

The Inclusion/Exclusion Saga: Two Peas in a Pod?

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Middlesex University, United Kingdom

Received 02 June 2009; received in revised form 19 August 2009; accepted 05 October 2009

ABSTRACT Inclusion and exclusion share a paradoxical union. They intersect on specific levels in teaching and learning environments as well as in other societal institutions. This paper examines the dialectic, yet interconnected link that exists between inclusion and exclusion in education institutions, and relates how both their development and continued existence are sustained by non-education organisations/institutions, including the workplace. It positions non-education institutions in a 'supportive role' as far as inclusion and exclusion practices are concerned since these very practices are in some ways an extension of those in learning institutions. Moreover, findings from research work that confirm a compelling association between ethnic minorities and social exclusion, relate to non-education institutions as much as they do to learning institutions. Dewey's concept of schooling and education brings a philosophical perspective to the discussion by showing the relationship between educational philosophy and inclusion and exclusion practices. The paper contends that there is an inextricable connection between inclusion, exclusion and labelling, which it explains, bears negative fruits. It then links the debate to the issue of language with special reference to 'mother tongue' not being the official language. It further examines the changing 'faces' of education policies and relates how these very policies fuel exclusion practices, while at the same time embracing an inclusive agenda. It admits that policy can play a vital role in stemming malpractices with regards to social inclusion and exclusion. However, it asserts that educational success is only possible when practical measures are put in place to break the cycles of marginalisation, deprivation, educational inequalities, low teacher expectation and visible and invisible patterns of prejudice and intolerance.

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Keywords: Social inclusion/Exclusion, Marginalisation, Labeling, Inequality

If we continue to leave vast sections of the people of the world outside the orbit of education, we make the world not only less just, but also less secure - Professor Amartya Sen 15th CCEM Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

Since all education involves growth and since there is nothing to which growth is relative, save more growth, there is nothing to which education is subordinate, save more education - John Dewey.

Introduction

An abridged analysis of the inclusion/exclusion narrative was first presented by the author as a discussion paper for the 7th International Conference, Comparative Education and Teacher Training, Tryavna, Bulgaria, 29 June – 3 July 2009. This paper picks up the issues introduced in that paper and widens the discussion to demonstrate the dialectical link that exists between inclusion and exclusion. Although the boundaries of this paper do not give room to widen the discussion fully, nevertheless, the paper can shed more light on the inclusion/ exclusion debate by opening up the discussion to include particular perspectives that are linked, directly and/or indirectly, to the issues under consideration.

The paper begins by providing the definitional framework for inclusion and exclusion, within which the issues may be interpreted. It then introduces a philosophical slant to the discussion by utilising Dewey's concept of schooling and education to show the relationship between educational philosophy and inclusion and exclusion practices. Dewey was singled out for reference because of the major contributions he made to educational philosophy as well as his interpretation of what education entails:

Education is a process of living through a continuous reconstruction of experiences. It is the development of all those capacities in the individual which will enable him to control his environment and fulfil his possibilities (Dewey in Khalid 1998, p. 4)

This position embraces informal as much as it does formal education since they occur synergistically during all life's stages. Dewey is suggesting that the continuity of life's experiences is possible via social groups and it is education that is the catalyst for this continuity.

The paper next identifies non-educational organisations/institutions, including the

workplace, as ‘catchments’ that, to some extent, retain the inclusion and exclusion problems that surface in learning institutions. This position is supported by findings from a number of studies including Ade-Ojo (2009a), Bhola and Gomez (2008), Kingston (2008), Confederation of British Industry (CBI, 2006), National Literacy Trust (2005). Other studies also demonstrate a strong association between ethnic minorities and social exclusion—see, for example, Burden and Hamm (2000), and Hawtin and Kettle (2000). Labelling is injected into the discussion because of its direct connection to the issues raised (Swain, French and Cameron, 2003; Persaud, 2000). I perceive it as not only ‘damaging’ to its victims, but also as reinforcing the ‘downside’ of inclusion and exclusion. Following this is a brief section on language, which bears witness to relationship between language and inclusion and exclusion (Hopson 2003; Gravelle, 2001). The penultimate section looks at the changing ‘faces’ of education policies in the inclusion exclusion debate. To conclude, the paper suggests that there is dire need to ‘break the cycles’ of educational inequalities for all learners concerned, in order to allow them to experience a purposeful and productive life.

Conceptualising inclusion and exclusion

It is problematic to pin a strict definition on inclusion and exclusion since both are complex and varied in scope and span the entire social spectrum. A range of explanations is proffered. Clough (2000, p. 7) puts inclusion and exclusion in a bipolar perspective by viewing inclusion as the removal of all forms of exclusionary practice. With specific reference to schooling, Cigman (2007, p. 70) articulates: “inclusion can refer to being ‘under the same roof’, being in the same class and being engaged in the common enterprise of learning”. Similarly, Mittler (2000, p. viii) asserts that inclusion is about everyone having opportunities for choice and self-determination. Zelaieta (2004, p.37) links inclusion to “a commitment and a responsibility to the process of restructuring schools so that they respond to the diversity of pupils in their locality”. Abbott (2006, p.628) supports the connection of inclusion to diversity by suggesting that schools should transform “to respond to pupil diversity”. But what of exclusion, is it merely the absence of inclusion practices? Given that inclusion and exclusion practices span the entire social dimension, it seems fitting to interpret the said practices within this range. The explanations offered below provide a useful framework for interpretation:

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Social inclusion: Ensuring the marginalised and those living in poverty have greater participation in decision making which affects their lives, allowing them to improve their living standards and their overall well-being ...

Social exclusion: The process whereby certain groups are pushed to the margins of society and prevented from participating fully by virtue of their poverty, low education or inadequate life-skills (Combat Poverty Agency, [CPA] 2008).

The above shows a distinction between both sets of practices. Yet, this transparency is sometimes positioned in ambiguous situations that challenge and frustrate this bipolarity. This means that ‘inclusion’ and ‘exclusion’ are not, strictly speaking, opposites, although notions of one do sometimes reflect an opposite situation of the other. It is at the ‘results’ or outcome level where questions are raised and paradoxes are exposed. For example, schools may sport an equal opportunity policy while “preparing children for class-determined careers in the labour market” (Archer 2003, p. 7). It is perhaps in cases such as this that inclusion becomes a euphemistic rendering of exclusion.

Clayton (2000) notes that low income, arising from unemployment or precarious or low-paid employment, is the single greatest symptom of social exclusion. In addition to poverty, Clayton lists, among others, the lack of education as an attribute of social exclusion. This suggests that providing education should be an integral part of the inclusion agenda, which should at the very least influence teaching learning practices that should benefit the learners. However, education systems and academic institutions are ‘open’ arenas of inclusion and exclusion practices, thus providing ready contexts within which interpretations can be analysed (Clayton, 2008; Tomlinson, 2005; Archer, 2003; Ross, 2003). It is not surprising therefore that it is within these very confines that the inclusion/exclusion conundrum grows and flourishes. Jha and Kelleher has this to say:

Education can be and often is perceived as a process of expanding human capacities to contribute to the making of a just, equal and compassionate society. However, it is not necessarily always a process of empowerment and transformation. It has equal potential or danger of being a process of socialising learners into existing norms, values and power structures and reinforcing unequal relations (Jha and Kelleher, 2006, pp.9—10).

Tomlinson voices a similar sentiment, albeit with an economic slant:

... no government up to the turn of the century came near to resolving the contradictions involved in greater investment in education and training for

all, in a society that still regarded educating the working class and socially excluded with ambivalence... (Tomlinson, 2005, p. 8).

Linking economic activities to situations where inclusion and exclusion issues are played out, seems justified for Healy (2007, p. xvii) who asserts that economic growth is accompanied by social inequality and endemic deprivation. Healy further points out that, despite economic growth, there are many people who have benefited little from it and these “are at risk of poverty and exclusion for a variety of reasons” Healy (2007, p. xvii). The list of reasons is [arguably] endless especially when considered against the backdrop of the current global, and particularly, the national economic climate. It is in this vein that I proffer these concerns for scrutiny:

- The extent to which education reinforces ‘unequal relations’.
- Whether the current economic climate is a ‘plus’ or ‘minus’ in resolving the contradictions involved in greater investment in education?
- Which inclusion practices are quelling social inequality and endemic deprivation?
- Which are reinforcing unequal relations, inclusion or exclusion, or both
- The implications there are for the disadvantaged and socially excluded.

None of the above has a cut-and-dry explanation for inclusion and exclusion issues are spread across all levels of education—from Early Childhood Education (ECE) right through to Higher Education (HE), including Special Education (SE) and Adult Education (AE) (Baldock, Fitzgerald and Kay, 2005; O’Brien and O’Fathaigh, 2007). AE has become a major component of the learning society. Gildersleeves (2009) cites AE as being able to make a contribution to “social justice, social inclusion and poverty reduction”. Besides, Edwards, Armstrong and Miller (2001), drawing on critical social policy studies and post-structuralist philosophy, contend that there is a direct relationship between social inclusion, social exclusion and lifelong learning since lifelong learning can help to bring about a decrease in exclusion practices, thus contributing to an inclusive society. They further advance that the notion of inclusion relies on exclusions, hence the need for all in AE to “take a more critical stance towards the social inclusion agenda to which it is being harnessed”. In a similar vein Clayton (2000) points out that one of the problems facing the socially excluded is the difficulty of gaining access to

lifelong learning. The foregoing conceptualisations clearly illustrate an ongoing inclusion/exclusion conundrum. But how does it link to education philosophy?

A philosophical link

I refer to Dewey's concept of education and schooling to explain the link between education philosophy and social inclusion and exclusion. As an educator and a philosopher, Dewey saw education as being dynamic and naturally progressive—"the continual reconstruction of experience" (Khalid, 1998, p.119)—"a continuous interaction between the individual and the society" (p.126). This stance raises this question: how can inclusion and/or exclusion practices foster and/or hinder this continuity? This question seems even more pertinent if one accepts Dewey's assertion that it is the development of continuous reconstructed experiences that will enable the learner "to control his environment and fulfil his possibilities" (p. 4). From the standpoint that "...exclusion is strongly associated with highly negative outcomes in education and in long-term life chances" (Gillborn, 2008, p. 60), it is highly probable that those excluded are unable to fulfil their 'possibilities'.

I would not attempt to use this paper to explore the varied and many related issues that the aforementioned question throws up. However, I wish to make mention of a situation that is directly linked to Dewey's education philosophy. As an "alternative provision" to exclusion, some students/pupils are sent to Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) (Gillborn, 2008, p. 61). Given that PRUs "provide education for pupils who have been excluded, and they can be used to provide short placements for those who are at risk of exclusion" (Department for Children School and Families, [DCSF] 2009), it seems reasonable to conclude that this provision in itself is an 'inclusion practice'. And if taken as such, should not only allow students/pupils 'to improve their overall well-being' (CPA, 2008), but should also allow a continuous reconstruction of educational experiences (Dewey). But Gillborn (2008, p. 61) noted that PRU units "do not guarantee students' access to the mainstream curriculum". What this clearly demonstrates is that on one hand the excluded are provided with an opportunity to become included, while on the other hand are denied 'mainstream privileges' that can help them to 'fulfil possibilities'. I now refer to my own [case study] research experience to support this conclusion. While researching the educational experiences of relocated Montserratians in London schools, I had the opportunity to meet two of the participants, Student A and Student B, who were in separate PRUs—urban and rural, respectively (Shotte, 2002; Shotte, 2001). When questioned about their general well being, they commented:

Student A: I am not happy. I want to go to school so that I can learn. I want to do work. Can't wait for to do school work...

Student B: I miss home. I miss school. You come to take me back to school? I want to go to school. All the teacher do is send me in the corner...

For these two students there seemed to be no hope of returning to mainstream. And their chances of 'fulfilling possibilities' appear just as grim for neither thought that each was having formal schooling. Here, the line between inclusion and exclusion certainly gets 'thinner' while the symbiosis between institutions gets stronger.

Dewey advocated the notion of the problem-solving method within an activity-oriented curriculum. For him, educational aims were the outgrowth of problematic situations arising in ongoing activities, which would allow children to "develop social efficiency" and gain life skills (Khalid, 1998, p.14). This does not seem to be the case in the PRUs noted above. The only skills that Students A and B appeared to be learning then are the ones that related to 'adjusting to life in PRUs'.

Obviously, both inclusion and exclusion practices can promote the 'continuous interaction between the individual and society' that Dewey advanced; but the results are operationalised on very different plateaux. This in turn, would not only affect the progress of those disadvantaged, but would also have some serious implications for the 'external stakeholders in education'—employers and social establishments.

And others too (non-education institutions)

Institutions and many organisations stand ready to promote the inclusion agenda in their local, national and international political discourses and educational dialogues. Little wonder that Thomas and O'Hanlon (2001, p. vii) view inclusion as a "cliché—obligatory in the discourse of all right-thinking people". Ironically, 'right-thinking people' do not always 'get it right', hence the need for dialogue of this nature. However, the focus of this discussion is not whether 'right thinking people' use the inclusion agenda as an institutional tool to effect positive ratings. Rather, it endorses inclusion's lawful position in curriculum improvement talks, widening participation approaches, education and lifelong learning methodologies (Combat Poverty Agency, [CPA] 2008; Healy, 2007; Ross, 2003) and education

policy revision. In support, O'Brien and O'Fathaigh (2007) contend that policy makers should be encouraged "to re-evaluate current arrangements in the interest of further advancing the social inclusion agenda". To this end, the relationship between education institutions and "external stakeholders in education" is crucial (Frohlich, 2004, p. 32).

But advancement of a 'social inclusion agenda', to whatever degree, is in itself a recognition that exclusion practices do exist. In fact, Edwards, Armstrong and Miller (2001) argue that social inclusion is not the "unconditional good" that it appears to be. They maintain that the reliance of one on the other may even be "desirable". It is therefore reasonable to conclude that such a stance might have "helped to lay the platform for many notionally progressive changes in legislation across the world" (Thomas and Loxley 2001, p. 4), during the mid-1970s. The United States of America (USA) pioneered this move with its Public Law 94—142 that addressed disability issues with a view to providing "the most natural, mainstream or integrated environment" (Thomas and Loxley 2001, p. 4). In the United Kingdom, it was the 1976 Education Act that mandated "children with disabilities should be integrated in mainstream where possible" (Tomlinson 2005, p. 24). The European Disability Forum (EDF), established in 1996, campaign for "a comprehensive European disability directive that will protect disabled people from discrimination at all levels" (EDF, 2008). However, these officially authorised initiatives and commitments to 'inclusion', have neither stemmed the tide of exclusion practices nor mainstreamed particular disadvantaged groups. In fact, there appears to be a reproduction of the very malpractices that governments are trying to eradicate. Perhaps it is this vein that Thomas and Loxley (2001, p. 4) assert: "exclusion shows no sign of declining".

The interconnectedness between the various non-education institutions is especially insightful in the inclusion/exclusion debate, not least for the fact that these institutions appear to be an extension of the 'education' milieu that encourages social inclusion while paradoxically excluding the 'included'. A look into the past reveals people who "taught their children the necessary skills required for the sustenance of life while keeping them in the company of adults" (Khalid, 1998, p.6). The cumulative experiences that were gained from utilising available natural resources were transmitted to successive generations via "social groups". This practice eventually graduated to educational institutions - schools. Fast-forwarding to the modern era brings into focus educational progress, technological advancement, related laws, principles policies and philosophies. Arguably, 'children' (learners) today are still 'in the company of adults' (teachers, among others), but whether or not they acquire 'the skills required for the sustenance of life' is questionable, as suggested below:

More than half of employers say school leavers often cannot function in the workplace due to a lack of basic maths [literacy] (BBC, 2007)

The foregoing is in spite of the fact that the youths' "IT skills - in increasingly technology-driven workplaces - are acceptable" (BBC, 2007). Still, Rikowski (2006) found it no surprise that the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) "criticised school-leavers ... as being insufficiently prepared for the world of work". Poor attitudes—generally low motivation, questionable work ethics (Kingston, 2008) and written and oral communication (CBI, 2006) are noted on the employers' dissatisfaction 'list'. Some institutions do organise 'remedial' sessions but National Trust (2005) insists that school leavers should become proficient in basic skills "before they leave school."

This grim situation is in spite of "the huge sums expended on basic skills development" (Ade-Ojo, 2009b). Moreover, private tutoring is booming, in many cases, "to supplement the poor teaching in some schools" (Griffiths, 2009, p.9). Although these examples expose the 'dark' side of the teaching/learning environment, they do demonstrate the uneasy relationship between schools and other institutions. But Whitty (2005, p.124) cautions that since "the relationship between individuals, institutions and society is complex", schools should not be blamed for the problems of society. Whitty further asserts that schools can make a difference in reversing "long-standing patterns of disadvantage", but are unable to "buck social trends" single-handedly. It is interesting to examine how social establishments can assist when the group of people who is most likely to be excluded from learning institutions, is the same group that are usually excluded from non-education institutions.

Ethnic minorities, the disabled and exclusion

It is generally accepted in research circles that diversity issues that relate to notions of nationality, ethnicity, gender, racism and religion are as neatly tied to education institutions as they are to those of the 'external stakeholders' (Favell, 2001; Percy-Smith, 2000). In analysing different dimensions of exclusion – economic, political and social, among others, Burden and Hamm (2000, p. 187) assert that ethnic minority and disabled groups are most likely to be placed in the 'exclusion zone'. With reference to the economic dimension, they note "considerable evidence of the economic exclusion of those from ethnic minority groups" (p.188). For the social dimension, homelessness, unemployment and educational underachievement

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

ment are issues of serious contention among ethnic minority groups—an overrepresentation of African-Caribbean boys in school exclusion (Gillborn, 2008; Jha and Kelleher, 2006; Hawtin and Kettle, 2000). Analysis of the social dimension clearly shows how school exclusion spreads to society:

...the disproportionate levels of school exclusions of African Caribbean pupils and students at the 'tip of the iceberg' lead to social exclusion and institutional racism in the wider society (Burden and Hamm 2000, p. 189).

The 'disproportionate levels' and the overrepresentation have been attributed to "racialised processes of low teacher expectation, negative stereotyping, disproportionate levels of criticism and control" (Burden and Hamm 2000, p. 189) and other associations that relate to other dimensions of exclusion. There is overrepresentation too for disabled groups with regards to social exclusion on whichever dimension. Discrimination and negative social attitudes are part and parcel of the everyday experience of the disabled. Knight and Brent describe their 'lived experience' this way:

... patronised, avoided, ignored, abandoned, mocked by strangers, assumed to be stupid, treated as an inconvenience, and regarded as unfit for public view (Knight and Brent, 1998, p.6).

The sentiments expressed in the foregoing are quite similar to what occurs in learning institutions. For example, SEN children are victims of bullying, harassment and discrimination, hence the need for these school policies:

- Embrace the Disability Duty and proactively promote equality. Work to eliminate harassment and discrimination and produce a Disability Equality Scheme (p.8).
- Establish appropriate, comfortable and safe mechanisms to help children with SEN and disabilities who are being bullied (Teachernet, 2007, p.9).

The examples cited in this brief section demonstrate that the groups that are most like to be excluded from schools are the same groups that 'suffer' from the inequalities reproduced by society. These are reinforced by the 'labelling syndrome'.

The issue of labelling

Labelling, inclusion and exclusion are inextricably linked. Labelling is another 'arena' where inclusion and exclusion stand within the same circumference. Swain et al (2003, p. 11) argue that labels are influential in helping us to understand our origin, what we have become and how we can position ourselves in society. But they also assert that they are capable of evoking feelings of superiority and inferiority and as "marks of inclusion or exclusion", can make us humble or proud, powerful or powerless.

While labels are useful for self or group identification, they can also be used "to oppress, coerce, control and exclude" (Swain et al. 2003, p. 12). An example of this is the SEN label. It identifies those who are in need of special assistance to help them to succeed academically. Yet, it is this very label that alerts others of one's 'deficiency', thus exposing him/her to self-doubt, ridicule, harassment and/or discrimination. Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) has a similar effect. Consider this personal experience at a London school:

Teacher: So why are you here? (sitting on the stairs). Why are you not in class?

Student: What do you care? It doesn't matter if I am in (the classroom) or out. All of you think I am stupid because I have ADHD. Everything is ADHD. ADHD. It doesn't matter. I am stupid anyway.

It is clear from the foregoing that labels not only encourage stereotypes but they also bring into focus the 'self-fulfilling prophecy'. Labels do "guide the attitudes and behaviour of others" towards the labelled (Swain et al. 2003, p. 12), even with regards to language. Labels such as EAL (English as an Additional Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language) provoke similar 'damaging' reactions.

The language issue

This is yet another complex issue as relates to inclusion and exclusion practices because language is central to social relations. Hopson (2003, p. 23) sees its role as one that frames and maintains or challenges and deconstructs "dominant themes and ideologies that reproduce global social relations".

In his discussion about language and colonial relationships, Memmi (1965) cited in Hopson (2003, p. 235), says this about the mother tongue:

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

... that which is sustained by his feelings, emotions, and dreams, that in which his tenderness and wonder are expressed, thus that which holds the greatest emotional impact, is precisely the one which is the least valued. It has no stature in the country or in the concert of peoples. If he wants to obtain a job, make a place for himself, exist in the community and the world, he must first bow to the language of his masters.

Memmi's conviction finds resonance in institutions where deficiency is synonymous to diversity and a hegemonic attitude prevails. Consequently, exclusion practices are more common than inclusive. Children whose mother tongue is not the official language, become victims of "cultural insularity" and eventually "cultural insensitivity" (Scott, 2003, p. 212). According to Scott, low teacher expectation is the catalyst for further marginalisation, particularly for those in "low-income urban settings" (Burden and Hamm 2000, p. 189). Given that asylum-seeking children, refugees and children from other ethnic minority groups generally live in 'low-income urban settings', and that these children may be "literate in languages other than English" (Gravelle 2001, p. 88), it follows then that they are also EAL or ESL students. Gravelle has this to say about EAL:

... the term EAL covers a wide range of levels of English language fluency from beginners to those with native-like fluency. It fails to give any recognition beyond this to the place of children's home languages in their identity and education development, seeing them merely as tools in the acquisition of English (Gravelle, 2001, p. 88)

This observation visibly demonstrates the abstruse link between language and inclusion and exclusion practices, for while children are 'included' in the EAL and ESL programmes, they are at the same time 'excluded' from pedagogic mainstream practices that can promote 'their identity and education development. The labelling situation is quite similar to the language one in that both inclusion and exclusion practices have 'gently shoved' the children concerned to the periphery of the mainstream. But what can education policy do to address these differences?

A look at policy

Collinson, et al. (2009, p. 13), in discussing professional growth and performance improvement, note that England recognised that "poverty and educational disadvantage are intrinsically linked" and acknowledged that there was a need to shift thinking "to consider the holistic needs of children". This recognition and ac-

knowledge were perhaps in response to criticisms that there was a lack of cohesion of public policies that supported education policies. Consequently, a multi-agency approach was taken. Responsibility for schools, children and families were joined within a single department—the Department for Schools Children and Families (DfSCF). Additionally, professional development for teachers is designed to “break down traditional boundaries and build collaboration among education health and social services providers” Collinson, et al. (2009, p. 13). Such collaboration is crucial considering that these service providers have regular contacts with disadvantaged and ethnic minority groups.

Education is an important subset of a wider social landscape that intersects at different contextual levels with other ‘factions’ and institutions in society. What this means is that policies related to inclusion and exclusion practices cannot be formulated and enforced solely on a teaching and learning basis or on what the elites might deem necessary. I would venture to infer that there is a symbiotic relationship between the different institutional components of society. For example, a nation’s economic machinery “exists as part of a legislative environment which imposes obligations on individuals and organisations such as schools, about discrimination along the lines of race, gender or disability” (Thomas and Loxley, 2001, p. 88).

DfEE (1997), in its policy documents, acknowledged that nationally, the government has an obligation to address inclusion, as noted below:

Our policies for raising standards are for all children, including those with special educational needs (SEN)...
... We aim to increase the level and quality of inclusion within mainstream schools, while protecting and enhancing specialist provision for those who need it. We will redefine the role of special schools to bring out their contribution in working with mainstream schools to support greater inclusion (DfEE, 1997).

The above commitment is in response to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, [UNESCO] 1994 Salamanca World Statement on Special Needs Education that called on governments “to adopt the principle of inclusive education, enrolling all children in regular schools, unless there are compelling reasons for doing otherwise” (DfEE, 1997, p. x). The target date was 2002. Three years later, Tomlinson had this to say:

...policies in both education and the economy continue to have the effect of legitimising continued inequality and the exclusion of weaker social groups (2005, p. 213).

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Clearly, education policies as well as those from other ‘symbiotic components’ of society have not been ‘expertly’ translated into practice. Despite government’s commitments and educators’ good intentions, why do policy and practice part ways at implementation level? Baldock, Fitzgerald and Kay explain:

Policy makers will often argue in favour of a policy on one set of grounds while also having other considerations in mind... governments have often adopted policies that have restricted the powers and autonomy of local councils (2005, p. 4).

About a decade after DfEE’s commitment, the introduction of DfSCF does raise some hope but the inevitable conflict between policy makers and implementers rages on as noted above, thus frustrating the inclusion process, and strengthening the ‘bond’ between inclusion and exclusion.

Conclusion

This paper demonstrated that with regards to education and non-education institutions, paradoxically, ‘inclusion’ and ‘exclusion’ practices are quite similar in that they bear similar fruits of marginalisation. It noted that there is a ‘contentious’, inextricable relationship between the two words at definitional, philosophical and practice levels, and even more so because of the interrelationship between all institutions. It also recounted how the issue of labelling and language relates to inclusion and exclusion practices and identifies ethnic minority and disabled groups as being the most likely to be excluded. Drawing on scholarly analysis, the paper concluded that the very measures that learning institutions have taken to promote inclusive education, are in themselves exclusive practices—at the point of intersection.

It is one thing to have policy documents to guide inclusive practices, but quite another to ensure that the practices are beneficial to the marginalised and the disadvantaged. Only time will tell whether DfSCF will one day be able to strike a balance between the practices related to the two words under discussion.

Admittedly, it will not be easy to restructure an education system so the disadvantaged and the marginalised can realise their fullest potential. However, it is imperative to put particular measures in place to address the ingrained, institutional malpractices that affect all learners. Only then can a realistic attempt be made to break the cycles that fence social barriers, marginalisation, educational

inequalities, low teacher expectation and visible and invisible patterns of prejudice and intolerance. Social inclusion and exclusion may remain 'two peas in a pod' but with more positive outcomes.

Correspondence

Dr Gertrude Shotte
School of Arts and Education
Middlesex University
Bramley Road
London N14 4ZY, England, UK
Tel.: +44 (0) 772 505 4077
Email: G.Shotte@mdx.ac.uk

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

References

Abbott, L. (2006) *Northern Ireland Head teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion*, International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10, 6, pp. 627–643.

Ade-Ojo, G. (2009a) *Practitioners Perception of the Impact of the Vision of Policy-makers on Practice: The example of the Recommendations of the Moser Commission*. Forthcoming in Research Papers in Education 2009.

Ade-Ojo, G. (2009b) *Socializing Young Literacy Learners into a Discourse of Failure: Dominant Discourses in Literacy Teaching and Assessment and their Impact on the Progression of Young Literacy Learners into Employment*. Paper presented at the 7th International Comparative Education Conference, Tryavna, Bulgaria 29 June—04 July 2009.

Archer, L. (2003) 'Social Class and Higher Education', in *Higher education and Social Class: Issues of Exclusion and Inclusion*, London, RoutledgeFalmer, pp.5-20.

Baldock, P., Fitzgerald, D. and Kay, J. (2005) *Understanding Early Years Policy*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing.

BBC (2007) *Teens 'Cannot Function in Work'*, retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk>, accessed on 15/04/09.

Bhola, S. and Gomez, V. (2008) *Signposts to Literacy for Sustainable Development*. Paris, UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Burden, T. and Hamm, T. (2000) 'Responding to Socially Excluded Groups', in J. Percy-Smith (Ed.) *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Social Inclusion*, Buckingham, Open University Press, pp. 184 - 200.

CBI (2006) *News Release: Government Must Show More Urgency in Raising Literacy and Numeracy through GCSEs – Employers Identify Basic Skills in Need of Improvement*, 21 August 2006.

Cigman, R. (2007) *Included or Excluded? The Challenges of Mainstream for SEN Children*, New York, Routledge.

Clayton, P. (2000) *Vocational Guidance and Inclusion in Lifelong Learning*, Department of Adult and Continuing Education, University of Glasgow, (Online <http://www.open.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/papers> accessed: 10/02/09).

Clough, P. (2000) 'Routes to Inclusion', in P. Clough & J. Corbett (Eds.) *Theories of Inclusive Education*, London: Paul Chapman, pp. 1– 33.

Collinson, V., Kozina, E., Lin, Y., Ling, L., Matheson, I., Newcombe, L. and Zogla, I. (2009) *Professional Development for Teachers: A World of Change*, European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp.3–20.

CPA (2008) *Glossary of Poverty and Social Inclusion Terms*, (Online <http://www.cpa.ie/povertyinireland>; accessed: 10/02/09).

DCSF (2009) *Exclusion and Alternative Provision – Pupil Referral Units*, (Online <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/>; accessed 01/03/09).

DfEE (1997) *Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Education Needs*, (Online <http://www.inclusive.co.uk/>; accessed 01/03/09).

EDF (2008) *The Representative Organisation of Disabled People in Europe*, (Online <http://www.edf-feph.org/>; accessed 27/02/09).

Edwards, R., Armstrong, P. and Miller, N. (2001) *Include me out: Critical Readings of Social Exclusion, Social Inclusion and Lifelong Learning*, International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20, 5, pp. 417 – 428.

Favell, L. (2001) *Preparing to Include Special Needs in Mainstream Schools: A Practical Guide*, London: David Fulton.

Frohlich, W. (2004) *Qualitätsentwicklung in der postgradualen Weiterbildung: Internationale Entwicklungen und Perspektiven*, Berlin, Waxmann Verlag.

Gildersleeves, L. (2009) *Adult Education and Lifelong Learning*, (Online www.cilip.org.uk: accessed 04/08/09).

Gillborn, D. (2008) *Racism and Education: Coincidence or Conspiracy?* London, Routledge.

Gravelle, M. (2001) 'Bilingual Learners and the Literacy Hour', in C. Jones and C. Wallace (eds.) *Making EMAG Work*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham, pp. 87 – 100.

Griffiths, S. (2009) *Boom Time for Tutors*, The Sunday Times, 17/05/09, p.9.

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Hawtin, M. and Kettle, J. (2000) 'Housing and Social Exclusion', in J. Percy-Smith (Ed.) *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Social Inclusion*, Buckingham, Open University Press, pp.107-129.

Healy, S. (2007) 'Foreword', in *Learning Partnerships for Social Inclusion: Exploring Lifelong Learning Contexts, Issues & Approaches*, Cork, Oak Tree Press, pp.xvii – xix.

Hopson, R. (2003) *The Problem of the Language Line: Cultural and Social Reproduction of Hegemonic Linguistic Structures for Learners of African Decent in USA*, in *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 6, 3, pp. 227 – 246.

Jha, J. and Kelleher, F. (2006) *Boys' Underachievement in Education*, London, Commonwealth Secretariat and Commonwealth of Learning.

Khalid, T. (1998) *Education: An Introduction to Educational Philosophy and History*, Islamabad: National Book Foundation.

Kingston, P. (2008) 'Wanted: Punctuality, Literacy and Numeracy', *Education Guardian*, Thursday 03 April, 2008.

Krumsvik, R. (2009) *Situated Learning in the Network Society and the Digitised School*, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 2, pp.167–186.

Mittler, P. (2000) *Working towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*, London, David Fulton.

National Literacy Trust (2005) *Effective Workforce: Learning Pays*, (Online www.literacytrust.org.uk; accessed 04/08/08).

O'Brien, S. and O'Fathaigh, M. (2007) *Learning Partnerships for Social Inclusion: Exploring Lifelong Learning Contexts, Issues & Approaches*, Cork, Oak Tree Press.

Percy-Smith, J. (2000) 'Introduction: The Contours of Social Exclusion', in J. Percy-Smith (Ed.) *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Social Inclusion*, Buckingham: Open University Press, pp.1 – 21.

Persaud, N. (2000) *Labelling: Its Effects on Labelled Students*. Paper presented at the International Special Education Congress 2000, University of Manchester 24–28 July 2000 (Online www.isec2000.org; accessed: 02/08/09).

Roness, D and Smith, K. (2009) *Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and Student Motivation*, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 2, pp.111–134.

Ross, A. (2003) 'Access to Higher Education: Inclusion for the Masses?' In *Higher Education and Social Class: Issues of Exclusion and Inclusion*, London, RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 45 – 74.

Scott, K. (2003) *My Students Think I'm Indian: The Presentation of an African-American Self to Pre-service Teachers*, *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 6, 3, pp. 211-226.

Shotte, G. (2002) *Education Migration and Identities*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Institute of Education, University of London, UK

Shotte, G. (2001) 'Education, Migration and Identities Among Relocated Montserratian Students in British Schools', *Equity and Diversity in Education – Commonwealth Snapshots*, London: Acorn Publishing for Commonwealth Secretariat pp. 20-31.

Swain, J., French, S. and Cameron, C. (2003) *Controversial Issues in a Disabling Society*, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Teachernet (2007) *Bullying Involving Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities - Safe to Learn: Embedding Anti-bullying Work in Schools*, (Online www.teachernet.gov.uk; accessed 04/08/09).

Thomas, G. and Loxley, A. (2001) *Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion*, Buckingham, Open University press.

Tomlinson, S. (2005) *Education in a Post-welfare State*, Berkshire, Open University Press.

Whitty, G. (2005) *Making Sense of Education Policy*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing.

Zelaieta, P. (2004) 'From Confusion to Collaboration: Can Special Schools Contribute to Initiative Practices in mainstream Schools?' in F. Armstrong & M. Moore (Eds.) *Action Research for Inclusive Education: Changing Places, Changing Practices, Changing Minds*, London: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.32 – 47.

when two things or people are the same in some way you can see more of them now than in the past it is more possible that it will happen adult they were separated for forty years when you have difficulty seeing things far away from you started speaking with the same pronunciation as people who live near him thought continually about the.Â In the state of Ohio, there is a festival for twins every year in a place calledâ€ Twinsburg. And in New York there is even a restaurant which employs 37 sets of identical twins! You probably either have some twins in your family or you knew some at school â€ there are more of them about these days. This is because women are older when they have their first child and because more women are having fertility treatment.