

DISCOURSES OF EXCLUSION AND INCLUSION IN THE SOUTH: LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES

ABSTRACT. The primary purpose of the article is to look at how current thinking in the social sciences conceptualizes discourses of inclusion and exclusion in education and what the value of this thinking is for policy development in countries like South Africa and India. The article argues that the main conceptual weakness of current understandings is a failure to adequately engage with social justice concerns. While current approaches promote the achievement of certain kinds of rights, they are often complicit in the denial of others. This is because, the article seeks to show, the policy text in many countries, including countries of the South, invariably defines individuals and groups in essentialized terms and fails to engage with the complexity of their identities.

INTRODUCTION

Social injustice is a feature of all human relationships and is present in all societies. How one talks to it and about it, however, is notoriously difficult because implicit in the language one uses and the assumptions which underlie one's language are frameworks of reference which inevitably find their origins in one or other understanding of the world and the people who are within it. The discursive construction of social justice, thus, is informed by conceptual webs of meaning, which not only condition experiences of social injustice but also respond to them. A discussion of the concept of social exclusion is underway in numerous contexts to assess its value in expanding understandings of injustice and inequality. Kabeer (2000), for example, pointedly asks whether the concepts of inclusion and exclusion, with their origins in the North, are appropriate for countries in the South.¹ While the concept is 'celebrated' in the North and has led to the introduction of Social Exclusion units in all UK government departments, its usage is less common in the South where very much more specific phenomena are made the subject of policy attention. Betts (2001, p. 2) argues, to illustrate the point, that the discourse of poverty "provides a much more powerful frame" for many countries. In South Africa, also, the new government has deliberately established gender and affirmative action units. The primary question being posed in the South is whether the concept of social exclusion adds value to understandings of complex phenomena such as poverty (de Haan, 2000).



The primary purpose of this article is to look at how discourses of inclusion and exclusion have been conceptualised and appropriated and to assess the value of these approaches for understanding how policy development might work in countries like South Africa and India. The article argues that the main conceptual weakness of current understandings is their failure to adequately engage with social justice concerns. What follows, it is argued, is a policy agenda that is often contradictory. While it might promote the achievement of certain kinds of rights, it often is complicit in the denial of others. This is because the policy text in many countries, including countries of the South, is invariably inscribed, as the article seeks to show, in essentialized terms. The discourses holding the policies up simplify what is often complex. People, whether as individuals or groups, are portrayed in ways that fail to work with the multiple interests, identities and perspectives that give life to their everyday realities. They are represented in catch-all terms, such as those of race, class, gender, culture, and language, that inadequately address the many different ways in which they participate in both the public and the private domain. The significance of this for educational change is profound. The politics that tend to be authorized by these approaches prioritizes particular domains of struggle with their own vocabularies and strategies, while it actively silences and marginalizes others. Forms of educational practice, as a result, proceed from this which are deeply implicated in perpetuating certain, and sometimes even new, forms of injustice. Given this argument, the article presents itself as a direct attempt to talk to educational change.

The article begins with some caveats in contextualizing the discussion, and then moves, in the second part, to a review of the important debates around educational inclusion and exclusion. The third part of the article foregrounds concerns of equity in current discourse and specifically critiques two approaches to inclusion, namely, the citizenship approach and the multicultural approach. This leads to the development of the 'interlocking framework' which has the potential to provide a more encompassing approach. The article concludes by highlighting key policy issues in educational inclusion and exclusion.

SOME CAVEATS

The notion of educational exclusion is currently enjoying much prominence in social policy research and in matters of public policy (Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2000; Slee, 2000; Kabeer, 2000; de Haan, 2000; Betts, 2001; Preece, 1999). Evident in this prominence, however, is how difficult it is to reach an agreement about what educational exclusion might mean,

what it refers to and what it includes and excludes.² On the one hand, conceptually it has become a short hand for discussing the inequities of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and poverty. This short-hand itself, as we try to show below, is enormously contentious. On the other hand, from a government policy view, it has come to signify an understanding that social problems are interlinked, complex, and require co-ordinated and cohesive actions. There are four qualifications that need to be introduced in discussing the notions of educational exclusion and inclusion. First, the usage of these concepts in the literature comes with the strong normative stance that inclusion is by definition good and exclusion, similarly so, is bad. Thus, the end of inclusion policies is to overcome exclusion: the triumph of the good over the bad, as it were. While this may be laudable, it fails to recognise the possibility that inclusive policies may result in new forms of exclusion. Education, for example, is both a means of social mobility and access and a means of social selection. Education includes inasmuch as it excludes. Second, the notion of inclusion operates on the principle of 'normalisation' in which groups, be they kinship groups, classes, structures or whatever, are defined and constituted (socially) in their 'ideal' forms, and relative to them, *other* communities, groups, and individuals are identified and invariably positioned. Out of this, amongst other things, the perception is generated that certain groups lack access or entitlements to certain services. Hence, as a consequence, such groups, communities, and individuals need to be targeted for special inclusive measures, which would overcome their exclusion. Such an approach often ignores the existing and complex social relations in society, which give rise to and perpetuate inequities. It fails to take into account the power relations (economic, social and epistemological) within society and ends up conserving existing political conditions. Third, the concepts elide differences between and within groups, communities and individuals in that it ignores 'who' is being included or excluded. Thus, what is ignored are, *inter alia*, the different (and unequal) racial, gender, and ethnic positioning of groups, communities and individuals. The tendency here is also to assume a pathology of individual and group failure. Fourth, the discourse of educational exclusion and inclusion fails to specify the relationships between race, class, gender, and other forms of difference and inequity in society and to show how these articulate with each other. Various theorists have advocated different versions of the complex interrelationships between race, class, and gender. Apple and Weiss (1983) forward the 'parallelism' framework in which race, class, and gender interact with three spheres of societal activity (economic, cultural, and political). This they call a relational framework. Others, such as Sarup (1986), forward a

cumulative, linear, hierarchical framework in which, for example, gender, race, and class add up to the 'triple oppression' of women. While none of the frameworks is incorrect, they do not, as McCarthy (1999, p. 547) notes, capture the 'mix of contingencies, interests, needs, differential assets, and capacities in local settings such as schools'.

A later section of the article returns to these points in an attempt at developing an interlocking approach. The following reviews the key debates in the discussions on educational inclusion and exclusion.

DIVERSE MEANINGS OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

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

As a point of departure, it is interesting to note that some of the literature casts the discussion largely in terms of inclusion (Slee, 2001; OFSTED, 2000), others in terms of exclusion (de Haan, 2000) and yet others in terms of both inclusion and exclusion (Betts, 2001).

The concepts, however, imply a juxtapositioning in that social inclusion of certain persons or groups implies exclusion of others. However, it is simplistic to assume that social inclusion and social exclusion are merely contradictory forces. Instead the argument about inclusion and exclusion being juxtaposed to each other points to the inherent relation between inclusion and exclusion; an inseparability between them. In this view, inclusion is neither the opposite of exclusion nor its bipolar contradiction. Rather any attempt at inclusion will entail a form of exclusion, and in order to understand the intent and effects of inclusionary measures, one needs to be aware of their inherent exclusionary influences and potential outcomes. Inclusion and exclusion need to be viewed as being conjoined, and not as diametrically opposing forces.

The following discusses the diverse approaches that have been taken to the concept of social exclusion. It draws on the classificatory schema developed by Silver (de Haan, 2000). In this schema, three paradigms of social exclusion are presented, viz., *the Solidarity, Specialisation and Monopoly* paradigms, which offer a framework to view the varied interpretations of the concept as they are used in their different contexts.

THE SOLIDARITY PARADIGM

This is dominant in France and influenced by the work of Rousseau. Rousseau argued that “exclusion is the rupture of a social bond between the individual and society that is cultural and moral . . . the poor, unemployed and ethnic minorities are defined as outsiders” (de Haan, 2000, p. 6). Exclusion here, then, constructs “outsiders” and renders societies dysfunctional. Inclusionary measures are, thus, aimed at establishing social cohesion and stability.

The specialization paradigm

Hegemonic in the United States, this approach is contested in the United Kingdom and is based on the work of Hobbes. Informed by individual liberalism, it proposes that

individuals are able to move across boundaries of social differentiation and economic division of labour. Liberal models of citizenship emphasise the contractual exchange of rights and obligations . . . exclusion reflects discrimination, the drawing of group distinctions that denies individuals full access to or participation in exchange or interaction. Causes of exclusion are often seen in unenforced rights and market failures. (de Haan, 2000, p. 6)

The monopoly paradigm

This is dominant in the United Kingdom and Northern European countries and is influenced by Weber’s work, which argues that “the social order is coercive, imposed through hierarchical power relations. Exclusion is defined as a consequence of the formation of group monopolies [which] restrict access of outsiders through social closure” (de Haan, 2000, p. 6).

Of importance here is whether the categorisation assists in understanding social relations in the South. While the paradigms may prove useful, researchers in the South are urged to apply the concepts carefully lest they simply, as Kabeer cautions (2000, p. 83), “relabel long-standing and locally developed approaches to social problems or, alternatively . . . promote a tendency to assess southern realities in terms of the extent to which they converge, or diverge from some ‘standard’ northern model.”

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

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

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

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

- Does the inclusion of citizens in programmes lead to their incorporation in ways that subject them to the status quo, or in ways that expect them to comply with and meet standards predetermined by authorities without their cooperation?
- Or even in those contexts, which offer complementary albeit integrated, progressive processes of inclusion, are these sufficient means of empowerment to help students re-shape the contexts of their educational experience so that these contexts are enriched by new perspectives?

As Jansen (1998) argues, while black students are being 'included' in formerly white schools in South Africa, they encounter a hostile, anti-cultural environment in which assumptions are fixed about issues such as what constitutes good schooling, appropriate language policy. Such schools inflict damage to self-esteem and the confidence of children. Children often learn that English has status while Zulu doesn't; that good teachers and role models are white; that appropriate history is European; and that failure is something that happens to non-white children (Jansen, 1998). Such co-optive assimilationist "inclusionary" attempts to desegregate previously racially segregated schools have also been confirmed by others in South Africa (see for example Carrim, 1992; Vally & Dalambo, 1999; Soudien, 1996), and in Northern countries too (see for example Gillborn, 1995 on the UK).

A further assumption embedded in classifying groups in society according to the dominant and normative understanding of how groups are constituted, is the belief that people feel deprived and that they wish to be included. In other words, citizens may consciously choose to exclude themselves from certain processes and opt to occupy alternative spaces (Robinson Pant, 2000). Rogers (2000) elaborates this view by arguing that the dichotomous discourse of inclusion and exclusion tends to create the excluded as the 'other' and sees the movement which does take place as one-sided, as a transaction which involves moving from a state of being

‘excluded’ to a state of being ‘included’. Nothing of their pasts is validated within the zone of the included. Monga’s (1984) work with ‘deprived’ women in India participating in the system emphasises this point. Similarly Betts notes that in South Africa

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

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

DISCOURSES OF INCLUSION THAT INFLUENCE POLICY

While there is much academic debate about the meanings and usefulness of the concepts, what is often ignored is the fact that educational exclusion and inclusion have become part of public policy in contemporary

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

- Rights and ethics discourse
- Efficacy discourse
- Political discourse
- Pragmatic discourse

The rights and ethics discourse

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

It is important to introduce the notion of attainable development targets. With growing concern for "(a) the universalism of human rights; (b) their social dimension; and (c) the means for effectively realising global social rights" (Deacon, 2000, p. 35), strategists are concerned that if "a government is unable to raise revenue so as to be able to comply with its human rights obligations, human rights guarantees become illusory" (Tomasevski, 1997, p. 240 quoted in Deacon, 2000, p. 35). This view emphasises the need for 'well-resourced' countries in the 'developed' world to redistribute resources globally so that those less developed countries are able to meet the basic rights of their citizens. Social policy that faces the need for global ownership of the problems of poverty (and social exclusion) has thus become a pressing issue. The United Nations, in tackling the need for provision of basic services, including education, to all, are factoring into their thinking a need to redress global imbalances. In this light, then, notions of inclusion and exclusion provide governments with 'measures' to determine whether development targets in relation to social rights are being achieved.

The efficacy discourse

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

In inclusive environments, institutions are challenged to include 'disabilities' in ways that make them normalise their differences and to become a part of every day life. Inclusive education thus challenges all school-goers to develop the skills to deal with difference as a normal part of life. It may thus be argued, on the basis of evidence, that inclusive education is a sensible and cost-effective route to pursue.

The political discourse

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

The pragmatic discourse

This discourse is practical in focusing on the dimensions of inclusive education as well as the means by which it may be enacted. Certain protagonists of this discourse believe that inclusive schools have 'determinate characteristics' *vis-à-vis*, structure, programmes, systems, practices, culture and ethos which distinguish them from non-inclusive schools. The discourse is also concerned with outlining an 'inclusive pedagogy' which relates to theories of instruction and learning or teaching strategies (Dyson, 1999, p. 42). It is important to determine inclusion through the 'absence of injustices, discrimination, exclusionary barriers rather than the presence of particular pedagogical practices and organisational

forms' (Dyson, 1999, p. 45). This discourse would thus include numerous manuals and/or guides with various recommendations on how to 'achieve' inclusive education. The discourse promotes the view that 'right action' in relation to policy and practice will lead to successful inclusive education.

The above indicates three important issues. First, the influence of social inclusion and exclusion in education has been due to the assertions and experiences of disabled peoples movements and "special needs schools". It has now grown to include all people who are subject to forms of discrimination. Second, the incorporation of social inclusion and exclusion in policy formulation has led to it being treated differently. Some policy approaches are particular, while others are generic, some are macro oriented some are concentrated on micro processes of implementation. Third, all approaches to policy in this regard have been motivated by concerns of establishing and/or increasing equality and equity in society. It will be useful to now examine the ways in which equity and equality issues in education are treated.

APPROACHES TO SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IN EDUCATION: EQUITY AND EQUALITY CONSIDERATIONS

Social inclusion initiatives appear to fall into the trap of assuming that what is posited as social equality will address all divides. Many approaches do not take account of equity and in fact undermine the project of achieving social justice. As will be shown below, the complex inter-relationship of race, class, gender and other pivots of injustice means that programmes promoting equality often tend to focus on one of these at the expense of the others and so, loses the thread connecting the others. As the following quotation explains:

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

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

The citizenship approach

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

However, complex citizenship laws have served to perpetuate forms of exclusion where, for example in some countries being born in a country does not necessarily guarantee one rights of citizenship. Citizenship, as a construct, was, therefore, a model for exclusion in that only citizens could have rights. Structural pluralism which comprises the differential incorporation of social groups into a common political society is another model (ILO, 1994). South Africa's apartheid system may be described as constituting such a system of differential incorporation, the legacy of which prevails in conditions of skewed relations of power in favour of a dominant, essentially white, privileged minority. Nayak describes India's caste system as a similar mechanism of exclusion. Vast sections of the population, by virtue of their caste status are denied basic citizenship rights including rights to education (Nayak, 1994). It is thus important to engage the legacies and consequences of these systems when dealing with educational exclusion. Unfortunately, the seeds of what is often a destructive divisiveness continue to be watered in institutions precisely because the histories and legacies of exclusion are so deep-rooted.

The multicultural approach

In efforts to accommodate 'difference', educational inclusion has taken the form of multicultural education or education for pluralism. There have been numerous criticisms of this view, not least the fact that the concept serves to mask real injustices, such as those of racial and cultural discrimination, and that it tends to stereotype the issues which supposedly belong to different groups, and so imposes on them common features and singular 'solutions' in extremely inappropriate ways (Carrim, 1995; Gillborn, 1995; Troyna, 1993). An example of this is the lumping together of 'black' and 'white' into unproblematised homogeneous categories (Carrim & Soudien, 1999; Osler & Starkey, 2000). Developing this line of thought, multiculturalism also assumes that persons belong to a single culture without beginning to accept the possibility that people may have allegiances to and commitments to a variety of cultures. Similar arguments are levelled

against 'multiracial education'. Figueroa draws on Mullard (1982) to identify phases in the development of this concept in Britain. They are 'assimilationist, integrationist and cultural pluralist'. All three phases it is believed, "stemmed from the same social imperative – to maintain as far as possible the dominant structure of institutions, values and beliefs" (Mullard, 1982, quoted in Figueroa, 1999, p. 47). Multiracial education was concerned with including alien (black) groups while maintaining the dominant order which was assumed to be entirely unproblematic and without structural difficulties. The approaches denied the existence of 'race' focusing instead on culture as a factor of 'difference'. Multiracial education "teaches black pupils that they will always remain second-class citizens" (Figueroa, 1991, p. 48).

In these approaches, social exclusion initiatives operate around somewhat crude categorizations of various social groups in relation to power and access to goods and services. Approaches do not, without investigation of the processes of social exclusion and the forms of counter-services provided by the 'excluded' groups, say anything about how people who are supposedly excluded view themselves. In critiquing these approaches, it is recognized that they provide marginalized groups access to educational facilities and other social goods such as employment, and can consequently ameliorate patterns of deprivation. However, approaches to educational inclusion do require a rigorous understanding of the context into which people are being included, the terms and conditions of the inclusion, and a preparedness to look critically at the policy makers who set these terms and the actors who implement these policies. As is argued below, social inclusion of necessity requires careful definition and ongoing reappraisal to ensure that it is indeed a social good and of benefit to society as a whole. It becomes clear through the ensuing discussion that institutional access alone – the creation of physical space – does not answer the call for educational inclusion. Besides issues of affordability, cultural and political environments and practices, both within and outside of educational institutions, may perpetuate exclusion even after students have technically been 'placed'.

AN INTERLOCKING FRAMEWORK

As argued earlier, educational exclusion operates in a sea of social exclusionary processes which affect access to basic rights in a number of domains: 'adequate' or 'quality' food, shelter, social security, employment, education, etc. It usually occurs in the guise and context of the acceptance of unproblematised identities within the broader society. To

pursue just one example, particular sections of society are assumed (almost legitimately) to have greater rights of access to commodities, housing, education, sporting facilities, local amenities, etc. because of their socio-economic status. In other words, the socio-economic structures of societies are taken as given and the educational exclusion which proceeds from them is regarded as being entirely normal. Thus educational inclusion, much as the rest of society, is framed by these inequalities and the various ideologies used to reinforce them. In the context of this, social inclusion could easily constitute a form of window dressing (changing the look of things) without recognising that as different groups become involved in systems, their interactions and varying interests of necessity ought to transform these systems. All too often, social inclusion occurs in an effort to appear responsive to the need for change, without introducing any fundamental changes, and, on the contrary, every effort to maintaining the status quo.

Finding a way through the thickets of injustice is complex. The analysis above suggests two possible alternatives from a theoretical and public policy perspective. On the one hand, it could be argued that it is simpler to use (return to) notions of class, caste, race, gender, etc. and to determine their relative significance. On the other hand, this article suggests that it is important to critically interrogate discourses of exclusion and inclusion given their importance in public policy in relation to concerns of social justice. In this regard, it is important to develop a relational interlocking approach so as to avoid the essentialising and managerialist features of current understandings.

Towards developing a more reflective approach, this article finds McCarthy's notion of 'nonsynchronicity' a useful concept and proposes an interlocking framework (see Sayed, 2002) whereby race, gender, class, region, language etc. all intersect in ways that recognise peoples' unique and particular experiences. This approach is also similar to what Hall (1996) has called a "theory of articulation". It argues that these factors cannot be placed on a two-dimensional grid, which simply seeks the intersection of two of the categories. Such a grid would merely tell of the dual effect of two of these categories on a number of groups. The concept of an interlocking framework recognises the highly complex ways in which race, class, gender and other categories intersect and inter-relate to produce unique individual and group experiences. The fact that there is a dominant articulating principle of conflict or inequality does not or should not undermine the prevalence of other levels of injustice. It simply suggests that the political approach pivots around a primary and articulating factor which might be dominant for that moment. What such an approach makes possible is the recognition of the complex context in

which injustice occurs. It brings an analysis within reach, for example, of the fluid and shifting setting of the developing world.

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

Applying the relational interlocking framework of articulations to institutional contexts requires that attention is paid to:

The point of institutional access: Access policies determine who does and who doesn’t have access to particular institutions. Students are often excluded on the basis of economic status or geographical location with schools only accepting students who fall within their ‘catchment’ area. Other levels of access relate closely to institutional access in terms of a school’s dominant culture undermining the cultures of some of its learners.

Institutional setting and ethos: Institutions may formally include but subtly continue to exclude learners. For example, particular indicators of inclusion are, participation in school structures such as the Student Representatives’ Council, sports teams and also, participation in the classroom, etc. Governance of institutions is a key area that determines, not only policies pertaining to access, but also those relating to institutional culture and practice.

The curriculum: Curricula are foci of power. Curricula have to address not only the varied interests of their expanded learner-base, but equally must reassess and transform those offensive aspects that reinforce inequality. New students may be included without any changes made to curricula to reflect their interests, histories etc. or to offer ‘new ways of seeing’.

Social location of institutions: The relations between institutions and the wider social contexts within which they exist need to be taken into account seriously. The “articulations” between forces outside of schools, their filtration into schools, the ways they are reinforced and/or opposed within schools need to be taken into consideration, not only to understand the dynamics within the institution but also to gain a more complex understanding of what exactly the institution in fact includes and excludes, how and why.

Educational inclusion thus presumes a broad-based collective will to effect transformation at every level of society. It requires grand schemes within an architecture that frames and facilitates transformation as well as political will at a sectoral, institutional and classroom level to create truly

inclusive spaces. Britain's Social Exclusion Unit has reported on its efforts at 'joined-up' thinking in tackling problems of social exclusion, including those on the educational front. Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott, who heads up the unit, expresses the desire to build on successes from its first four-year run, claiming that:

Analysis carried out by the unit has shown me just how interconnected and self-reinforcing the problems of social exclusion are [ranging from] disparities in educational attainment, truancy and poor housing conditions – all examples of the cycle of deprivation and disinvestment ... we recognise these sorts of multiple problems cannot be solved by looking at single issues. We now place emphasis on 'joining up' policy between government departments and taking a long-term approach, applying three basic principles: reintegration, prevention – addressing the causes not just the symptoms – and mainstreaming ... The key to all of this is partnership. (*Guardian – Society*, 16 January 2001, pp. 3–4)

CONCLUSION

This article has discussed the concepts of educational inclusion and educational exclusion in the context of the social exclusion – social inclusion debate in the South. It has considered these concepts in relation to the multi-dimensional issues of exclusion and shown ways in which the concepts could usefully be employed in the South. The discussion has emphasized that the issues are hardly simple or easy to tackle. Educational inclusion requires careful consideration of every aspect of schooling and the social context in which it finds itself. Innovative approaches to educational inclusion will need to address issues at macro, micro, personal and interpersonal levels and to recognize and engage with the political implications of working at these levels. Connections between school and community cultures have to be drawn, as well as between educational and community programmes of inclusion. These connections, moreover, need to be seen in their broader political context. They also need to be understood in terms of the practical consequences they have for educational change.

The concepts of 'diversity' and difference are fundamental to inclusive initiatives lest these seek to create homogenous communities. Social and educational exclusion are seen to occur around a complex of injustices which can usefully be addressed through understanding the culture of power and using the nonsynchronous model and interlocking framework, within a theory of articulation, as tools of analysis. The concepts of inclusion and exclusion press for much closer conscious and self-conscious consideration of identity and role: who is doing the excluding and including, who is choosing the excluding and including, how are

these processes of inclusion and exclusion facilitated, and what are the dominant views and relations of social, economic and political power. The article emphasises the importance of such interrogation at the levels of research and policy formation to ensure that they do not implicitly perpetuate injustices. As such, it seeks to argue for a return to a more political understanding of the implications of educational policy for social change. Without such an understanding, policy discussions will not be able to engage with the complex ways in which power circulates and reinvents itself in the school setting. Schools will then remain sites of domination and subordination.

NOTES

¹ This article was conceptualised and developed in the context of a research project funded by DFID which sought to consider educational exclusion and inclusion in South Africa and India. Views expressed are those of the authors and not of DFID. The empirical data of the project is not reported here. The article takes as its point of departure a concern with effecting social justice in post-apartheid South Africa. The primary objective is, however, to develop a theoretical understanding of the concepts of educational exclusion and inclusion in South Africa.

² This article does not exhaustively review the concepts of educational exclusion and inclusion. For a more detailed discussion see Sayed, 2002.

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

REFERENCES

- Betts, J. (2001). *Uppingham Seminar 2001: Unpacking the Discourses of Social Inclusion/Exclusion*, Final Report on Uppingham Seminar.
- Carrim, N. (1992). *Desegregation in Indian and Coloured Schooling*. Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand.
- Carrim, N. (1995). From "race" to ethnicity: Shifts in the educational discourses of South African and Britain in the 1990s. *Compare* 25(1), 17–35.
- Carrim, N. & Soudien, C. (1999). A critical antiracism in South Africa. In S. May (ed), *Critical Multiculturalism* (pp. 153–171). London: Falmer Press.
- Delpit, L. (1997). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. In A.H. Halsey et al. (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy, Society* (pp. 582–596). London: OUP.
- de Haan, A. (2000). *Debates on Social Exclusion in the South: What have They Contributed to Our Understanding of Deprivation?* Draft for Uppingham Conference, 2001.

- de Haan, A. (1999). *Social Exclusion: Towards an Holistic Understanding of Deprivation*. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/sdd_socex.pdf
- de Haan, A. (n.d.). *Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation*. <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SPT/journal/past/pdf/issue2-2.pdf>
- Dyson, A. (1999). Inclusion and Inclusions: Theories and Discourses in Inclusive Education. In H. Daniels & P. Garner (eds), *Inclusive Education* (pp. 36–53). London: Kogan Page.
- Figueroa, P. (1991). What is multicultural and antiracist education? Philosophical and sociological reflections. In P. Figueroa (ed), *Education and the Social Construction of Race* (pp. 46–75). London: Routledge.
- Ghuman, P. (1999). Racism, ethnic identity and education of South Asian adolescents. In H. Daniels & P. Garner (eds), *Inclusive Education, World Yearbook of Education* (pp. 207–228). London: n.p.
- Gillborn, D. (1995). *Racism and Antiracism in Real Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gillborn, D. & Mirza, H.S. (2000). *Educational Inequality: Mapping Race, Class and Gender: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. London: OFSTED. <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>
- The Guardian (16 January 2002). *John Prescott on Why the Social Exclusion Unit is Crucial to Government Policy*. Available at <http://societyguardian.co.uk/socialexclusion>
- Hallak, J. (1999). *Globalisation, Human Rights and Education*, IIEP Contributions No. 33. Unesco. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/iiep>
- ILO (1994). *Social Exclusion and Africa South of the Sahara: A Review of the Literature*.
- Jansen, J. (1998). 'Our teachers see children not colour': The politics of diversity in South African schools. In M. Cross, Mkwanazi-Twala & G. Klein (eds), *Dealing with Diversity in South African Education: A Debate on the Politics of a National Curriculum* (pp. 101–106). Juta: Cape Town.
- Kabeer, N. (2000). Social exclusion, poverty and discrimination: Towards an analytical framework. *IDS Bulletin* 31(4), 83–97.
- Lepani, B. (2001). *Reconceptualising Education*. Sydney: Lateral Solutions.
- Lepani, B. (1999). *Social Futures: Meeting the Wisdom Challenge*. Presented at the Biennial Conference Home Economics Institute of Australia, Brisbane.
- McCarthy, C. (1997). Nonsynchrony and social difference: An alternative to current radical accounts of race and schooling. In H.A.H. Lauder, H. Brown, P. Stuart & A. Wells (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy, Society* (pp. 541–556). London: Oxford University Press.
- Monga, T., Puri, G.S. & Bhupala, D.S. (1984). *Darada na jane koi*. Moga, Pañjaba: Munga Pabalikeshanaza.
- Nayak, P. (1994). *Economic Development and Social Exclusion in India*. Geneva: ILO. <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inst/papers/1994/dp77/ch2.htm>
- O'Brein, D. et al. (1997). *Poverty and Social Exclusion in North and South*, IDS Working Paper 55. London: IDS. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/Wp55.pdf>
- OFSTED (2000). *Improving City Schools: Strategies to Promote Educational Inclusion*. London: OFSTED. <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>
- Slee, R. (2001). 'Inclusion in practice': Does practise make perfect? *Educational Review* 53(2), 113–123.
- Social Exclusion Unity (2001). Preventing social exclusion. Available at: <http://www.cabinet-offic.gov.uk/sev/2001/pse/PSE%20HTML/summary/htm>
- Soudien, C. (1998). "We know why we're here": The experience of African children in a 'coloured' school in Cape Town. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 1(1), 7–31.

- Soudien, C. (1998). The debate on equality and equity in South African education. In M. Cross, Mkwanazi-Twala & G. Klein (eds), *Dealing with Diversity in South African Education: A Debate on the Politics of a National Curriculum* (pp. 125–134). Juta: Cape Town.
- Troyna, B. (1993). *Racism and Education: Research Perspectives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Vally, S. & Dalambo Y. (1999). *Racial Integration in Public Secondary Schools: Report of the South African Human Rights Commission on Racism in Public Secondary Schools in South Africa*. Johannesburg: South African Human Rights Commission.

AUTHOR'S BIO

Yusuf Sayed recently moved from the Centre for International Education, University of Sussex, and now works as a Senior Adviser at the Department for International Development in the United Kingdom.

Crain Soudien is Professor and Head of Department at the School of Education, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Nazir Carrim is a Senior Lecturer at the School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

*School of Education
University of Cape Town
Private Bag, Rondebosch
Cape Town, South Africa, 7701
E-mail: cs@humanities.uct.ac.za*