Inclusive Education's Promises and Trajectories: Critical Notes about Future Research on a Venerable Idea[1]

Alfredo J. Artiles
Arizona State University

&

Elizabeth B. Kozleski
University of Kansas
United States

Abstract: The purpose of this article is to offer critical notes on inclusive education research in the U.S. We discuss issues germane to conceptual clarity and the ways in which inclusive education interacts with reforms that share equity goals, noting disruptions and unintended consequences that arise at the nexus of these reforms. In addition, we identify enduring challenges and paradoxes in

this research literature. These include sampling issues, an emphasis on <u>where</u> students are placed as a proxy for inclusive education vis-à-vis inclusive education as the transformation of educational systems, the ways in which outcome measures have been examined in this research, and the need for and challenges of building strategic alliances that could advance an inclusive education agenda. We conclude with reflections and suggestions for a future research program that include sharpening inclusion's identity, attending to the fluid nature of ability differences and students' multiple identities, broadening the unit of analysis to systems of activities, and documenting processes and outcomes.

Keywords: Inclusive education; educational equity; disability; difference

Promesas y trayectorias de la educación inclusiva: Notas críticas sobre el futuro de la investigación de una venerable idea

Resumen: El propósito de este artículo es ofrecer notas críticas sobre la investigación en educación inclusiva en los EE.UU. Discutimos temas pertinentes sobre la claridad conceptual y las formas en que la educación inclusiva interactúa con reformas que comparten los objetivos de equidad, tomando en cuenta las disrupciones y consecuencias no deseadas que se presentan en conexión con estas reformas. Además, identificamos desafíos de larga duración y paradojas en la literatura de investigación. Estos incluyen cuestiones de muestreo, el énfasis en que los estudiantes se colocan como un proxy de educación inclusiva y de la transformación de los sistemas educativos, las formas en las que se han examinado las medidas de éxito de la investigación, y la necesidad así como los desafíos de la construcción de alianzas estratégicas que podrían avanzar en una agenda de educación inclusiva. Concluimos con reflexiones y sugerencias para un futuro programa de investigación que incluya refinar la identidad de la inclusión, atendiendo a la naturaleza fluida de las diferencias de capacidades y las múltiples identidades de los estudiantes, la ampliación de la unidad de análisis de los sistemas de actividades, y como documentar los procesos y resultados.

Palabras clave: educación inclusiva; equidad educativa; discapacidad; diferencia

Promessas e trajetórias de educação inclusiva: Notas críticas sobre o futuro da investigação de uma noção venerável

Resumo: O objetivo deste artigo é fornecer notas críticas sobre pesquisa em educação inclusiva em os EUA. Discutimos questões relevantes sobre a clareza conceitual e as formas em que a educação inclusiva interage com as reformas que compartilham os objetivos de equidade, tendo em conta as interrupções e consequências não intencionais que surgem em conexão com essas reformas. Além disso, foram identificados desafios de longo prazo e paradoxos na literatura de pesquisa. Estes incluem questões sobre amostragem, a questão dos alunos ser colocados como proxy da transformação dos sistemas educacionais inclusivos, modelos que têm sido discutidos como medidas de sucesso da investigação e a necessidade, bem como os desafios da construção de alianças estratégicas que poderiam fazer avançar uma agenda de educação inclusiva. Concluímos com reflexões e sugestões para futuros programas de investigação que definam melhor a identidade de inclusão, considerando a natureza fluida das diferenças nas capacidades e múltiplas identidades dos estudantes, a expansão da unidade de analise e sistemas para documentar processos e resultados.

Palavras-chave: educação inclusiva; equidade educacional; deficiência; diferença

Inclusive Education's Promises and Trajectories
Critical Notes about Future Research on a Venerable Idea

Few ideas have received so much praise and enthusiastic responses in the worlds of educational policy, research, and practice than inclusive education. But, ironically, few ideas have been so critiqued and resisted as this notion. Indeed, inclusive education has provoked contradictory responses from professionals, researchers, and politicians (Slee, 2011). However, it could be argued that the contentiousness that characterized the early years of this educational movement has subsided in recent years. The debates about inclusive education's merits and feasibility of the 1990s appear to have waned, and the idea of inclusive education seems to permeate policies, legislation and professional preparation programs in the U.S. On the other hand, what is lacking in this literature is a critical discussion of the original promises of inclusive education vis-à-vis the paradoxes that are emerging in the contemporary implementation of this movement, particularly as inclusive education intersects with other equity oriented education reform efforts. The purpose of this essay is to present a critique of the research on inclusive education in the U.S., its conceptualization, and trajectories. We offer recommendations for future research on this topic that engages the limits and challenges of this movement. But before we present this analysis and recommendations, we situate the inclusive education scholarship in a historical perspective.

A Short History of an Idea and a Movement

A Justice-Minded Notion in Search of Meaning

Inclusive education's origins were ambitious, far-reaching and grounded in an explicit justice agenda (e.g., Ryndak & Fisher, 1988). In part, inclusion's proposal to transform entire educational systems emerged out of a growing awareness and critiques of educational inequalities that had been historically embedded in the socioeconomic and cultural conditions of nations (Ferguson, Kozleski, & Smith, 2003; Sailor, Gee, & Karasoff, 1993). An explicit goal of these efforts was to achieve what David Labaree (1997) described as the "democratic equality approach to schooling"—i.e., "education is seen as a public good, designed to prepare people for political roles" (p. 42).

Inclusion's rationale was to disrupt the assumptions, practices, tools, and policies that privileged certain groups of students and disadvantaged others (Skrtic, 1995). Thus, the challenge was to design and implement educational systems that would be responsive to the characteristics, needs, and interests of students that represent the widest spectrum of human variability. Learning and developmental pathways mediated by socioeconomic status, gender, language, ability level, race, and ethnicity, among others, would be addressed and leveraged in inclusive educational systems. In this sense, inclusive education tended to emphasize one of the two aspects that constitute a democratic equality approach, namely "relative equality" in which social inequality is minimized to ensure that everybody is considered equal (Labaree, 1997)[2]. Based on these premises, most scholars and professionals would agree that inclusive education is concerned with "the transformation of school cultures to (1) increase *access* (or presence) of **all** students (not only marginalized or vulnerable groups), (2) enhance school personnel's and students' *acceptance* of all students, (3) maximize student

---

[2] The second aspect of a democratic equality goal, "effective citizenship" (i.e., education as a means to prepare people with political competence as citizens) has received less attention in the inclusive education movement.

participation in various domains of activity, and (4) increase the *achievement* of all students" (Artiles, Kozleski, Dorn, & Christensen, 2006, p. 67, emphases in original).

      The discourse about inclusive education that originated in developed nations in the Western hemisphere spread throughout geographical regions to the point that it was described as a "global agenda" (Pijl, Meijer, & Hegarty, 1997). This international movement was shaped, among other forces, by the Declaration of Salamanca in 1994. This historic declaration was largely based on a rights discourse to address the educational needs of students. To wit (UNESCO, 1994, p. viii-ix):

      We believe and proclaim that

- every child has a fundamental right to education, and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning,

- every child has unique characteristics, interests, abilities, and learning needs,

- education systems should be designed and educational programs implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs,

- those with special educational needs must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them within a child centered pedagogy capable of meetings these needs,

- regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society, and achieving education for all; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system.

In the U.S., inclusive education is most closely linked to a specific provision of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 2004), the Least Restrictive Environment clause. In this clause of the Act that has been included in the law since it was originally passed in 1975, the law states that to the maximum extent possible children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated in the least restrictive environment. Further, the clause goes on to stipulate that only when education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily should children be educated elsewhere. Advocates of inclusive education have argued that since it is possible to provide the necessary supplementary aids and services, this section of IDEA provides the legal rationale for inclusive education in every school in the U.S. Several court cases have clarified aspects of this clause (Yell, 2015), finding a middle ground between fully inclusive placements and placements that prevent students with disabilities from access and opportunity to experience school with their typical peers.

      The original justice agenda embedded in the inclusion movement was framed as a matter of individual rights and connected to access, participation, and/or outcomes. Skrtic (1991), however, pointed out that multiple discourses have circulated in policy, research, and practice circles throughout the history of inclusion, and we contend that each of these discourses differentially favors particular justice paradigms that have implications for reform agendas and their implementation.

Skrtic (1995) identified discourses concerned with two broad themes, namely the <u>justification</u> for and <u>implementation</u> of inclusion in the U.S. in the 1980s and 1990s (see also Dyson, 1999). The logic of the <u>justification</u> discourse was grounded in what was described as a rights and ethics perspective. Inclusive education was justified, according to this discourse, because special education had not shown a positive impact on the development and learning rates of learners with special educational needs. This was a contentious argument since the available data were mixed, and debates ensued germane to the evidence cited to support or counter this critique (Graff & Kozleski, 2014). Notice that the inclusive education discourse shifted from a vision encompassing all learners to a focus on students with disabilities;[3] we return to this point in a subsequent section of this article. The efficacy critique to justify inclusive education was based on a distributive justice argument in which access to educational opportunities was paramount (Artiles, Harris-Murri, & Rostenberg, 2006).

The discourse on inclusion <u>implementation</u> was indexed in at least two alternative forms: (a) arguments for engaging in political struggles as a vehicle for change, and (b) pragmatic considerations. Commentators argued that inclusive education could not become a reality unless political deliberations and struggles took place to dismantle the traditional educational system that excluded students with special educational needs and disabilities. Other scholars were concerned with practical matters germane to programs and schools; that is, with issues related to inclusion's design, traits, and everyday curricular, pedagogical, assessment, and professional preparation practices (Artiles et al., 2006). This pragmatic view within the implementation discourse represents the bulk of the inclusive education literature. Given the multi-voiced nature of the inclusion movement, it is not surprising that its bold aspirations traveled across locales and time with disparate meanings and with alternative consequences (Srivastava, de Boer & Pijl, 2015).

The consistent support of UNESCO underscores the degree to which the inclusive education agenda is international in nature. The movement culminated in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (2006), which (in 2016) has now been signed by 160 nations and the European Union. Notably, the U.S. has not signed. Some argue that the inclusive education movement fails to recognize its uneven application across racial, gender, religious, linguistic, nationality, and class that exist within and across national boundaries (Artiles, Kozleski, & Gonzalez, 2011). As a result, many children labeled for special needs education are members of racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural minority groups (Artiles, Kozleski, & Waitoller, 2011; Kozleski & Yu, in press). Although inclusive education went global, as reflected in the number of signatories committed to the ideals embodied in the Salamanca Declaration (i.e., 92 nations and 25 international agencies) as well as the CRPD, it is important to note that when the analytic gaze descends to local levels, inclusive education adopts uniquely local flavors. Artiles and Dyson (2005) addressed this issue in the context of the growing influence of globalization on educational policies and practices. They acknowledged that globalization forces are not necessarily adverse; the risk for a negative impact, they argue, is exacerbated when we "overlook legitimate local differences. [These local differences may reside] in the ways rights are understood in different cultural contexts, differences in the roles ascribed to education, differences in forms and processes of exclusion, or simply in differences in what is practicable" (p. 42).

All in all, a critical reading of this literature suggests that there is a substantial distance between the conceptualization of inclusive education and its implementation. Many policies and proclamations embraced a sweeping rhetoric supported by a vision of universal rights, though local

---

[3] For stylistic purposes, we use interchangeably person-first language (i.e., students with disabilities) and terms aligned with the social model of disability (i.e., disabled students) to acknowledge the individual dimension of disability as well as the roles society and institutions play in constructing disabilities.

iterations of this movement across cultural contexts have often collided with its standardizing ambitions (McDermott, Edgar & Scarloss, 2011; Slee, 2011). The preceding brief discussion about the history and meanings of inclusive education serves as the backdrop for an analysis of the gaps and paradoxes rarely acknowledged in the inclusive education literature. We conclude with reflections to guide future research on this important topic.

A Closer Look at the U.S. Inclusion Research: Grappling with Promises, Gaps and Paradoxes

Historically, the bulk of the scholarship on inclusive education revolves around the inclusion of students with disability labels into general education settings. This is reflected within the discourse of the scholarship published in the most visible U.S. special education journals including, but not limited to *Exceptional Children, Journal of Learning Disabilities, Journal of Special Education, Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities,* and *Remedial and Special Education*. For the purposes of this critical essay, we draw on the dominant U.S. narrative to explore how inclusive education has been positioned, described, and critiqued. We are aware this view differs from alternative narratives of inclusion that have been largely crafted in disciplines beyond education, though alternative standpoints have also been produced within education. These alternative perspectives have been published in interdisciplinary journals in and outside of the U.S.

We used our knowledge and longstanding engagement with the inclusive education research literature to identify four themes. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list of themes about gaps and contradictions in this literature. Nevertheless, we deem these themes as central to an understanding of this movement. The themes are grounded in previous systematic reviews of this research we have conducted in the last decade (Artiles et al., 2006; Kozleski & Yu, in press; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013), as well as in our experience with research and technical assistance work on equity issues in inclusive and special education (e.g., Artiles et al., 2011; Klinger et al., 2006; Kozleski & Thorius, 2013). The first theme relates to who is included as participants in inclusive education research. Of interest was the narrow range of students represented in research on inclusive education. A second theme alludes to the importance of a geography of inclusion. That is, *where* students were educated became more important than what and how they learned and the systems in which they were educated. Third, we raise questions and reflect about the identity of inclusive education with regard to its purpose and function. Finally, we discuss the intersections of inclusive education with other justice reforms and their unintended consequences.

From *All* to *Certain* Groups: Sampling in Inclusive Education Scholarship

Notwithstanding the ambiguities in meaning and the myriad conceptualizations of inclusive education, the definition offered in the introduction of this manuscript suggests that inclusive education is concerned with an ambitious project of educational transformation. Inclusive education aspires to change entire systems to enhance educational access, participation, and outcomes for students from **all** backgrounds, independent of any form of difference that students purportedly embody.

Despite these laudable aspirations, the majority of inclusion research in the U.S. focuses primarily on students with disabilities (Artiles et al., 2006). This has also been observed at the international level (Artiles et al., 2011). It is paradoxical that an educational reform movement that purports to benefit all students is enacted with only certain groups. Scholars and advocates in the low prevalence disabilities community produced most of the early work aimed at justifying inclusion

in the U.S. (e.g., Kunc, 1992; Sailor, 1991; Sailor, Gee, & Karasoff, 1993). Low incidence disability scholars also produced a fair amount of qualitative and single subject research on inclusive education (Evans, et al, 1992; Giangreco, et al, 1993; Hunt & Farron-Davis, 1992; Kozleski & Jackson, 1993; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2012; Schnorr, 1990; Staub et al, 1994). However, the majority of studies on inclusive education published in the last 15 years focused on students with high prevalence disabilities (Bulgren et al, 2006; Klingner & Vaughn, 1999; McLeskey, Landers, Williamson, & Hoppey, 2012). Beginning about 2005, researchers shifted attention from how to support individual students to how to organize schools to support a variety of services and supports (Zumeta, 2014). These organizational designs for schools are intended to help practitioners and school leaders prepare for, prevent, and support the movement of students from classrooms to more intensive support services. In the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, enacted in 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the law encourages states and their school districts to develop organizational approaches to the provision of additional educational services and supports. The continued emphasis on high prevalence categories may reflect the fact that students with these disabilities constitute the majority of the special education population, that they are more likely to be placed in general education, and/or that more research funding is available for developing content knowledge in academic topics such as math, science, and reading.

Place v. Systems: What Counts as Inclusive Education?

We previously documented that most U.S. inclusive education research has two units of analysis, namely schools or classrooms (Artiles et al., 2006). The former research tended to lack specificity in terms of the disability categories represented in those studies, and equally important, many researchers failed to document outcome measures. Inclusive education classroom research, in turn, had similar limitations, though in some instances, reports included more information about student disabilities and proximal outcome measures. The classroom research lacked specificity around the theoretical underpinnings of the notion of learning used in these investigations. A notable shortcoming of inquiries across these two strands of research is the failure to examine intersections in student identities (e.g., with race, social class, language, or gender) and their potential mediating force in developmental or learning measures (Artiles et al., 2006).

These trends in the empirical knowledge base suggest that inclusive education seems to have become the latest brand of special education (Artiles, Kozleski, & Gonzalez, 2011; Skrtic, 1991). Moreover, it was common in the inclusion literature to find an emphasis on placement in general education. At this point, it is important to notice that the notion of inclusive education evolved from earlier reforms that were identified with terms such as mainstreaming, which evolved into the regular education initiative, and eventually was identified as integration, and finally it was called (full) inclusion. That next iteration, the ambitious idea to revamp entire educational systems, became mired in a concern with the physical location of programs. The main task of inclusive education continues to revolve around moving students from one type of space to another. Erevelles (2011b) went as far as to conclude that "the main thrust of inclusion becomes the shifting of students around on the educational chessboard … an act that purports to make these students *less intrusive* rather than to make schools *more inclusive* (p. 2158, emphases in original).

For instance, a careful literature review of studies on inclusive education in the *Journal of Special Education* opens with the statement: "Full inclusion, in which students with disabilities are full-time members in general education classrooms, is a recognized, and increasingly common, educational practice (Hunt & Goetz, 1997, p. 3)." The authors examined the extant literature on parents' perceptions, classroom and school practices, placement costs, educational achievement, and

social relationships between students with and without disabilities. Only research articles that examined *where* students with more significant needs were placed and served were included in the analysis. Yet, as Skrtic, Sailor, and Gee (1996) suggested, notions of fundamental disruptions to the highly bureaucratized educational systems of the latter half of the 20th century ground inclusive education. Rather than a conversation about which classroom excluded students might gain access to, inclusive education seemed to signal a new logic about the habitus of education. That is, inclusive education required transformations in the organization and structure of schools and school systems, pedagogical reforms that mirrored new knowledge about how learning emerges, and institutional reformation in which membership and voice serve as the impetus for the design and tailoring of services to the needs and contexts of individuals and their families (Skrtic et al., 1996).

In spite of calls for understanding the fundamental shifts that inclusive education required, most of the U.S. research remained mired in examining the effects of activities that occurred within existing schools, in specific places. The evidence has been mixed as to the ways in which student participation produced particular outcomes, though the lack of specificity (e.g., about sampling and outcome metrics) complicates determinations about the differential impact of programs (Artiles et al., 2006). While there is much to be learned in how, for instance, a classroom might be designed to optimize literacy development for every student, it begs the questions of where learning should occur, for whom, and with what kinds of affordances. Further, the focus on a specific locale, such as the classroom, constricts the field of analysis so that influences on the acquisition and use of literacy are assumed to reside only within the confines of the classroom. Finally, although there is evidence of the positive impact of inclusive programs on students with disabilities in some domains, it is not rare to find that disabled students experienced deeper inequalities. These inequalities arose because curricular changes did not take place, personnel were not prepared or supported to work with these learners, and/or assessments did not capture adequately students' potential and performance (Sailor, 2002).

The Horizons of Change: Of Telos and Outcomes

Within the U.S., inclusive education has been advanced as a reform of special education, a policy mandate that is regulated and monitored by governments, as well as a social movement that is advanced by a variety of advocates and interests. Most published research on the topic comes from special education or educational psychology (Waitoller & Artiles, 2013). Disability studies scholars have also engaged the conversation through research and theory (Erevelles, 2011b). However, to practitioners who work in schools on a daily basis, the term inclusive education is likely associated with special education. In fact, a review of the literature and analysis of the state of inclusive education in 11 countries, suggests that inclusive education remains associated (at least in the minds of professionals and policymakers) with the education of children with disabilities (Artiles, Kozleski, & Waitoller, 2011).

One of the challenges of creating inclusive classrooms inside the compartmentalized bureaucracies of schools and school systems is that creating inclusivity within compartmentalization may be impossible. Thus, the conundrum for proponents of inclusive education is where to begin. First generation inclusive education remained at the student and classroom level. Some general education practitioners were resistant to adopt inclusive models (Kavale & Forness, 2000). Once studies moved beyond the notion of whether to include certain individuals and its value, researchers and practitioners ran into struggles with the nature of the curriculum, conceptualizations of learning and development, the structures, routines, and technical processes built into schooling, as well as the

tensions between education for a democratic community and schooling as an economic investment for globalization purposes (Waitoller & Kozleski, 2015).

An important tension within this scholarship addresses not only the impact of inclusive education on students with disabilities but also on typical peers (Bunch & Valeo, 2004; Ochs, Kremer-Sadlik, Solomon, & Sirota, 2001). One argument that has been made is that typical students run the risk of being disadvantaged in terms of progress in the curriculum because students with disabilities require too much attention and slow down the progress of typical students. An important study, funded by the U.S. Department of Education examined the effects of serving children with and without disabilities in the same classrooms. In an experimental research design, researchers found that students without disabilities perform at the same or even improved levels in classrooms where students with varying abilities and disabilities learn together. Korenich and Salisbury completed the final report on their study in 2006, which mirrors research by Hanuschek, Kain and Rivkin (2002) and Huber, Rosenfeld, and Fiorello (2001). These researchers concluded that bringing students with differing abilities, histories, and skills does not harm one group to benefit another, given appropriate books and materials required by the curriculum. On the other hand, a recent study conducted with a large-scale nationally representative dataset suggests that having peers with disabilities in the classroom does have an effect on non-cognitive outcomes (e.g., problem behaviors, social skills) that were moderated by individual and contextual factors (Gottfried, 2014).

Second wave inclusive education research beginning in the early 2000s examined change strategies at the local, district, and state levels (Skrtic, Sailor, & Gee, 2005). But, notions of inclusive education seemed to be mired in a conceptualization of inclusive education as an advancement of new schooling frameworks for addressing the needs of children with disabilities. Attempts to reframe the conversation to include all students who are marginalized ran into widely held commonsense notions about inclusive education as a disability agenda. These trends raised questions about the identity of inclusive education. Should inclusive education give up on its ambitions to benefit *all* students? Should the end goal continue to be access to educational locales? Given the troubling neglect of outcome measures to gauge the impact of inclusive education on student program participation (Artiles et al., 2006), what should be the outcome metrics for this movement?

Reform Convergences & Contradictions: U.S. Inclusive Education in the XXI Century

A trend rarely acknowledged in this literature is that the trajectory of inclusive education in the U.S. has intersected with other policy and reform efforts (e.g., discipline policies, Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA], language policies), and many of these initiatives aimed to remedy inequities for various groups of students. The trajectories of inclusion and these policies/reforms have not always intersected in smooth ways. When these intersections converge in local contexts, idiosyncratic meanings of inclusion are forged, which are applied to individuals or groups of students. Moreover, because of mismatches or misalignments among the converging reforms/policies, "torque effects" (or twists) can be produced in the enacted policies that result in classification decisions for certain individuals (e.g., a disability diagnosis) that will purportedly "benefit" from inclusive programs. These decisions change the social and physical identities of the people targeted (i.e., classified) in these policies (Bowker & Star, 2002; Timmermans, 1996) producing new human kinds (Hacking, 2007). As a result, the nature and meaning of these policies, as well as the individuals' or groups' trajectories, undergo twists that often have unintended consequences, such as racial disparities in disability identification rates (Artiles, 2011) or exclusion of students with disabilities from accountability practices such as achievement testing (Thurlow & Kopriva, 2015). An illustration follows about the complexities inherent in these torque effects.

The ESEA 2001 policy (also known as No Child Left Behind—NCLB) brought about substantial changes in the federal regulation of educational practices, particularly with its emphasis on closing achievement gaps among subgroups of students in reading, math, and science. NCLB focused on ensuring accountability of educational outcomes, affording parents' options about educational programs, privileging evidence based practices, and favoring local control and flexibility. Public reporting of educational outcomes was central to this policy and these data were disaggregated by racial, socioeconomic, linguistic, and disability subgroups. Schools that did not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) were expected to improve through the implementation of specific interventions and reforms, otherwise, such schools could be eventually closed and/or parents were given the choice to transfer their children to schools that meet AYP.

In turn, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) also stipulates that states "set—and report progress on meeting—'performance goals for students with disabilities [SWD] that are consistent with the state's definition of AYP' … This alignment was to enhance the effectiveness of the education of [students with disabilities] by establishing high expectations, ensuring access to the general education curriculum, and coordinating school improvement efforts at different levels, in particular those stipulated by the ESEA" (Harr-Robins et al., 2012, p. 2). We should note, however, that achievement data of students with disabilities were not always treated the same way for accountability purposes (Darling-Hammond, 2007). This created the perverse incentive to diagnose students with disabilities as a means to exclude them from accountability systems.

Despite the best intentions of these policies, a number of inequitable consequences have been documented. For instance, although some between-group achievement gaps have improved (with different magnitudes), substantial gaps persist. The National Assessment of Educational Progress reports that reading scores in 2015 showed no significant change in reading score gaps between two comparison groups, White and Hispanic and White and African-American (Nation's Report Card, 2015). Because of the considerable racial and socioeconomic segregation of the nation's schools, these minority groups are trapped in contexts with fewer material and human resources in which low educational performance rates are entangled with structural inequities in a self-perpetuating cycle. Mishandling (and outright cheating) of testing practices and evidence reporting have been documented around the U.S. (Nichols & Berliner, 2007). In addition, disproportionate numbers of racial minority students are placed in special education programs (Losen & Orfield, 2002), increasing the likelihood that they will fall farther behind academically.

Two other policies that address related educational inequities and opportunities have gained substantial visibility in the U.S. in recent years. First, major cases of school violence contributed to the passage of zero tolerance policies to ensure school safety, a productive learning environment, and an effective system of school discipline. Unfortunately, the available evidence reflects an unsettling state of affairs. A report from the American Psychological Association (2008) concluded that zero tolerance policies have failed to address school discipline and safety concerns:

> Zero tolerance has not been shown to improve school climate or school safety. Its application in suspension and expulsion has not proven an effective means of improving student behavior. It has not resolved, and indeed may have exacerbated, minority overrepresentation in school punishments. Zero tolerance policies as applied appear to run counter to our best knowledge of child development (p. 860).

We should also note that available evidence does not support the student poverty argument, a common explanation for racial disparities in discipline. To wit: "when the relationship of socio-economic status to disproportionality in discipline has been explored directly, race continues to

make a significant contribution ... independent of socioeconomic status" (Fabello et al. as cited in Losen, 2012, p. 12).

Second, IDEA requires that disability diagnosis be reported by student race. The established monitoring system includes at least two features as follows:

> First, Section 616 makes "disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education . . . to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification" a monitoring priority area and the primary source for states to report to the Secretary and to the public under Indicators 9 and 10. Second, Section 618 requires that each state collects and analyzes data to determine if "significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in the state and the [LEAs] of the State" with respect to identification, placement and discipline, and if so, these LEAs must spend 15% of their Part B funds on coordinated early intervening services (Albrecht, Skiba, Losen, Chung, & Middelberg, 2012, pp. 16-17).

This policy does not require monitoring of this problem for English learners and it did not establish a threshold for disproportionality. Thus, there is substantial variability in the cut off scores that states require to initiate remedial actions (Sullivan & Kozleski, 2009). The majority of states require that racial minority students are at least between two to three times more likely to be placed in special education than their counterparts to launch district self-reviews or audits from state education agencies. Some states require disproportionality patterns get documented two or three consecutive years before state responses are triggered (Artiles, 2011). This state of affairs reflects the protean nature of the idea of disability, or what Star and Griesemer (1989) called "boundary objects."[4] Thus, the notion of disability morphs from scientific definitions, to federal definitions, to the state operationalization of the construct, and is appropriated and contextualized at the local school level according to the unique circumstances of practitioners' work and personal lives (Artiles, 2011). This phenomenon can be characterized as "categorical alignment" (Epstein, 2007) in which scientific, administrative, and sociocultural definitions of disability are laminated as if they have the same meaning.

The "categorical alignment" of disability (Artiles, 2011) that is forged across scales (from macro to micro levels) of educational systems as the policy-monitoring procedures are enacted has important equity implications for groups of students. Specifically, despite the potential of the monitoring policy to remedy inequities in special education, these gaming strategies are deeply problematic for racial and linguistic minority students who already face overwhelming historical barriers to educational opportunity (Cavendish, Artiles, & Harry, 2014). This is particularly the case if we consider the negative implications associated with special education placement. The recent report of the Equity and Excellence Commission (U.S. Department of Education, 2013) summarized a few:

> [Students with disabilities] frequently have had special problems gaining full access to schools' general education curriculum; are often placed in separate classrooms for more than 20% of the school day; are suspended at disproportionately high rates;

---

[4] Boundary objects "have different meanings in different social worlds but their structure is common enough to more than one world to make them recognizable, a means to translation. The creation and management of boundary objects is a key process in developing and maintaining coherence across intersecting social worlds" (Star & Griesemer, 1989, p. 393).

> often lack teachers who are dual-certified in a content area; and do not receive
> appropriate instructional differentiation aligned with their disabilities (p. 14).

Added to these adversities are other troubling longstanding trends. For instance, we know that racial and linguistic minorities, like students with disabilities, perform at a significantly lower level in standardized academic assessments than their counterparts (Lee & Reeves, 2012). They also exhibit higher dropout and lower graduation rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

To conclude, (racial and linguistic) minorities continue to experience substantial educational inequalities, even though reforms aim to bridge achievement gaps, make schools more accountable and safer, and produce more equitable disability diagnoses. Considering that disciplinary sanctions and disability labels are added to these groups' identities in disproportionate numbers, their trajectories toward inequities are further compounded. The compounding effect of these inequities perpetuate what has been described as "second generation discrimination"—i.e., structures, policies, and practices that limit access to high-value programs, practices, human/material assets, and knowledge **within** institutions (e.g., curriculum tracking), thus reproducing inequitable conditions (Meier, Stewart, & England, 1989; Noguera, 2007).

Fortunately, multiple efforts are being conducted to remedy injustices. On the other hand, torque effects and unintended equity consequences are produced at the intersections of these remedies. In fact, the evidence suggests that inequities can deepen for the very students targeted in these reforms when mandates and policies converge in local settings—e.g., although there are greater accountability demands for **all** students, many students living under the violence of historical structural inequities are not getting the most basic material and human resources to meet these policy requirements. Meanwhile, educational institutions can shuffle non-dominant groups in a maze of identities to avoid the hammer of monitoring and compliance bureaucracies. Thus, many non-dominant learners become chronic discipline offenders and eventually join either the juvenile justice/correctional systems or receive disability labels. Shifting student identities in this fashion allows educational systems to elude the accountability panopticon, thus enabling them to stay away from compliance self-reviews or state audits, while second generation discrimination remains unscathed.

This is the context in which inclusive education programs are being enacted; these are the trajectories that many of the students entering inclusive programs are coming from. Yet, there is little attention to these contextual influences and their implications in the construction of inclusive education environments nor in the body of research that aims to study and advance knowledge in and about inclusive education. Given the historical trajectories, research trends, and gaps and paradoxes in the inclusive education literature, we end this article with notes for a future research agenda.

Reimagining Possible Futures: Notes for a Research Agenda

In the following section, we reflect on the potential of strategic alliances for leveraging the pursuit of inclusive education, discuss the implications of more fluid understandings of ability and disability, and make the case for the study of both the processes and outcomes of inclusive education.

Beyond Disabilities: The Possibilities and Challenges of Strategic Alliances

Some commentators would characterize inclusive education as an important contributor to the disability rights movement. Indeed, aligned with preceding victories in the historical evolution of this movement (e.g., IDEA; ADA), inclusive education was largely justified by a civil rights argument. Historically, there have been synergies to forge civil right gains among disparate minority groups. The disability rights movement, for instance, benefitted from the lessons, strategies, and victories of African American struggles for civil rights. It has been recognized that the adoption of a collective identity as disabled under a minority group model, along with demands for legal rights yielded the "theoretical foundation" for the ADA (Hahn, 2000).

On the other hand, the disability rights movement has received significantly less attention in fields that have traditionally studied social movements, such as sociology and critical legal studies (Gustafson, 2006). LatCrit scholars, for instance, have recognized that "our engagement of disability communities and issues has been ad hoc at best" (Iglesias & Valdes, 2001, p. 1293). Gustafson (2006) also asserted that "[l]egal scholarship … seems to lag behind writings in disability studies in analyzing the legal construction of disability" (p. 1022). This lack of interdisciplinary cross-fertilization flies in the face of social movements' commitment to collective social justice projects for all marginalized groups. It is unfortunate that social movements for different marginalized groups have not engaged in more complex analyses of intersecting axes of oppression that include disability. This is particularly unfortunate for the inclusive education movement considering that, in its expansive version, it is purportedly concerned with **<u>all</u>** forms of difference, and in its narrow iteration, focuses on disability, which is a permeable category that, as we explained in a previous section, regularly traverses race, gender, language, sexual orientation, social class, and nationality.

Strategic alliances and coalitions between the inclusive education movement and other social movements could contribute to several crucial goals. For instance, these alliances could press for more responsive policies and greater research funding on the intersections of disability with other markers of difference such as race, gender, language, and social class. Similarly, strategic alliances could contribute to the refinement of generative metrics about the impact of such movements. Although there is no consensus on a set of success indicators, common measures include integration, economic advancement, and symbolic victories won in court cases (Gustafson, 2006). People with disabilities do not fare well on these indices, and the picture is gloomier when we examine the evidence at the intersections of race, gender, social class, and disability (Artiles, 2013).

What would inclusive education's emphasis on educational opportunity add to the analysis of a social movement's impact? Because of the persistent entanglements of race, gender and disability, how can strategic alliances and coalitions with race and gender minded groups advance the mission and goals of the inclusive education movement, particularly as we press the question about what Susan Silbey (2005) described as "legal consciousness?"—i.e., "Why do people acquiesce to a legal system that, despite its promises of equal treatment, systematically reproduces inequality?" (p. 323) These are indeed urgent questions that future inclusion scholarship must face. Interestingly, efforts to build alliances among women's rights, disability rights, reproductive justice, and racial justice activists that advocate for strategic policy priorities have shown encouraging results (Roberts & Jesudason, 2013).

Notwithstanding the promise of coalitions, we should note an important caveat. Strategic alliances do not happen in a vacuum. Social movements work with categories of difference that have cultural historical meanings and baggage. This fact can complicate and even undermine these efforts. There is evidence, for instance, that white individuals with disabilities are reluctant to engage with a disability rights discourse when reflecting on past unjust treatment or when articulating solutions to

discriminatory experiences (Engel & Munger, 2003). These individuals' reluctance to invoke a rights discourse stemmed from their equating rights talk with the stigma of race, and the use of such rhetoric would identify them with a group with which they would not want to build alliances. This is an interesting case of (allegedly universal) rights creating resistance to progress on civil rights agendas (Gustafson, 2006). There is a pressing need for additional inquiries into this "resistance" phenomenon as it affects vulnerable groups such as African American boys with disabilities, since they are disproportionately represented in some disability categories.

We should also note that globalization and the diasporas of multiple groups across the globe are creating what Ash (2012) described as "parallel societies" or "subsidized isolation" within developed nations that in turn, are deepening inequities for marginalized groups, and could impinge upon this "resistance" phenomenon across categories of difference. Inclusive education's efforts to build coalitions with other social movements would have to be mindful of these potential challenges, and considerable work would be required to examine potential biases, perceptions, stereotypes and prejudices about disabilities among other social movements. Borrowing from Gustafson (2006), inclusive education's strategic alliances with other social movements will need to rest on careful analyses of "the interdependence of various rights discourses" (p. 1020).

Intersections in the Fluid States of Disability: A New Research Program

Inclusive education has not taken advantage of the scholarship on the fluidity of disability that has been produced in disability studies, legal studies, the social sciences, and the humanities. The concept of disability as a "fluid and expansive category" (Gustafson, 2006, p. 1023) has been framed in at least two important ways. First, disability has been theorized as a universal human experience because people inhabit it in different ways and at different points in the course of their lives. Thus, disability is permeable as individuals move in and (sometimes) out of it over time (Crossley, 1999). Second, disability identities morph from one context to another contingent upon how individuals experience them, how people in disparate settings engage with them, and how institutional conditions and practices mediate affordances, constraints, and/or consequences linked to disabilities (Varenne & McDermott, 1999). In a way, this fluid dimension of disability calls for analytic attention to the governmentality (i.e., the ways in which discourses and institutional practices "structure the possible field of action of others") (Foucault, 1986) of identities deemed to be out of the realm of the "normal," and how such governmentality is played out in particular everyday practices at school and beyond.

The fluidity of disability has important implications for research on inclusive education. Perhaps the most obvious consequence is the need to use a situated perspective on the study of disability. If contextual contingencies are critical to understand how disability takes on different meanings, elicits disparate responses, and is differentially mediated by institutional forces, researchers will be compelled to document the situated nature of disability, and the attendant aspects relevant to the purposes of their inquiries (e.g., child development or learning). That is, inclusive education should move from a concern with the politics of identity to understanding the "politics of engagement" (Naraian, 2013), to see disability as "predicated not on 'being' but on 'becoming' "(Erevelles, 2011a). In other words, future inclusive education research must go beyond the examination of placement patterns and the effects of curricula and interventions on static outcomes (e.g., achievement scores, frequency of disruptive behaviors). Instead, research needs to account for process-oriented understandings of how categories change and learners experience programs within local school contexts. For example, researchers might study how the language and mental health needs of ELLs dissolve from institutional records after a learning disability diagnosis is assigned.

Another study might examine how ELLs' literacy assets in their first language (L1) are used (or ignored) during instruction. Simultaneous attention to a combination of local and structural factors (e.g., lack of teacher knowledge, policy requirements to ignore L1, scarce funding to hire bilingual counselors) may help to illuminate how these instructional practices emerge and for what purpose.

Such research needs to explore the trajectories of disabling condition(s) in a person's biography (e.g., is it a temporary condition? was it present at birth?), and engage with the "active silences" (Erevelles, 2011b) that are revealed in the intersections of disability with race, social class, language, ethnicity, gender, and so forth. Sampling, therefore, will require a more fine-grained approach that examines within-population diversity and institutional and contextual conditions. Such research would mark an important advance in inclusive education since researchers have documented for decades substantial limitations in sample reporting strategies that have crucial implications for the aggregation of research findings, For instance, problems have been noted in sampling for students with LD (Artiles, Trent, & Kuan, 1997; Keogh, Major-Kingsley, Omori-Gordon, & Reid, 1982; Trent et al., 2014; Vasquez et al., 2011), studies on student voice (Gonzalez, Hernandez-Saca, & Artiles, 2013), and ELLs (Artiles & Klingner, 2006; Ragan & Lesaux, 2006).

Moreover, the fluidity of disability requires a comparative perspective in research questions and designs. Specifically, researchers will be expected to produce knowledge that contrasts the meaning and consequences of disabilities across institutional contexts and social situations. This means, for instance, that research would shift from documenting how students with LD placed in inclusive programs acquire basic literacy skills to detailing the ways in which students with LD use literacy tools across contexts (e.g., classroom writing tasks, grocery shopping, playing videogames with friends or siblings at home). Additionally, researchers will explore the purposes for which students with LD (a) use literacy tools, (b) identify which tools are more impactful by setting, and (c) what consequences these findings have for the definition of competence in literacy education for learners with LD. Studies might also examine tool use across a range of "kinds" of learners in which students themselves are seen in complex ways. Thus, study participants might include descriptions of themselves that reveal the sociocultural conditions under which they live, how they learn, the languages they use (and for what purposes), and their historical and current opportunities to learn. Organized in ways that acknowledge the multifaceted nature of learners, research on inclusive education can help educators re-examine how they think about their students and how they organize to serve them. For instance, conventional notions about what students with various intellectual capacities are able to learn and accomplish need to be recalibrated. Increasingly, students with low prevalence disabilities are able to engage in and benefit from academic learning (Saunders, Bethune, Spooner, & Browder, 2013). How this happens, under what conditions, and what the implications are for the organization of learning contexts remains incompletely understood.

Inclusion's Complexities: Documenting Processes and Outcomes

We explained above that inclusive education is grounded in a rights discourse that aims to expand access to valued resources (e.g., general education curriculum, social interactions with diverse students). Thus, systems have been set up to monitor the proportion of students with disabilities that are educated for different portions of the school day in general education classrooms as an index of inclusion. The emphasis on rights and access is crucial, as it constitutes the cornerstone of liberal justice projects in contemporary America (Rawls, 2001). However, it is necessary that inclusive education broaden its justice agenda to what happens **after what is indexed as inclusion** (i.e., access) is attained (Artiles, 2012). When inclusive education narrowly defines its end goal as attaining access to physical settings, we must be reminded that our ethical obligation should be to

ask, what happens after inclusion?—i.e., we should have been examining the <u>enactment</u> of hard-earned rights *after* students pass the doors of general education classrooms (Artiles, 2012). Although there is a body of work on the characteristics of schools engaged in inclusive education, there is hardly any attention to the equity dilemmas/tensions/contradictions that arise from the implementation of inclusion (for exceptions, see Artiles et al., 2011; Kozleski et al., 2013, Kozleski & Smith, 2009). This perspective is related to what Gustafson (2006) described as "rights in action" – i.e., "how rights can become active in day-to-day life even when individuals do not choose to assert them" (Engel & Munger, 2003, p. 11). We should not assume that rights are inert entities engraved in statutes and policies. Rather, following law and society scholars, inclusive education needs to examine its rights in action at the intersections of (a) institutions' formal interpretations of rights, (b) individuals' efforts to summon rights, and (c) society's culture at large (Gustafson, 2006). As we explained in a previous section, inclusive education coexists with myriad reforms and policies, some of which target equity agendas and grant alternative rights. These overlapping reforms and their associated rights can have unintended consequences that could deepen the inequalities they intended to fix in the first place.

Inequities arising within inclusive education systems can be identified as a new form of discrimination that has been named "inclusive exclusions" or "discrimination by inclusion" (Carbado, Fisk, & Gulati, 2008). A rights-in-action perspective will allow inclusion researchers to examine the everyday enactments of inclusive policies and practices. These implementation processes are charged with institutional assumptions and intersect with the practices associated with other equity mandates. This mangle of practices becomes visible in interpersonal processes that shape advantages for some and disadvantages for others (Carbado et al., 2008).

Let us consider, for instance, three sets of efforts that address educational opportunity, namely inclusive education, monitoring requirements to reduce the racialization of disabilities, and language policies to support English learners. Inclusive education in the U.S. typically monitors whether students with special needs are being educated in ordinary schools and general education classrooms for a sizable proportion of the school day. Inclusion work, however, might not be monitoring whether subgroups of students (e.g., English learners, racial minorities) are benefitting equally from these policies and practices.

On the other hand, English learners (EL) have experienced over time a push for assimilation through policies like bilingual education in which the proof of success is the acquisition of English (as opposed to the attainment of bilingualism). It has even been argued that racism can promote assimilation, and a case in point is ELs—i.e., should people "be forced to give up some aspect of their identity—for example, language—in order to fit into mainstream American society and its institutions"? (Carbado et al., 2008, p. 13). Given the assimilationist focus of these language policies, it is not surprising that a measure of English proficiency is used as EL program entry and exit criteria (Ragan & Lesaux, 2006). A consequence of this practice is that the EL population is perennially comprised of learners, at least in some grades, with lower levels of language proficiency and academic performance (Fry, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2013). Because of this practice, this population may have a greater probability to be diagnosed with a disability label, particularly in states that have weaker systems of language support (Artiles, Waitoller, & Neal, 2011). In fact, emerging evidence suggests ELs are disproportionately placed in special education in some localities and states (de Valenzuela et al., 2006; Sullivan, 2011). How do pressures to reduce the number of ELs in school systems create incentives for EL referrals to special education since language supports for ELs tend to disappear when these students are diagnosed with a disability? Are ELs disproportionately represented in certain disability categories? How would the intersection of a second language with disability hinder inclusive educational opportunities for certain groups?

To what extent would ELs be invisible in inclusive education programs? These are some of the questions that would not be addressed if attention to a rights-in-action perspective is absent.

Moreover, some states might be engaged in "ritual conformity" (Scheid & Suchman, 2001) with regards to monitoring requirements on racial disproportionality in special education. That is, some districts and/or states might resist the policy requirements for a host of (fiscal, technical, political) reasons; thus, cut off disproportionality scores that trigger remedial actions are increased and determinations about "inappropriate identification" of minority students are maintained at a minimum (Cavendish et al., 2014). Yet, these states or districts could make symbolic compliance gestures toward the policy by participating in reporting and conducting self-reviews about placement practices. This way, the very professionals that are expected to look after the development and well-being of students might become unwitting enforcers of longstanding hierarchies (Naraian, 2013).

Research on disproportionality also reveals that minority learners are placed in more segregated settings than their white counterparts with the same disability diagnosis (Skiba et al., 2008). Nevertheless, some inclusive education scholars may not notice that more non-dominant students are placed in special education (i.e., racial minorities, ELs) or become aware of the level of restrictiveness in placement decisions across student race or language backgrounds if a rights-in-action stance is not used across these multiple reform efforts. A crucial implication of these reflections, therefore, is that researchers should rely on comprehensive systems of monitoring "and look for post-enactment changes not only in individual experience, but also in organizational structures, individual perceptions, legal culture, and individual identity" (Gustafson, 2006, p. 1022).

Conclusion

We presented a critical discussion of foundational ideas that support the inclusive education movement and the historical trajectories of the work done to date in the U.S. Our scope is broad, and we started the analysis with a discussion of conceptual limitations in the definition of inclusion. We showed that this scholarly community has produced multiple discourses about inclusion that rely on alternative assumptions and stress disparate views of justice. We argued that this cacophony of views is not necessarily a problem, but it creates challenges for the alignment of multiple educational reform agendas and the very implementation of inclusion, which in turn has repercussions for building a research knowledge base on inclusive education. We conclude that inclusion scholars have not been systematic enough in critically examining these conceptual and implementation trends.

In addition, we summarized the research produced on this topic in the U.S. We found that inclusion research tends to focus on whole schools or classrooms and attention to this topic in the research literature varied by time period. We also identified several gaps and paradoxes in this research. In addition, we emphasized the socio-political and technical contexts in which inclusion is enacted in XXI Century U.S. schools. Inclusion coexists with several other reforms that share a commitment to justice agendas. Similar to inclusion, these reforms are grounded in a rights and access justice perspective. We suggested that the coexistence of multiple reforms that purportedly share a justice purpose actually can create disruptions and contradictions among these change projects, or as Timmermans (1996) described it, "torque effects" that have consequences not only for the reform movements, but also for the identities of learners.

We challenge inclusion scholars and practitioners to reflect on and refine the identity of this movement. Is it a theory of education, a reform of special education, another policy requirement to address the needs of particular groups of students, or a social movement? These are not mutually exclusive options, but if any of them are interrelated in any fashion, we should specify the nature of these connections and their implications for research, policy, and practice. We explore issues with

study sampling that emphasize individuals with high prevalence disabilities and minimize the multiple aspects of their experiences including membership in specific communities of practice, life histories, interests, and opportunities. And, finally, we emphasize that inclusive education that focuses on place as the chief index of accomplishment fails to account for the more complex activities of inclusive communities that involve interaction, membership, participation, and re-formation.

The discussions about the state of inclusive education and its theoretical and methodological limitations led us to identify several areas that future scholarship ought to engage. First, we explore the need for pursuing strategic alliances with other movements that pursue inclusion agendas. Indeed, like other movements working for and with oppressed groups, the inclusive education movement shares a commitment to justice. Alliances with such communities would leverage resources and strengthen inclusion's intellectual and methodological resources. On the other hand, we also warned that these kinds of alliances are not built smoothly, particularly among groups working with marginalized communities, because of the political and historical baggage that certain markers of difference (e.g., race) have in the eyes of various communities. Second, future inclusion scholarship needs to take up the idea of intersectionality as XXI Century students' identities embody multidimensional forms of difference. This fact is also related to the notion of disability as a fluid entity in the sense of the permeability of this construct—i.e., people travel in and out of disability at different points in their lives, and experiencing disability is contingent upon the social contexts in which individuals engage and participate with others in institutional practices. These complexities challenge researchers to produce knowledge on disability and its intersections with multiple identities using a situated analytic lens and with a stronger emic perspective.

A critical shift in future inclusion scholarship is the unit of analysis. We documented that most studies had either a whole school or classroom focus. However, datasets are built and research findings are reported with the individual student in mind. We argue that future research must be grounded in a unit of analysis that examines individuals embedded in multilayered systems of activities. This will strengthen the generalizability of findings for studies will take into account the institutional conditions under which students participate in inclusive systems. This shift will also enable scholars to link systematically macro and micro forces in the study of inclusion.

Finally, we suggested that future scholarship on inclusive education should be mindful of complexity and document implementation processes and outcomes. We proposed to produce new scholarship based on the notion of "rights in action" to document how inclusive education's rights and entitlements are taken up at the junctures of institutions' construal of these rights, individuals bid for these rights, and communities' culture(s) at large.

References

Albrecht, S. F., Skiba, R. J., Losen, D. L., Chung, C., & Middelberg, L. (2012). Federal policy on disproportionality in special education: Is it moving us forward? *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 23*, 14-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1044207311407917

American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist, 63*, 852-862. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852

Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an interdisciplinary understanding of educational equity and difference: The case of the racialization of ability. *Educational Researcher, 40*, 431-445. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11429391

Artiles, A. J. (2012, October). *After inclusion: Notes on the future of a (transformative?) idea.* Presentation made at the School of Education, University of Birmingham. Birmingham, UK.

Artiles, A. J. (2013). Untangling the racialization of disabilities: An intersectionality critique across disability models. *DuBois Review, 10,* 329-347. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s1742058x13000271

Artiles, A. J., & Dyson, A. (2005). Inclusive education in the globalization age: The promise of comparative cultural historical analysis. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualizing inclusive education* (pp. 37-62). London: Routledge.

Artiles, A. J., & Klingner, J. K. (2006). Forging a knowledge base on English language learners with special needs: Theoretical, population, and technical issues. *Teachers College Record*, *108*, 2187-2194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00778.x

Artiles, A. J., Harris-Murri, N., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead. *Theory into Practice*, *45*, 260-268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4503_8

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Dorn, S., & Christensen, C. (2006). Learning in inclusive education research: Re-mediating theory and methods with a transformative agenda. *Review of Research in Education*, *30*, 65-108. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732X030001065

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., & Gonzalez, T. (2011). Beyond the allure of inclusive education in the United States: Facing difficult questions, tracing enduring challenges. *Revista Teias*, *12*(4), 285-308.

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., & Waitoller, F. R. (Eds.), (2011). *Inclusive education on five continents: Unraveling equity issues.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Artiles, A. J., Trent, S.C., & Kuan, L.A. (1997). Learning disabilities research on ethnic minority students: An analysis of 22 years of studies published in selected refereed journals. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *12*, 82-91.

Artiles, A. J., Waitoller, F., & Neal, R. (2011). Grappling with the intersection of language and ability differences: Equity issues for Chicano/Latino students in special education. In R.R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Past, present, and future* (3rd ed.) (pp. 213-234). London: Routledge/Falmer.

Ash, T. (2012, November 22). Freedom & Diversity: A Liberal Pentagram for Living Together. *The New York Review of Books*, 33-36.

Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (2002). *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bulgren, J. A., Marquis, J. G., Deshler, D. D., Schumaker, J. B., Lenze, B. K., Davis, B., & Grossen, B. (2006). The instructional context of inclusive secondary general education classes: Teachers' instructional roles and practices, curricular demands, and research-based practices and standards. *Learning Disabilities – A Contemporary Journal*, *4*, 39-65.

Bunch, G., & Valeo, A. (2004). Student attitudes toward peers with disabilities in inclusive and special education schools. *Disability & Society*, *19*(1), 61-76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0968759032000155640

Carbado, D. W., Fisk, C., & Gulati, G. M. (2008). *After inclusion.* Duke Law School - Public Law & Legal Theory Research Paper Series, Paper No. 210 and University of California, Irvine School of Law - Legal Studies Research Paper Series, Paper No. 2008-4.

Cavendish, W., Artiles, A. J., & Harry, B. (2014). Tracking inequality: Does policy legitimize the racialization of disability? *Multiple Voices, 14*(2), 30-40.

Crossley, S. (1999). The disability kaleidoscope. *Notre Dame Law Review*, *74*(3), 621-716.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of "No Child Left Behind." *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*, 245–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503207

De Valenzuela, J. S., Copeland, S. R., Huaqing Qi, C., & Park, M. (2006). Examining educational equity: Revisiting the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education. *Council for Exceptional Children, 72*(4), 425-441. https://www.crosscultured.com/documents/SPED%20interest%20group/de%20Valenzuela%20et%20al%202006[1].pdf

Dyson, A. (1999). Inclusion and inclusions: Theories and discourses in inclusive education. In H. Daniels & P. Gardner (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 1999: Inclusive education* (pp. 36-53). London: Kogan Page.

Engel, D. M., & Munger, F. W. (2003). *Rights of Inclusion: Law and identity in the life stories of Americans with disabilities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226208343.001.0001

Epstein, S. (2007). *Inclusion: The politics of difference in medical research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226213118.001.0001

Erevelles, N. (2011a). *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781137001184

Erevelles, N. (2011b). "Coming out crip" in inclusive education. *Teachers College Record, 113*, 2155-2185.

Evans, I. M., Salisbury, C. L., Palombaro, M. M., Berryman, J., & Hollowood, T. M. (1992). Acceptance of elementary-aged children with severe disabilities in an inclusive school. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *17*, 205-212.

Ferguson, D. L., Kozleski, E. B., & Smith, A. (2003). Transformed, inclusive schools: A framework to guide fundamental change in urban schools. *Effective Education for Learners with Exceptionalities*, *15*, Elsevier Science, 43-74.

Foucault, M. (1986). Disciplinary power and subjection. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 229-241). Oxford: Blackwell.

Fry, R. (2007, June). *How far behind in math and reading are English language learners?* Pew Hispanic Center Brief. Washington, D. C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Giangreco, M. F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jon": Transformational Experiences of Teachers Educating Students with Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *59*, 359-359.

Gonzalez, T., Hernandez-Saca, D., & Artiles, A. J. (2013, April). *A search for voice: A review of student voice research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Gottfried, M. A. (2014). Classmates with disabilities and students' noncognitive outcomes. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 36,* 20-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373713493130

Graff, C. S., & Kozleski, E. B. (2014). Calcifying, sorting and segregating: *Brown* at 60. *Multiple Voices, 14*, 52 – 67.

Gustafson, K. (2006). Disability, fluidity, and measuring without baselines. *Mississippi Law Journal*, 75, 1007-1037.

Hacking, I. (2007). Kinds of people: Moving targets. *Proceedings of the British Academy, 151*, 285-318. http://dx.doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197264249.003.0010

Hahn, H. (2000). Disputing the doctrine of benign neglect: A challenge to the disparate treatment of Americans with disabilities. In L. P. Francis & A. Silvers (Eds.), *Americans with disabilities* (pp. 269-274). New York: Routledge.

Hanuschek, E., Kain, J., & Rivkin, S. (2002). Inferring program effects for special populations: Does special education raise achievement for students with disabilities? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *84*(4), 584-599. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/003465302760556431

Harr-Robins, J., Song, M., Hurlburt, S., Pruce, C., Danielson, L., Garet, M., & Taylor, J. (2012). *The inclusion of students with disabilities in school accountability systems* (NCEE 2012-4056). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Huber, K. D., Rosenfeld, J. G., & Fiorello, C. A. (2001). The differential impact of inclusion and inclusive practices on high, average, and low achieving general education students. *Psychology in the Schools*, *38*(6), 497-504. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.1038

Hunt, P., & Farron-Davis, F. (1992). A preliminary investigation of IEP quality and content associated with placement in general education versus special education classes. *Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *17*, 247-253. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/154079699201700406

Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1997). Research on inclusive education programs, practices, and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, *31*, 3-29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002246699703100102

Iglesias, E. M., & Valdes, F. (2001). LatCrit at five: Institutionalizing a postsubordination future. *Denver University Law Review*, *78*, 1249-1293.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement (IDEA) Act 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-46. Retrieved on 3/5/2011 from http://idea.ed.gov/download/statute.html.

Kavale, K. A., & Forness, S. R. (2000). History, rhetoric, and reality analysis of the inclusion debate. *Remedial and Special Education*, *21*(5), 279-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/074193250002100505

Keogh, B. K., Major-Kingsley, S., Omori-Gordon, H., & Reid, H. P. (1982). *A system of marker variables for the field of learning disabilities.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Klingner, J., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., . . . Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13(38).* Available at http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/143

Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1999). Students' perceptions of instruction in inclusion classrooms: Implications for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *66*, 23-37.

Korenich, R., & Salisbury, C. (2006). *Learning opportunities and performance outcomes in inclusive elementary classrooms: Executive summary OERI/IES Project.* Chicago, IL: UIC Child & Family Development Center.

Kozleski, E. B., Gonzalez, T., Atkinson, L., Mruczek, C., & Lacy, L. (2013). Teacher education in practice: Reconciling practices and theories in the United States context. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *28*, 156-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778114

Kozleski, E. B, & Jackson, L. (1993). Taylor's story: Full inclusion in her neighborhood elementary school. *Exceptionality*, *4*, 153-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327035ex0403_2

Kozleski, E. B., & Smith, A. (2009). The complexities of systems change in creating equity for students with disabilities in urban schools. *Urban Education*, *44*(4), 427-451. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085909337595

Kozleski, E. B., & Thorius, K. A. K. (Eds.) (2013). *Ability, equity, and culture: Sustaining inclusive urban education reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kozleski, E. B., & Yu, I. (in press). Inclusive education. In L. H. Meyer, *Oxford Bibliographies in Education.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kunc, N. (1992). The need to belong: Rediscovering Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thought, W. Stainback, & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education* (pp. 25-39). Baltimore: Brookes Publishing..

Kurth, J. A., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2012). Impact of setting and instructional context for adolescents with autism. *Journal of Special Education, 46*, 36-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022466910366480

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34,* 39-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312034001039

Lee, J., & Reeves, T. (2012). Revisiting the impact of NCLB high-stakes school accountability, capacity, and resources: State NAEP 1990-2009 reading and math achievement gaps and trends. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*, 209-231. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373711431604

Losen, D. J. (2012, March). Discipline policies, successful schools, racial justice and the law. In J. S. Kaye, K. R. DeCataldo, & T.A. Lang (Eds.), *Keeping kids in school and out of court* (pp. 1-25). Albany, NY: New York State Permanent Judicial Commission on Justice for Children.

Losen, D. J., & Orfield, G. (2002). *Racial inequity in special education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

McDermott, R., Edgar, B., & Scarloss, B. (2011). Global norming. IN A. Artiles, E. Kozleski, & F. Waitoller (Eds.), *Inclusive education: Examining equity on five continents* (pp. 223-235). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

McLeskey, J., Landers, E., Williamson, P., & Hoppey, D. (2012). Are we moving toward educating students with disabilities in less restrictive settings? *Journal of Special Education, 46*, 131-140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022466910376670

Meier, K., Stewart, J., & England, R. (1989). *Race, class and education: The politics of second generation discrimination.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Naraian, S. (2013). Dis/ability, agency, and context: A differential consciousness for doing inclusive education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 43*, 360-387. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/curi.12014

Nations' Report Card. (2015). *Summary of major findings.* Retrieved 3.20.16. Link: http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/#?grade=4

Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. (2007). *Collateral damage.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). PL 107-110. 115 Stat. 1425.

Noguera, P. (2007, January). *School reform and second-generation discrimination: Toward the development of equitable schools.* Essay published by the Understanding Educational Equity and Excellence at Scale Project. Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Providence, RI.

Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Solomon, O., & Sirota, K. G. (2001). Inclusion as social practice: Views of children with autism. *Social Development, 10*(3), 399-419. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00172

Pijl, S. J., Meijer, C. J. W., & Hegarty, S. (Eds.). (1997). *Inclusive education: A global agenda.* London: Routledge.

Ragan, A., & Lesaux, N. (2006). Federal, state, and district level English language learner program entry and exit requirements: Effects on the education of language minority learners.

Education Policy Analysis Archives, *14*(20). Retrieved [May 2, 2013] from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n20/.

Rawls J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roberts, D., & Jesudason, S. (2013). Movement intersectionality: The case of race, gender, disability, and genetic technologies. *DuBois Review, 10,* 313-328. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s1742058x13000210

Ryndak, D. L., & Fisher, D. B. (1988). *The foundations of inclusive education: A compendium of articles on effective strategies to achieve inclusive education*. Baltimore, MD: TASH.

Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. *Remedial and Special Education*, 12, 8-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/074193259101200604

Sailor, W. (2002). Devolution, school/community/family partnerships, and inclusive education. In (W. Sailor) *Whole-school success and inclusive education* (pp. 7-25). NY: Teacher College Press.

Sailor, W., Gee, K., & Karasoff, P. (1993). Full inclusion and school restructuring. In M. Snell (Ed.), *Instruction of students with severe disabilities* (pp. 1-30). New York: Macmillan.

Saunders, A. F., Bethune, K. S., Spooner, F., & Browder, D. (2013). Solving the common core equation teaching mathematics CCSS to students with moderate and severe disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *45*(3), 24-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/004005991304500303

Scheid, T. L., & Suchman, M. C. (2001). Ritual conformity to the Americans with Disabilities Act: Coercive and normative isomorphism. In S. W. Hartwell & R. K. Schutt (Eds.), *The organizational response to social problems* (pp. 105-140). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0196-1152(01)80008-9

Schnorr, R. (1990). "Peter? He comes and goes...": First graders' perspectives on a part-time mainstream student. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *15*, 23-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/154079699001500402

Silbey, S. S. (2005). After legal consciousness. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *1*, 323-368. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.115938

Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A. C., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung. C. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges. *Exceptional Children*, *74*, 264-288.

Skrtic, T. E. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. *Harvard Educational Review*, *61*, 148-206. http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.61.2.0q702751580h0617

Skrtic, T. M. (1995). Power/knowledge and pragmatism: A postmodern view of the professions. In T. Skrtic (Ed.), *Disability and democracy: Reconstructing (special) education for postmodernity* (pp. 25-62). New York: Teachers College Press.

Skrtic, T. E., Sailor, W., & Gee, K. (1996). Voice, collaboration, and inclusion: Democratic themes in educational and social reform. *Remedial and Special Education*, *17*, 142-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/074193259601700304

Skrtic, T., Sailor, W., & Gee, K. (2005). Voice, collaboration, and inclusion: Democratic themes in educational and social reform initiatives. In D. Mitchell (ed.), *Systems and Contexts,* Vol. 1 (pp 214-226). London: Routledge Farmer.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Srivastava, M., de Boer, A., & Pijl, S. J. (2015). Inclusive education in developing countries: A closer look at its implementation in the last 10 years. *Educational Review*, *67*(2), 179-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.847061

Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. (1989). Institutional ecologies, translations, and coherence: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's museum of vertebrate zoology, 1907-1939. *Social Studies of Science, 19,* 387-420. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001

Staub, D., Schwartz, I. S., Gallucci, C., & Peck, C. A. (1994). Four portraits of friendship at an inclusive school. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/154079699401900407

Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in special education identification and placement of English language learners. *Exceptional Children*, *77*, 317-334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001440291107700304

Sullivan, A. & Kozleski, E. B. (2009). *2009 Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) Analysis: Indicators 9 & 10, Part B.* Tempe, AZ: Equity Alliance at ASU.

Thurlow, M. L., & Kopriva, R. J. (2015). Advancing accessibility and accommodations in content assessments for students with disabilities and English learners. *Review of Research in Education*, *39*(1), 331-369. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732X14556076

Timmermans, S. (1996) Saving lives or saving identities? The double dynamic of techno-scientific scripts. *Social Studies of Science*, *26*, 767-797.

Trent, S. C., Driver, M. K., Rodriguez, D., Oh, K., Stewart, S., Kea, C., & Artiles, A. J. (2014). Beyond Brown: Empirical research on diverse learners with or at-risk for specific learning disabilities from 1994 – 2012. *Multiple Voices, 14(2),* 12-29.

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). (2006). Retrieved 3/29/2016 from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/resources/general-assembly/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-ares61106.html

UNESCO (1994). *Final Report - World conference on special needs education: Access and quality.* Paris: UNESCO.

U.S. Department of Education (2013). *For each and every child—A strategy for education equity and excellence.* Washington, D.C.: Author. Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Successful failure: The school America builds.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Vasquez, III, E., Lopez, A., Straub, C., Powell, S., McKinney, T., Walker, Z., . . . Bedesem, P. L. (2011). Empirical research on ethnic minority students: 1995-2009. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26*(2), 84-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2011.00328.x

Waitoller, F., & Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A literature review and notes for a sociocultural research program. *Review of Educational Research, 83,* 319-356.

Waitoller, F. W. & Kozleski, E. B. (2015). No stone left unturned: Exploring the convergence of new capitalism in inclusive education in the U.S. *Education Policy Analysis Annuals. 23*(18), http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1779

Yell, M (2015). *The Law and Special Education*. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson.

Zumeta, R. O. (2014). Implementing intensive intervention: How do we get there from here? *Remedial and Special Education*, *36*(2):83-88. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/0741932514558935

About the Authors

Alfredo J. Artiles
Arizona State University
alfredo.artiles@asu.edu
http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5772-0787

Alfredo J. Artiles is the Ryan C. Harris Professor of Special Education and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at Arizona State University's Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. His scholarship examines educational inequities related to the intersections of disability with sociocultural differences. He co-directs the Equity Alliance and was Vice President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Dr. Artiles edits the Teachers College Press book series *Disability, Culture, & Equity*. He received the 2012 Palmer O. Johnson Award for best article published in an AERA journal. Dr. Artiles serves on President Obama's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanics.

Elizabeth B. Kozleski
University of Kansas
elizabeth.kozleski@ku.edu

Professor Elizabeth B. Kozleski, Chair of Special Education at the University of Kansas, conducts research on equity and justice issues in inclusive education and professional learning. Recent awards include the UNESCO Chair in Inclusive International Research, the TED-Merrill award for leadership in special education teacher education, and the Scholar of the Century award from the University of Northern Colorado. Recent books include *Ability, Equity, and Culture* and *Inclusive Education: Examining Equity on Five Continents.*

education policy analysis archives

Volume 24 Number 43   April 4, 2016   ISSN 1068-2341

Please contribute commentaries at http://epaa.info/wordpress/ and send errata notes to Gustavo E. Fischman fischman@asu.edu

Join EPAA's Facebook community at https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAAPE and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.