JULIE ALLAN

1 INTRODUCTION

Posing the question 'what is the purpose?' in respect of inclusion, participation, and democracy might seem like a futile gesture. For those of us involved in inclusion, as teachers, teacher educators or researchers, the purpose appears to have been clear: to maximise the participation of young people in mainstream schools. There has been increasing recognition that this is a complex process and that in order to understand inclusion, it is necessary also to attend to the exclusionary pressures within institutions (Booth & Ainscow, 1995). Furthermore, there is widespread acceptance of the need to undergo radical school change (Barton, 1997) and to pathologise schools as the source of exclusion and failure, rather than the young people within them (Slee, 1996). Yet, in spite of this more sophisticated understanding of what needs to be done to achieve inclusion, questions about what young people are being included 'in' and for what purpose remain.

Education policies, including policies of inclusion, operate within a regime of accountability which is inefficient, ineffective and socially unjust (Salter and Tapper, 2000; Vidovitch and Slee, 2001) and which is described by Strathearn (1999) as a 'tyranny of transparancy' (p. 309). Schools and education authorities are forced to concentrate on 'proving' rather than improving and as Ball (2000) points out, these performative frameworks create an imperative for fabrication by those under scrutiny. Blackmore (cited in Vidovitch and Slee, 2001) contends that if accountability frameworks are not problematised, they could become the 'midwives of globalization ... which deliver market ideologies uncritically around the globe' (p. 451), while McNeil (2002) asks if whether the language of accountability will eliminate democratic discussions about the purpose of schooling. These warnings, however, appear to have gone unheeded and the obsession with standards has 'shut down the civic imagination, constrained curriculum and attenuated pedagogy' (Rose, cited in Slee, 1997, p. 307).

The quest for indicators and outcomes within the quality assurance genre has extended to inclusion; however, the views of disabled youngsters and their parents, regarding what the desirable consequences of inclusion should be have been disregarded. Consequently, institutions concerned with teacher education have been forced to search for 'inclusivity indicators' (Nunan et al, 2000, p. 75), which reduce inclusion to a contrived cultural performance by professionals. These symbolic displays of values, for example that teachers should 'recognise the cultural and social embeddedness of problems with respect to both their conceptualisation and solution' (ibid, p. 80), surely cannot be taken as 'evidence' of their existence. Alternatively, attempts have been made to produce indicators

1

which specify increases in the numbers of children 'present' in mainstream schools (DfEE, 1997) or even a reduction in the number of children formally assessed as having special educational needs (Scottish Executive, 1999). These are quite simply inept.

The desire for certainty within education more generally creates closure in practices and profound injustices for particular individuals. Derrida (1997) suggests that injustice is a product of the pressure to reach a just decision, and the instant when this occurs is a 'madness' (Derrida, 1990, p. 967). Furthermore, he argues that the certainty with which recommendations, for example about what constitutes good practice, need to be made allows for the evasion of responsibility. This ir-responsibility extends to the kind of guarantees and assurances (of quality, 'value added,' or enhancement) required within education, which Derrida (2001) suggests, sets up an inertia from which it is impossible to break away:

> Any presumption of guarantee and of non-contradiction in so paroxystic a situation ... is an optimistic gesticulation, an act of good conscience and irresponsibility, and therefore indecision and profound inactivity under the guise of activism (p. 71).

In order to grasp the problems created by this will to certainty, we need to un-derstand the role of misunderstanding (Biesta, 2001) within educational processes and to allow much of what we think we know to be unravelled. So, far from being futile, asking 'what is the purpose of inclusion, participation and democracy?' is an attempt to create, in Derrida's (1992) terms, an 'epic gesture ... a call towards that which is given at the same time as contradictory or impossible' (p. 30).

THE STIRLING COLLOQUIUM MEETING

This book has emerged from a meeting of an International Colloquium on inclusion, held at the University of Stirling, Scotland, in June 2001. The group comprises international scholars in the field of inclusive education, who have met regularly since 1994. The first publication to emerge from the Colloquium's first meeting in Newcastle, edited by Catherine Clark, Alan Dyson and Alan Millward (1995), attempted to map the field of inclusion and in so doing, demonstrated the huge diversity of meanings, policies and practices, within as well as between, countries. Tony Booth and Mel Ainscow (1998), in the second book to emerge from our deliberations, this time in Cambridge, concluded that the only way to succeed in understanding inclusion was to look simultaneously at exclusion. Keith Ballard (1999) foregrounded 'voice' in the meeting in Aukland, New Zealand and in re-sponse to our collections of 'stories' from young people, parents and professionals, he urged us to accept John Ralston Saul's (1997) notion of participation as 'the very expression of permanent discomfort' (p. 195). Forthcoming publications from a meeting in Rochester, USA (edited by Linda Ware) will address ideology and inclusion and Tony Booth, Kari Nes and Marit Strømstad consider inclusive teacher education in the book arising from a meeting in Hamar, Norway.

At the Stirling Colloquium meeting, participants set out to address the following questions:

- What are the goals/ambitions for inclusion and what forms of participation are necessary to achieve these? What changes in culture and politics are implied?
- What is the nature of the interaction between inclusion and identity (both individual and collective)?
- Is it possible to specify an ethical framework for inclusion?
- What kinds of consequences can be specified in relation to inclusion?

The authors have considered these questions either implicitly or explicitly in their chapters, but in posing them, I was not expecting definitive answers. Rather, I was looking to broaden our dialogue and to move out, even if only for a short time, from narrow frameworks of outcomes, indicators and notions of 'what works.' The book, then, seeks to broaden the arena in which inclusion is debated, to help to navigate around the contradictory and fragmentary policies which push and pull professionals in different directions, and to articulate a framework which works within, rather than against, these tensions to achieve consequences that are acceptable to children and families.

This collection addresses inclusion in relation to the kinds of educational goals which are appropriate for individuals and their communities. It seeks to articulate the nature of participation and democracy which might be achieved in inclusive settings and the consequences for all concerned. These consequences relate to the kinds of educational, social and personal experiences which are acceptable, and are distinctively different from the narrowly defined performative 'outcomes.'

The authors share a common concern for challenging the tautological discourses of inclusion, participation and democracy and interrupting the fixation on schooling, techniques and resources. They offer a broader vision of what might be possible and analyses of what stands in the way of this in practice. The Colloquium members would all characterise themselves as 'pro-inclusion,' and the majority of the chapters contain some powerful reflexive commentary of individuals' political and personal engagement with the inclusion project.

As the host of the Colloquium, I felt obliged to provide the participants with some authentically Scottish experiences. One event stood out from the usual garish emblems of nationhood and the inevitable Castle visit and I mention this here, not in an effort to imply that I was a classy host, but because it seemed to provide an illustration to the Colloquium participants of 'real' inclusion in practice. I invited my head of department, Peter Cope, to bring his group of young fiddle players to perform and the impact on the participants was electrifying. The Blackford Fiddle Group consists of youngsters and adults of all ages who play traditional Scottish fiddle music. The Group is explicitly inclusive, in that there is no entry selection and tuition is deliberately 'non-scholastic,' (for example by teaching in groups and using colour coded notation) in an effort to be as accessible as possible and in contrast with approaches to formal music learning. During public performances, such as the one witnessed by the Colloquium participants, individuals elect when

and what to play, according to their familiarity with particular tunes and their skill level. Linda Ware said of the performance: 'We've been sitting around all day discussion how to do inclusion and these guys have just done it, right before our eyes.' Subsequently Peter Cope and I have been working with the young fiddlers in an attempt to understand, from their perspective, what it means to be included. We see is value in stepping outside conventional school frameworks in order to understand the processes of inclusion and participation. The contributors to this volume also underline the importance of addressing the 'bigger picture.'

INTRODUCING THE CHAPTERS

Part One of the book goes beyond schooling to consider the nature of indi-viduals' engagement with communities and society. In the first chapter, *Including ourselves: teaching, trust, identity and community,* Keith Ballard takes as his starting point the premise that ideological contexts and practices are in conflict with notions of trust and community. Ballard uses the idea of 'stories to live by' to examine how our own stories as researchers and teachers may interact with the stories of others in and beyond our communities and society. He asks: if the dominant story in our various societies is one of individualism and of distrust, then what is it that we are to be included in? Ballard examines the extent to which the 'sociality of identity' (James, 1994, p. 3) is being lost through challenges to the concept of society and the disengagement of individuals. His account of technicist and reductionist approaches to teaching (in which the teacher's role is to manage learning outcomes), accountability, and 'performance management' in education shows how it takes the very soul away from individual teachers and learners. Ballard's analysis elucidates the nature of participation as concerned with a sense of belonging and developing identity through relationships. Inclusion, he contends, is about ourselves.

Marit Strømstad offers a critique of the emphasis within Norway on school reform to achieve inclusion, arguing that the technicist, practice oriented, approach has sidestepped the major societal changes required. She analyses the ways in which inclusion appeared within Norway's Reform 97 and demonstrates the ways in which its impact is limited by its narrow focus and by the ways in which the participation of students is confined to practical, rather than pedagogical, matters. Strømstad presents findings from research on participation which highlights stark differences in perceptions of students and their teachers about the level of students' participation in decision-making. Inclusion, according to Strømstad, is political work which needs to be undertaken by all concerned.

In chapter three, *Participation and democracy: what's inclusion got to do with it?*, Colleen Cummings, Alan Dyson and Alan Millward unpack some of the as-sumptions behind notions of inclusion, participation and democracy and explore the relationship between them. Their research on the role of schools in area regeneration highlights the struggles faced by schools in particular areas to manage children's behaviour, improve educational attainment and meet the wider social and learning

needs in the context of a strong accountability regime. The authors report on the different conceptualisations of the role of schools arising within different social and economic contexts and in response to the 'standards agenda' and the education market place. They call for a more sophisticated understanding of the relationship between educational processes and outcomes and subsequent life chances than has hitherto been evident and ask whether the term 'inclusive education' has outlived its usefulness.

Kari Nes, in her chapter *Why does education for all have to be inclusive education? From Jomtien to Salamanca and beyond*, considers what the principle of education for all means in practice. She traces the impact of the Salamanca and Jomtien statements alongside Kisanji's (1998) analysis of indigenous customary education in North and South African villages. She uses this analytical framework to scrutinise the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth et al, 2000) and the Norwegian National Curriculum and argues for an social anthropological approach to curriculum planning which analyses culture and addresses the basic needs of people.

Each of the chapters contained in Part Two offer a challenge to the way in which inclusion is understood. Dora Bjarnsson explores the question of adult status for disabled people, drawing on a study of young Icelandics. She illustrates how the choices made by parents on behalf of their sons or daughters may restrict entry into adulthood and portrays the youngsters as travellers, moving along a either a main road or a special road. A further group of young people were characterised as nomads, travelling in the wasteland, and failing to acquire adult status.

Gwynned Lloyd examines the case of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in the context of inclusion. She analyses the media's portrayal of the enthusiastic oversimplification and normalisation of this complex 'disorder' and contrasts this with the more cautious tone adopted in the medical and psychological literature. Her analysis also focuses on the opposing views of two exponents of different positions (Baldwin & Cooper, 2000) and, in a context in which parents can escape blame through the acceptance of the validity of the concept and the diagnostic procedures of ADHD, she questions the motivations and interests of individuals who appear to promote the medication of children with an ADHD diagnosis without an adequate research base. Lloyd considers ways of informing parents and teachers so that they may develop a critical awareness of the broader context of this condition and of the implications for inclusion.

In *Working past pity: problematising disability in the secondary curriculum*, Linda Ware describes her research with secondary school teachers in which she introduced them to humanities-based disability studies and helped them to integrate disability-related topics in their curriculum. Her project also included a lecture series and a number of 'collaborative inquiry dialogues' for University and secondary teachers. Ware analyses the teachers' knowledge shifts and their accompanying frustration the students who experienced this innovative curriculum describe how it altered how they understood both disability and themselves. Ware's goal of giving voice to unspoken questions that challenge the received narratives of disability represents a radical reworking of the inclusion project which goes