

Understanding the development of inclusive education system

Mel Ainscow¹

¹School of Education.
The University of Manchester

United Kingdom

mel.ainscow@man.ac.uk

Abstract

It is now almost ten years since the Salamanca Conference on Special Needs Education endorsed the idea of inclusive education. Arguably the most significant international document that has ever appeared in the special needs field, the Salamanca Statement argues that regular schools with an inclusive orientation are ‘the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all’. Furthermore, it suggests that such schools can ‘provide an effective education for the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the costeffectiveness of the entire education system’ (UNESCO, 1994).

During the subsequent ten years or so, there has been considerable activity in many countries to move educational policy and practice in a more inclusive direction (Mittler, 2000). In this paper I use evidence from research carried out during that period in order to consider what needs to be done to build on the progress that has been made so far. In particular, I consider the question: *What are the ‘levers’ that can move education systems in an inclusive direction?*

Keywords: special needs, inclusive education, inclusive policies, educational research

Mapping the field

As countries have tried to move their education systems in a more inclusive direction, with colleagues I have carried out a programme of research in order to learn from their experiences. This research has focused on: the development of classroom practice (e.g. Ainscow, 1999 and 2000; Ainscow and Brown, 2000; Ainscow, Howes, Farrell and Frankham, 2003); school development (e.g. Ainscow, 1995; Ainscow, Barrs and Martin, 1998, Booth and Ainscow, 2002); teacher development (e.g. Ainscow, 1994; 2002); and systemic change (e.g. Ainscow and Haile-Giorgis, 1999; Ainscow, Farrell and Tweddle, 2000), particularly in respect to the role of local education authorities (e.g. Ainscow and Howes, 2001; Ainscow and Tweddle, 2003). At the same time, through the work of the *Enabling Education Network* (EENET), we have encouraged links between groups around the world that are trying to encourage the development of inclusive education (Further details can be obtained from www.eenet.org.uk).

Much of our research has involved the use of an approach that we refer to as ‘collaborative inquiry’. This advocates practitioner research, carried out in partnership with academics, as a means of developing better understanding of educational processes (e.g. Ainscow, 1999). Kurt Lewin’s dictum that you cannot understand an organisation until you try to change it is, perhaps, the clearest justification for this approach (Schein, 2001). In practical terms, we believe that such understanding is best developed as a result of ‘outsiders’, such as ourselves, working alongside practitioners, policy makers and other stakeholders as they seek practical solutions to the problems they face.

Such research leads to detailed examples of how those within particular contexts have attempted to develop inclusive policies and practices. It also provides frameworks and propositions that can be used by those within other contexts to analyse their own working situations. One such framework provides a useful map for the argument I develop in this paper (see Figure 1). It is intended to help us focus on factors that bear on inclusive developments within an education system. More specifically, it focuses our attention on possible levers that can help to move the system forward.




Figure 1: Levers for change

Senge (1989) sees ‘levers’ as actions that can be taken in order to change the behaviour of an organisation and those individuals within it. He goes on to argue that those who wish to encourage change within an organisation must be smart in determining where the high leverage lies. Too often, he suggests, approaches used to bring about large-scale changes in organisations are ‘low leverage’. That is to say, they tend to change the way things look but not the way they work. Possible examples of low leverage activity in the education field include: policy documents, conferences and in-service courses. Whilst such initiatives may make a contribution, by and large they do not lead to significant changes in thinking and practice. Our aim, therefore, must be to identify what may turn out to be more subtle, less obvious and higher leverage efforts to bring about change in schools.

The framework places schools at the centre of the analysis. This reinforces the point that moves towards inclusion must focus on increasing the capacity of local neighbourhood mainstream schools to support the participation and learning of an increasingly diverse range of learners. This is the paradigm shift implied by the Salamanca Statement. It sees moves towards inclusion as being about the development of schools, rather simply involving attempts to integrate vulnerable groups of students into existing arrangements. It is, therefore, essentially about those within schools developing practices that can ‘reach out to all learners’ (Ainscow, 1999).

At the same time, the framework draws attention to a range of contextual influences that bear on the way schools carry out their work. As I will explain, these influences may provide support and encouragement to those in schools who are wishing to move in an inclusive direction. At the same time, it also draws our attention to how the same factors can act as barriers to progress.

These influences relate to: the principles that guide policy priorities within an education system; the views and actions of others within the local context, including members of the wider community that the school serves, the staff of the departments that have responsibility for the administration of the school; and the criteria that are used to evaluate the performance of schools.

In what follows I examine these wider influences in more detail. Before doing so, however, I will summarise what our research suggests about the way inclusive developments can be encouraged within schools.

Developing inclusive practices

We have recently completed a three-year study that has attempted to throw further light on what needs to happen in order to develop inclusive practices in schools (Ainscow et al, 2003; Dyson and Ainscow, 2004). The study involved teams from three universities working with groups of schools as they attempted to move practice forward. It led us to conclude that the development of inclusive practice is not about adopting new technologies of the sort described in much of the existing literature (e.g. Stainback and Stainback, 1990; Thousand and Villa, 1991; Wang, 1991; Sebba and Sachdev, 1997; Florian et al, 1998). Rather, it involves social learning processes within a given workplace that influence people's action and, indeed, the thinking that informs their actions. This led us to interrogate our evidence in order to seek a deeper understanding of what these processes involve. To assist in this analysis we used as our guide the idea of 'communities of practice', as developed by Etienne Wenger (1998), focusing specifically on the way he sees learning as 'a characteristic of practice'.

Although the words 'community' and 'practice' evoke common images, Wenger has particular definitions of these terms, giving the phrase 'community of practice' a distinctive meaning. A practice, for example, need not be framed as the work and skill of a particular

practitioner. Rather, a practice consists of those things that individuals in a community do, drawing on available resources, to further a set of shared goals. This goes beyond how practitioners complete their tasks, to include, for example, how they make it through the day, commiserating about the pressures and constraints within which they have to operate.

Wenger provides a framework that can be used to analyse learning in social contexts. At the centre of this framework is the concept of a ‘community of practice’, a social group engaged in the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise. Practices are ways of negotiating meaning through social action. In Wenger’s view, meaning arises from two complementary processes, ‘participation’ and ‘reification’. He notes:

Practices evolve as shared histories of learning. History in this sense is neither merely a personal or collective experience, nor just a set of enduring artefacts and institutions, but a combination of participation and reification over time. (Page 87)

In this formulation, *participation* is seen as the shared experiences and negotiations that result from social interaction within a purposive community. Participation is thus inherently local, since shared experiences and negotiation processes will differ from one setting to the next, regardless of their interconnections. So, for example, within schools in our study we saw how hours of meetings, shared experiences and informal discussions over hurriedly taken lunches, also involved the development of particular meanings of frequently used phrases such as ‘raising standards’ and ‘inclusion’. These shared meanings help to define a teacher’s experience of being a teacher. In the same way we can assume that groups of colleagues doing similar work in another school have their own shared histories that give meaning to being a teacher in that particular context.

According to Wenger, *reification* is the process by which communities of practice produce concrete representations of their practices, such as tools, symbols, rules and documents (and even concepts and theories). So, for example, documents such as the school development plan or behaviour policy, are reifications of the practice of teachers. They include representations of the activities in which teachers engage, and some illustrations of the conditions and problems that a teacher might encounter in practice. At the same time, it is important to remember that such documents often provide overly rationalized portrayals of ideal

practice in which the challenges and uncertainties of unfolding action are smoothed over in the telling (Brown and Duguid, 1991)

Wenger argues that learning within a given community can often be best explained within the intertwining of reification and participation. He suggests that these are complementary processes, in that each has the capacity to repair the ambiguity of meaning the other can engender. So, for example, a particular strategy may be developed as part of a school's planning activities and summarised in a set of guidance for action, providing a codified reification of intended practice. However, the meaning and practical implications of the strategy only becomes clear as it is tried in the field and discussed between colleagues. In this way, participation results in social learning that could not be produced solely by reification alone. At the same time, the reified products, such as policy documents, serve as a kind of memory of practice, cementing in place the new learning. Such an analysis provides a way of describing the means by which practices develop within a school.

At this stage in the argument it is important to stress that I am not suggesting that communities of practice are in themselves a panacea for the development of inclusive practices. Rather, the concept helps us to attend to and make sense of the significance of social process of learning as powerful mediators of meaning. Wenger notes:

"Communities of practice are not intrinsically beneficial or harmful.... Yet they are a force to be reckoned with, for better or for worse. As a locus of engagement in action, interpersonal relationships, shared knowledge, and negotiation of enterprises, such communities hold the key to real transformation - the kind that has real effect on people's lives... The influence of other forces (e.g. the control of an institution or the authority of an individual) are no less important, but... they are mediated by the communities in which their meanings are negotiated in practice" (ibid. p.85).

The methodology for developing inclusive practices must, therefore, take account of these social processes of learning that go on within particular contexts. It requires a group of stakeholders within a particular context to look for a common agenda to guide their discussions of practice and, at much the same time, a series of struggles to establish ways of work-

ing that enable them to collect and find meaning in different types of information. The notion of the community of practice is a significant reminder of how this meaning is made.

Similarly important is the development of a common language with which colleagues can talk to one another and indeed to themselves about detailed aspects of their practice (Huberman, 1993; Little and McLaughlin, 1993). It seems, moreover, that without such a language teachers find it very difficult to experiment with new possibilities. It has been noted, for example, that when researchers report to teachers what has been observed during their lessons they will often express surprise (Ainscow, 1999). It seems that much of what teachers do during the intensive encounters that occur in a typical lesson is carried out at an automatic, intuitive level, involving the use of tacit knowledge. Furthermore there is little time to stop and think. This is perhaps why having the opportunity to see colleagues at work is so crucial to the success of attempts to develop practice. It is through such shared experiences that colleagues can help one another to articulate what they currently do and define what they might like to do. It is also the means whereby taken-for-granted assumptions about particular groups of students can be subjected to mutual critique.

Our research has drawn attention to certain ways of engaging with evidence that seem to be helpful in encouraging such dialogue. Our observation is that these can help to create space for reappraisal and rethinking by interrupting existing discourses, and by focusing attention on overlooked possibilities for moving practice forward. These approaches involve:

- Surveys of staff, student and parent views;
- Mutual observation of classroom practices, followed by structured discussion of what happened;
- Group discussion of a video recording of one colleague teaching;
- Discussion of statistical evidence regarding test results, attendance registers or exclusion records;
- Data from interviews with pupils;
- Staff development exercises based on case study material or interview data; and
- School to school cooperation, including mutual visits to help collect evidence.

Under certain conditions all of these approaches can provide *interruptions* that help to 'make the familiar unfamiliar' in ways that stimulate self-questioning, creativity and action.

Here, the role of the school principal is crucial (Riehl, 2000). So, for example, Lambert and her colleagues seem to be talking about a similar process in their discussion of what they call 'the constructivist leader'. They stress the importance of leaders gathering, generating and interpreting information within a school in order to create an 'inquiring stance'. They argue that such information causes 'disequilibrium' in thinking and, as a result, provides a challenge to existing assumptions about teaching and learning (Lambert et al, 1995).

We have found that these kinds of actions may create space and encourage discussion. However, they are not in themselves straightforward mechanisms for the development of more inclusive practices. The space that is created may be filled according to conflicting agendas. In this way, deeply held beliefs within a school may prevent the experimentation that is necessary in order to foster the development of more inclusive ways of working. So, for example, at the end of a lesson in a secondary school during which there was a very low level of participation amongst the class, the teacher explained what had happened with reference to the fact that most of the class were listed on the school's special educational needs register.

Such explanations make us acutely aware that the relationship between the recognition of anomalies in school practices and the presence of students presenting difficulties as the occasions for such recognition is deeply ambiguous. It is very easy for educational difficulties to be pathologised as difficulties inherent *within* students, even when those same difficulties are used productively to interrogate some aspects of school practice. This is true not only of students with disabilities and those defined as 'having special educational needs', but also of those whose socioeconomic status, race, language and gender renders them problematic to particular teachers in particular schools. Consequently, it is necessary, I suggest, to develop the capacity of those within schools to reveal and challenge deeply entrenched deficit views of 'difference', which define certain types of students as 'lacking something' (Trent et al, 1998).

Specifically, it is necessary to be vigilant in scrutinising how deficit assumptions may be influencing perceptions of certain students. As Bartolome (1994) explains, teaching methods are neither devised nor implemented in a vacuum. Design, selection and use of particular teaching approaches and strategies arise from perceptions about learning and learners. In this respect even the most pedagogically advanced methods are likely to be ineffective in the hands of those who implicitly or explicitly subscribe to a belief system that regards some stu-

dents, at best, as disadvantaged and in need of fixing, or, worse, as deficient and, therefore, beyond fixing.

The wider context

So far I have focused on factors within schools that can act as ‘levers for change’. However, our experience suggests that developments within individual schools are more likely to lead to sustainable development if they are part of a process of systemic change. In other words, inclusive school development has to be seen in relation to wider factors that may help or hinder progress.

Through our work, then, we have tried to ‘map’ factors at the district level that have the potential to either facilitate or inhibit the promotion of inclusive practices in schools. These are all ‘variables’ which education departments either control directly, or over which they can at least exert considerable influence. We intend that this work will eventually lead to the development of a framework instrument that will provide a basis for self-review processes. Some of these factors seem to be potentially more potent. However, our research suggests that two factors, particularly when they are closely linked, seem to be superordinate to all others. These are: *clarity of definition*, and *the forms of evidence* that are used to measure educational performance.

In my own country, there is still considerable confusion about what ‘inclusion’ actually means (Ainscow et al, 2000). To some extent, this lack of clarity might be tracked back to central Government policy statements. For example, the use of the term ‘social inclusion’ has been associated mainly with improving attendance and reducing the incidence of exclusions from schools. At the same time, the idea of ‘inclusive education’ has appeared in most national guidance in connection with the rights of individual children and young people categorised as having special educational needs to be educated in mainstream schools, whenever possible. Most recently, Ofsted, the inspection agency, has introduced the term ‘educational inclusion’, noting that ‘effective schools are inclusive schools’. The subtle differences between these concepts adds to the sense of uncertainty as to what is intended and, of course, it is now well established that educational reform is particularly difficult in contexts where there is a lack of common understanding amongst stakeholders (e.g. Fullan, 1991).

This being the case, in our own work we have supported a number of English local education authorities (LEAs) as they have attempted to develop a definition of 'inclusion' that can be used to guide policy development. Predictably, the exact detail of each LEA's definition is unique, because of the need to take account of local circumstances, culture and history. Nevertheless, four key elements have tended to feature strongly, and these are commended to those in any education system who are intending to review their own working definition. The four elements are as follows:

- *Inclusion is a process.* That is to say, inclusion has to be seen as a never-ending search to find better ways of responding to diversity. It is about learning how to live with difference, and, learning how to learn from difference. In this way differences come to be seen more positively as a stimulus for fostering learning, amongst children and adults.

- *Inclusion is concerned with the identification and removal of barriers.* Consequently, it involves collecting, collating and evaluating information from a wide variety of sources in order to plan for improvements in policy and practice. It is about using evidence of various kinds to stimulate creativity and problem-solving,

- *Inclusion is about the presence, participation and achievement of all students.* Here 'presence' is concerned with where children are educated, and how reliably and punctually they attend; 'participation' relates to the quality of their experiences whilst they are there and, therefore, must incorporate the views of the learners themselves; and 'achievement' is about the outcomes of learning across the curriculum, not merely test or examination results.

- Inclusion involves a particular emphasis on those groups of learners who may be at risk of marginalisation, exclusion or underachievement. This indicates the moral responsibility to ensure that those groups that are statistically most 'at risk' are carefully monitored, and that, where necessary, steps are taken to ensure their presence, participation and achievement in the education system.

Our experience has been that a well-orchestrated debate about these elements can lead to a wider understanding of the principle of inclusion within a community. We are also find-

ing that such a debate, though by its nature slow and, possibly, never ending, can have leverage in respect to fostering the conditions within which schools can feel encouraged to move in a more inclusive direction. Such a debate must involve all stakeholders within the local community. It must also involve those within the local education district office.

Our search for ‘levers’ has also led us to acknowledge the importance of evidence. In essence, it leads us to conclude that, within education systems, ‘what gets measured gets done’. Nowadays, LEAs in England are required to collect far more statistical data than ever before. This is widely recognised as a double-edged sword precisely because it is such a potent lever for change. On the one hand, data are required in order to monitor the progress of children, evaluate the impact of interventions, review the effectiveness of policies and processes, plan new initiatives, and so on. In these senses, data can, justifiably, be seen as the lifeblood of continuous improvement. On the other hand, if effectiveness is evaluated on the basis of narrow, even inappropriate, performance indicators, then the impact can be deeply damaging. Whilst appearing to promote the causes of accountability and transparency, the use of data can, in practice: conceal more than they reveal; invite misinterpretation; and, worse of all, have a perverse effect on the behaviour of professionals. This has led the current ‘audit culture’ to be described as a ‘tyranny of transparency’ (Strathern, 2000).

All of this suggests that great care needs to be exercised in deciding what evidence is collected and, indeed, how it is used. English LEAs are required by Government to collect particular data. Given national policies, they cannot opt out of collecting such data on the grounds that their publication might be misinterpreted, or that they may influence practice in an unhelpful way. On the other hand, LEAs are free to collect additional evidence that can then be used to evaluate the effectiveness of their own policy and practice in respect to progress towards greater inclusion. The challenge for LEAs is, therefore, to harness the potential of evidence as a lever for change, whilst avoiding the problems described earlier.

Our own work suggests that the starting point for making decisions about the evidence to collect should be with an agreed definition of inclusion. In other words, we must ‘measure what we value’, rather than is often the case, ‘valuing what we can measure’. In line with the suggestions made earlier, then, we argue that the evidence collected at the district level needs to relate to the ‘presence, participation and achievement’ of all students, with an emphasis

placed on those groups of learners regarded to be ‘at risk of marginalisation, exclusion or underachievement’.

Looking to the future

As we have seen, the development of inclusive policies and practices within rapidly changing education systems is a complex business. This paper is, therefore, an attempt to make a contribution to a better understanding of these complex issues in the field. As such, it is intended that the ideas discussed here will stimulate thinking and debate in ways that will enable further progress to be made in taking forward the inclusion agenda.

As my colleagues and I continue working with the education systems in which we are currently involved, both in England and in other parts of the world, we have two inter-linked aspirations, both of which are inherent in our approach to collaborative research. First, we hope that our partners will derive direct and practical benefits from their involvement, and that, as a result, children, young people and their families will receive more effective educational services. Secondly, we hope to make further progress in understanding and articulating some of the complex issues involved in this work. We also intend that the analysis that has been developed will provide the basis of self-review frameworks, such as the ‘Index for Inclusion’ (Booth and Ainscow, 2002), for the development of inclusive policies, practices and cultures within schools and school systems.

As we take this work forward it is important to keep in mind the arguments presented in this paper. In particular, we have to remember that much of what goes on within organisations, such as LEAs and schools, is largely taken-for-granted and, therefore, rarely discussed. In other words, practices are manifestations of organisational culture (Schein, 1985; Angelides and Ainscow, 2000). This leads us to assume that many of the barriers experienced by learners arise from existing ways of thinking. Consequently, strategies for developing inclusive practices have to involve *interruptions* to thinking, in order to encourage ‘insiders’ to explore overlooked possibilities for moving practice forward. Our research so far indicates that a focus on the issues of definition and the related use of evidence has the potential to create such interruptions.

Acknowledgements

1. I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues Tony Booth, Alan Dyson, Peter Farrell, Andy Howes, Dave Tweddle, Windyz Ferreira, Sam Fox, Susie Miles and Mel West to the ideas presented in this paper.
2. Some of the research reported in this paper was funded by Award L139 25 1001 and as such is part of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme of the UK's Economic and Social Research Council.
3. This article is based on the paper presented in the IVth International Congress on Psychology an Education, held in Almería (Spain) in April, 2004.

References

- Ainscow, M. (1994). *Special Needs in the Classroom: A Teacher Education Guide*. London: Jessica Kingsley/Paris: UNESCO.
- Ainscow, M. (1995). Special needs through school improvement; school improvement through special needs. In C. Clark, A. Dyson and A. Millward (Eds.) *Towards Inclusive Schools?*. London: Fulton
- Ainscow, M. (1999). *Understanding the Development of Inclusive Schools*. Falmer
- Ainscow, M. (2000). The next step for special education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 27, (2), 76-80.
- Ainscow, M. (2002). Using research to encourage the development of inclusive practices. In: P. Farrell and M. Ainscow (Eds.) *Making Special Education Inclusive*. London: Fulton.
- Ainscow, M., Barrs, D. and Martin. J. (1998). Taking school improvement into the classroom. *Improving Schools* 1(3), 43-48.
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P. and Tweddle, D. (1999). *Effective Practice in Inclusion and in Special and Mainstream Schools Working Together*. London: Department for Education and Employment
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P. And Tweddle, D. (2000). Developing policies for inclusive education: a study of the role of local education authorities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 4(3), 211-229

- Ainscow, M. and Haile-Giorgis, M. (1999) Educational arrangements for children categorised as having special needs in Central and Eastern Europe. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 14, (2), 103-121.
- Ainscow, M. and Howes, A. (2001). *LEAs and school improvement: what is it that makes the difference?* Paper presented at the British Education Research Association Conference, Leeds.
- Ainscow, M., Howes, A., Farrell, P. and Frankham, J. (2003). Making sense of the development of inclusive practices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 18(2), 227-242
- Ainscow, M. and Tweddle, D. (2003). Understanding the changing role of English local education authorities in promoting inclusion. In J. Allan (Ed.) *Inclusion, Participation and Democracy: What is the Purpose?* Kluwer, Academic Publishers, pp.165-177.
- Angelides, P. and Ainscow, M. (2000). Making sense of the role of culture in school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11, (2), 145-164.
- Bartolome, L.I. (1994) *Beyond the methods fetish: towards a humanising pedagogy*. Harvard Education Review. 54, 2, 173-194.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow, M.(2002). *The Index for Inclusion*, 2nd edition. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Brown, J.S. and Duguid, P. (1991). Organisational learning and communities of practice: Towards a unified view of working, learning and innovation. *Organisational Science* 2(1), pp.40-57.
- Dyson, A. and Ainscow, M. (2004). Standards and inclusive education: squaring the circle. *British Education Research Journal* (in press)
- Florian, L., Rose, R. and Tilstone, C. (eds.) (1998). *Planning Inclusive Practice*. London: Routledge
- Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. London: Cassell.
- Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994). *School Improvement in an Era of Change*. London; Cassell
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R.T. (1994). *Learning Together and Alone*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Huberman, M. (1993). The model of the independent artisan in teachers' professional relationships. In J.W. Little and M.W. McLaughlin (eds), *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Lambert, L. et al (1995). *The Constructivist Leader*. New York: Teachers College Press

- Little, J.W. and McLaughlin, M.W. (eds.) (1993). *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Mittler, P. (2000). *Working Towards Inclusive Education*. London: Fulton
- Riehl, C.J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: a review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research* 70(1), 55-81. (27pp)
- Robinson, V.M.J. (1998). Methodology and the research-practice gap. *Educational Researcher* 27, 7-26
- Sebba, J. and Sachdev, D. (1997). *What Works in Inclusive Education?* Ilford: Barnardo's
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organisational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E.H. (2001). Clinical inquiry/research. In P.Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage
- Senge, P.M. (1989). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*. London: Century.
- Strathern, M. (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal*. 26 (3), 309-321
- Stainback, W. and Stainback, S. (eds.) (1990). *Support Networks for Inclusive Schooling*. Baltimore: Brookes
- Thousand, J.S. and Villa, R.A. (1991). Accommodating for greater student variance. In M. Ainscow (ed.) *Effective Schools for All*. London: Fulton
- Trent, S.C., Artiles, A.J. and Englert, C.S. (1998). From deficit thinking to social constructivism: a review of theory, research and practice in special education. *Review of Research in Education* 23, 277-307
- UNESCO (1994). *Final Report: World conference on special needs education: Access and quality*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wang, M.C. (1991). Adaptive education; an alternative approach to providing for student diversity. In M. Ainscow (Ed.) *Effective Schools for All*. London: Fulton
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge University Press