

Word limit: 11.000

Running head: INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Inclusive Education in the Globalization Age:
The Promise of Comparative Cultural-Historical Analysis

Alfredo J. Artiles

NCCRESt

Arizona State University

Alan Dyson

University of Manchester

This paper was published as: Artiles, A. & Dyson, A. (2005) Inclusive Education in the Globalization Age: The Promise of Comparative Cultural-Historical Analysis, in: D. Mitchell (Ed) *Contextualising Inclusive Education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives* (London, Routledge), pp. 37-62

Authors' Note: Dr. Artiles acknowledges the support of the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) under grant # H326E020003 awarded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Inclusive Education in the Globalization Age: The Promise of Comparative Cultural-Historical Analysis

Introduction

In this chapter, we wish to explore a tension which is at the heart of all attempts to trace international ‘movements’ in education. On the one hand, such movements are recognizable as international precisely because different national systems begin to show similar features at the same time. On the other hand, whenever these apparent similarities are examined in detail, they tend to dissolve into the local forms and practices which characterise different national contexts. Inclusive education clearly is one such international movement, contributing, as it does, a significant dimension to the education policies of countries across the world and supported, as it is, by international declarations and international organizations (UNESCO, 1994, UNESCO, 1999, UNESCO, 2001). There is, therefore, a very real sense in which inclusive education constitutes what one group of commentators has called ‘a global agenda’ (Pijl et al., 1997). At the same time, however, it is equally clear that the forms of educational practice that are labeled as ‘inclusive education’ have a strongly local flavor. The inclusion efforts of the affluent western democracies, where well-resourced segregated forms of special education are being merged with equally-well-resourced regular education seem to be quite different from those of many economically-poorer countries where special education has never been fully developed and where regular education is desperately lacking in resources. This is, of course, quite apart from the differences in the scope and definition of special education in different countries or the exclusion and marginalization of different groups of learners in different countries and regions.

The question of whether inclusive education is best understood as a global or a local phenomenon cannot, we suggest, be separated from the location of that phenomenon at a particular historical moment. If inclusive education is global, that is because it has emerged in a period which is characterized by globalization in many aspects of human activity. And if the global nature of inclusive education cannot quite obscure its local flavors, that is because of the ambiguous nature of globalization itself.

Globalization refers to the tendency for human activities which occur at places geographically remote from each other nonetheless to interact with each other so that local practices – in terms, say, of culture, politics or economics - become overlain, or are entirely swept aside, by global patterns. Globalization in this sense is multi-faceted, though there are three aspects that might demand particular attention (Suárez-Orozco, 2001): the development of communication technologies that have changed modern understandings of time and space as people increasingly have instantaneous access to events that are unfolding on the other side of the globe; the consolidation of regional and global markets and the emergence of information-knowledge economies; and an unparalleled mass migration, mostly from developing to developed countries.

The implication of globalization from a policy perspective is that countries are likely to be well informed about how policy questions are handled elsewhere and at the same time cannot develop their own policies without reference to how global developments impact on their own situation. The effects of this global interactivity are not necessarily benevolent. For instance, it is creating

paradoxical conditions for the consolidation of democratic systems, particularly in developing nations. In the Latin American region there is evidence about both the strengthening of economies and a decline in investment in social programs—the emerging outcome is that poverty levels during the 1990s remained virtually unchanged while equity indicators in the education sector reflect troubling trends (e.g., differential access to school, school completion and grade repetition particularly for marginalized groups) (Arnové & Torres, 1999; Reimers, 1991). More generally, global economic conditions are widely seen as inhibiting the implementation of the Education for All agenda in economically poorer countries (Forum, 2000). Indeed, education systems are notably vulnerable to these globalizing trends. As national markets become consolidated into regional and global ones, the level of investment in education is determined by global trends as much as by local decisions. At the same time, pressure builds on education systems across the world to deliver a workforce that is appropriately equipped to service these markets and educational provision becomes shaped by these ends.

Within this situation, inclusive education can be seen as both a response and a contribution to global economic and other trends. This is true in two senses: first, it is supported by a globalized discourse of rights and entitlements; second, it is linked to global economic developments:

The discourse of inclusion

Daniels and Garner (1999), reviewing the international development of inclusive education, make the point that inclusive education is essentially based on a rights discourse :

The concept of ‘inclusion’ is by no means new...its roots have been sown by a succession of educationalists and philosophers throughout the twentieth century – but it is the recent widespread and increasingly vociferous demand to establish individual rights as a central component in policy-making that has provided the impetus to place inclusion firmly on the agenda of social change.

(Daniels & Garner, 1999), p.3)

Such a discourse lends itself easily to international declarations. In 1994, delegates from 92 governments and 25 international organizations, meeting under the aegis of UNESCO, adopted the Salamanca Statement on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994) – a document which has gone on to exert a powerful influence on education policies across the world. The Statement sets out a commitment to inclusive education in ringing tones:

We believe and proclaim that:

- every child has a fundamental right to education, and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning,
- every child has unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs,
- education systems should be designed and educational programmes implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs,
- those with special educational needs must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them within a childcentred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs,
- regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system.

(UNESCO, 1994), pp.viii-ix)

This formulation bears some analysis. Its extraordinary power - and its world-wide influence - comes to a significant extent from its ability to deal in absolutes. In part, this comes from its reliance on a notion of children's rights which is, not surprisingly, grounded in other United Nations declarations – the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 1990 commitment to the right of education for all, the 1993 Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (UNESCO, 1994), p.vii). In part, however, it comes from an extension of this absolute approach from questions of rights into questions of how those rights might be delivered. The right to education slips easily into an assertion of individual learner uniqueness and thence into assertions that education systems should be designed around uniqueness, that children with special educational needs 'must' attend regular schools and that inclusively-oriented schools produce a range of educational and social benefits. In other words, the universalising discourse is based not simply on its assertion of universal human rights, but on the universalisation of theories of human difference, policy prescriptions and largely unsubstantiated empirical claims. It is but a short step from here to asserting that the forms of inclusive education which are desirable and effective in one national context must be equally desirable and effective in all such contexts.

Inclusive education and global economics

Despite the salience of rights within its discourse, inclusive education is also inextricably bound up with the need of countries to compete (or at least survive) in a global economic marketplace. As the Salamanca Statement makes clear, inclusive education is seen by UNESCO and the governments which follow the UNESCO lead as a means of 'achieving education for all' (EFA). In turn, the World Education Forum, sponsored by a range international bodies including UNESCO and the World Bank, argues that EFA is strongly linked to national economic development and hence to the world economic and political order:

...it is unacceptable that more than 113 million children have no access to primary education, 880 million adults are illiterate, gender discrimination continues to permeate education systems, and the quality of learning and the acquisition of human values and skills fall far short of the aspirations and needs of individuals and societies. Youth and adults are denied access to the skills and knowledge necessary for gainful employment and full participation in their societies. Without accelerated progress towards education for all, national and internationally agreed targets for poverty reduction will be missed, and inequalities between countries and within societies will widen.

...Education is a fundamental human right. It is the key to sustainable development and peace and stability within and among countries, and thus an indispensable means for effective participation in the societies and economies of the twenty-first century, which are affected by rapid globalization. Achieving EFA goals should be postponed no longer. The basic learning needs of all can and must be met as a matter of urgency.

(Forum, 2000), p.8

In this situation, inclusive approaches to education are essential, not simply on the basis of a notional right to participation in common social institutions, but because 'regular schools with this inclusive orientation' represent the only realistic prospect in many countries of giving marginalised learners access to educational provision of *any* kind:

There is an urgent need to adopt effective strategies to identify and include the socially, culturally and economically excluded. This requires participatory analysis of exclusion at household, community and school levels, and the development of diverse, flexible, and innovative approaches to learning and an environment that fosters mutual respect and trust.

(Forum, 2000), p.20

As one might expect in the context of globalisation, such arguments are not restricted to UNESCO, nor to economically poorer countries. As the chapter on England in this collection shows, similar links between inclusive education and economic development are made by policy-makers there. Similarly, in the USA, policy-makers routinely present their reform initiatives (in particular, the *No Child Left Behind Act*) as an attempt to include historically marginalised groups in an overall raising of standards – an attempt, moreover, which is driven by the need to make those groups economically competitive and which is explicitly linked to the global EFA initiative (see, for instance, (Paige, 2004a, Paige, 2004b).

The economic analyses which underpin these arguments are highly influential in policy terms. In a paper commissioned (significantly) by the World Bank, the disability researcher Susan Peters sets out the complex inter-connections between domestic economics, global economics, EFA and inclusive education which drive development in this field:

Financing and support of educational services for students with special needs is a primary concern for all countries, regardless of available resources. Countries of the North are experiencing constraints as well as countries of the South, albeit with vast disparities...Regardless of relative wealth, education in all countries has had to compete with other economic priorities such as health care, social welfare, and defense budgets. However, education is widely seen as a means to develop human capital, to improve economic performance, and to enhance individual capabilities and choices in order to enjoy freedoms of citizenship. The strategy of Education for All is driven by a human-rights discourse and clear economic purpose linked to development.

Within this global context, the Salamanca Statement of 1994 and a growing body of research assert that Inclusive Education is not only cost-efficient, but also cost-effective...Within education, countries are increasingly realizing the inefficiency of multiple systems of administration, organizational structures and services, and the financially unrealistic options of special schools.

(Peters, 2003), pp.4-5)

The globalizing aspect of these drivers is clear. The global economic position creates resource pressures in all countries while at the same time requiring them to develop as highly-educated a workforce as possible to enhance their national economic competitiveness. In this situation, separate educational sub-systems for different groups of learners come to seem inefficient (or, in the case of poorer countries, non-viable), while approaches which focus on educating all learners in regular schools and enhancing the quality of those schools hold out the promise of both greater efficiency and greater effectiveness.

The 'global agenda': enlightenment or conspiracy?

Looked at in this way, inclusive education is both an outcome of global economic trends and itself an instrument of the globalization of educational policy and ideology. This dual nature can

easily lead to the cynical conclusion that the high ideals of inclusion are simply a smokescreen for baser economic motives and to a deep suspicion of the international traffic in inclusion consultants spreading the word of inclusion chiefly from the economically richer western democracies to the economically poorer countries of the South. Indeed, some commentators believe they smell can smell the unpleasant odor of western cultural imperialism in this movement (Haskell, 1998).

However, globalization is not necessarily or homogeneously negative in its consequences. The effort to define rights and entitlements in ways which rally action across the world, or to learn in one country from practices and forms of provision developed elsewhere may be enormously positive in a world situation where millions of learners are unable to participate fully in current educational arrangements. The potential for negative consequences arises not from such efforts per se, but if and when the globalizing tendencies of inclusion lead us - as commentators or advocates, practitioners or policy-makers - to overlook legitimate local differences. These may be in the way rights are understood in different cultural contexts, differences in the role ascribed to education, differences in forms and processes of exclusion, or simply differences in what is practicable. Under these circumstances, universal principles and prescriptions may simply lead to a false belief that the transfer of policy and practice between contexts is anything other than hugely problematic.

Equally, the universalizing discourse of inclusive education may draw attention away from its relationship to global economic imperatives and the way these imperatives play out in different contexts. It is not self-evident that the 'human-rights discourse and clear economic purpose' to which Peters refers are everywhere and always compatible. Certainly, the economics of the relationship between education and economic development are hugely contested (Robinson, 1997, Wolf, 2002) as is the question of whether the aims of education can be reduced to economics in the first place. In inclusive education, there is the further complexity of the economic purposes of education for learners who may never become highly productive in economic terms.

None of this is intended as a straightforward critique of inclusive education in the style of some of its self-professed opponents and sceptics (see, for instance, Garner & Gains, 2000, Kauffman & Hallahan, 1995). To ask whether inclusive education is 'right' or 'wrong', whether it 'works' or 'does not work' is, we suggest, to miss the point. Inclusion is, as Booth (Booth, 1995) points out, a slippery concept that means different things in different systemic, socio-economic and cultural contexts. If the common language of inclusion is not simply over-ride local concerns and conditions, the global inclusion 'movement' must engage in dialogue with – and be engaged in dialogue by – the local and the context-specific. For this reason, we suggest that those who wish to understand the global phenomenon of inclusive education need to do so from a perspective which takes due account of context. In the remainder of this chapter we will describe and argue for just such a perspective.

Comparative inclusive education: Toward a cultural historical map of the dialectics of the local and the global

Arnove (1999) argues for a comparative perspective on education and identifies three dimensions that characterize such approach, namely scientific, pragmatic, and global. A comparative

education model is concerned with the generation of knowledge and theory building characteristic of all scientific fields; the premise is that all sciences are comparative in nature. From this perspective, comparative analyses enable researchers to understand variations and identify patterns in the ways in which educational systems around the globe are shaped by societal, political, economic, and cultural forces (Bray & Thomas, 1995). The pragmatic dimension aims to “discover what can be learned that will contribute to improved policy and practice at home” (Arnové, 1999, p. 6). This means comparative analyses enable nations to engage in processes of knowledge transfer (what some called “lending and borrowing”) to improve their educational systems. The global perspective, in turn, contributes to an understanding of local educational processes as shaped by proximal and distal forces. As explained above, globalization reminds us of the international interdependencies that affect local events.

The contemporary proliferation of inclusive education suggests researchers and policymakers can benefit from comparative analyses for scientific, pragmatic, and global purposes. Comparative analyses enable us to examine fundamental aspects such as the definition of inclusive education that is used in a given context, the purposes and functions that inclusion serves in the target context, and the historical (global and local) precursors that shaped the development of an inclusive education system. In addition, a comparative analytic framework needs to acknowledge the interlocking of general and special education and it must examine such fusion as embedded in political and cultural arenas. In this vein, aspects of analytic interest include the power and status of groups being served in and excluded from education, the social locations of advocates and detractors of inclusive education, and the consequences of inclusion for all individuals involved (Artiles, 2003; Artiles & Larsen, 1998).

The comparative cultural historical framework we outline in this chapter enables us to organize systematically the multiple aspects of interest in such way that is sensitive to local conditions yet grounded in broad parameters that facilitate comparisons across cultural contexts. The framework encompasses four dimensions as follows: participants, culture, history, and outcomes.

Participants dimension

This dimension is concerned with the participants in the inclusive education system. Comparative analyses of inclusion must begin with a description of the grouping dimensions of importance to local actors and the inclusion movement. This description should include first the target group(s) purportedly benefiting from the inclusive education system or model. Are these participants individuals with disabilities? Are these groups defined by categorical classifications or are groups defined by the more fluid notion of special needs education? If a categorical system of disabilities is used, which disabilities are being targeted for inclusion? How are these categories defined and operationalised? What are the other groups of participants expected to support the inclusion of the target groups?

It is equally important to describe these populations in terms of key additional demographic information such as socioeconomic background, race and/or ethnicity, language, gender, and religion. These demographic descriptions need to include the families of participants as well. Lastly, the same descriptors should be used to characterize the professionals and staff working in the inclusive education model or system. It is desirable to describe the professional participants

in terms of their qualifications (e.g., highest degree attained, certification, participation in mentoring and professional development programs) and other indicators of quality.

Cultural dimension

The second dimension focuses on culture. This is indeed a challenging domain to address in comparative analyses as culture is considered one of the most complex constructs in the English language (Williams, 1983). The view of culture that informs our framework aims to address the limits of traditional definitions and thus, we endorse a multidimensional framework. For this purpose, we draw from cultural historical theory (Cole, 1996; Rogoff, 2003). Culture is defined as “an historically unique configuration of the residue of the collective problem solving activities of a social group in its efforts to survive and prosper within its environment(s)” (Gallego, Cole, & LCHC, 2001, p. 12).

From a cultural historical perspective, culture embodies three constitutive aspects, namely *regulative, interpretive, and instrumental* (Erickson, 2001; Gallego & Cole & LCHC, 2001). We typically envision culture as a cohesive system of rules and prescribed roles that mediate the actions and emotions of a cultural community. From a *regulative* perspective, the patterning that characterizes a group’s identity is foregrounded. That is, a key assumption of the regulative aspect is that cultures are cohesive. For a system of regulations to work, a group must agree on the need for and content of the rules. Moreover, the group is required to pass on information about this regulative dimension to newcomers so that cultural continuity is ensured. The byproduct of this logic is that it is in a group’s best interest to reproduce its culture and the implicit regulative model—indeed, a central premise of this dimension is that culture must reproduce its legacies in order to survive (Erickson, 2001).

The regulative dimension of culture helps us define the model of inclusion that is being implemented in a given locale. This is no easy task as there is a variety of inclusive models being implemented even within the same nation (Dyson, 2001). Models, therefore, vary in core aspects such as the official definition of inclusion, the stated goals of the general education system, the stated vision of an inclusive society that supports the model, and the regulations and norms that govern the organization and administration of inclusive schools. To take one small but telling example, the French government has recently published a bill proposing the banning outward symbols of religious faith - including the Moslem headscarf - in public schools. Such a move is, one press report states, seen by the government as raising no issues of inclusion or exclusion because,

The principle of secularism, which expresses values of respect, dialogue and tolerance, is at the heart of France's republican identity.

(reporter & Dakroub, 2004)

However, in England, where there is no equivalent principle of secularism and where inclusion is taken (not least by government) to imply particular sensitivity to ethnic, cultural and religious differences, this move has been met with widespread incomprehension amongst educational liberals. In this respect, the models of inclusion in two otherwise similar countries derive from quite different cultural norms.

Culture also embodies an *interpretive* aspect. Some scholars argue culture is located in people’s subjective understandings of the world, that is, in the values, beliefs, knowledge, and emotions

used to interpret events (Eagleton, 2000). As Erickson (2001) explains, we “live in webs of meaning, caring, and desire that we create and that create us” (Erickson, 2001, p. 38). Individuals are apprenticed to ways of interpreting the world in their cultural communities. Note that the weight of cohesion (i.e., group patterning) and reproduction is still emphasized in this aspect of culture as it is implicitly suggested people use their group’s ways of interpreting the world to mediate their actions and ultimately ensure the survival of their culture. An important insight from this aspect of culture is that people navigate the regulative streams of culture by using cultural filters (values, beliefs) to decode and interpret the world.

This dimension compels us to understand how actors involved in the implementation of inclusive education systems make sense of their labor. The interpretive dimension focuses on the meaning making processes that mediate local actors’ efforts to forge an inclusive education culture. Note actors interpret and make sense of the regulative aspects of the local inclusion education model through the beliefs, values, and expectations that each brings to the work; after all, participants are engaged in biographical projects that are shaped by race, gender, class, and language background, among others. This means analyses should document participants’ beliefs to gain deeper understandings of their interpretive processes. This information will enable researchers to explain how, despite the existence of official definitions of inclusion, there still are multiple and often partial understandings of the program.

Culture also embodies an *instrumental* aspect that infuses a dynamic spin to the understanding of culture described thus far. In fact, this notion enables us to gain a deeper understanding of the indivisibility of the regulative, interpretive and instrumental aspects of culture. Culture is indexed in the practices in which people participate. The notion of practice has gained considerable currency in the last two decades in the social sciences as a means to transcend the longstanding dualisms between structure *v.* agency, nature *v.* nurture, or individual *v.* social. Indeed, the work of scholars such as Bourdieu, Foucault, Giddens, Scribner, and Lave has enabled us to tackle these dichotomies through the adoption of practice as the unit of analysis. Giddens explains the use of *practice* as the unit of analysis assists us to substitute “the central notion of *duality of structure*. By the duality of structure, I mean the essential recursiveness of social life, as constituted in social practices: structure is both medium and outcome of the reproduction of practices, and ‘exists’ in the generating moments of this constitution” (as cited in Cole, 1996, p.p. 138-139) (emphases in original). An implication of the central role of practice is that the nature of ethnic groups, for example, as culture bearing communities should be regarded as an outcome of people’s engagement with practices as opposed to a definitional feature of such groups (Barth, 1969).

The instrumental aspect of culture helps us envision the tension that inhabits the stability of culture; that is, the dialectic of production and reproduction. The pressure to reproduce culture in any situation stems from the presence of established regulative systems and from the fact that individuals enter social encounters with a toolkit or repertoires of practice appropriated through participation in their cultural groups (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003). Hence, analyses of inclusion cannot focus solely on the regulative aspects of inclusion programs, participants’ assumptions or beliefs about inclusion, or even on how individuals’ beliefs affect the ways in which they engage with inclusive programs. This linear thinking artificially separates individuals’ cognitions from context characteristics; sometimes it even implies that group membership determines people’s

ways of thinking and acting (e.g., learning styles linked to ethnic heritage) and thus, it implicitly suggests culture is stagnant. Although the instrumental aspect of culture does not deny people's proclivities to use certain repertoires of cultural practices, it also requires researchers focus on individuals' history of participation in cultural practices; that is, the focus is on processes of change.

This means cultural historical analyses of inclusion need to document how people participate in inclusive practices as they use their cultural toolkits in their attempts to enact the vision of inclusion that structures the program, and as they cope with the immediate demands of the tasks they are trying to accomplish. When individuals are committed to the vision of inclusion that informs their program and if they have adequate resources to achieve the program goals, it is likely their efforts will contribute to reproduce the envisioned culture of inclusive education.

Let us assume, for example, a school community commits to create an inclusive education program that stresses placement of students with special needs in general education classrooms; features of the program include some supports (teacher aids) and adaptations (basic curriculum and instructional modifications). A cultural historical analysis would require the observation of people's participation in key activities (defined theoretically or through consensus building procedures) of the inclusion program. In addition, the analysis would be informed by an understanding of how participants' beliefs on key domains (e.g., inclusive education, teaching, learning, special needs) mediate their participation in the program's practices. In other words, the analytic focus is on people's engagement with the activities of the inclusion program (i.e., cultural practices) because culture "is experienced in local, face-to-face interactions that are locally constrained and heterogeneous with respect to both 'culture as a whole' and the parts of the entire toolkit experienced by an given individual" (Cole & Engestrom, 1993, p. 15). Over time, a culture is crafted to instantiate the inclusion program—i.e., participants develop shared understandings of what it means to engage in inclusive practices, traditions emerge, the coordinated use or rules and roles are agreed upon, and regularities crystallize over time to constitute the cultural identity of this inclusive education program (Rogoff, 2003). People's participation in these practices contributes to the reproduction of such culture.

However, there is always considerable unpredictability in the social ecology of life and thus, culture is not fate (Erickson, 2001). Again, the notion of practice as the unit of analysis allows us to understand that social encounters always afford people the possibility to counter cultural reproduction or innovate traditions. Specifically, as people navigate the regularities of a cultural community, tensions arise between the traditional cultural practices and the emergent goals that are shaped by the specific circumstances surrounding local events. Individuals negotiate these tensions by using their agency (use cultural resources) to adapt to ecological factors, resist local demands, or renew cultural legacies. It is important, therefore, to understand people's use of cultural rules and meaning making processes as always mediated, not only by their individual toolkits and the cultural norms of their community, but also by the immediate contexts and ecological circumstances in which events take place. This is how the dialectics of cultural stability is crafted, how cultural production and reproduction co-exist.

Following with the aforementioned example of "inclusion as placement" (Dyson, 2001), it is possible a practitioner realizes, while reviewing with a colleague a reading lesson plan for special needs students, that their inclusion model did not examine critically curriculum and

instructional barriers that could stifle their efforts. She also becomes aware the current inclusion program does not include accountability provisions to ensure special needs students attain at comparable levels than their nondisabled peers. These insights obtained as she planned a reading lesson prompt her to question some of the basic postulates of the school's inclusion program. As a result, the school community embarks on a process of redefining their vision of inclusive education. This hypothetical example illustrates the value of using practice as the unit of analysis because it assists us to understand how people's participation in cultural practices can contribute to both, cultural reproduction and change.

Note also that the dialectics of the stability of culture shapes the construction of a culture's cohesion; that is, cultural patterning and within-group diversity. Just as distinctive boundaries can be drawn between cultural groups, there are important variations in the ways in which people participate in their community's practices (Rogoff, 2003). The cohesion of culture, then, refers to the fact that people within a cultural group learn differing sets and subsets of culture (Barth, 1969; Erickson, 2001). Indeed, one of the most fascinating features of culture is the construction of its cohesion—i.e., how a culture gets distributed, similarly and differently within and across groups and within and between generations (Erickson, 2001). Like culture's stability, the cohesion of culture is crafted in the moment-to-moment history of events. As Varenne and McDermott (1999) explain, "... the coherence of a culture is crafted from the partial and mutually dependent knowledge of each person caught in the process. It is constituted, in the long run, by the work they do together" (p. 137). Through such processes, within-group diversity emerges in every culture as individuals negotiate emergent goals and cope with local demands to reproduce and innovate cultural legacies. This shift from individuals as mere carriers and reproducers of cultural codes to active creative agents and producers of culture is a welcome emphasis in contemporary culture theory particularly in complex stratified multicultural societies where resistance might play a key role (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998; Holland & Lave, 2001; Varenne & McDermott, 1999).

This facet of culture is an important source of insight since it affords researchers an analytic tool to explain that although the model of "inclusion as placement" can be described as a cohesive whole, there are also participants (certain parents or teachers) who have different understandings of inclusive education or perhaps that even oppose the inclusion program. As explained above, the variability within the cultural community of this inclusion model can be crafted during the negotiated interactions between people that bring different commitments or understandings of the community's vision.

Furthermore, the role of *power* is crucial to an understanding of culture. As Erickson (2001) suggests, culture's webs of meaning and practices "also hang in social gravity. Within the webs all our activity is vested in the weight of history; that is, in a social world of inequality all movement is up or down" (p. 38). The role of power reminds us the analysis of culture should always be grounded in a relational and comparative framework (Holland & Lave, 2001; Rosaldo, 1993). This is an important insight for at least two reasons. First, it emphasizes the need to identify actors' perspectives to make visible what otherwise would be regarded as "natural." The assumption is that an actor's perspective is always invisible since it is the cultural medium through which events are experienced. Critics of traditional social science practices, for example, have identified how although implicit Eurocentric assumptions permeate understandings of

human development and culture, such suppositions are never made visible (Rosaldo, 1993). For example, the expectations, biases, evaluative criteria, or beliefs of European fieldworkers or observers are never acknowledged in descriptions or studies of Asian, African, or Pacific Islander cultural communities (Said, 1979; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). The result is that such non-European groups are depicted as exotic or “different;” hence, the Eurocentric gaze is deemed “natural.”

The second reason is that the power dimension of culture enables us to understand how cultural boundaries—i.e., the objective presence of cultural difference—can be transformed into cultural borders, which is defined as a social construct that is political in origin. Through such process power is exercised because actors with differential access to power or who possess high-prestige cultural knowledge engage in the politics of difference as they turn boundaries into borders. From this perspective, the notion of difference is the product of political processes. As Minow (1990) explains, difference,

after all, is a comparative term. It implies a reference: different from whom? (...) But the point of comparison is often unstated. (...) If we identify the unstated points of comparison necessary to the idea of difference, we will then examine the relationships between people who have and people who lack the power to assign the label of difference. If we explore the environmental context that makes some trait stand out and some people seem not to fit in, we will have the opportunity to reconsider how and for what ends we construct and manage the environment. The difference will no longer seem empirically discoverable, consisting of traits inherent in the “different person.” Instead, perceptions of difference can become clues to broader problems of social policy and human responsibility (pp. 22-23).

The dimension of power, therefore, reinforces the adoption of a unit of analysis that bridges agency and structure, it compels us to use a micro-macro gaze so that we envision events “as a hybrid of the local and the socio-historical levels of analysis” (Gallego, Cole, & LCHC, 2001, p. 957). Attention to power can afford important insights that are not typically addressed in the conventional scholarship in education. The role of certain markers of difference in the history of a given society or community such as race, class, gender, or language background can help researchers contextualize further how power issues may mediate the implementation of inclusive education models. Questions such as the following can enable researchers begin to explore power issues: Is there silence about certain issues, groups, or practices?, what are the ideological underpinnings of inclusion goals and means?, what does it mean to be included for various groups in the target community?, when do certain types of difference count, under what conditions and in what ways and for what reasons? (Varenne & McDermott, 1999).

Temporal dimension

Level of analysis is a key aspect of this framework and a temporal dimension allows us to address it. Work on the temporal distribution of culture across time scales can assist us in this regard (Cole, 1996; Dien, 2000; Lemke, 2000). It is argued, for example, the role of culture in human development can be studied at the cultural historical level that gives us access to the history of a given group or community. The focus is on the distinctive patterns that characterize a community’s identity. However, cultural processes can also be examined at the individual level in terms of the life history trajectories of members of a given group. Interestingly, culture

mediates processes at yet another temporal scale, the so called moment-to-moment history of events or the microgenetic scale. A key assumption is that these temporal scales are embedded and mutually influence one another. From this perspective, we can characterize this multilevel temporal model as a *temporal heterarchy*—i.e., the “interdependence of processes at very different timescales . . . of an organizational hierarchy in a complex self-organizing system” (Lemke, 2000, p. 280). It is important to note that the temporal levels unfold simultaneously (Scribner, 1985).

This dimension enables researchers to select the temporal scale at which an analysis is conducted. This is an important advantage of the model as it allows access to multiple levels of analysis of inclusive education, from the scrutiny of moment-to-moment interactions between teachers and students to the evolution of the cultural history of entire programs. Moreover, analyses can be conducted diachronically or synchronically, depending on the needs and goals of the researchers.

Outcomes dimension

The outcomes of the inclusive education movement need also to be described. To some extent, this can be done within standard taxonomies of educational outcomes. However, there are two additional levels of complexity in the case of inclusive education. First, there is the potential contradiction between the outcomes that are intended by practitioners and policy-makers on the one hand, and those that are actually generated for learners on the other. The intended outcomes emerge out of processes of cultural reproduction – the existing understandings of inclusion and the purposes of education. The actual outcomes, however, have the potential to feed back into processes of production as they confront practitioners with realities which create new demands. It is probably true to say, however, that the efforts of policy-makers, practitioners, advocates and researchers have been weighted heavily towards what professionals intend to happen for learners rather than towards robust evaluations of what outcomes actually materialize (see, for instance, (Dyson et al., 2002c).

Second, both the intended and actual outcomes of inclusive education are complex and multi-dimensional. For instance, the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth & Ainscow, 2002) which is used as an indicator system in a range of countries, views these outcomes in terms of the enhanced participation of all learners in the cultures, curricula and communities of their schools. This goes well beyond the simple ‘integration’ of learners with disabilities into regular schools and begs the question of whether these forms of participation are outcomes in their own right or are simply mediating processes leading to more standard academic and social learner outcomes. However, the Salamanca Statement that we examined earlier, goes further still, talking in terms of a wide range of outcomes for communities and for society as a whole. Indeed, the economic imperatives which, we have argued, underpin to some extent the inclusive education movement would seem to require that the economic impacts of inclusion are considered alongside those that are more personal or social.

Using the framework

It is not our intention to suggest that the framework we have proposed should be applied mechanistically to the analysis of inclusive education in particular contexts. It guides, but does not replace, contextual sensitivity and interpretive skill. Nonetheless, it does, we believe, have

considerable heuristic power and an example of how this works might be helpful. Since this collection is primarily concerned with country studies, our example is drawn from a lower system level – that of the school.

One of us (Dyson) has recently completed a study with colleagues of the development of inclusive practices in twenty-five schools in three English local education authorities (LEAs)¹. The study involved a collaborative action research process between university researchers and teams of leaders and teachers in each of the schools, lasting for some three years. Each of the school teams identified some aspect of practice in the school that was less inclusive than it would have liked, took action to develop practice in a more inclusive direction and monitored the impact of that action. The findings of the full study are being reported elsewhere (e.g., see, (Ainscow et al., 2004b, Ainscow et al., 2001, Dyson, 2003, Dyson et al., 2002a, Dyson et al., 2002b, Dyson et al., 2003, Gallannaugh & Dyson, 2003). However, for our purposes, it is sufficient to focus on a single school – Broadmeadow Primary School.

Broadmeadow educated children aged 5 to 11 coming predominantly from low-income, white families living on a large social housing estate. In common with all the other schools in the study, the Broadmeadow team were invited to identify for themselves the aspects of the school's practice that were less inclusive than they wished. By implication, of course, they had to define what they meant by 'inclusion'. In doing this, they were offered some guidance by the relatively recent national commitment to the development of an inclusive education system (DfEE, 1997). This guidance, however, was deceptive. Although the government drew upon the discourse of rights and even aligned itself with the principles of the Salamanca Statement, it adopted what it described as a 'pragmatic not dogmatic' approach which accepted that some children could not be educated in mainstream schools, foresaw a continuing role for special schools and laid down few if any prescriptions about what inclusive education would look like in terms of school and classroom practices.

Government ministers at the time also tended to elide the issue of including children with disabilities and special needs with the issue of 'social inclusion', by which they meant the wider problems of low attainment, unemployment and disaffection which were reckoned to afflict a sizeable minority of the population (Blunkett, 1999). Moreover, at the same time the government was pursuing a so-called 'standards agenda' which focused heavily on driving up levels of measured attainment and institutional performance through a process of national target-setting and high levels of school accountability. This placed considerable premium on the attainments of children who were just below the borderline level set by national targets. Since the target was for 80% of children in primary schools to reach the specified level, the borderline group was effectively those whose attainments were somewhat below the national mean, but not those with the very lowest levels of attainment.

In this context, the Broadmeadow team decided that their focus should not be on children formally identified as having special educational needs (SEN). In the view of the head teacher, the school had already made a major commitment to these students and they were, therefore,

¹ *Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools*, funded by ESRC (L139251005) as part of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme and undertaken by teams from Christchurch University College Canterbury, the University of Manchester and the University of Newcastle.

well provided for and as fully 'included' as was possible. Instead, the team focused on children in the 'borderline' group:

They [the target group]'re underachievers. They're actually children of the broadly average ability but who are underachieving. Whereas our SEN children on the whole they haven't got the average learning potential – they're below average, and some are significantly below average.

The explicit aim was to enable these children to reach the national standard. As the head teacher commented:

It's all about level 4s [the national standard] really, isn't it?

The 'borderline' children, the head felt, presented particular problems:

We're always playing catch up with some children, but it's too late. The catch-up's coming too late. And the sort of catch-up we're doing, it goes some way, but it's building bricks – it's like building a wall isn't it? And the top row's going to be very wobbly if you haven't got the bottom right. And some of those early layers of bricks are either missing completely, or they're very insecure. And this is obviously impacting. And it's the barrier – it's what's stopping these children attaining what they should attain for children of their age.

The origins of these difficulties were understood as lying in the home, with parents who failed to provide books and reading opportunities for their children. There was, teachers told us,

...a loss of family life and the talking that goes on in it.

Specifically, children suffered from a language deficit acquired in the home:

...the children we take in particularly have problems with language. Because I think their first-hand experience is quite little...I think their lack of experience with language, perhaps at home, already has created a problem when they come into school.

In addition, this lack of preparedness for schooling was said to be exacerbated in the case of boys by the existence of what was variously described as a local 'job' or 'northern lad' culture, within which boys were expected to behave in stereotypical ways and influenced each other adversely as they grew older. As one teacher told us:

I think so far as language skills are concerned, there's a difference between boys and girls – no matter what we all might say...Female language centres are more highly developed, aren't they?...I think girls' language development is much quicker than boys'...I think schools are set up to be the sort of places girls would like, more than boys. Boys want to rush around and do exciting things and not sit there reading and writing – we make them do it. I mean it isn't a natural boy thing to do, is it, at that age?

In response to this situation, the team decided to shift the emphasis of teaching in the school from a largely instructional mode to one that made good some of the children's supposed deficits and allowed them to capitalise on their existing skills. Instead, therefore, of placing more emphasis on the technical skills of writing, they offered their students a range of practical experiences as a precursor to writing, encouraged them to talk about these experiences in collaborative groups and engaged them in what they called 'thinking skills' activities. The intention was that they would build up a sound experiential and cognitive base – the foundations of the 'wall' – out of which writing would flow more naturally. As the school's deputy head teacher explained:

...if you think of like a triangle or pinnacle thing – at the end of it we would like to see, from the school’s point of view, a specific improvement in attainment in some areas [such as] writing. But we felt that the opportunity with this project would be to influence kind of a cultural change, in staff as well. And we could use it to look at teaching styles, learning styles, expectations, but with the focus that all these strategies and ideas towards thinking, a whole host of things, will benefit writing.

Applying the framework

This mention of cultural change brings us back to our proposed cultural-historical framework. Although it is not possible here to develop a full analysis of what was happening in this school, some of the dimensions of such an analysis are already clear. For instance, the chosen temporal scale for the analysis is the cultural historical level as the focus is on the transformation of school culture(s). However, it would be possible to analyze, in addition to the school culture(s), processes of change at the individual level by crafting a case study on the learning trajectories of a particular “type” of student and/or teacher(s).

As it happens, we know relatively little about the teachers themselves as individuals (since this was not a focus of the study). However, we do know that, as a profession, teachers in England are graduates (and therefore academically successful learners themselves), that they are relatively highly-trained, that they earn well above the national average wage and that they are regarded as being members of the middle classes. This information may be important if the target temporal scale of the analysis was concerned with the individual level, in this case focusing on teachers to understand how the teachers in this school interpret and respond to the challenges presented by the academically less-successful children they teach and the predominantly working class community served by the school.

Attention to the participants dimension of our framework suggests the target group supposedly benefiting from the school’s attempt to become more inclusive is not the children with disabilities and/or special educational needs who frequently form the focus of such efforts, but children on the borderline of the national standard in measured attainment. We also know that this identification derives from the de facto requirement on schools to categorise their students in terms of where they stand in relation to national assessments – those who will easily achieve the national standard, those who cannot achieve the national standard and those who are on the borderline. However, this categorisation is cross-cut by other, perhaps more deeply rooted systems. Hence, we see teachers making a series of distinctions: between underachievers with ‘learning potential’ and children with special educational needs who do not have ‘learning potential’; between girls with highly-developed ‘language centres’ and boys with poorly-developed ‘language centres’; and between the ‘children we take in’ who have language problems because of their home background and some implicit ideal group of children whose language develops rapidly in ‘supportive’ homes.

We know that the ‘culture’ of the school is something of which the teachers were struggling to become aware in order that they might change it. We see the dialectic between cultural production and reproduction that arises as old practices prove inadequate to meeting new demands and as the teachers who participate in the school culture(s) seek to develop new practices. However, we also see the mediating force of power at work within and upon the

culture(s) of the school. There is the most obvious form of power exerted by national government through the demands and accountabilities it imposes on the school. Significantly, however, this is not the simple power of command. The demands of national government are internalised by teachers so that the national system of attainment targets transforms itself into a quasi-categorisation system that becomes a way of ‘seeing’ the schools’ students.

Moreover, the accounts which teachers give us of their students, the difficulties they experience, the origin of those difficulties in family and area and the likely impacts of different approaches to teaching are not accounts of some objective reality. These accounts themselves are cultural products which, amongst other things, demonstrate the power of the school to represent its students in particular ways and to use these representations as a means of rationalising actions in respect of those students. In this sense, the framework’s multilevel nature allows us to understand the interplay between structural forces (as represented in the school narratives of students located at the cultural historical level) and individual trajectories at the ontogenetic level (as indexed by teachers’ uses of such narratives to interpret student performance in daily interactions).

Although this study was not truly longitudinal, we could nonetheless see how these accounts and the cultures from which they emerged might change over time. The new demands that the teachers were facing arose at particular points in time; these demands embodied complex tensions in the stability (reproduction *v.* production) and cohesion (group patterns *v.* within group diversity) dimensions of culture. The new demands arose as the result of multiple events: the intensification of the standards agenda by the incoming ‘New’ Labour government in 1997; its introduction at the same time of a rather prescriptive national literacy strategy; a mini-crisis in 2000 about the apparent failure of the literacy strategy to improve attainments in writing, just as the schools in the project were choosing a focus for their work. These policy developments created pressure at the local level to *reproduce* traditional practices that would ultimately stratify student performance (i.e., by privileging particular measures of student competence without reconfiguring the very structures that produced the achievement differentials) while the policies purportedly aimed to *produce* a new culture of school practices (i.e., evidence based accountability).

These historical events were compounded by other, more local events – notably, the coming together shortly before the project started of a relatively youthful head and deputy head teacher determined to make their mark on the school and committed (albeit in different ways) to the principles of inclusive education as they understood them. Analysis at the cultural historical level would enable us to document the school’s *cultural patterning* as it strived to become inclusive, while the study of ontogenetic trajectories (e.g., certain teachers and students) would enable us to document variability in the school’s characteristic patterns (i.e., *within group diversity*).

We can also characterise at least some of the outcomes from the model of inclusive education pursued by this school. In terms of raising the measured attainments of the target group of ‘borderline’ students, the school did rather well. It was also able to document changes in classroom practice, some changes in the discourses of teaching and learning that were used by the staff and changes in the level of engagement by students with learning activities. At the same time, some outcomes seemed likely to reinforce the status quo which had generated the very

problems that the school's actions sought to address. Nothing the school did challenged the hierarchies established by the national testing regime, or the social conditions out of which children's difficulties (if such they were) emerged, or the relationship between the process of schooling and the 'habitus' of working class children. Arguably, indeed, the school's willingness to take up the challenge issued by the government in precisely the terms in which that challenge was issued did little but legitimate the essentially exclusive tendencies of the existing system. Again, our multilevel framework enables us to document the complex tensions between macro and micro issues in order to understand the cultural historical nature of local practices.

Analysis, ambiguity and inter-national learning

It is common for educationalists to talk about the development of inclusive education as if it were a race towards a single, clearly-defined and consensually-understood finishing post. We find ourselves talking about schools, or administrations or national systems that are 'ahead' in terms of inclusion, or that 'got into inclusive education early' or that are 'lagging behind' the others. What this analysis demonstrates, we suggest, is that such uni-dimensional perspectives are simplistic. From a cultural-historical perspective, the development of inclusive education is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, with different countries (and, we might add, different schools and classrooms) developing not simply at different rates but in quite different directions. It follows that comparisons of countries (as of schools and classrooms) are not possible in any simple and straightforward way. One of the manifestations of the globalisation of education is, of course, the extent to which systems for making international comparisons of educational performance - such as the PISA study (OECD, 2001) - have flourished and become increasingly influential in shaping national policies. The implication of our analysis, however, is that there can be no equivalent in inclusive education and that even the relatively sophisticated indicator systems which are currently gaining international adherence (e.g., see (Booth & Ainscow, 2002), have to be treated with considerable caution.

This in turn has implications for the transferability of educational practices between countries (or between schools or classrooms). Because such practices are embedded in local cultures, histories and conceptualisations, they are unlikely to survive in their original form unless the complex contexts out of which they grow are transplanted at the same time. Not only is such transplantation hugely problematic, but it may mean no more than riding roughshod over local contexts. In this situation, Haskell's (Haskell, 1998) characterisation of the inclusive education movement as a form of cultural imperialism will be amply justified.

There is one further cautionary note to be sounded as a result of our analysis. The contextualised nature of inclusive education means that in any given form, it always reflects the outcome of historical and cultural choices. The corollary of this, of course, is that other choices were always theoretically possible and inclusion could have taken some other form. In the case of Broadmeadow School, for instance, some other group than the 'borderline' students could *theoretically* have been the focus of the school's efforts, some other analysis of children's difficulties could have been made and some other actions could have been taken. Under these circumstances, any form of inclusion is always ambiguous because behind it lie the choices that were not made, the other forms of inclusion that were rejected. This inevitably compounds the problem of international transfer. It is not simply that inclusion is multi-dimensional, or that it is embedded in complex historical and cultural contexts. The ambiguity of any one form of

inclusion means that there is no ‘perfect’ model of inclusion that can be exported around the world.

Do these difficulties with the notion of international transfer mean, then, that there is nothing that national systems can learn from each other and that the contributions to a collection such as the present one have little more than curiosity value to readers in other countries? Our answer to this question is to assert that this need not be the case, provided that the emphasis is indeed on learning rather than on transfer. As we argued above, culture is not fate. Cultural reproduction can always potentially be countered; the ‘choices’ made can always theoretically be otherwise. Given the dynamic tension between reproduction and production, the presence of alternative cultural practices is a powerful means of problematising the choices that have always been made and opening up new possibilities for seeing and doing. This is as much true at institutional as at national level. One of the factors in Broadmeadow School’s development of its new approach to literacy, for instance, was when the staff had access to a skilled teacher from outside the school who worked with students in ways quite different from those to which they were accustomed. Indeed, across the project as a whole, the impact of accessing alternatives – seeing teachers teach differently, spending time in schools which organised themselves differently, or visiting cities which had very different policies on inclusion – was the most powerful factor we could find in catalysing inclusive developments. It is not that teachers ‘borrowed’ educational practices from these alternatives, but that they used alternatives to enable them to reflect on their own practices. In this sense, such alternatives acted as what we have called ‘interruptions’ (Ainscow et al., 2004a), ‘contradictions’ or ‘disruptions’ (Artiles, Trent, Hoffman-Kipp, Lopez-Torres, 2000; Engestrom, 1993) to the taken for granted reproduction of established practice

In much the same way, encounters between national systems, whether actual – through visits and exchanges – or virtual – through accounts such as those in this collection – have the potential of ‘making the familiar strange’. This is a much less certain process than that of technology transfer in which techniques, procedures and structures from one system are imported into another. It depends on the willingness of national systems to open themselves up to international scrutiny and, even more so, on their capacity to use what they learn about other systems to reflect on why things are the way they are in their own system. It also then depends on their capacity to take action to make things in some culturally-specific way ‘better’.

Such a process is genuinely inter-national without at the same time being in a negative sense globalising. Because it uses experience from elsewhere as a catalyst rather than a template, it respects local cultures and promotes local solutions without at the same time implying that the local should be accepted uncritically simply because it *is* local. Moreover, it delineates an important role for international scholarship of a particular kind – scholarship which focuses on penetrating the complexities of local practices while it strives to discern regularities in the midst of diversity, uncovering their roots in local cultures and histories and making them available for scrutiny from outside. It is the attempt to represent the local in a form with which those from elsewhere can engage which represents the core purpose of this collection.

References

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T. & Dyson, A. (2004a) Standards and inclusive education: schools squaring the circle in: R. Slee (Ed) *Critical Analyses of Inclusive Education policy: An international survey* (McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 19-21 July 2004, Faculty of Education, McGill University).
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T. & Dyson, A. (2004b) Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: a collaborative action research network, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(2), pp. 125-139.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., Dyson, A., Gallannaugh, F., Howes, A., Millward, A. & Smith, R. (2001) Understanding barriers to participation in education *American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting* (New Orleans, 1-5 April 2001,
- Blunkett, D. (1999) *Social Exclusion and the Politics of Opportunity: A mid-term progress check. A speech by the Rt. Hon David Blunkett MP* (London, DfEE).
- Booth, T. (1995) Mapping inclusion and exclusion: concepts for all? in: C. Clark, A. Dyson & A. Millward (Eds) *Towards Inclusive Schools?* (London, David Fulton).
- Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2002) *Index for Inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (Bristol, Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education).
- Daniels, H. & Garner, P. (1999) Introduction, in: H. Daniels & P. Garner (Eds) *World Yearbook of Education 1999: Inclusive education* (London, Kogan Page).
- DfEE (1997) *Excellence for All Children: Meeting special educational needs* (London, The Stationery Office).
- Dyson, A. (2003) Inclusive education: a global perspective *Education Association of South Africa Conference* (Stellenbosch, South Africa,
- Dyson, A., Gallannaugh, F. & Millward, A. (2002a) Making space in the standards agenda: developing inclusive practices in schools *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference* (University of Exeter, 12-14 September 2002,
- Dyson, A., Gallannaugh, F. & Millward, A. (2002b) Making space in the standards agenda: developing inclusive practices in schools *European Conference on Educational Research* (Lisbon, September 11-14 2002,
- Dyson, A., Gallannaugh, F. & Millward, A. (2003) Making space in the standards agenda: developing inclusive practices in schools, *European Educational Research Journal*, 2(2), pp. 228-244.
- Dyson, A., Howes, A. & Roberts, B. (2002c) A systematic review of the effectiveness of school-level actions for promoting participation by all students (EPPI-Centre Review, version 1.1) *Research Evidence in Education Library* (London, EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education).
- Forum, W.E. (2000) The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments. Text adopted by the World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000 (Paris, UNESCO).
- Gallannaugh, F. & Dyson, A. (2003) Schools understanding inclusion: issues in inclusion and social class *BERA Annual Conference* (Herriot-Watt University,
- Garner, P. & Gains, C. (2000) The debate that never happened, *Special!* (Autumn 2000), pp. 8-11.

- Haskell, S., H. (1998) Inclusive schooling: the contemporary cultural imperialism of western ideologies *Second International Exhibition and Congress on Rehabilitation, 29 - 31 March 1998* (Dubai, United Arab Emirates,
- Kauffman, J.K. & Hallahan, D.P. (Eds.) (1995) *The Illusion of Full Inclusion* (Austin, Texas, PRO-ED).
- OECD (2001) Knowledge and Skills for Life: First results from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2000 (Paris, OECD).
- Paige, R. (2004a) A better education for all children in the United States, *Education Today - Newsletter*.
- Paige, R. (2004b) Remarks of Secretary Paige before the Florida Atlantic University School of Education Conference on Reading Literacy, Boca Raton, Florida (Washington, US Department of Education).
- Peters, S.J. (2003) Inclusive education: achieving Education for All by including those with disabilities and special educational needs (Disability Group, The World Bank).
- Pijl, S.J., Meijer, C.J.W. & Hegarty, S. (Eds.) (1997) *Inclusive Education: A global agenda* (London, Routledge).
- reporter, A.A. & Dakroub, H. (2004) Muslim girls may quit classes *TES* (London,
- Robinson, P. (1997) *Literacy, Numeracy and Economic Performance* (London, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics).
- UNESCO (1994) *Final Report: World conference on special needs education: Access and quality* (Paris, UNESCO).
- UNESCO (1999) *Salamanca Five Years On. A Review of UNESCO Activities in the Light of the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action. Adopted at the World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality* (Paris, UNESCO).
- UNESCO (2001) *Open File on Inclusive Education. Support Materials for Managers and Administrators* (Paris, UNESCO).
- Wolf, A. (2002) *Does Education Matter? Myths about Education and Economic Growth* (London, Penguin Books).