for the UN Millennium Development Goal of (primary) Education for All (Mittler, 2000; Miles and Ahuja, 2007). Nevertheless, this goal has already been postponed and at the current rate of progress seems unlikely to be achieved in the foreseeable future, at least within the current framework of global relations. Here again a more critical lens points to the need for inclusive education as social justice to be understood within a transformative agenda.

Inclusive Education as Social Justice

Whilst inclusive education began as a response to special education, the early focus of the inclusion movement on special schooling as 'segregation' echoed the moral claims of the civil rights movement in the USA (Warren, 1954; Volume 1). In this sense, the origins of inclusive education derived just as much from concerns for greater social justice in education and society.

We would argue that a return to a social justice agenda (Smith and Kozleski, 2005; Volume 1) offers a firmer foundation for addressing the challenges of developing more equitable and inclusive education in the 21st century. In so doing, we take issue with those who would research inclusion as solely a values-neutral issue of 'evidence-based practice', which can at times elide into the generation of 'policy-led evidence' (Ball, 2008). Such an approach tends to downplay the importance of a sociological critique (Tomlinson, 1982, Volume 1) in theorizing special and inclusive education. A retreat into an efficacy-based model of research in inclusive education does not succeed in avoiding the question of values: 'neutrality in social justice research is... a myth, whether or not one declares one's value system' (Blair, 1998:20). Most importantly, the rejection of a position starting from inclusive education as social justice, is based on:

the mistaken belief that one can in education unproblematically separate the disinterested from the interested, the apolitical from the ideological, the objective from the subjective, the reasoned from the irrational, the evidence-based from the arbitrary.

(Thomas and Glenny 2002: 347; Volume 4)

An early formulation of inclusion as a civil rights issue lay in terms of disability discrimination as a form of oppression, analogous to racism or sexism. In a classic and widely cited account of a material basis for a theory of disability as oppression, Abberley (1987; Volume 1) argues for a distinction between oppression on the grounds of disability and exploitation on the basis of social class:

As with racism and sexism, a theory of disability as oppression must at some point face the question of who benefits from oppression ... the main and consistent beneficiary must be identified as the present social order, or, more accurately, capitalism in a particular historical and national form.

Abberley (1987: 16; Volume 1)

This question of 'who benefits?' remains of importance to understanding complex intersections of race, gender and class today. For example, Abberley's differentiation of exploitation and oppression points to the possibility of understanding how schools fail white working class boys, without denying the reality of racism experienced by black students, and without conflating or counterposing the issues.

In theorizing discourses of justice in inclusive education, Rizvi and Lingard (1996; Volume 1) argue for a 'complex equality' that combines Rawlsian distributive justice (Rawls, 1972) with cultural rights. They suggest that the right of access to regular schools is insufficient without considering the need to restructure schools; and seek to resist a market-individualist view of social justice. Nancy Fraser (2005; Volume 1), whilst not restricting her analysis to education, develops the argument further in the context of globalization, by

adding a dimension of ‘recognition’ to Rawls’s notion of distribution. Artiles, Harris-Murri and Rostenberg (2006: 267; Volume 1) review social justice perspectives in inclusive education, identifying parallel ‘justification’ and ‘implementation’ discourses with ‘individual’ and ‘communitarian’ foci. They call for a shift from traditional approaches to social justice in theorizing inclusive education, towards future transformative models, that ‘must embrace participatory strategies in which distribution of resources, access, and social cohesion constitutes the foundation of democratic egalitarian alternatives’.

Slee and Allan (2001: 185-6; Volume 2) ask whether there is ‘a need for a theory of activism which enables ideas about inclusion to be enacted?’ They point to ways in which exclusionary practices are continually re-inscribed in policies which profess to be inclusive, then position themselves in opposition to this process: ‘The partisan research ... genre to which we have signed up is one aspect of the general call to activism’. There is a sense in which their stance offers an invitation to each of us involved with inclusion and diversity in education, to reflect on our position in relation to promoting social justice.

Developing Inclusive Schools and School Systems

For those concerned with promoting inclusive education, a central focus remains the development of more inclusive practices within the mainstream of the education system, so that fewer children experience exclusion or marginalization. However following the publication in 2005 of a pamphlet by Mary Warnock (Warnock, 2005), in which she retracted much of her influential earlier work on the ‘integration’ of children with special educational needs, the UK media has carried a somewhat disconnected debate about whether inclusion has gone too far. In fact, in the UK there has not been a mass exodus of children moving from special schools into the mainstream, and there seems little prospect of this happening in the foreseeable future. The proportion of the school-age population in the special school sector remains very much the same after a decade of New Labour, and five years after the introduction of the Statutory Inclusion Framework (Ofsted 2004; Daniels and Porter 2007). Equally, the evidence suggests that including students with identified special needs does not adversely affect the achievement of other learners (Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson and Kaplan, 2005). At the same time a contrary trend is visible, an attempted elision of the concepts of mainstream and special, in a redeployment of ‘inclusion’ to: ‘break down the divide between mainstream and special schools, to create a unified system where all schools and their pupils are included within the wider community of schools’, DfES (2004: 38).

We have discussed how the early inclusion movement advocated for access to regular schooling for individuals with disabilities, and found that the necessary accommodations had implications for school organization that were beneficial to many students (Thousand and Villa, 2005). Yet a

certain tension can be detected between those campaigning within a disability rights framework (Rieser and Mason, 1992), many of whom argued for starting by including those students seen as presenting the greatest challenges to schools; and researchers working within an organizational approach, for whom 'just concentrating on disability is actually very limiting as an agenda' (Ainscow, M. in Clough and Corbett, 2000: 42).

The question of leadership came to the fore in promoting the development of more inclusive schools, and research on inclusive education connected with the fields of school effectiveness and school improvement (Ainscow, 1991). These approaches have been subject to heavy criticism as simplistic (Morley and Rasool, 1999), reductionist (Wrigley, 2004) and as not serving the interests of those marginalised and excluded by the drive to raise attainment (Slee, Weiner and Tomlinson, 1998). On the other hand we do know that inequality, disadvantage, social class, and poverty are major determinants of educational opportunity (Galloway, Martin and Wilcox, 1985; Wilms, 1999; both Volume 2).

Nevertheless, research on developing inclusive education at the level of schools and school systems has proved to be an important and fertile field of work internationally (Dyson, Howes and Roberts 2002). One product of this stream of research that has had a very widespread impact is the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth and Ainscow, 2002), a tool for school development and self-evaluation, offering an operational definition of inclusion in relation to not only policies and practices within schools, but also school cultures. This has led to more recent work exploring how the development of more inclusive school cultures can be facilitated (Kugelmass, 2007), for example through Ainscow, Booth and Dyson et al.'s (2006: 143) notion of 'creating principled interruptions' in established patterns of thinking and acting through 'evidence-stimulated reflection'. There is a sense in which the process of developing more inclusive practices can be described as a form of reflective practice, where: 'becoming more inclusive is a matter of thinking and talking, reviewing and refining practice, and making attempts to develop a more inclusive culture', (Ainscow, Booth and Dyson et al., 2006: 139). How far this can be achieved within the constraints of an increasingly marketised school system (Apple, 1993; Volume 2) remains perhaps the major challenge facing proponents of more inclusive and equitable public education for diverse learners.

Inclusive Pedagogy in Curricula and Classrooms

The theoretical basis for special education in separate pedagogies is discussed in an earlier section. Volume 3 collects writings around this dimension of debate, deconstructing the knowledge claims underlying specialist pedagogies (Gallagher 1998; Volume 3).

Recent research (Florian, 2008; Norwich and Lewis 2007, Volume 3; Corbett and Norwich 2005; Davis and Florian 2004) suggests that, despite traditional assumptions about special education, there is limited evidence



for separate specialist pedagogies for learners described as having special educational needs. Norwich and Lewis (2007) propose a useful distinction between specialist knowledge of particular disabilities and categories of special educational need; the use of specialist teaching strategies and equipment; and whether these can be said to constitute a special pedagogy. Whilst some learners may require more intensive teaching, this doesn't necessarily amount to a fundamentally different or 'special' mode of learning. Indeed, the issue of inclusive pedagogy extends beyond learners with disabilities to all learners who may be at risk of underachieving (Dyson and Hick, 2004; Wrigley and Hick, forthcoming).

Interestingly, Ofsted (2006) recently pointed out that the composition of special schools in the UK is changing, so that many no longer 'specialize' in one category of SEN. For example schools designated as catering for students categorized as having 'moderate learning difficulties', are increasingly accommodating students described as having 'autistic spectrum disorders' and 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties'. This development reflects these research findings questioning the extent to which there can be said to be specialist pedagogies for particular categories of disability.

The construction of more inclusive pedagogies remains a central challenge for educators today; however there are a number of recent developments that may indicate fruitful directions for future work. Jenny Corbett (2001; Volume 3) proposes a notion of 'connective pedagogy' that points to a location of disability issues within a wider inclusion agenda, emphasising the social context of schooling. Classroom practices can be conceived as nested within school culture, which in turn is nested within both national curriculum and policy frameworks and local demographic characteristics. The question of social context for pedagogy is taken up by Wrigley (2006, Volume 3) and in urban settings by Booth (2003, Volume 3) and Potts (2003, Volume 3). One approach to classroom practices that exemplify inclusive pedagogies is considered in Skidmore's work on dialogic teaching (Skidmore, 2006; Volume 3). When the question of pedagogy is considered in relation to a transformative social justice agenda, the issue can be reframed in relation to a tradition of critical pedagogy. Here, Linda Ware (2004: 201) suggests that adopting 'a Freirean lens allows for recognizing the importance of both hope and struggle in an interdependent fashion'.

Learning from Diverse Voices

The final volume of the series recognizes the importance of listening to a diverse range of voices in understanding inclusion and diversity in education. This refers firstly to those who are the subject of inclusive education, students labelled or identified as different, exceptional or 'special', but also to parents and paraprofessionals; and points to the need to recast the role of professionals in this process.

This understanding has important implications for the conduct of research in inclusion and diversity in education. The significance of the



agency of the subject in such research, is exemplified in Paul Connolly's study of the role of young boys in the 'appropriation and reproduction of their masculine identities' (Connolly, 2006:140; Volume 4). Ann Lewis (2004; Volume 4) offers guidance to researchers attempting to elicit the views of students with disabilities; whilst Peter Clough (1995; Volume 4) explores some of the methodological issues that researchers need to address here. Julie Allan points to the importance of listening through a wider range of cultural means of expression (Allan, 2005; Volume 4). This approach may indicate a line of enquiry of increasing importance in the future, reflecting for example the development of digital literacies and multi-modal learning using new and emerging technologies. A further implication of the turn to the 'voice' of the subject of inclusive education, is a recognition of the need to reconstruct professional roles in more inclusive modes (Midwinter, 1977, Volume 4; Leyden, 1978, Volume 1; Hick, 2005, Volume 4).

Beyond Inclusion and Diversity?

Our analysis has indicated that any choice of language use is value-laden and has a half-life, a utility that is limited in timespan. We have used the term 'inclusion and diversity' as the best available compromise in referring to the current and emerging stages of debate in the field, whilst recognizing that this term also reflects its past and may not always remain a term of choice. The future terrain of the field will be demarcated by wider social developments in equity and inequality, in global markets and population movements, and in the changing demographics of cultural and linguistic diversity. Across this shifting terrain the prospects for inclusion or exclusion and diversity in education will be contested by a range of social forces, including the conscious contribution of educators informed by values of social justice. We hope that these volumes may prove a useful resource for students and others seeking to shape their own responses to these future challenges.

Notes

1. This is legislation such as the Individual with Disabilities Act (IDEA, PL101-476), in the USA, and the Education Acts of 1993 and 2001 in the UK, all of which explicitly talk about the integration in the context of disability.
2. The shift of focus sometimes seems only notional as official figures (U.S. Department of Education, 1998) show that the number of children with "learning disabilities" rose from 757,213 in 1978 to 1,745,871 in 1982 to 2,748,497 in 1997-8.
3. It is significant that this happened when it did, just after World War Two. Note that there had been six such attempts to desegregate beforehand.
4. The term race is used to refer to 'race' as a social construct (albeit a powerful construct with impact on the 'real' world that is of fundamental importance), as the notion of biological 'races' has of course long been discredited in modern genetics.
5. <http://www.urbanschools.org/>

References

- Ainscow, M. (ed., 1991) *Effective Schools for All*. London: Fulton.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., and Dyson, A. with Farrell, P., Frankham, J., Gallannaugh, F., Howes, A. and Smith, R. (2006) *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Arter, J. A. and Jenkins, J. R. (1979) Differential diagnosis – prescriptive teaching: a critical appraisal, *Review of Educational Research*, 49(4): 517–55.
- Artiles, A. J. (2003). Special education's changing identity: paradoxes and dilemmas in views of culture and space. *Harvard Educational Review*, 73: 164–202.
- Ball, S. (2008) *The education debate: policy and politics in the 21st Century*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Barton, L. (2004) The Politics of Special Education: A Necessary or Irrelevant Approach?, in Ware, L. (ed.) *Ideology and the Politics of (In)Exclusion*, 4:63–75. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bauman, Z. (1995). *Life in Fragments*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Benjamin, S. (2003). *The Micropolitics of Inclusive Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Blackler, F. (1995). Knowledge, knowledge work and organizations: an overview and interpretation. *Organization Studies*, 6, 1021–1046.
- Blair, M. (1998) The Myth of Neutrality in Educational Research, in Connolly, P. & Troyna, B. (eds) *Researching Racism in Education: Politics, Theory and Practice*, 1:12–20. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Blane, D., White, I. & Morris, J.N. (1996). Education, social circumstances and mortality. In: D. Blane, E. Brunner, & R. Wilkinson (Eds.) *Health and Social Organization: Towards a Health Policy for the 21st Century*. pp. 171–87. London: Routledge.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (1998) *From Them To Us: an international study of inclusion in education*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow M. (2002, 2nd edn.) *Index for inclusion : developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: CSIE.
- Campbell, R. J., Robinson, W., Neelands, J., Hewston, R. and Mazzoli, L. (2007) Personalised learning: ambiguities in theory and practice, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(2): 135–154.
- Christoplos, F. and Renz, P. (1969) A critical examination of special education programs, *Journal of Special Education*, 3(4): 371–80.
- Clough, P. and Corbett, J. (2000) *Theories of Inclusive Education: a student's guide*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Coles, G. (1978). The Learning-Disabilities Test Battery: empirical and social issues, *Harvard Educational Review*, 48: 313–40.
- Coles, G. (1987) *The Learning Mystique*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Corbett, J. and Norwich, B. (2005) Common or specialised pedagogy? In Nind, M., Rix, J., Sheehy, K. and Simmons, K. (eds.) *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education*, 2: 13–30. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cummings, C, Dyson, A, Millward, A. (2003), in Allan, J. (ed.) *Inclusion, Participation and Democracy: What is the purpose?*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 49–66.
- Danforth, S. and Gabel, S. L. (eds., 2006) *Vital Questions Facing Disability Studies in Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Daniels, H. and Porter, J. (2007) *Learning Needs and Difficulties Among Children of Primary School Age: definition, identification, provision and issues* (Primary Review Research Survey 5/2), Cambridge: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.
- Davis, P. and Florian, L with Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Farrell, P., Hick, P., Humphrey, N., Jenkins, P., Kaplan, I., Palmer, S., Parkinson, G., Polat, F., Reason, R., Byers, R., Dee, L., Kershner, R., and Rouse, M. (2004) *Teaching Strategies and Approaches for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: A Scoping Study*. London: DfES. Research Report 516.

- DeVault, M. L., Harnischfeger, A. and Wiley, D. E. (1977) Curricula, Personnel Resources and Grouping Strategies. St. Ann, MO: ML-GROUP for Policy Studies in Education, Central Midwestern Regional Lab.
- Dewey, John. (1938) *Experience and Education*. New York: Kappa Delta Pi.
- DfES (2004) *Removing Barriers to Achievement: The Government's Strategy for SEN*. London: DfES.
- DfES (2006) *Exclusion of Black Pupils: Priority Review: Getting It, Getting It Right*. London: DfES. Available on-line on 21/06/08 at: www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/resources/PriorityReviewSept06.pdf
- Dickens, W. T. & Flynn, J. R. (2001). Heritability estimates versus large environmental effects: the IQ paradox resolved, *Psychological Review*, 108: 346–69.
- Dyson and Hick (2004) 'Mixed Difficulties', in Lewis, A. and Norwich, B. (Eds.) *Special Teaching for Special Children: A Pedagogy for Inclusion?* Maidenhead: O.U. Press.
- Dyson A, Howes A, Roberts B, (2002). A systematic review of the effectiveness of school-level actions for promoting participation by all students In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Ericsson, K. A., and Delaney, P. F. (1999). Long-term working memory as an alternative to capacity models of working memory in everyday skilled performance, in A. Miyake and P. Shah (Eds.), *Models of Working Memory: Mechanisms of Active Maintenance and Executive Control* (pp. 257–297), Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A. and Charness, N. (1994) Expert performance: its structure and acquisition, *American Psychologist*, 49(7): 725–47.
- Ferguson, P. M., Ferguson, D. L. and Taylor S. J. (eds) (1992) *Interpreting Disability: A Qualitative Reader*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Florian, L. (2008) Towards an inclusive pedagogy, in Hick, P., Kershner, R. and Farrell, P. (eds.) *Psychology for Inclusive Education: New Directions in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Fulcher, G. (1989) *Disabling Policies?* London: Falmer.
- Gallagher, D. (2004) Educational research, philosophical orthodoxy, and unfulfilled promises: the quandary of traditional research in U.S. special education. In G. Thomas & R. Pring (eds.) *Evidence Based Practice in Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gardner, H., Torff, B. & Hatch, T. (1996). The age of innocence reconsidered: preserving the best of the progressive traditions in psychology and education. In R. Olson and N. Torrance (Eds.) *The Handbook of Education and Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Goffman, E. (1968). *Asylums*. London: Pelican. (first published 1961 by Anchor-Doubleday, New York).
- Goffman, E. (1987) The moral career of the mental patient, in E. Rubington and M. S. Weinberg (eds) *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, 5th edn. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Gordon, H. (1923). Mental and scholastic tests among retarded children. Education Pamphlet 44. London: HMSO.
- Gould, S. J. (1981) *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Hart, S. (1996). *Beyond Special Needs*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Hartley, D. (2007) Personalisation: the emerging 'revised' code of education? *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(5): 629–642.
- Hegarty, S. (1993) Reviewing the literature on integration, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 8(3): 194–200.
- Hehir, T. & Latus, T. (1992). *Special education at the century's end: evolution, theory and practice since 1970*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series.
- Herrnstein, R.J. and Murray, C. (1994) *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hick, P. (2005) Still missing out: minority ethnic communities and special educational needs, in Richardson, B. (ed.) *Tell It Like It Is: How our schools fail Black children*: 134–139. Stoke: Trentham.



xlviii Editor's Introduction

- Hick, P., Visser, J. and MacNab, N. (2007) Education and Social Exclusion, in Abrams, D., Christian, J. and Gordon, D. (eds.) *Multi-professional Handbook of Social Exclusion*, 6: 95–114. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Holt, J. (1964) *How Children Fail*. New York: Pitman Publishing Company.
- Holt, J. (1977) *Instead of education: ways to help people do things better*. London: Penguin Books.
- Howe, M. J. A. (1990). *The origins of exceptional abilities*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Johnson, M. (1993) Integration, Italian style, *Education*, 18 June: 469.
- Johnson, D. D. and Pearson, P. D. (1975) Skills management systems: a critique, *Reading Teacher*, 28: 757–65.
- Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P. et al. (2005). *The impact of population inclusivity in schools on student outcomes*. Research Evidence in Education Library: 87. London, EPPI-Centre, Institution of Education, University of London.
- Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (2005). *Special education: What it is and why we need it*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
- Kugelmas, J. (2007) Constructivist views of learning: implications for inclusive education, in Florian, L. (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, 20: 272–279. London: SAGE.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Leyden, G (1978). The process of reconstruction: an overview, in B. Gillham *Reconstructing Educational Psychology*. London: Croom Helm.
- Lindsay, G., Pathier, S. & Strand, S. (2006) *Special educational needs and ethnicity: Issues of over- and under-representation*. RR 757. Nottingham: DfES.
- London, P. (1972) The end of ideology in behaviour modification. *American Psychologist*, 27: 913–920.
- Lunt, I. and B. Norwich (1999) *Can effective schools be inclusive schools?* London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Macpherson, W. (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry* (London, The Stationery Office), cited in Gillborn, D. (2005) Education policy as an act of white supremacy: whiteness, critical race theory and education reform, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20 (4): 485–505.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973) Testing for competence rather than for ‘intelligence’. *American Psychologist*, 28, 1–14.
- McClelland, D. C., Baldwin, A.L., Bronfenbrenner, U. & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1958) *Talent and Society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Meekosha, H. and Jacobowicz, A. (1996) Disability, participation, representation and social justice, in C. Christensen and F. Rizvi (eds) *Disability and the Dilemmas of Education and Justice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Midwinter, E. (1977) The professional-lay relationship: a Victorian legacy, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 18: 101–13.
- Mittler, P. (2000) *Working towards inclusive education : social contexts*. London: Fulton.
- Miles, S. and Ahuja, A. (2007) Learning from difference: sharing international experiences of developments in inclusive education, in Florian, L. (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, 10: 131–145. London: SAGE.
- Morley, L and Rassool, N. (1999) *School effectiveness : fracturing the discourse*. London: Falmer.
- Nes, K. (2004) Quality versus Equality? Inclusion Politics in Norway at Century’s End, in Ware, L. (ed.) *Ideology and the Politics of (In)Exclusion*, 8:125–140. New York: Peter Lang.
- Newcomer, P.L. and Hammill, D. D. (1975) ITPA and academic achievement, *Reading Teacher*, 28: 731–42.
- O’Brien, J. & Forest, M. (1989). *Action for Inclusion: how to improve schools by welcoming children with special needs into regular classrooms*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.





- Offord, D.R., Chmura Kraemer, H., Kazdin, A. E., Jensen, P.S., Harrington, R. and Gardner, J.S. (1999) Lowering the burden of suffering: monitoring the benefits of clinical, targeted and universal approaches (pp 293–310). In: D.P. Keating and C. Hertzman *Developmental health and the wealth of nations: social, biological and educational dynamics*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ofsted (2004) *Special educational needs and disability: towards inclusive schools* (HMI 2276). London: Ofsted.
- Ofsted (2006) *Inclusion: does it matter where pupils are taught? Provision and outcomes in different settings for pupils with learning difficulties and disabilities*. (HMI 2535) London: OFSTED
- Rawls, J. (1972) *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Reid, K. & Valle, J. (2005). The discursive practice of learning disability: implications for instruction and parent-school relations. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 62–78
- Reppucci, N. D. & Saunders, J. T. (1974). Social psychology of behaviour modification: problems of implementation in natural settings. *American Psychologist*, 29, 649–60.
- Rieser, R. and Mason, M. (1992, 2nd edn.) *Disability equality in the classroom: a human rights issue*. London: Disability Equality in Education.
- Rivers, I. (2001) The bullying of sexual minorities at school: its nature and long-term correlates, *Educational and Child Psychology*, 18(1): 32–46.
- Rueda, R. & Mehan, H. (1986). Met cognition and passing: strategic interactions in the lives of students with learning disabilities, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 17: 145–165.
- Rueda, R. and Mehan, H. (1986) Metacognition and passing: strategic interactions in the lives of students with learning disabilities, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 17: 145–65.
- Rustemier, S. (2002). *Social and educational justice: the human rights framework for Inclusion*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Sayed, Y. (2002). Exclusion and Inclusion in the South with Reference to Education: a Review of the Literature: Learning about Inclusion and Exclusion in Education: Policy and Implementation in India and South Africa. Available at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/pvty/Inex/Discpaper1.pdf>
- Scardamalia, M & Bereiter, C. (1999). Schools as knowledge-building organizations. In: D. P. Keating and C. Hertzman *Developmental health and the wealth of nations: social, biological and educational dynamics*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Schön, D.A. (1991) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Schweinhart, L. J. and Weikart, D.P. (1997) Lasting differences: the high/scope preschool curriculum comparison through age 23, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 12: 117–43.
- Senf, G. M. (1987). Learning disabilities as sociologic sponge. In S. Vaughn & C. S. Bos *Research in Learning Disabilities*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Singer, P. (1999) *A Darwinian Left: Politics, Evolution and Cooperation*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Slee, R., Weiner, G. and Tomlinson, S., Eds. (1998). *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Slee, R. (2001). 'Inclusion in practice': does practice make perfect? *Educational Review* 53(2), 113–123.
- Smith, F. (1998). *The book of learning and forgetting*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spencer, B. L. (2004). Just one more way to fail: the 'conditions of impossibility' of standardized literacy testing. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 16.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Terman, L. M. (1924) The possibilities and limitations of training, *Journal of Educational Research*, 10: 335–43.
- The Independent (2007) *Teachers Fail to Understand Black Pupils*, The Independent, 4th March 2007. Accessed on-line on 21/06/08 at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/teachers-fail-to-understand-black-pupils-charity-warns-438819.html>



I Editor's Introduction

- Thomas, G. and Loxley, A. (2007) *Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion* (2nd edition). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Tomlinson, S. (1985). The expansion of special education, *Oxford Review of Education*, 11(2): 157–65.
- U.S. Supreme Court (1954). Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka et al. appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas, 347 U.S. 483.
- de Valenzuela, J. S. (2007) Sociocultural views of learning, in Florian, (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, 21: 280–289. London: SAGE.
- Villa, R., Thousand, J. eds., (2005, 2nd edn.) *Creating an Inclusive School*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1934/1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wahlstein, D. (1997). The malleability of intelligence is not constrained by heritability. In B. Devlin, S. E. Fienberg, D. P. Resnick and K. Roeder (Eds.) *Intelligence, Genes and Success: Scientists Respond to the Bell Curve*. New York: Copernicus.
- Warnock, M. (2005) *Special Educational Needs: A New Look*. Surrey, UK: Philosophy of Education Society, IMPACT No. 11.
- Weatherley, R. & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: implementing special educational reform, *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 171–197.
- Wheeler, L. R. (1970). A trans-decade comparison of the IQs of Tennessee mountain children. In I. Al-Issa & W. Dennis (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of behaviour* (pp. 120–133). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Wood, S. & Shears, B. (1986). *Teaching Children with Severe Learning Difficulties: a Radical Re-appraisal*. London: Croom Helm.
- Wrigley, T. (2004) ‘School effectiveness’: the problem of reductionism, in *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2): 227–244.
- Wrigley, T. and Hick, P. (2009, forthcoming) Promoting Equality: Pedagogy and Policy, in Cole, M. (ed.) *Promoting Equality in Secondary Schools*. London: Continuum.
- Young, I. M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

