

1 Introduction

Social injustice is a feature of all human relationships and is present in all societies. How one talks to it and about it, however, is notoriously difficult, because implicit in the language one uses and the assumptions that underlie one's language are frameworks of reference which, inevitably, find their origins in one or other understanding of the world and the people within. As a result of this realisation, discussion of the concept of social exclusion is underway in numerous contexts to assess its value in expanding understandings of injustice and inequality.¹ While the concept is 'celebrated' in the North and has led to the introduction of Social Exclusion units in all UK government departments, its usage is less common in the South where very much more specific phenomena are made the subject of policy attention. Betts (2001: 2) argues, to illustrate the point, that the discourse of poverty 'provides a much more powerful frame' (Betts 2001: 2) for many countries. In South Africa, the new government has deliberately established gender and affirmative action units. The primary question being posed in the South is whether indeed the concept of social exclusion adds value to understandings of complex phenomena such as poverty (de Haan 2000).

The primary purpose of this article is to look at how discourses of inclusion and exclusion have been conceptualised and appropriated. It argues that the main conceptual weakness of current understandings is their failure to adequately engage with social justice concerns. The article begins with some caveats in contextualising the discussion. In the second part, it moves to a review of some of the important debates around educational inclusion and exclusion, and traces the roots of the concept in education to debates in special education needs (SEN). The third part of the article foregrounds concerns of equity in current discourse and specifically critiques two approaches to inclusion: the citizenship approach and the multicultural approach. This leads to the development of the 'interlocking framework', which has the potential to provide a more encompassing approach. The fourth and concluding section focuses on issues of policy and examines the discourse of policy that underpins the ways in which the concepts are framed. This

(Re)Framing Education Exclusion and Inclusion Discourses:

Limits and Possibilities

Y u s u f S a y e d a n d
C r a i n S o u d i e n

IDS Bulletin Vol 34 No 1 2003

leads to an examination of what are some of the key elements in developing an inclusive education policy framework.

1.1 Some caveats

The notion of educational exclusion is currently enjoying much prominence in social policy research and in matters of public policy (Popkewitz and Lindblad 2000; Slee 2001; Kabeer 2000; de Haan 2000; Betts 2001; Preece 1999). Evident in this prominence, however, is how difficult it is to reach an agreement about what educational exclusion might mean, what it refers to and what it includes and excludes.² On the one hand, conceptually it has become a shorthand for discussing the inequities of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and poverty. This shorthand itself, as we try to show below, is enormously contentious. On the other hand, from a government policy view, it has come to signify an understanding that social problems are interlinked, complex and require coordinated and cohesive actions.

There are four qualifications that need to be introduced in discussing the notions of educational exclusion and inclusion. First, the usage of these concepts in the literature comes with the strong normative stance that inclusion is by definition good and exclusion, similarly so, is bad. Thus, the end of inclusion policies is to overcome exclusion: the triumph of the good over the bad. While this is undoubtedly laudable, it fails to recognise the possibility that inclusive policies may result in new forms of exclusion. Education, even in its 'universal' form, is both a means of social mobility and access and also a means of social selection. Education includes inasmuch as it excludes. Second, the notion of inclusion operates on the principle of 'normalisation', in which groups, be they kinship groups, classes, structures or whatever, are defined and constituted (socially) in their 'ideal' forms, and relative to them *other* communities, groups, and individuals are identified and invariably positioned. Out of this, among other things, the perception is generated that certain groups lack access or entitlements to certain services. Hence, as a consequence, such groups, communities, and individuals need to be targeted for special inclusive measures, which would overcome their exclusion. Such an approach

often ignores the existing and complex social relations in society, which give rise to and perpetuate inequities. It fails to take into account the power relations (economic, social and epistemological) within society and ends up conserving existing political conditions. Third, the concept elides differences between and within groups, communities and individuals in that it ignores 'who' is being included or excluded. Thus, what is ignored are, *inter alia*, the different (and unequal) racial, gender, and ethnic positioning of groups, communities and individuals. Universalising the discourse assumes a pathology of individual and group failure. Fourth, the discourse of educational exclusion and inclusion fails to specify the relationships between race, class, gender, and indeed other forms of difference and inequity in society and to show these articulate with each other. Various theorists have advocated different versions of the complex interrelationships between race, class, and gender. Apple and Weiss (1983) forward the 'parallelist' framework in which race, class, and gender interact with three spheres of societal activity (economic, cultural, and political). This they call a relational framework. Others, such as Sarup (1986), forward a cumulative, linear, hierarchical framework in which, for example, gender, race, and class add up to the 'triple oppression' of women. While none of the frameworks is incorrect, they do not, as McCarthy (1997: 547) notes, capture the 'mix of contingencies, interest, needs, differential assets, and capacities in local settings such as schools'.

2 Diverse meanings of inclusion and exclusion

A review of the field suggests an absence of common understandings of inclusion and exclusion. Instead, there appears to be a rich debate surrounding the nature of the concept and its usefulness to the South. De Haan (2000), in reflecting on the ways in which inclusion and exclusion have been used, argues that such understandings are, or ought to be, socially constructed and rooted in the contexts in which they find themselves.

As a point of departure, it is interesting to note that some of the literature casts the discussion largely in terms of inclusion (Slee 2001; OFSTED 2000),

others in terms of exclusion (de Haan 2000) and yet others in terms of both inclusion and exclusion (Betts 2001).

The concepts clearly are juxtaposed, in that social inclusion of certain persons or groups is supposed to imply exclusion of others. However, it is simplistic to assume that social inclusion and social exclusion are merely contradictory forces. Such an approach fails to account for the processes through which people become either excluded or included. It does not explain who determines the status of the included and the excluded. Kabeer cautions (2000: 83), 'relabel long-standing and locally developed approaches to social problems or, alternatively ... promote a tendency to assess southern realities in terms of the extent to which they converge, or diverge from some "standard" northern model.'

Implicit in Kabeer's cautionary note is the need to see social exclusion as an unfolding social process where social, economic and political struggle is waged to reproduce or challenge dominant relations of power. This view asserts that any research into social exclusion should focus on the processes and indeed the rules through which inequality and injustice occur.

Flowing from this, the question that might be posed, is how discourses of inclusion and exclusion obscure or mask the agendas of cooperation and control. Jackson (1999: 127) questions whether:

an integrated approach works for gender, and argues that feminist research and gender analysis offers both better situated understandings of the character and experience of marginality, and useful insights for the emerging applications of social exclusion frameworks to developing countries.

Jackson's argument can be complemented by considering the following questions:

- Does the inclusion of citizens in programmes lead to their incorporation in ways that subject them to the status quo, or in ways that expect them to comply with and meet standards predetermined by authorities without their cooperation?

- Or even in those contexts, which offer complementary albeit integrated, progressive processes of inclusion, are these sufficient means of empowerment to help students reshape the contexts of their educational experience so that these contexts are enriched by new perspectives?

As Jansen (1998) argues, while black students are being 'included' in formerly white schools in South Africa, they encounter a hostile, anti-cultural environment in which assumptions are fixed about issues such as what constitutes good schooling, appropriate language policy. Such schools inflict damage to self-esteem and the confidence of children. Children often learn that English has status while Zulu does not; that good teachers and role models are white; that appropriate history is European; and that failure is something that happens to non-white children.

Accordingly, de Haan argues, one of the main critiques of social exclusion is its 'one size fits all' approach (de Haan 2000: 10). This approach assumes that social inequality can be overcome by providing the same opportunities equally for all citizens. While this would go a long way towards correcting historic imbalances and injustices, it is short-sighted, as discussed in the next section. One size does not fit all because citizens are not located in homogeneous, symmetrical and stable social, economic and political positions. The difficulties they encounter as gendered, raced or classed subjects are neither equivalent nor interchangeable and the solutions that are generated in response to these individually are not transposable one to the other. One cannot, therefore, as often happens, lump the inequalities together so that one prescription is assumed to cure all the problems. How one addresses the differences and the different kinds of inequalities thrown up by the complex social contexts in which people find themselves, is a strategic matter. In seeking to address these inequalities, many questions arise, not least of all, deciding to whom a prescription applies and what rights of association and what rights of choice are availed those to whom the prescription is administered. It highlights the difficulties in providing groups of people, including learners, the opportunities of exploring ways in which they might seek solidarity with one another,³ and asks

whether differential programmes do not in fact foster new forms of segregation and consequently new discriminations.

A further assumption embedded in classifying groups in society according to the dominant and normative understanding of how groups are constituted, is the belief that people feel deprived and that they wish to be included. In other words, citizens may consciously choose to exclude themselves from certain processes and opt to occupy alternative spaces (Robinson Pant 2000). Rogers (2000) elaborates this view by arguing that the dichotomous discourse of inclusion and exclusion tends to create the excluded as the 'other' and sees the movement which does take place as one-sided, as a transaction that involves moving from a state of being 'excluded' to a state of being 'included'. Nothing of their pasts is validated within the zone of the included. Monga's example of 'deprived' women in India participating in the system emphasises this point:

People without the commodified 'skills' advocated by the state are still participating socially, they themselves are subverting the dominant discourses, rather than being co-opted by them, whether these be the discourses of social inclusion/exclusion, oppression or liberation, or the formalisation/informalisation of the South African case (cited in Betts 2001: 10).

2.1 Defining 'inclusive' education

A significant problem with the notion of inclusive education is that the theory is being posited in a society based on inequality. While sites of education offer the space for teachers and students to challenge and transform societal practice through building links rather than perpetuating divides, they are also social structures subject to the same rules as the rest of society. Educational inclusion does not guarantee an unproblematic integration of students or an automatic notion of community. This raises issues of equity and difference and relates to issues of co-option and homogenity dealt with later in this article.

The UK's Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) view of what educational inclusion entails, is:

more than a concern about any one group of pupils such as those pupils who have been or are likely to be excluded from school. Its scope is broad. It is about equal opportunities for all pupils, whatever their age, gender, ethnicity, attainment and background. It pays particular attention to the provision made for and the achievement of different groups of pupils within a school (OFSTED 2000: 4).

This suggests the challenge for education is to see social inclusion as a sectoral problem, not a burden of the 'learners' or 'marginalised minorities'. This view is echoed by Slee who believes that many programmes which assess outcomes refer to the inadequacy of participants in the programme if performance is 'poor' (Slee 2001).

Where the OFSTED definition falters is in its assumption that social inclusion by its nature alters the status quo. Processes of inclusion change the social relations and presumably the processes, outcomes and measures of assessing these outcomes of a programme. The process brings together different voices, experiences and expectations and beckons the need for processes and facilities that can helpfully mediate these differences. The players and institutions open themselves to new ways of seeing and new opportunities. It is not appropriate to measure success/failure with traditional frameworks.

On the issue of co-option and control, Slee argues that inclusive education is nothing more than 'a default vocabulary for assimilation' (Slee 2001: 114). The concept masks deeper issues of educational agendas and why there has been a shift towards inclusion. This is not an argument against inclusion, it is a criticism of the fact that students are seen as excluded on the basis of their mismatch to 'educational standards', rather than the educational sector being seen as problematic for excluding them in the first instance. In other words students are seen as deficit while the situations from which they are being excluded are seen as upholding good quality standards and producing quality graduates.

A further problem is that inclusion is generally discussed in relation to disabled students. This raises two interrelated issues. First discrimination or

inequality is not only about physical or mental disability. Second, that the issue of educational inclusion rather than being about special education is an issue for 'regular' schools which have to consider their culture and practice in terms of how they foster segregation (Slee 2001: 114). In keeping with this argument, it is proposed that special needs education (SNE) is a problematic concept in the inclusion debate because schools are not made to account for their practice of exclusion as they are able to say that they are regular rather than special needs schools.

From the above discussion it is clear that social systems that respond positively to social policies that advocate inclusivity necessarily involve change. There is a need to direct these transformations in innovative ways that produce 'new systems'. As was argued, one of the criticisms levelled at programmes of inclusion is that they place the burden of inclusion on those who are newly included. New recruits are expected to develop the necessary capacities to bring them 'up to standard' with those who are already in the system. This approach relates closely to the deficit model and is not dissimilar to affirmative action programmes that emphasise equality rather than equity. More progressive approaches emphasise the importance of transformation of systems, which are expanding their ambits.

This article adopts the view that there are many different aspects to educational inclusion, and, as Dyson, argues, that there are probably different inclusions (Dyson 1999). It is hoped that this broader framework allows for rich discussion of inclusive education that takes account of many categories of difference.

What emerges from the above is how concerns of social justice are framed in debates. In this regard, it is crucial to examine the ways in which equity and equality issues in education are treated, which the next section addresses.

3 Approaches to social exclusion and social inclusion in education: equity and equality considerations

Social inclusion initiatives appear to fall into the trap of assuming that what is posited as social equality will address all divides. Many approaches

do not take account of equity and in fact undermine the project of achieving social justice. As will be shown below, the complex inter-relationship of race, class, gender and other pivots of injustice mean that programmes promoting equality often tend to focus on one of these at the expense of the others and so loses the thread connecting the others, as the following quote explains:

Equality is more conducive to measurement and standardisation [while,] in comparison, the intangible aspects of equity resist quantification. Equity is often mistakenly measured in terms of equality such as input resources (expenditures) or educational outcomes (achievement scores) Equity transcends the notion of equality by focusing on the qualitative value of justice. Central as the movement towards racial equality may be in reforms presently under consideration in South Africa, the question remains whether these reforms will also address inequities which stem from class, gender and so on, and therefore meet the criteria of justice (Fry 1991/2, quoted in Soudien 1998: 127).

The distinction between equity and equality is manifest in two important education inclusion approaches.

3.1 The citizenship approach

Educational inclusion which challenges normative understandings of what groups are and how they are constituted is, as has been argued earlier, about fundamental change and real transformation. This notion of citizenship, however, does not yet have currency in many countries, including countries in the South where governments have failed to accord their 'nationals' full citizenship rights. For example, in the colonial (and also post-colonial) contexts many states regarded some of their subjects as 'other' and withheld from them rights as citizens.

However, complex citizenship laws have served to perpetuate forms of exclusion where, for example in some countries being born in a country does not necessarily guarantee one rights of citizenship. Citizenship, as a construct, was, therefore, a model for exclusion in that only citizens could have rights. Structural pluralism, which comprises the

differential incorporation of social groups into a common political society is another model (ILO 1994). South Africa's apartheid system may be described as constituting such a system of differential incorporation, the legacy of which prevails in conditions of skewed relations of power in favour of a dominant, essentially white, privileged minority. Nayak describes India's caste system as a similar mechanism of exclusion. Vast sections of the population, by virtue of their caste status are denied basic citizenship rights including rights to education (Nayak 1994). It is thus important to engage the legacies and consequences of these systems when dealing with educational exclusion. Unfortunately, the seeds of what is often a destructive divisiveness continue to be watered in institutions precisely because the histories and legacies of exclusion are so deep-rooted.

3.2 The multicultural approach

In efforts to accommodate 'difference', educational inclusion has taken the form of multicultural education or education for pluralism. There have been numerous criticisms of this view, not least the fact that the concept serves to mask real injustices, such as those of racial and cultural discrimination, and that it tends to stereotype the issues which supposedly belong to different groups, and so imposes on them common features and singular 'solutions' in extremely inappropriate ways. An example of this is the lumping together of 'black' and 'white' into unproblematised homogeneous categories (Osler and Starkey 2000).

In these approaches, social exclusion initiatives operate around somewhat crude categorisations of various social groups in relation to power and access to goods and services. Approaches do not, without investigation of the processes of social exclusion and the forms of counter-services provided by the 'excluded' groups, say anything about how people who are supposedly excluded view themselves. In critiquing these approaches it is recognised that they provide marginalised groups access to educational facilities and other social goods such as employment and consequently can ameliorate patterns of deprivation. However, approaches to educational inclusion do require a rigorous understanding of the context into which people are being included, the terms and conditions of the inclusion, and a

preparedness to look critically at the policy makers who set these terms and the actors who implement these policies. As is argued below, social inclusion of necessity requires careful definition and ongoing reappraisal to ensure that it is indeed a social good and of benefit to society as a whole. It becomes clear through the ensuing discussion that institutional access alone – the creation of physical space – does not answer the call for educational inclusion. Besides issues of affordability, cultural and political environments and practices, both within and outside of educational institutions, may perpetuate exclusion even after students have technically been 'placed'.

4 An interlocking framework

Towards developing a more reflective approach, this article finds McCarthy's notion of 'nonsynchronicity' a useful concept and proposes an interlocking framework (see Sayed 2002) whereby race, gender, class, region, language, etc. all intersect in ways that recognise peoples' unique and particular experiences. It argues that these factors cannot be placed on a two-dimensional grid that simply seeks the intersection of two of the categories. Such a grid would merely tell of the dual effect of two of these categories on a number of groups. The concept of an interlocking framework recognises the highly complex ways in which race, class, gender and other categories intersect and inter-relate to produce unique individual and group experiences. The fact that there is a dominant articulating principle of conflict or inequality does not or should not undermine the prevalence of other levels of injustice. It simply suggests that the political approach pivots around a primary and articulating factor, which might be dominant for that moment. What such an approach makes possible is the recognition of the complex context in which injustice occurs. It brings an analysis within reach, for example, of the fluid and shifting setting of the developing world where social categories are in constant reformation.

Nonsynchrony thus helps explain the contradictory nature in which relations of domination articulate to present differently textured conditions, and in addition, the way in which struggles may engage with these interfaces in unique and peculiar ways, re-shaping and sometimes transforming the dynamic to produce a different set of contradictions.

Applying the relational interlocking framework to the institutional contexts requires attention to issues of power. Various authors including Jansen (1998), McCarthy (1997), Ogbu (1997), Delpit (1997), Ghuman (1999), Osler and Starkey (2000), discuss these all-important concerns.

Delpit, in explaining the endemic problem of racism in education, writes from a perspective which assumes that the voices of 'Black and Native American educators ... have been silenced' (Delpit 1997: 120). She argues for a radical departure from liberal notions of education towards a more rigorous understanding of the 'culture of power' in the educational context. Her work captures concerns sketched earlier regarding the ways in which power is exercised in the school setting on various fronts. Delpit identifies various aspects of power (Delpit 1997: 120) which highlight how it manifests in schools. She notes that power is manifested, *inter alia*, in what is taught, assessment, ways of talking, ways of dressing, interacting, the 'social capital' of parents, and discipline.

These relations of power explain why, in McCarthy's words:

students (and teachers) tend to be rewarded and sanctioned differently according to the resources and assets they are able to mobilise inside the school and in the community. This capacity to mobilise resources and to exploit the unequal reward system and symbolic rituals of schooling varies considerably according to the race, gender, and class backgrounds of minority and majority students. White middle-class male students therefore come into schools with clear social and economic advantages and in turn often have these advantages confirmed and augmented by the unequal curriculum and pedagogical practices of schooling. However, this process is not simple, and the production of inequality in school is a highly contradictory and nonsynchronous phenomenon – one that does not guarantee nice, clean or definite outcomes for embattled minority and majority school actors (McCarthy 1997: 548).

Nonsynchrony and the culture of power as it pertains to the educational sector thus helps understand

certain of the primary, though sometimes implicit ways in which educational exclusion may be conducted even within institutional walls. The subtle subtext of educational exclusion, by virtue of its nature, could easily go unnoticed or overlooked in programmes of transformation. While the theory helps identify some areas of possible intervention, it also points to the fact that national and local situations will have to be carefully considered to identify ways in which injustices persist and appropriate ways in which they could be transformed. Governance approaches and structures become critical areas of directing transformation.

5 Issues of policy and inclusion

While there is much academic debate about the meanings and usefulness of the concepts, often ignored is the fact that educational exclusion and inclusion have become part of public policy in contemporary society. For example, in the UK the Labour Government has initiated what it considers to be a 'joined-up' policy initiative in the form of the Social Exclusion Unity headed by the senior Deputy-Minister, while in South Australia, the state government has established a Social Inclusion Initiative. As these examples illustrate, concepts are significant in so far as they influence governments' policy and actions. Thus, there is need to unpack public policy discourses in this regard. This article identifies four dominant discourses that are present in public policy (Dyson 1999):

- rights and ethics discourse
- efficacy discourse
- political discourse
- pragmatic discourse.

5.1 The rights and ethics discourse

Proposing that children have a right to education, this discourse emerged in the 1950s with the intention of 'equalising opportunities and spreading economic and cultural benefits more widely through society' (Dyson 1999: 39). The intention was to address the inequalities generated by the education systems of capitalist societies. Special education is seen as reproducing societal divides by separating 'disabled' persons from the rest of society and protecting such services from addressing the need for 'integration'.

It is important to introduce the notion of attainable development targets. With growing concern for '(1) the Universalism of human rights; (2) their social dimension; and (3) the means for effectively realising global social rights' (Deacon 2000: 35), strategists are concerned that if 'a government is unable to raise revenue so as to be able to comply with its human rights obligations, human rights guarantees become illusory' (Tomasevski 1997: 240 cited in Deacon 2000: 35). This view emphasises the need for 'well-resourced' countries in the 'developed' world to redistribute resources globally so that those less developed countries are able to meet the basic rights of their citizens. Social policy that faces the need for global ownership of the problems of poverty (and social exclusion) has thus become a pressing issue. The United Nations, in tackling the need for provision of basic services, including education, to all, are factoring into their thinking a need to redress global imbalances.

5.2 The efficacy discourse

This discourse argues that inclusive schools are more cost-efficient, socially beneficial and educationally effective than segregated special schools. According to Dyson, this discourse critiques special education arguing that expected outcomes of special programmes (mainly remedial teaching of reading) appeared unsuccessful (Dyson 1999: 41). Furthermore, it appears that students seemed to fare similarly in special and 'mainstream' schools. Special education is also seen as more costly in all respects (overheads, infrastructural costs, human resource investment) (Dyson 1999). In support of the discourse, research also indicates that physically disabled students do not learn differently from 'other' students.

In inclusive environments, institutions are challenged to include 'disabilities' in ways that make them normalise their differences and to become a part of everyday life. Inclusive education thus challenges all school-goers to develop the skills to deal with difference as a normal part of life.

It may thus be argued, on the basis of evidence, that inclusive education is a sensible and cost-effective route to pursue.

5.3 The political discourse

Marginalised groups (defined in official, e.g. scheduled tribes/caste in India policy, or self-defined, e.g. Khoisan group in South Africa) organise themselves politically to advocate and lobby for their special interest and needs to secure a greater share of resources, representation, and involvement. In this discourse, groups argue for their political rights under the rubric of securing inclusion. In the political process, they may align themselves with other groups, other struggles to broaden their base. The political struggle may be at the level of ideas and concepts, in challenging conventional views about themselves, and in changing policies.

5.4 The pragmatic discourse

This discourse is practical in focusing on the dimensions of inclusive education as well as the means by which it may be enacted. Certain protagonists of this discourse believe that inclusive schools have 'determinate characteristics' *vis-à-vis* structure, programmes, systems, practices, culture and ethos, which distinguish them from non-inclusive schools. The discourse is also concerned with outlining an 'inclusive pedagogy', which relates to theories of instruction and learning or teaching strategies (Dyson 1999: 42). It is important to determine inclusion though, by the 'absence of injustices, discrimination, exclusionary barriers rather than the presence of particular pedagogical practices and organisational forms' (Dyson 1999: 45). This discourse would thus include numerous manuals and/or guides with various recommendations on how to 'achieve' inclusive education. The discourse promotes the view that 'right action' in relation to policy and practice will lead to successful inclusive education.

There are a number of considerations for developing inclusive education policies that are useful to context:

- *feasible and implementable*. National policy ought to be feasible, not only in terms of facilitating national processes of educational delivery, but also in terms of articulating with and facilitating regional policy development and institutional policy development. Policy has to make sense for all these levels of delivery.

- *part and parcel of broader educational policy.* For example, educational policy formation thus needs to take account of other sectors, e.g. how educational delivery (and curricula particularly) relate to the labour market and job opportunities. Furthermore, inclusive education policy ought to be broad enough to address the multidimensional nature of educational exclusion. It needs to take account of the contradictory nature of exclusions and the nonsynchronous way in which factors of social injustice articulate in different contexts to generate various forms of exclusion.
- *democratic in nature*, which implies democratic representation as opposed to nominal representation and the real inclusion or consideration of what may be conflicting issues with a view to resolving or working with discrepancies and conflicts. Policies need to move beyond the rhetoric of empowerment by recognising that relations of power need to be addressed in ways that allow deprived social groups to determine the ways in which they wish to acquire and exercise and maintain a share of power.
- *addressing the culture of domination and the patterns of social and structural behaviour that generate domination.*
- *flexible and adaptable*, containing simultaneously elements that allow for (a) adaptation to regional and local conditions, and (b) the ongoing mechanism for reflexivity and innovation.

N o t e s

1. This article takes as its point of departure a concern with affecting social justice in post-apartheid South Africa. The primary objective is, however, to develop a theoretical understanding of the concepts of educational exclusion and inclusion in South Africa. As such, the empirical data of the project is not reported here. This article was conceptualised and developed in the context of a research process funded by DFID, which sought to consider educational exclusion and inclusion in South Africa and India.
2. This article does not exhaustively review the concepts of educational exclusion and inclusion. For a more detailed discussion, see Sayed (2002).

6 C o n c l u s i o n

This article has discussed the concepts of educational inclusion and educational exclusion in relation to the multi-dimensional issues of exclusion and shown ways in which the concepts could usefully be employed in the South. The discussion has emphasised that the issues are hardly simple or easy to tackle. Educational inclusion requires careful consideration of every aspect of schooling and the social context in which it finds itself. Innovative approaches to educational inclusion will need to address issues at macro, micro, personal and interpersonal levels. Connections between school and community cultures have to be drawn, as well as between educational and community programmes of inclusion. The concepts of 'diversity' and difference are fundamental to inclusive initiatives, lest these seek to create homogenous communities. Social and educational exclusion are seen to occur around a complex of injustices, which can usefully be addressed through understanding the culture of power and using the nonsynchronous model and interlocking framework as tools of analysis. The concepts of inclusion and exclusion press for much closer conscious and self-conscious consideration of identity and role: who is doing the excluding and including, who is choosing the excluding and including, how are these processes of inclusion and exclusion facilitated, and what are the dominant views and relations of social, economic and political power.

3. Slee cites the work of Felicity Armstrong in noting that instances of special education may indeed allow learners to feel a great deal more 'included' and whole, than ordinary education. Armstrong interviewed a deputy head teacher at a special school who said that students find affinity with other students when they feel a sense of common identity and a sense of community and sharing. These students may not experience this in a school in which their disability singles them out and sets them apart from other students (Slee 2001: 114).

References

- Apple, M. and Weiss, L. (eds), 1983, *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- Barton, L., 1999, 'Market Ideologies, Education and the Challenge for Inclusion', in H. Daniels and P. Gartner (eds), *Inclusive Education, World Yearbook of Education*, London: 54–62
- Betts, Julia, 2001, 'Uppingham Seminar 2001: unpacking the discourses of social inclusion/exclusion', *Final Report on Uppingham Seminar*
- Deacon, B., 2000, 'Globalisation: A Threat to Equitable Social Provision', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31 No 4: 32–41
- Delpit, Lisa, 1997, 'The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children', in H.A.H. Lauder, H. Brown, P. Stuart and A. Wells (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy, Society*, London: Oxford University Press: 582–96
- de Haan, A., 2000, 'Debates on social exclusion in the South: what have they contributed to our understanding of deprivation?', draft for Uppingham Seminar, 2001
- de Haan, A., 1999, *Social Exclusion: Towards an Holistic Understanding of Deprivation*, www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/sdd_socex.pdf
- de Haan, A., (n.d.) *Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation*, www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SPT/journal/past/pdf/issue2-2.pdf
- Dyson, A., 1999, 'Inclusion and Inclusions: Theories and Discourses in Inclusive Education', in H. Daniels and P. Garner (eds), *Inclusive Education*, London: Kogan Page: 36–53
- Figueroa, P., 1991, 'What is Multicultural and Antiracist Education? Philosophical and Sociological Reflections', in P. Figueroa (ed.), *Education and the Social Construction of Race*, London: Routledge: 46–75
- Ghuman, P., 1999, 'Racism, Ethnic Identity and Education of South Asian Adolescents', in H. Daniels and P. Gartner (eds), *Inclusive Education, World Yearbook of Education*, London: Kogan Page: 207–28
- Gillborn, D. and Mirza, S.H., 2000, *Educational Inequality: Mapping Race, Class and Gender: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*, London: OFSTED, www.ofsted.gov.uk
- The Guardian*, 2002, 'John Prescott on why the Social Exclusion Unit is crucial to government policy', http://societyguardian.co.uk/social_exclusion, 16 January
- Hallak, J., 1999, 'Globalisation, human rights and education', *IIEP Contributions* No 33, UNESCO, www.unesco.org/iiep
- ILO, 1994, *Social Exclusion and Africa South of the Sahara: A Review of the Literature*, Geneva: ILO
- Jackson, C., 1999, 'Social Exclusion and Gender: Does One Size Fit All?', *European Journal of Development Research*, Vol 11 No 1: 125–46
- Jansen, J., 1998, 'Our Teachers See Children Not Colour: The Politics of Diversity in South African Schools', in M. Cross, Mkwanazi-Twala, and G. Klein (eds), *Dealing with Diversity in South African Education: A Debate on the Politics of a National Curriculum*, Cape Town: Juta: 101–6
- Kabeer, N., 2000, 'Social exclusion, poverty and discrimination: towards an analytical framework', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31 No 4: 83–97
- Lepani, B., 2001, *Reconceptualising Education*, Sydney: Lateral Solutions
- Lepani, B., 1999, 'Social futures: meeting the wisdom challenge', presented at the Biennial Conference Home Economics Institute of Australia, Brisbane
- McCarthy, C., 1997, 'Nonsynchrony and Social Difference: An Alternative to Current Radical Accounts of Race and Schooling', in H.A.H. Lauder, H. Brown, P. Stuart and A. Wells (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy, Society*, London: Oxford University Press: 541–56
- Nayak, P., 1994, *Economic Development and Social Exclusion in India*, Geneva: ILO, www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inst/articles/1994/dp77/ch2.htm
- O'Brein, D., Wilkes, J., de Haan, A. and Maxwell, S., 1997, 'Poverty and social exclusion in North and South', *IDS Working Paper* 55, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/Wp55.pdf
- OFSTED, 2000, *Improving City Schools: Strategies to Promote Educational Inclusion*, London: OFSTED, www.ofsted.gov.uk
- Ogbu, J.U., 1997, 'Racial Stratification and Education in the United States: Why Inequality Persists' in A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown and A.S. Wells (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy and Society*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press: 765–78
- Osler, A. and Starkey, H., 2000, 'Learning for Citizenship: Diversity, Identity, Equality', paper prepared for Politeia – European Conference, <http://politeia.net/seminar/Papers/CITZ-OSLERANDSTARKEY.html>

- Popkewitz, T. and Lindblad, S., 2000, 'Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion: Some Conceptual Difficulties and Problematics in Policy and Research', *Discourse*, Vol 21 No 1: 5–54
- Preece, J., 1999, 'Setting the Scene: the Wider Political Context', in J. Preece (ed.), *Combating Social Exclusion in Adult Education*, Aldershot: Ashgate: 1–13
- Robinson Pant, A., 2000, *Response Paper* to Arjan de Haan, Uppingham Seminar
- Rogers, A., 2000, *Response Paper* to Arjan de Haan, Uppingham Seminar
- Sarup, M., 1986, *The Politics of Multi-Racial Education*, London: Routledge
- Sayed, Y., 2002, 'Education Exclusion and Inclusion in the South: A Review of the Literature', Exclusion and Inclusion Research Project, *Discussion Paper 1*, Brighton: CIE, University of Sussex
- Slee, R., 2001, "'Inclusion in Practice": Does Practise Make Perfect?', *Educational Review*, Vol 53 No 2: 113–23
- Social Exclusion Unit, 2001, *Preventing Social Exclusion*, www.cabinet-offic.gov.uk/sev/2001/pse/PSE%20HTML/summary/htm
- Soudien, C., 1998, 'The Debate on Equality and Equity in South African Education', in M. Cross, Mkwanz-Twala, and G. Klein (eds), *Dealing with Diversity in South African Education: A Debate on the Politics of a National Curriculum*, Cape Town: Juta: 125–34