

Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink?

Kyriaki Messiou, University of Southampton, k.messiou@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper sets out to challenge thinking and practice amongst researchers in the field of inclusive education. It does this based on an analysis of published articles in the *International Journal of Inclusive Education* between 2005-2015, which identified topics and methodologies used in studies of inclusive education. The analysis highlights the fact that most of the studies are only concerned with certain groups of learners and that a limited number make use of collaborative, transformative approaches. It is argued that focusing only on some students, rather than on all, is contrary to the principles of inclusive education. At the same time, given the emphasis of inclusion on enabling the participation for all students, it is argued that more research needs to adopt collaborative approaches that set out to change thinking and practice in the field. Illustrative examples from articles that used such approaches are discussed to highlight their potential benefits.

Keywords

inclusive education, research, methodologies, collaborative approaches

Introduction

Inclusive education has been a contested term since its appearance, with strong advocates as well as strong opponents (Brantlinger, 1997). Others have argued that it has become a buzzword, implying that it is simply a fashion (O'Hanlon and Thomas, 2004). The term has gained grounds internationally since the United Nations Salamanca Statement (1994), signed by 192 member countries, which argued for schools with an inclusive orientation as being “the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all”. Since then, the term has undergone considerable scrutiny, with a variety of definitions used by different authors.

Operti, Walker, and Zhang (2014) suggest that there are four core ideas internationally that relate to the continually-evolving journey towards inclusion: the human rights based perspective (1948 -), a response to children with special needs (1990 -), a response to marginalised groups (2000 -), and transforming education systems (2005 -). As they rightly argue, “regions are still far from effectively implementing the concept of inclusive education as transforming the education system at large” (p. 159), and a number of countries are still focusing either on special needs or other marginalised groups.

As a result of their review of international trends, Ainscow, Booth and Dyson (2006a) suggest a typology of six ways of thinking about inclusion. This is useful for thinking about the various ways in which inclusion has been conceptualised. These are:

- *Inclusion as concerned with disability and ‘special educational needs’*: this is seen as the most common approach. As the authors highlight, seeing inclusion as concerned with disability and ‘special educational needs’, can act as a barrier to the development of the broader view of inclusion. At the same time, the way categories are used to draw attention to the deficiencies of individuals, rather than addressing wider contextual factors, might create barriers to individuals’ participation.
- *Inclusion as a response to disciplinary exclusions*: here, inclusion is associated with children with challenging behaviour who might be therefore excluded from school. However, the authors again draw attention to the contextual factors that might lead to these exclusions.
- *Inclusion as about all groups vulnerable to exclusion*: similar to the first perspective, this way of thinking focuses on certain categories of students, such as travellers, ethnic minorities etc., that are seen as vulnerable to exclusion.
- *Inclusion as the promotion of the school for all*: this approach relates to what is called the comprehensive school in England, which refers to the development of a school for all, rather than allocating children in different kinds of schools based on their attainment at the age of 11, as it used to happen in the past.
- *Inclusion as “Education for All”*: this refers to UNESCO’s “Education for All” agenda, with its focus on increasing access to and participation within education internationally, by setting certain goals. As the authors highlight, setting global targets can be challenging, since there are differences at the local level.
- *Inclusion as a principled approach to education and society*: here the articulation of inclusive values, such as equity, participation, community, respect for diversity, are seen as important in guiding overall policies and practices.

What is important here is that these conceptualisations highlight the fact that inclusive education can be understood in different ways, and that different emphases can be given by different authors and stakeholders. Of all the conceptualisations, I choose to focus on what they define as a principled approach to education, which highlights the need for the articulation of values, and use these values as a starting point to develop practices. Similarly, Allan (2005) refers to inclusion as an ethical project, something that we must do to ourselves rather than as something that we do to a discrete population of others. Therefore, the issue of values and ethics is central to inclusion.

In an attempt to define inclusion as a principled approach, Ainscow et al. (2006a) go on to suggest that “inclusion is concerned with all children and young people in schools; it is focused on presence, participation and achievement” (p.25). Mittler (2000) has also argued that inclusion is about facilitating active involvement and participation. What is distinctive in Ainscow et al.’s (2006a) definition, however, is the fact that the focus is on all children and that the three concepts of presence, participation and achievement are brought together. In other words, this definition emphasises the need to move away from focusing only on whether and where children are educated, but also looking at their participation and their achievement.

For me, the focus on all rather than on certain groups of students, is significant. Labelling individuals has the potential dangers of stigmatisation and damage (Lauchlan and Boyle, 2007). In relation to inclusion, as mentioned earlier, such a focus has the potential danger of moving away from efforts that look at contextual factors towards a focus on individuals’ deficiencies. In addition, as I have demonstrated through my own work, a focus on categories might neglect other children that do not belong in a predetermined category and as such become marginalised (Messiou, 2006; 2012). However, it is important to bear in mind the arguments of those who take different views. For example, some writers argue that a focus on some groups of learners, such as disabled students and those defined as having special educational needs, alongside a recognition of difference, is necessary for provision to be made available, in order to address barriers in education (Norwich, 1993; Terzi, 2005). These two positions - a focus on the impact of contextual factors on all learners, and a concern with the recognition of difference - relate to different ideological positions. More specifically, they reflect what have been defined as the social and the medical models of disabilities (Barnes, Oliver, and Barton, 2002; Oliver, 1996).

A focus on all, rather than on some, is echoed on the International Journal of Inclusive Education journal website, where it is stated that “the journal extends beyond enrolment to **successful participation** which generates greater options for **all** people in education and beyond”. Booth and Ainscow (2002) define participation as:

“...learning alongside others and collaborating with them in shared learning experiences. It requires active engagement with learning and having a say in how education is experienced. More deeply, it is about being recognised, accepted and valued for oneself” (p.3).

Therefore, adopting these definitions - and especially the idea that inclusive education as being concerned with **all** children’s **presence, participation and achievement** - the position that I am taking here is that, research in inclusive education should focus on all children. At the same time, I am adopting Clark, Dyson, Millward and Skidmore’s (1995) ‘organisational paradigm’ of inquiry which highlights the need to focus on identifying features within schools that facilitate responses to diversity. It is worth adding, that a similarly broader

definition is now increasingly recognised and reflected in international policy documents, such as the most recent Incheon Declaration, “*Education 2030: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*”, published in May 2015 following the World Forum on Education.

Similar ideas inform the Index for Inclusion (2002) – a widely used review and self-development tool for schools - with its focus on the importance of analysing contextual factors in schools in order to address barriers to learning and participation of all students. Therefore, following such approaches, the position that I am taking is that research in the field of inclusive education should focus on contextual barriers, rather than on deficit views that place the blame for educational failure on individual learners. I also take the view that such research should adopt forms of inquiry that can be done in collaborative ways, in line with inclusive principles. As Ainscow et al. (2006a) argue, collaborative ways of working, where researchers work alongside participants in schools, are intended to overcome the traditional gap between research and practice. Therefore, it can be argued that employing collaborative approaches of research in inclusive education, will, in turn, facilitate presence, participation and achievement. Taking such a position, I was interested in finding out whether this is indeed happening, or not, in research in the field of inclusive education.

The process of analysis: Topics of focus and methodologies

With this purpose in mind, I carried out an analysis of research that has been carried out in the field of inclusive education over the last eleven years and published in this journal. The *International Journal of Inclusive Education* is the only peer-reviewed journal, which includes the term ‘inclusive education’ in its title. At the same time, it is regarded as a prestigious journal in the field of inclusive/special education and learning support. Though it is acknowledged that there are articles that relate to inclusive education published in other journals, the focus of this paper is to illustrate what has been published in this specific journal, being the only one that uses the term in its title.

A total of 640 articles were published during the period 2005 to 2015 (excluding editorials). These were analysed and classified, taking into account:

- a. The topics of focus; and
- b. The kind of methodologies used.

The analysis identified a number of topics of focus. The following table and figure present the percentages of these different topics:

Insert Table 1 **Insert Figure 1**

As can be seen, the biggest proportion of studies focus on particular groups/categories, particularly disability (21 %) and special needs (15 %), or a combination of the two (3 %). Others are concerned with a combination of categories (15 %), such as gender and disability, ethnic minority and disability, etc. Though the percentages of other groups might seem small, such as ADHD for example (2 %), or behaviour (3 %), what is important is that, if they are all added up, then the percentage rises to 82 % of the studies focusing on individual

groups/categories. Significantly in terms of my argument, studies that focus on all children, or address diversity - which is more compatible to the broad concept of inclusion that I have adopted - make up only 8 % of the studies. In addition, 10 % of studies is what I called “other” which relate to issues such as reading interventions, equity, etc.

Moving on, Table 2 and Figure 2 present a summary of the predominant methodological approach used in the studies. Of course, the sample included both empirical studies and non-empirical studies. This is why a big percentage is based on what I called literature based or purely theoretical papers.

Insert Table 2

Insert Figure 2

As can be seen, the majority of studies are qualitative in nature (38 %). This makes sense given that when talking about inclusion we are focusing on a process, such that qualitative methodologies are more appropriate (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Maykoute and Morehouse, 1994). However, it is also noticeable that very few studies focus on collaborative approaches (3%). In particular, only 20 of the 640 studies were identified which, in some ways, were collaborative in nature. These are presented in a chronological order of publication in Table 3.

By the term collaborative, I mean studies that employ elements of active participation of participants at various levels, from the design of the study through to data collection and analysis. At the same time, due to the participatory nature of such studies, transformation is more likely to occur, as opposed to more traditional ways of doing research where, I suggest, the findings mainly have relevance and impact only within the academic community.

Mertens (2005) argues that, on the one hand, the transformative paradigm places central importance on the lives and experiences of marginalised groups. On the other hand, such research studies have the potential to reveal how contexts and social actors lead to the marginalisation of some learners and is used to confront oppression, at whichever level it occurs. For my own analysis, it is this second part that interests me most: forms of research that are concerned with confronting obstacles through the process of research and, therefore, seeking to achieve change in a given context.

Insert Table 3

In selecting the 20 studies in relation to this approach, I therefore used two criteria: collaborative and transformative. Even though there were studies that were collaborative to some degree, particularly in the methodologies employed (e.g. the use of photography), they were not necessarily transformative in the sense described above. For example, a study by Kellet (2009), which focused on literacy and poverty, involved a micro-phase in which primary school children engaged in their own child-led research about literacy. This phase was highly collaborative in nature, since the children led the research. However, in the second phase of the study, the macro-phase, researchers themselves analysed the children’s findings with a focus on comparing between disadvantaged and affluent schools.

Justifications are offered as to why this happened. Instead of involving children in comparing the findings from the two contrasting schools, with the potential dangers of stigmatising individual children coming from disadvantaged backgrounds, it was felt that this analysis should be done by adults. This is an issue that directly relates to notions of inclusion and raises the matter of carrying out research ethically.

Kellet's study was therefore not included in these 20 studies, since the transformative aspect seemed to be absent, though the decision made for not using a collaborative approach in the second phase seems appropriate. However, in my view, an engagement with the findings with the school teachers could have promoted a starting point for transformation of the contexts. Even though this might have happened as part of the project, it is not mentioned in the specific article.

On the other hand, there were other studies which, on first sight, appeared not to have a collaborative element in their design. However, having looked at them more closely, I decided to include them here. For example, a case study by Molyneux and Tyler, (2014) was included, whilst other case studies from the 640 were not. This was due to the kind of collaboration used in collecting and analysing data that, in my view, deserved to be classified as being collaborative and differed from others that simply used participants as sources of data collection.

It has to be noted that, even within the twenty studies, levels of collaboration varied. For example, Thompson, Lyons and Timmons (2015) used a learning collaborative methodology, which, as they explain, involved community and academic research collaboration through four stages: plan, do, study and act. However, in practice, their project only used the first three stages, as they state. In other words, though in principle they believed in the learning collaborative methodology, in practice, they did not seem to follow the process through.

So, to sum up, based on this analysis it seems that the vast majority of articles that focus on inclusive education in this journal:

- 1) focus on certain categories of people/students (such as SEN, gay/lesbian), and
- 2) use predominantly qualitative approaches of research, whereas collaborative approaches seem to be used rarely.

These realisations led me to develop an argument about research in the field of inclusive education that I present below. I do this by addressing five questions that I suggest provide a framework for the rethinking that is needed, in order to make research on inclusive education more appropriate to its stated task.

1. If inclusion is about all, why do we still mostly focus on some?

As can be seen through the review, the majority of studies focus on categories of learners, particularly those deemed as having special educational needs and disabilities. Some would argue that is simply happening because there are still definitions of inclusion used in the field that only focus on these groups of learners. As mentioned above, according to Operti et al. (2014), this is still the dominant approach.

One possible explanation for this could be that research has shown that there are some students that need more attention than others, such as those defined as having special educational needs, disabled students, those from ethnic minorities, gender, etc. (eg. Derrington and Kendall, 2003; Francis and Skelton, 2005; Oliver, 1996). Others argue that by understanding and removing the barriers to participation for the most vulnerable groups, education provision is improved and, therefore, the benefits are for all (Giangreco, Carter, Doyle and Suter, 2010; Rieser, 2011). Meanwhile, Norwich (2014) argues that researchers need to use categories in order to ‘sort and describe the groups of children they study’. This of course, presupposes a rather traditional stance, where researchers study their ‘subjects’. Whatever the justification, my argument is that such approaches are not compatible with those definitions of inclusion that call for a focus on all learners, some of whom may be experiencing difficulties that are invisible or overlooked.

So, I argue that there is a contradiction between broad definitions of inclusion and much of the practice of carrying out research in relation to this theme. For me, this relates to the argument of Slee (2001), who, talking about teacher education, suggests that we must move away from offering discreet special education units and rather focus on studies of difference and identity politics. My argument regarding research orientations and practices is similar: if we really want to promote inclusive schools that will lead to more inclusive societies, research that puts divisions amongst groups and individuals is unlikely to facilitate progress.

2. Is there a danger that focusing only on some groups of learners, certain assumptions are made about them simply because they fall in a category?

Part of my argument is that by focusing only on ‘some’ students, researchers tend to make certain assumptions about their participants, simply because they fall within a category, or because they hold a certain label. In other words, researchers who adopt this approach are more likely to have as their starting point an assumption that students falling in certain categories experience similar difficulties and, therefore, deserve to be the focus of attention. Linked to this point, Tomlinson (2012) discusses the dangers of what she calls the “SEN industry” and highlights that the ideology of special needs, with its focus “on the supposed deficiencies of individual children, obscured the political, social and economic needs which expanded special education was serving” (p. 17). Similarly, Ainscow (2000) suggests that focusing only on special educational needs can be limiting as an agenda, since it deflects attention from wider contextual factors.

Within any group of learners there might be students who, although holding a certain label, or falling in a specific category, might not experience any difficulties, or might have little in common with others placed within the same category. At the same time, each student has multiple identities, such as their ethnic and gender identities. Ideas of intersectionality which focus on the intersection of identities and, therefore, the need for an engagement with multiple voices (Choo and Ferree, 2010; McCall, 2005), are relevant to this argument. At the same time, the idea of “situated identities”, which have been defined as ‘the attributions that are made about participants in a particular setting as a consequence of their actions’ (Alexander and Lauderdale, 1977, p. 225), are also relevant here. In other words, the complex intersection of identities, contexts and situatedness are all important for understanding different individuals’ experiences.

All of which leads me to argue that, adopting categories and labels focus can be dangerous, not least in that certain assumptions might be made about a defined group of learners that might not be true of all of its members. This reminds me of the words of a teacher from a recent project (Messiou et al, 2016; Messiou and Ainscow, 2015). Talking about students falling in the group ‘white working class boys’, she admitted: “Of course, we look at diversity – but really we haven’t been looking...really looking at individual groups, but not looking at individual children within the group”. This is indicative of how teachers, as well as researchers, when focusing on labels or categories, tend to make certain assumptions about groups seen to share certain characteristics, and, in so doing, possibly forget to look at individuals.

In the English context, another example is the way children entitled to ‘free school meals’ based on socio economic indicators lead to the ‘Pupil Premium’, which is ‘additional funding for publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and close the gap between them and their peers’ (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings>). Ainscow, Dyson, Hopwood and Thomson (2016) refer to headteachers in schools that reported that many pupils entitled to free school meals were doing well educationally, whilst other pupils were in greater need. At the same time, they point out that: ‘it would appear that teachers now commonly refer to ‘pupil premium pupils’, as though such a group could be defined meaningfully, when in fact it consists of no more than a highly diverse aggregation of individuals whose only common feature is that they have claimed free school meals’ (p.22) Such approaches entail the dangers of stereotyping, as well as other concerns, as I explain below.

3. Do researchers contribute to further marginalisation of individuals and groups through own practices, by singling out individuals to carry out research?

If we, as researchers, focus on certain groups of students, such as those defined as having special educational needs, or those from different ethnic backgrounds, then possibly our methodological designs will involve working closely only with those groups of students and, therefore, there is a danger of drawing attention to them as being different to others. Given the preoccupation with ethical issues when doing research these days, at least in English universities, there does not seem to be sufficient articulation of this issue: the possible consequences of our own practices of singling out individuals from their groups to carry out interviews with them, for example. As I have argued in the past (Messiou, 2002; 2006), by singling out individuals there is a danger of signalling to others that they are different in some ways. At the same time, this is problematic, especially in research that aims to promote the ideas of inclusion. In other words, there is sometimes a mismatch between our actions as researchers and our values. As Walton (2011) argues: “Selecting some children to participate in inclusion research on the basis of disability or other marker of difference undermines the inclusive endeavour”(p.83).

Of course, I do not want to ignore the fact that we have to be pragmatic when conducting research. This means that there is sometimes a need to focus only on a smaller number of participants as compared to involving all. However, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the approaches used to select representative samples in research, are based on predetermined categories, which are to varying degrees social constructs. This seems to me to present some

tensions in relation to definitions of inclusion being about all. At the same time, using representative samples and the actual practices of singling participants out from the groups might have negative implications for some, which is not compatible with what researchers that aim to promote inclusion wish to achieve. So, ideally, research that aims to promote inclusion should involve all but this might be challenging in practical terms. So, if research in inclusive education does focus on some, at least this should be done in sensitive and ethically appropriate ways to avoid the dangers mentioned here. Finally, focusing only on some might mean that we neglect others, which is the next part of my argument.

4. Is there a danger that we neglect some learners that do not fall into any category, but might equally experience marginalisation?

By focusing on some pupils there is a danger that we might neglect others who might equally experience marginalisation but do not fall into any predetermined category. This argument relates to my earlier work that illustrates that marginalisation is a loose concept and can be experienced by any child, regardless if they fall into predetermined categories or not (Messiou, 2006; 2012). In particular, my research identified four ways of conceptualising marginalisation; i.e.

1. When a child experiences some kind of marginalisation that is recognised by almost everybody, including himself/herself;
2. When a child feels that he/she is experiencing marginalisation whereas most of the others do not recognise this;
3. When a child is found in what appear to be marginalised situations but does not feel it, or does not view it as marginalisation; and
4. When a child is experiencing marginalisation but does not admit it.

What was distinctive was that not all children that fell in one of the those conceptualisations belonged in a predetermined category (such as ethnic minorities, special educational needs etc.). Therefore, this points to the idea that marginalisation can be a subtle process that might be experienced by many learners, some of whom may be hard to identify. It is, therefore, most likely that certain students might have never been participants in a research study; simply because of not belonging in any specific group that is considered to deem special attention. So, even though inclusion is concerned with all, ones that might experience marginalisation might never receive attention.

5. If inclusion is about facilitating active involvement and participation, why are there so few studies that adopt collaborative approaches?

As seen in the definitions discussed earlier, participation is central to the concept of inclusion. If researchers argue that participation is so essential, why is this not reflected more in their methodological designs? By using the phrase ‘working collaboratively’, I refer to involving the participants, including students, at various stages of the research from the development of research questions through to collecting and analysing data. Such thinking relates to participatory approaches (Bourke, 2009; Nind, 2014).

Of course, there are different levels of involvement, as suggested by Hart’s (1992) ladder of participation: from tokenistic approaches, to shared decisions between participants and

researchers. I argue that many qualitative studies, including ones published in this journal, which focus on understanding the experiences of individuals or groups of students, do enable participation many times. However, for me what is important is how the whole process and the findings of research allow for transformation, rather than just remaining at the level of understanding experiences. The challenges experienced by all children and groups of children in education have been documented strongly in research in various countries. Even though this might be needed as a short term step towards promoting inclusion, since such focused and exploratory approaches are the predominant ones, as the analysis in this paper indicates, the question is: How much more understanding is needed before we move into action through research?

Implications of using collaborative approaches in relation to inclusive education

So, to sum up, my main argument in this paper is:

If inclusion is about presence, participation and achievement of all, then:

- a) we should aim to involve all learners, rather than focusing only on some; and,*
- b) we should employ collaborative transformative approaches of research in order to facilitate presence, participation and achievement.*

I now focus on the second aspect of this argument, in order to illustrate the benefits and challenges involved in using collaborative approaches.

Firstly, as already argued, focusing on all learners rather than on some is more compatible with the ideas of inclusion. Secondly, research that adopts such collaborative transformative approaches has the potential to have a direct impact on participants. For example, Thomson and Gunter (2008) focused on exploring bullying in schools and employed a collaborative participatory approach with some student researchers. In particular, groups of students were involved in research training, and collected and analysed data in their school. The students collaborated with researchers and their teachers to carry out the research and photography was used as a means of collecting data. As the authors argue, their findings have relevance to the notion of inclusion more broadly. What is also interesting here is that the project facilitated the school's reform process, through a specific set of actions such as the setting up of student parliament in the school.

More importantly, Ainscow, Booth and Dyson's article (2006b) refers to work carried out with a network of schools, showing the ways in which the schools' practices were transformed as a result of the collaborative action research that took place. The cameos presented in the article are illustrative of the impact that this approach had on the participating schools, which is in line with the ideas of transformative practice. For me, perhaps more than any other example, this points to what is needed in order to promote inclusive thinking and practice: research where researchers dare to spare considerable amounts of time in schools, making sure that there is an impact on thinking and practices within these contexts, as well as providing research knowledge that has wider implications. What distinguishes such studies from others is the active involvement of participants, whilst at the same time seeking a direct impact on participants and their organisations. In this way, findings are more likely to be meaningful and relevant, both to practitioners and researchers.

It is worth adding that in the UK context, where impact is something that is gaining more importance from research funding bodies on the one hand, and from the Research Excellence Framework (that determines the allocation of research funds in universities) on the other hand, it is likely that in the near future there will be calls for an increase in research that uses such approaches. Similarly, funding from the European Union now features impact strongly in the application processes.

At the same time, it has to be acknowledged that there remain challenges in using such approaches. Research that involves authentic collaboration with participants is complicated. In particular, it is time consuming and involves a lot of commitment on the part of researchers, as well as on the part of participants. Focusing especially in work in schools, this becomes even more complicated given the busy school contexts and the fact that researchers have to fit around these schedules. For a further discussion of the challenges involved see Messiou et al. (2016).

Finally, approaches such as these directly relate to Griffiths's (1998) argument for kinds of research that promote social justice: "research in which the methodology or epistemology of the research is itself a reason for claiming it to be research for social justice" (p. 26). And, to return to the definition used at the beginning of this paper, in relation to school practices in particular, such approaches can influence the presence, participation and achievement of all students, as illustrated in some of the examples above. They also demonstrate the sorts of values that we hold as researchers and the ethical ways in which we set out to conduct our research. In this respect, it is encouraging to see in Table 3 that, more recently, there seems to be a noticeable increase in the studies that adopt such approaches: 17 of the 20 studies have been published over the last five years. Therefore, it seems that such approaches might start to be used more widely gradually.

At the same time, as my analysis demonstrates, there seems to be a dearth of studies that are collaborative and attempt to be transformative, with the majority of studies being qualitative, quantitative and literature based. I believe that it is time to redress this balance. Having said this, I respect the need for research and methodological designs that are fit for purpose in relation to the research questions that scholars are trying to address. For example, Griffiths (1998) refers to research that directly focuses on social justice issues, such as Gillborn and Gipps's (1996) study that focused on achievement and pupils from ethnic minorities, and entailed a review of existing research.

I believe that this kind of work is necessary. However, my argument is that if we are adopting the definitions that I outlined, we should be aiming towards more collaborative and transformative approaches. Such kind of research has been shown to be in a position to bring about changes (e.g. Ainscow, 2015; Ainscow et al., 2006a; Hopkins, 2008). Some good examples, that directly relate to social justice and partnerships in research that brought about change in schools, are those described in the edited book of Atweh, Kemmis and Weeks (1998), where researchers worked in collaboration with participants to understand social justice issues (such as gender) and bring about changes in the specific contexts (e.g. Marshall, Cobb and Ling, 1998; Brooker, Smeal, Ehrich, Daws and Brannock, 1998).

A final thought

Tomlinson, in her influential book "A Sociology of Special Education", published in 1982, asked whether there are vested interests of expanding groups of professionals and

practitioners served by the ‘discovery’ of more and more children with special needs. Similarly, I ask the question: are there vested interests on the part of researchers, in carrying on with category-based approaches and traditional ways of doing research, under the name of inclusive education? If the answer is yes, then research in the field of inclusive education, has largely failed to achieve its stated aims.

Roger Slee (2011), the editor of this journal, argues that ‘inclusive education invites us to think about the nature of the world we live in, a world that we prefer and our role in shaping both of those worlds’ (p. 14). My argument is that it is our role as researchers to play a part in shaping these worlds. This can be achieved by transforming existing patterns of thinking and practice through collaborative approaches when doing research, in order to develop more inclusive practices. The first step is for researchers to reconsider their own thinking and positions as to where they truly stand in relation to inclusive education. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, it is about articulating our own values and how these impact on our practices. Are researchers in the field of inclusive education prepared for such a rethink and changes in the way of working?

Note:

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the University of the Basque Country in San Sebastian/Donostia, Spain on 23rd October 2015 at the “Lines and new challenges in research into educational inclusion” conference, organised by the KIDE Group (UPV/EHU-University of the Basque Country).

References:

- Ainscow, M. (1999) *Understanding the Development of Inclusive Schools*. London: Falmer.
- Ainscow, M. (2000) Profile, in P. Clough and J. Corbett (Eds.) *Theories of Inclusive Education* (pp. 39-42). London: Paul Chapman.
- Ainscow, M. Booth, T. and Dyson, A. (2006a) *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Ainscow, M. Booth, T. and Dyson, A. (2006b) Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10:4-5, 295-308.
- Ainscow, M. (2015) *Towards self-improving school systems: Lessons from a city challenge*. London: Routledge.
- Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Hopwood, L., and Thomson, S. (2016) *Primary Schools Responding to Diversity: barriers and possibilities*. York: Cambridge Primary Review Trust.
- Alexander, N.C. and Lauderdale, P. (1977) Situated identities and social influence, *Sociometry*, 40 (3), 225-233.

- Allan, J. (2005) Inclusion as an ethical project. In S.Tremain (Ed.) *Foucault and the government of disability*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Atweh, B., Kemmis, S. and Weeks, P. (1998) *Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Barnes, C., Oliver, M. and Barton, L. (2002) *Disability Studies Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (2002) *Index for Inclusion* (2nd edition). Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Bourke, L. (2009) Reflections on doing participatory research in health: participation, method and power, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12 (5), 457- 474.
- Brantlinger, E. (1997) Using Ideology: Cases of Nonrecognition of the Politics of Research and Practice in Special Education, *Review of Educational Research*, 67 (4), 425-459.
- Brooker, R., Smeal, G., Ehrich, L., Daws, L. and Brannock, J. (1998) Action research for professional development on gender issues, in B. Atweh, S. Kemmis and P. Weeks (Eds.) *Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Choo, H. Y. and Ferree, M.M. (2010) Practising Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities, *Sociological Theory*, 28 (2), 129-149.
- Clark, C., Dyson, A., Millward, A., and Skidmore, D. (1995). Dialectical analysis, special needs and schools as organisations. In C. Clark, A. Dyson, and A. Millward (Eds.), *Towards inclusive schools?* (pp. 78–95). London: Fulton.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research, in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-17) London: Sage.
- Derrington, C. and Kendall, S. (2003) The experiences and perceptions of Gypsy Traveller pupils in English secondary schools. In Shevlin, M. and Rose, R. (Eds) *Encouraging Voices: Respecting the Insights of Young People Who Have Been Marginalised*. Dublin: National Disability Authority.
- Francis, B. and Skelton, C. (2005) *Reassessing gender and achievement: Questioning contemporary key debates*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Giangreco, M.F. , Carter, E.W., Doyle, M.B. and Suter, J.C. (2010) Supporting students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms: personell and peers. In R. Rose (Ed.) *Confronting obstacles to inclusion: International responses to developing inclusive education*. London: Routledge.
- Gillborn, D. and Gips, C. (1996) *Recent Research on the Achievement of Ethnic Minority Pupils*. London: HMSO(Ofsted).

Griffiths, M. (1998) *Educational research for social justice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hart, R. (1992) *Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship*. Florence: UNICEF.

Hopkins, D. (2008) *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Kellett, M. (2009) Children as researchers: what we can learn from them about the impact of poverty on literacy opportunities?, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13:4, 395-408.

Lauchlan, F. and Boyle, C. (2007) Is the use of labels in special education helpful? , *Support for Learning*, 22 (1), 36-42.

Marshall, R., Cobb, A. and Ling, C. (1998) Change in schools: practice and vision, in B. Atweh, S. Kemmis and P. Weeks (Eds.) *Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge.

Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994) *Beginning Qualitative Research*. Bristol: Falmer Press.

McCall, L. (2005) The complexity of intersectionality, *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30 (3), 1771-1800.

Messiou, K., Ainscow, M., Echeita, G. Goldrick, S. Hope, M. Paes, I. Sandoval, M., Simon, C. and Vitorino, T. (2016). Learning from differences: a strategy for teacher development in respect to student diversity. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 27 (1), 45-61.

Messiou, K. and Ainscow, M. (2015) Responding to learner diversity: Student views as a catalyst for powerful teacher development?, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 246-255.

Messiou, K. (2012) *Confronting Marginalisation in Education: A Framework for Promoting Inclusion*. London: Routledge.

Messiou, K. (2006) (invited) Understanding marginalisation in education: the voice of children. *European Journal of Psychology of Education (Special Issue)*, XXI, 3, pp. 305-318.

Messiou, K. (2002) Marginalisation in primary schools: Listening to children's voices, *Support for Learning*, 17, 3, pp. 117-121.

Mertens, D. M. (2015) *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology* (4th Edition). USA: SAGE.

Mittler, P. (2000) From Exclusion to Inclusion, in P. Mittler (2000) *Working Towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*, London: David Fulton.

- Molyneux, P. and Tyler, D. (2014) Place-based education and pre-service teachers: a case study from India, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18:9, 877-88.
- Nind, M. (2014) *What is inclusive research?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Norwich, B. (1993) Has 'Special Educational Needs' Outlived its Usefulness?, in: J. Visser and G. Upton (eds) *Special Education in Britain After Warnock*, London: Fulton.
- Norwich, B. (2014) Categories of special educational needs. In L. Florian (Ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education* (2nd Revised Edition). London: SAGE.
- O'Hanlon, C. and Thomas, G. (2004) 'Editors' Preface', in D. Skidmore (ed.) *Inclusion*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Oliver, M. (1996) *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Opertti, R., Walker, Z. and Zhang, Y. (2014) Inclusive Education: From targeting groups and schools to achieving quality education as the core of EFA, In L. Florian (Ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education* (2nd Revised Edition). London: SAGE.
- Rieser, R. (2011) Disability, human rights and inclusive education, and why inclusive education is the only educational philosophy and practice that makes sense in today's world. In G. Richards and F. Armstrong (Eds) *Teaching and Learning in Diverse and Inclusive Classrooms*. London: Routledge.
- Slee, R. (2001) Social Justice and the changing directions in educational research: the case of inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 5, 2-3: 167-177.
- Slee, R. (2011) *The Irregular School*. London: Routledge.
- Terzi, L. (2005) Beyond the dilemma of difference: The capability approach to disability and special educational needs, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39 (3), 443-459.
- Thompson, A.S., Lyons, W. and Timmons, V. (2015) Inclusive education policy: what the leadership of Canadian teacher associations has to say about it, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19:2, 121-140.
- Thomson, P. and Gunter, H. (2008) Researching bullying with students: a lens on everyday life in an 'innovative school', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12:2, 185-200.
- Tomlinson, S. (1982) *A Sociology of Special Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Tomlinson, S. (2012): The irresistible rise of the SEN industry, *Oxford Review of Education*, 38 (3), 267-286.
- UNESCO (1994) *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*, Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2015) *Education 2030: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*, Paris: UNESCO.

Walton, E. (2011) “They discluded me”: possibilities and limitations of children’s participation in inclusion research in South Africa, *Perspectives in Education*, Volume 29(1), 83-92.