REVIEW

June 2002

EPPI-Centre

A systematic review of the effectiveness of school-level actions for promoting participation by all students

Review conducted by the Inclusive Education Review Group

Evidence for Policy and Practice
Information and Co-ordinating Centre

The EPPI-Centre is part of the Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London
http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/

AUTHORS

Authors and institutional bases

This report was authored by Alan Dyson, Andy Howes and Barbara Roberts, drawing extensively on the work and comments of their colleagues in the Review Group as a whole.

The Inclusive Education Review Group is based around the partners in the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Teaching and Learning Programme network on understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools (L139251005). It includes the academic and research staff teams from the three higher education institutions of the University of Christchurch College Canterbury, Manchester University and the University of Newcastle upon Tyne who are all members of the network:
Mel Ainscow
Tony Booth
Alan Dyson
Sue Edmundson
Peter Farrell
Frances Gallannaugh
Andrew Howes
Alan Millward
Sharon Moss
Roy Smith
Carrie Weston
In order to broaden the range of perspectives represented, other academic and practitioner colleagues joined the group for this review. They were:
Brahm Norwich, Exeter University
Jennifer Evans, London Institute of Education
Amanda Naisbett, Teacher Adviser, Redcar and Cleveland Local Education Authority (ESRC network)
Amanda Barlow, Teacher, Blackburn and Darwen LEA (ESRC network)
Linda Kelly, Education Liaison Librarian, Robinson Library, Newcastle

Barbara Roberts, Research Associate at Newcastle University, was also a member of the Review Group and took primary responsibility for the day-to-day management of the review. Alan Dyson acted as overall co-ordinator.

The Review Group was supported throughout the review process by an Advisory Group drawn from policy-makers, practitioners, parents, researchers and representatives of relevant voluntary organisations with an interest in inclusion.

The members of the Advisory Group were:
Alfredo Artiles, Vanderbilt University
Roger Slee, University of Western Australia
Joseph Kisanji, Open University of Tanzania
Sally Tomlinson, Emeritus Professor, Oxford University
Pat Elton, Redcar and Cleveland Local Education Authority
David Taylor, School Improvement Officer, Blackburn with Darwen Local Education Authority

Anne Connor, School Improvement Officer, Blackburn with Darwen Local Education Authority
Paul Greenway, SEN Manager, Blackburn and Darwen Local Education Authority
Dame Dela Smith, Head Teacher, Beaumont Hill Special School, Darlington, and member of (former) National Advisory Group for Special Educational Needs
Vanessa Wiseman, Headteacher, Langdon School, Newham, and member of the former National Advisory Group for Special Educational Needs
Paul Dukes, Teacher, Gilbrook School (part of the ESRC network)
Darshan Sachdev, Research Officer, formerly with Barnardo's and latterly with Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Health Authority
Robina Mallett, Member of (former) National Advisory Group for Special Educational Needs
Caroline Roaf, Editor of 'Support for Learning'

Address for correspondence

Professor Alan Dyson
Special Needs Research Centre
Department of Education
University of Newcastle upon Tyne
St Thomas Street
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU
Telephone: 0191 222 6943

Email: D.A.Dyson@ncl.ac.uk

Submission date: 10/06/2002

This report should be cited as: Dyson A, Howes A, Roberts B, (2002). A systematic review of the effectiveness of school-level actions for promoting participation by all students (EPPI-Centre Review, version 1.1*). In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.

* This review has been updated since it was published originally. This update involves a change in citation details only and has not changed the substantive findings of the review.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Advisory Group played an active role in shaping the Review Group's work and in providing critical comment on review drafts and plans at each of the key stages of the review process. We should like to express our thanks to all members for their contributions and support throughout the review.

We would also like to express our thanks to the staff at the Robinson Library, Newcastle, and in particular to Linda Kelly, the Education Liaison Librarian, with whom we worked closely in developing the search strategy.

Finally we wish to acknowledge the training in the systematic review process and the support provided by members of the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) staff. Our particular thanks go to Angela Harden and Dina Kiwan.

Funding

The review was funded by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) via the EPPI-Centre. To this were added substantial resources in kind (i.e. research associate time) from the ESRC network, from HEFCE-funded academic staff and from school- and Local Education Authority-funded staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

Background

In recent years, inclusive education has become a major issue in both international and national education debates. It is also a central concern for local education authorities, school leaders and teachers. Despite – or perhaps because of – this interest, however, there is currently some confusion around the issue. There are, for instance, many competing definitions of inclusive education. There is also a difficulty in much of the literature in disentangling the advocacy of more inclusive approaches from the evidence as to how such approaches can be sustained and what their consequences are for students.

Aims of review and review question

This review aims to clarify some of these issues by identifying and evaluating the empirical evidence around the question of what schools can do to become more inclusive, in the particular sense of maximising the participation of *all* students in their cultures, curricula and communities. Our concern in undertaking the review was therefore with responses, not to one or other group of students, but to student diversity *per se*. Likewise, we were concerned with what schools can do, not merely to maintain the *presence* of students in school but to maximise their *participation* in school life. Finally, we were interested in the wide-ranging actions which schools can take to make themselves more inclusive in this sense and not merely with minor adjustments which they can make to one or another aspect of their practice.

Our review question therefore was:
What evidence is there that mainstream schools can act in ways which enable them to respond to student diversity so as to facilitate participation by all students in the cultures, curricula and communities of those schools?

Answers to this question would, we believed, be of primary importance to those in leadership positions in schools. They would also be important to a wide range of other stakeholders both in this country and elsewhere: to parents and school students, to members of governing bodies, to those who support and challenge schools in local education authorities (LEAs), universities and elsewhere, to those who train teachers and contribute to the professional development of school leaders and to policy-makers who are responsible for setting the framework within which schools operate. With this in mind, we engaged a broad-based advisory group in the formulation of our question and the development of our review. This group included academics, headteachers, teachers, parents, LEA officers and a representative of a voluntary organisation.

Methods

Identifying and describing studies

Literature searches were undertaken to identify empirical research which might help to answer the review question. We sought in particular to locate studies which examined the effectiveness of school action in promoting participation and/or shed light on the process of implementing effective change efforts in this direction. We searched for relevant research published in English from the UK and internationally through bibliographic databases, handsearching of key journals, websites, personal contacts, and scanning the reference lists of already identified relevant reports. Searches were conducted as far back as the dates available within each source. We decided against setting a specific cut-off date, given the different rates and directions of policy development in different countries and the inevitably arbitrary nature of any such date. We screened all the research papers identified by the searches against a set of inclusion/exclusion criteria to identify those papers which were focused on our concerns with participation, diversity and wide-ranging school action. Using standardised coding strategies, we described the research meeting our inclusion criteria according to its substantive focus (e.g. type of school, range of diversity in the student populations to which schools were responding, the aspects of participation they sought to promote and the range of school action being taken towards this end) and its methodology (e.g. type of study, methods of data collection).

Assessing methodological quality and synthesising findings

Data on the focus, methods and findings of each study were also extracted and coded using standard and review-specific tools. We synthesised these extracted data by searching for common themes and key differences which were relevant to our review question. In order to increase the trustworthiness of the review's findings, we derived the themes in the first instance from a smaller group of 'key' studies, selected for their centrality to the review's concerns and their methodological quality as judged against standard criteria. Data extraction, coding and assessment of methodological quality for each study was carried out by at least two of the reviewers independently who then agreed a final version.

Results

Description of research activity

The searches of databases, websites, key journals and other sources detailed in the search strategy produced a substantial quantity of potentially relevant literature – some 14,692 citations. Of these, 325 reports were deemed likely to meet our inclusion criteria on the basis of their title or abstract and were available within the relevant timeframe. Subsequent re-screening of full texts of these reports resulted in the identification of 49 reports that met our inclusion criteria. These reports went forward to the next stage in the review. At this stage, a further eight reports were excluded as they were judged on more detailed examination not to meet our inclusion criteria.

Of the 41 remaining reports, those relating to the same research study were linked to create a total of 27 'entities'. All studies focused on schools which were in the process of, or had undergone, change through their adoption of policies and/or their engagement with specific school improvement initiatives designed to enhance their responses to student diversity. The large majority (25) of studies investigated the structures and practices of schools through single or small number case studies involving field work in the schools themselves. The two other studies conducted an investigation of the impact of national policy 'at a distance' through a survey of teachers' views and understandings and consideration of how these might impact on practice in schools.

When examining the range of diversity, school action, and aspects of participation that studies focused on, it became clear that many studies simply *reported* on some aspect of diversity, action or participation while a smaller number presented what we judged to be *detailed* data. The latter group were, of course, more useful from our point of view.

Using the EPPI-Centre coding scheme for study types, we identified three outcome-and-process evaluations, five process evaluations and nineteen descriptive studies. Given our inclusion criteria, studies tended to focus on wide-ranging processes of school development. For this review, studies were only coded as 'interventions' (and therefore as process or outcome evaluations) where there was a clear, bounded and purposeful change, such as the implementation of a specific policy or practice. This, however, still resulted in some variation in categorisation between different reviewers and there was some overlap between the 'descriptive' and 'process evaluation' categories.

We identified studies which focused on all phases of schooling – primary/elementary, middle and secondary/high – and on combinations of these. The majority of studies (18) were conducted exclusively in either elementary/primary schools or secondary/high schools and were located in the UK or USA.

Methodological quality and synthesised findings

From the 27 included studies, we identified six which were judged to be 'key' in terms of their methodological quality and centrality to the review question. These went on to form the basis of findings and recommendations in this report. Although the key studies (and some others which were less central to the review question) represented high-quality research, we found many studies that were small-scale, non-cumulative, poorly designed or poorly reported. Even where methodological quality was acceptable, there might be assumptions built into the design which were not adequately challenged through the research process itself.

Given the diversity of studies in terms of setting, focus and conceptual framework, the findings of studies proved not to be complementary or cumulative in any obvious way. It was therefore necessary to synthesise findings from individual studies around inductively-derived themes. These were identified in the first instance from the key studies whose findings were considered both trustworthy and relevant. These themes were then used to interrogate the findings of the remaining studies.

Our review indicates that there is a limited, but by no means negligible, body of empirical evidence about the relationship between school action and the participation of *all* students in the cultures, curricula and communities of those schools. That evidence suggests the following:

- Some schools are characterised by an 'inclusive culture'. Within such schools, there is some degree of consensus amongst adults around values of respect for difference and a commitment to offering all students access to learning opportunities. This consensus may not be total and may not necessarily remove all tensions or contradictions in practice. On the other hand, there is likely to be a high level of staff collaboration and joint problem-solving, and similar values and commitments may extend into the student body and into parent and other community stakeholders in the school.

- The extent to which such 'inclusive cultures' lead directly and unproblematically to enhanced student participation is not entirely clear from the research evidence. Some aspects of these cultures, however, can be seen as participatory by definition. For instance, respect from teachers towards diverse students may itself be understood as a form of participation by students in the school community. Moreover, schools characterised by such cultures are also likely to be characterised by forms of organisation (such as specialist provision being made in the ordinary classroom rather than by withdrawal) and practice (such as constructivist approaches to teaching and learning) which could be regarded as participatory by definition.

- Schools with 'inclusive cultures' are also likely to be characterised by the presence of leaders who are committed to inclusive values and to a leadership style which encourages a range of individuals to participate in leadership functions.

- Such schools are also likely to have good links with parents and with their communities.

- The local and national policy environment can act to support or to undermine the realisation of schools' inclusive values.

Conclusions and recommendations

Implications for policy and practice

On the basis of this evidence, a number of recommendations for policy and practice can be made as follows:

- Attempts to develop inclusive schools should pay attention to the development of 'inclusive' cultures and, particularly, to the building of some degree of consensus around inclusive values in the school community.

- Headteachers and other school leaders should be selected and trained in the light of their commitment to inclusive values and their capacity to lead in a participatory manner.

- The external policy environment should be compatible with inclusive developments if it is to support rather than to undermine schools' efforts.

- There are general principles of school organisation and classroom practice which should be followed: notably, the removal of structural barriers between different groups of students and staff, the dismantling of separate programmes, services and specialisms and the development of pedagogical approaches (such as constructivist approaches) which enable students to learn together rather than separately.

- Schools should build close relations with parents and communities based on developing a shared commitment to inclusive values.

Recommendations for research

- Given the problems with methodological quality noted above, there is a need for studies which are methodologically sound but which also test the extent of schools' inclusivity, draw on a wide range of evidence, focus on outcomes for students, trace links between actions and participation in detail, and make comparison between more- and less-inclusive schools. Such studies would also help to evaluate the recommendations for policy and practice outlined above.

- There is a need for a more programmatic approach to research to overcome the limitations of a multiplicity of unrelated small-scale studies.

- The lack of detail about methodology in much of the literature suggests that practices of research reporting need to change.

- The systematic review process has proved powerful in enabling us to identify trustworthy empirical evidence in a field where such evidence tends to be embedded in conceptual development, advocacy and illustration. It should therefore become more firmly established amongst the research methodologies in education. However, it should not, in its current form, be seen as the *only* way to engage legitimately with research literature. In particular, narrative reviews and non-empirical forms of inquiry (such as theoretical development and conceptual analysis) which are not readily accessed through the sorts of systematic review processes in which we engaged are important in a developing field such as inclusive education. Moreover, the development of policy and practice cannot always wait for evidence from systematic reviews.

Recommendations for the field

- Inclusive education emerges from the review as a relatively young field which needs to develop a well-established empirical research base through a more co-ordinated approach than has hitherto been adopted.

- Although empirical work has not always been a priority in the field, the literature on inclusive education is filled with claims which can and should be tested empirically.

- Critical perspectives have played a powerful role in the development of the field, but are much less evident in attempts to reconstruct an inclusive alternative to special education and other segregating practices. We therefore recommend that these attempts too be subjected to critical scrutiny.

- The inability, in many cases, of the research process to bring into question the assumptions that are built into the research design implies a need for researchers to be more willing to engage in such problematising work.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Defining inclusive education

Inclusive education is at the centre of government policies in special needs education (DfEE, 1997) and, under the guise of 'social inclusion', is pivotal to the government's attempts to address disaffection and under-achievement in education (Blunkett, 1999). It also forms a 'global agenda' (Pijl *et al*., 1997) for the international education community and has, in particular, been promoted heavily by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO, 1994). Despite – or perhaps because of – this widespread attention, the conceptualisation of inclusion remains unclear (Dyson, 1999) and the evidence base is fragmented (Clark *et al*., 1995).

This lack of clarity makes it important for any review in this field to be explicit about the 'version' of inclusive education on which it is based. Some commentators, for instance, see inclusion as effectively being about a reform of special education in order to place and maintain students with disabilities in mainstream schools (see, for instance, Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). Others begin to align educational inclusion with social inclusion and see it in terms of raising the attainments of low-achieving groups (see, for instance, Ofsted, 2000). In our case, we draw on somewhat wider notions of inclusive education which have, amongst other things, informed important policy documents – notably, UNESCO's Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) and the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education's *Index for Inclusion* (Booth *et al*., 2000).

The *Index* defines inclusion in the following way:

- Inclusion in education involves the processes of increasing the participation of students in, and reducing their exclusion from, the cultures, curricula and communities of local schools.

- Inclusion involves restructuring the cultures, policies and practices in schools so that they respond to the diversity of students in their locality.

- Inclusion is concerned with the learning and participation of all students vulnerable to exclusionary pressures, not only those with impairments or those who are categorised as 'having special educational needs'. (Booth *et al*., 2000 p.12)

There are three features of this definition which inform our review. The first is that inclusion is not so much concerned with provision for one or other group of students as for student diversity *per se*. The issue for schools is not that they have to accommodate a small number of atypical students into their standard practices, but that they have to respond simultaneously to students who *all* differ from each other in important ways – some of which pose particular challenges to the school. The second is that inclusion is not simply about maintaining the presence of students in schools but about maximising their *participation* in specified aspects of the school. The third is that inclusion is a process which can be shaped by school-level action (namely, the restructuring of 'cultures, policies and practices').

This definition begs an important question: faced with student diversity, what, precisely, are the 'cultures, policies and practices' which schools can develop in order to maximise participation by students in their 'cultures, curricula and communities'? There are, of course, many other questions that can be asked about the process of inclusion: how the presence and participation of particular groups of students can be promoted, for instance, or how far participation leads to observable learning outcomes. These are questions which subsequent reviews might well address. However, our current question is of central importance for all in the education system – and particularly for those in school leadership positions – at a time when schools are being encouraged, through reductions in special school placement and disciplinary exclusions, to educate a wider range of students, and when issues of equity are also prominent through the social inclusion agenda.

1.2 Previous reviews

Reviews of the research evidence in inclusive education are not common, but they do exist. For instance, Sebba and Sachdev (1997) have reviewed the evidence of 'what works' in inclusive education, Hegarty (1993) has led an OECD study of integration, and Lipsky and Gartner (1997) have attempted to bring together a wide range of (predominantly US) evidence in this field. However, reviews such as this differ from that proposed here in two important respects: first they are, in the technical sense, non-systematic; second, they tend to adopt a narrower definition of inclusive education than that proposed here, seeing it effectively as an issue solely within the field of special education. Where wider-ranging reviews do exist (for instance, Campbell *et al*., 2000), they tend to present evidence on different groups of 'excluded' students separately, rather than addressing the issue of diversity in a holistic manner. It is therefore safe to say that a review of the kind proposed here has not previously been undertaken.

1.3 The challenges

In beginning this review, we were not unaware of the challenges which it posed and which explain to some extent why it has not been tackled previously. The definition of inclusion we were drawing upon was a new one and therefore it was unlikely that the literature would be indexed in a convenient way for our purposes. On the contrary, there is a very substantial literature indexed as being about 'inclusion' which, from our point of view, was likely to be too narrowly focused on special educational needs.

Moreover, we were uncertain as to how much research we would find which had explicitly addressed the sort of holistic issues with which we were concerned. We were also uncertain as to how many 'good' studies we would find, or indeed what a 'good' study would look like in our field. Not only is 'participation' difficult to define – not to mention participation in 'cultures, curricula and communities' – but it is particularly difficult to define in a way that can be operationalised for research purposes and for which reliable measures or indicators can be devised. Finally, even if we were able to define our terms, locate studies and select those in which we could have confidence, it was far from certain that the various procedures and tools for the systematic review process, developed initially by the EPPI-Centre for work in somewhat different fields, would be appropriate in our field.

The temptation was therefore to undertake a less ambitious review where we could be more certain of finding studies which readily fitted within the existing frameworks. We opted against this for two reasons. First, we felt that the issues we were addressing were important precisely because of their complexity. Second, we felt that, if systematic reviews were to be useful, they would have to be useful in respect of complex as well as simple questions. In effect, we did not wish to shrink from the issues to avoid any potential constraints of the methods.

One implication of these challenges was that the early stages of our work were somewhat exploratory. As a result, the protocol which we initially formulated remained a rather fluid document while we refined our concepts and questions. As it was, the protocol which was published on the web was not finalised until some way through the review process. The advantage of this delay, however, is that the actual conduct of the review differed little from that which it proposed.

1.4 Engaging a range of perspectives

A particular challenge which faced us was the implications that the fluid and contested nature of inclusive education had for membership of our review and advisory groups. We wished our review to be of maximum use to as many groups as possible and therefore felt it was important that those groups be involved in the review process. It is common to think of a simple division between ‘researchers’ and ‘users’. However, there are multiple groups with a legitimate interest in the issue of inclusion: parents, students, academics, teachers, policy-makers, voluntary organisations and so on. Not only do these groups frequently disagree with each other, but they also tend to be characterised by internal divisions and disagreements. Moreover, roles commonly overlap; for instance, our review and advisory groups included teachers who were involved in research, researchers who were involved in school development, policy-makers who had been teachers, researchers who had been policy-makers and teachers, and members of all groups who were parents. A simplistic notion of ‘user-involvement’ was not helpful in this situation.

The breadth of our review and advisory groups was therefore an attempt to embrace multiple divergent views as fully as possible. To a certain extent, we succeeded. There were lively debates at each stage of the review process and individuals from different stakeholder communities contributed to all of them. The area in which we worked, the precise review question and the interpretation of our findings were all shaped through complex and often protracted interactions. However, participation was by no means equally distributed. The determining factor for level of participation was not which ‘group’ individuals were drawn from; rather, it was the amount of time and effort they were able to devote to a complex and demanding review process and the priority which this had amongst their other commitments. In practice, therefore, the review was driven by a core group of researchers who were able to devote themselves to the process and who drew on the contributions of others in helping them shape their decisions. This was a ‘good-enough’ process for a first review. However, as we gain experience and are more fully in control of the technicalities of the review process, it should be possible to be even more proactive in engaging a wider range of perspectives.

2. AIMS OF REVIEW AND REVIEW QUESTION

2.1 Aims

In the light of these issues, we sought to investigate the evidence base for actions that schools can take to enable them to respond to student diversity *per se* so as to facilitate participation in the cultures, curricula and communities of those schools. We wished to identify for practitioners and policy-makers whole-school strategies and practices which have been shown by research to be effective in this respect.

2.2 Review question

Our review question was:
What evidence is there that, mainstream schools can act in ways which enable them to respond to student diversity so as to facilitate participation by all students in the cultures, curricula and communities of those schools?

2.3 Scope of review

In defining the scope of our review, we were interested in evidence relating to action which schools might take to make themselves more inclusive in our sense. We expected that, in many cases, evidence would relate to schools where the commitment to inclusion was all-embracing and fully enacted in practice, though we did not wish to rule out evidence from attempts at inclusion that were rudimentary, contradictory or unsuccessful. Studies might include case studies of schools, studies of the impact of national or local inclusion initiatives in schools, or surveys of the views of stakeholders about factors in inclusive schooling.

We were aware that there were a very large number of studies which investigated particular *aspects* of inclusion in our sense. In particular, they focused on changes in specific aspects of practice and organisation, aimed at maximising particular forms of participation by particular groups of students. Such studies may well be important for future reviews, but we did not include them here for two reasons: pragmatically, they were beyond our capacity to seek and review; conceptually, there might well be a difference between the accumulation of separate inclusive practices and the creation of an 'inclusive' school. At this stage in the review group's life, therefore, we were concerned with locating and assessing whatever evidence there might be as to whether and how schools could develop *holistic* approaches to inclusive education.

In the sections which follow, we elaborate on the distinctions between these two types of study.

2.3.1 Defining school 'action'

We were only interested in studies of the ways in which schools can respond to diversity and facilitate participation across a wide range of practices and organisational features. We did not therefore include in our review studies which focused *only* on one or other aspect of the school and the ways in which

it might or might not facilitate participation. So, for example, we did not include studies which *only* investigated 'mixed-ability' teaching, strategies for raising attendance, curriculum differentiation and adaptation, and so on. We focused on studies which investigated schools' *overall* responsiveness to diversity.

Our concern was with those features of a school which can be initiated, maintained and developed – which, in short, can be 'managed'. Explicit policies, working patterns, organisation and structure and certain aspects of staff relations fell within this category; the state curriculum, staff biographies, professional discourses originating outside the school and so on did not.

Our concern was with what *schools per se* can do to become more inclusive. We did not, in other words, focus primarily on what actors outside the school can do, for instance in the formulation of national and local policy, or in consultancy and development work with schools. Our interest was in the school action which results from these external influences. Likewise, we did not focus on what individual teachers can do to make their own classrooms more inclusive, nor did we attempt to 'second guess' research studies by extrapolating evidence from classrooms to whole schools. Studies which *only* dealt with the wider environment within which schools are located or with the work of individual teachers in their classrooms were therefore excluded.

A useful test of what counted as a 'school action' in this sense was whether it was something which someone in a formal or informal leadership position in a school might reasonably hope to initiate, maintain or develop. We did not restrict ourselves to studies of 'what school leaders do' – though we intended our review to be of particular use to such leaders. However, in the event of it proving impossible by other means to determine whether a study was dealing with school action in our sense, evidence that someone in a leadership position was involved in initiating, maintaining or developing the putative action was the deciding factor.

2.3.2 Defining diversity

The review was concerned with schools' responses to diversity *per se*. It excluded studies which focused simply on provision for one or other group of students. This was the case even where those groups were relatively large and internally diverse (for instance, students categorised as having special needs or as being members of ethnic minorities). This was because we hypothesised that the task of responding to the full range of student diversity was of a different order from that of making *specific* adaptations in response to *particular* groups. It would not, therefore, have been appropriate for the review to extrapolate from studies of specific responses to more holistic responses. It is, of course, an empirical question as to whether the two sorts of responses are, in fact, similar and it may be that the findings of subsequent systematic reviews focused on groups could usefully be compared with the findings of the current review in order to investigate this question.

In practice, many studies, although referring to a wide range of student diversity, did not actually present detailed data on the whole of this range. For instance, they might provide detailed data in respect to students with special educational needs, but little or no data with respect to other students. These studies were included in the review, but their focus in terms of particular aspects of diversity was noted.

We recognised that in most countries' education systems there are many schools which do not serve the whole of their local population and are, to this extent, inherently exclusive. Our concern, however, was to identify studies of schools which were broadly comparable to the state primary and secondary schools with which the majority of users of this review will be involved. Therefore, we only included studies of schools which serve a wide range of children in their locality (as defined in that national context). These were normally mainstream (i.e. non-special) schools in the state sector. Schools which select the majority of their population on the basis of 'academic ability' were deemed not to meet this criterion, though denominational and faith schools were not excluded *per se* (on the grounds that they form an integral part of many mainstream state education systems). 'Alternative' schools, Pupil Referral Units (PRUs), off-site units and other forms of 'non-standard' provision were excluded.

2.3.3 Defining participation

Inclusive education as defined is about the *participation* of students in key aspects of their schools: their 'cultures', that is their shared sets of values and expectations; their 'curricula', that is the learning experiences on offer; and their 'communities', that is the sets of relationships they sustain. Aspects of participation might be indicated, for instance, by access to a full curriculum, a sense of being welcomed and valued or a contribution to decision-making. Our focus was on how schools maximise participation in all of these aspects. We were not, therefore, interested in studies which investigated only one or other indicator of participation in isolation – the implementation of differentiation to maximise curriculum access, or 'buddying' schemes to make vulnerable students feel welcome, or the development of a consensual system of rewards and sanctions. Such studies were only included if these were instances of a more wide-ranging approach to participation.

It is a reasonable hypothesis that participation in this sense is linked to greater learning and hence to higher attainment. However, the review did not seek out studies which investigated this hypothesis or which were concerned only with attainment. It did not, in particular, attempt to encompass the school effectiveness literature *per se*. This is not because these issues and literatures are unimportant. However, preliminary work suggested that engaging with them at this point would involve us in dealing with an unmanageably large number of studies. The strategy of the group therefore was to tackle significant questions one by one in a way which was more likely to be manageable, rather than to attempt to address *every* interesting question in a first review.

Given the nature of the field, it was likely that we would identify a large number of studies from the search terms we used which did not, on close inspection, prove to meet our full inclusion criteria. In particular, many studies of 'inclusive schools' are actually studies of schools which include students with particular disabilities, but make little reference to provision for all other students. Similarly, many such studies focus on maintaining the *presence* of particular groups of students in schools, but have little to say about their *participation*. In scanning titles and abstracts, therefore, to decide whether to include studies, we expected to see explicit reference to student diversity and participation as defined above.

2.4 Parameters for the review

2.4.1 Date

We gave a good deal of consideration to setting a date before which the review would not extend. There were pragmatic reasons for setting such a date – principally to make the search task more manageable, particularly given the international scope of the review (see below). There were also important conceptual reasons. Education systems change over time and findings from one period may well be of minimal relevance to another period. In particular, the concern with developing schools able to maximise the participation of *all* students is a relatively recent one. Prior to 1988 in England, for instance, there was no common curriculum in which all students participated. Likewise, prior to the mid-1970s, it was taken for granted across the UK that there would be a special school sector in which a minority of students would be educated, so that virtually all mainstream schools – even so-called 'comprehensive' schools – bore the marks of selection.

Despite these arguments, there were considerable difficulties in setting a specific cut-off date, particularly in an international review, given the different rates and directions of policy development in different countries. Moreover, it was possible that there were relatively early studies which did in fact deal with the issues of diversity and participation on which this review focused – studies relating to the establishment of 'common schools' in Scandinavian countries, for instance, or to some of the more adventurous experiments with comprehensivisation in the UK. For these reasons, we opted not to set a cut-off date for searching. Limits on dates were therefore set by the years available within each source searched.

2.4.2 National/international scope

We chose to review literature from the UK, bearing in mind the differences between its different component education systems. However, inclusive education is international in its scope and is particularly well researched in the USA, Australia and New Zealand. There is also some relevant and accessible English-language literature from other countries, notably in Europe and a small amount of English-language literature from countries of the South. Potentially, a full international search was extremely time- and resource-consuming and beyond the capacity of the group to manage. We therefore chose to review literature in English from other countries insofar as it was accessible via standard international databases available in the UK (Appendix A). It seemed likely that major, funded studies would be recorded in these databases, but that, inevitably, smaller, local studies would not.

2.4.3 Other issues

This review was not restricted to studies of one or other methodological type. In a first review within an emerging field which is characterised by a range of methodological approaches, we recognised that a range of study types had the potential to produce relevant findings. For instance, outcome evaluations might examine the impact of school action; ethnographic case studies could provide an insight into the processes of school action and the way these link (or do not link) to participation. We did not therefore specify any restrictions here.

A good deal of the literature in this field is theoretical and/or exhortatory. Whilst some of this offers useful conceptual frameworks, the major aim of the review was to explore the *evidential* base regarding inclusive education and therefore we elected to review only studies which present the findings of empirical work. There is also a good deal of literature which takes the form of 'insider accounts' or 'outsider descriptions'. This literature may have much to offer as the basis for analysis. However, our definition of empirical work presupposed some degree of *systematic investigation* (purposeful data collection and analysis within any methodological framework, whether undertaken by insiders or outsiders). We therefore excluded such accounts.

The EPPI-Centre initiative is only funded for reviews focused on compulsory schooling and we restricted our search accordingly. Additionally the policy and practice frameworks in areas such as further and higher education, vocational training and lifelong learning, though of major importance, are so different from those in compulsory schooling that an all-encompassing review would, we considered, have been unmanageable.

3. METHODS USED IN THE REVIEW

3.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The scope and parameters of the review were operationalised in the form of a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria. Studies needed to meet all the following criteria to be included in the review.

Studies which failed to meet all the criteria were excluded on one or more of the following grounds. Studies had to be:

- written in English
- evidential, rather than purely theoretical, exhortatory or descriptive (i.e. present the findings of empirical work evidencing some degree of systematic investigation)
- concerned with the phases of compulsory schooling and with schools serving a wide range of children in their locality
- concerned with responses at school level (so not with actions only taken at either below the school level such as by individual teachers or beyond the school level such as by national and local government and agencies)
- concerned with responses of schools to diversity *per se*
- concerned with many aspects of participation (so not just one or more particular aspect of participation)
- concerned with responses which extend across a wide range of school practices and structures
- concerned with responses aimed at the maximisation of participation of *all* students in the culture, curricula and communities of their schools (so not just one or more particular groups of students)

3.2 Identification of studies

The search strategy (Appendix A), developed in conjunction with the Liaison Librarian at Newcastle University and the EPPI-Centre, incorporated a number of strands and sources including personal contacts, handsearching of recommended relevant journals, the searching of bibliographic databases and websites, and a widely-circulated request to a number of potential sources of 'grey' literature.

Eleven key journals were identified by members of the Review and Advisory Groups and all volumes accessible through the associated libraries of Newcastle, Northumbria and Manchester Universities (details in Appendix A) were searched. Thirty-one potentially relevant websites (Appendix A) were similarly identified and searched.

In order to identify sources of grey literature, a request was circulated to a number of charitable institutions, nominated by Review and Advisory Group members as likely to have an interest in social and educational inclusion, and to all local education authorities (and their equivalents) in the UK.

Personal contacts and the handsearching of key journals, conducted at an early stage, produced a number of studies which, following the recommended method

of ‘pearl growing’, proved useful in the development of search terms for individual databases Eighteen databases were searched and the results were downloaded into reference management software, EndNote.

All citations were then screened according to our inclusion and exclusion criteria. In the first instance, a broad screening of citations interpreted these criteria generously so as not to overlook any potentially relevant citations. These were then re-screened more rigorously. The reliability of decisions made by those involved in the screening process was checked by all screeners together reviewing random samples of included and excluded citations. Individual screeners produced a written account of the basis for their decisions on these citations and these were discussed by all members of the screening team. This resulted in clarification and a fuller understanding of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Despite this, there were some instances where a confident decision could not be made on the basis of the abstracts and titles. Decisions in these cases were deferred until the full text could be read.

The full texts of all reports identified through this process were ordered. Given the time-limited nature of this review and the difficulties in obtaining some reports, a deadline was set after which reports were automatically excluded from the review (but not, of course, from any updating exercise). The full texts of reports were re-screened and those still judged to meet the inclusion criteria went forward to data extraction, where again they might be excluded should this process reveal that the study did not, after more detailed examination, meet the inclusion criteria.

3.3 Data extraction methods

A distinction was made between ‘reports’ of research studies (i.e. particular publications or other outputs) and the studies themselves. It was the *studies* which were the subject of the review. Separate reports of the same study were therefore linked at this stage and reviewed as ‘entities’. Data extraction was based on the fullest report (‘primary report’) and any supplementary information from other reports was added.

The generic EPPI-Centre guidelines for data extraction and quality assessment of educational research (EPPI-Centre, 2001), were used in conjunction with EPPI-Reviewer, specialist software for storing and analysing the data collected during a systematic review. These make it possible to interrogate studies in terms of a standard set of questions, some of which are differentiated for different study methodologies. These questions extract data on the content of the study as described by the author in terms of design, study development, study participants, methods of sampling and recruitment, methods of data collection and analysis, on the components of any intervention under examination and on the study findings.

Two issues had to be resolved in using this tool: categorising study types and understanding the need for review-specific questions.

3.3.1 Categorising study types

The EPPI-Centre tool requires a distinction to be made between ‘intervention’ studies and other study types. Only intervention studies can go on to be categorised as outcome or process evaluations in the EPPI typology. Certainly, the process of change in schools sometimes takes the form of a single, clearly identifiable ‘programme’ or ‘package’ such as a ‘branded’ school improvement

programme (for instance, as 'Improving the Quality of Education for All' (IQEA) or 'Accelerated Schools'). These might be regarded as 'interventions' in the EPPI sense. More commonly, however, change processes are somewhat diffuse: a new head teacher takes over, reconfigures some school structures, develops new policies over time, instigates staff development programmes, employs new staff, and so on. Whilst this constitutes purposeful action aimed at change, it is debatable whether such processes constitute 'interventions' in the narrow sense.

A further ambiguity was that, in school change initiatives, it is far from clear what count as processes and what as outcomes. For instance, a change in teacher practice can be regarded as an outcome of an 'intervention' or as a process mediating pupil-level outcomes (such as raised attainments). Moreover, that change might itself be mediated by other 'deeper' processes, such as a change in attitudes or in school culture.

Reviewers' interpretation of this distinction was crucial to the differentiation between study types. Our solution, therefore, was to categorise as 'intervention' studies (and therefore as process or outcome evaluations) only those studies where there was a clear, bounded and purposeful change such as the implementation of a specific policy or practice. Where there was any doubt, it was agreed that studies should be categorised as 'descriptive'. This, however, still resulted in some variation in categorisation by reviewers and a degree of overlap between some studies categorised as 'descriptive' or 'process evaluations'. The need for further development of this aspect of the tools was fed back to the EPPI-Centre and acknowledged.

3.3.2 The need for review-specific questions

The focus of our review was such that we needed to ask a range of questions of studies that were more specific than those in the generic data extraction tool. Accordingly, we developed and trialed a set of review-specific data extraction questions (Appendix B). These questions relate particularly to the range and type of diversity, school action and participation for which the study provides evidence and the manner in which links between action and participation are established.

3.4 Assessing the quality of studies

3.4.1 Methodological quality and 'centrality' to the review question

The generic EPPI-Centre guidelines ask questions relating to the quality of the study which guide reviewers in making a judgement on the reliability of the findings and on whether any alternative conclusions to those suggested by the author might be reached. The guidelines propose a set of four quality criteria to judge the reliability of the findings of 'outcome evaluations' and eight very general quality criteria which can, in theory, be applied to any type of study. The latter relate to a set of eight quality criteria which had previously been developed by the EPPI-Centre and piloted in several systematic reviews. In these reviews they were used to judge the quality of what the EPPI-Centre describes as 'qualitative' or non-experimental 'quantitative' research aiming to address questions about the need for, the feasibility of, and/or the acceptability of social and educational interventions for promoting health amongst young people (e.g. Harden *et al*., 2001; Shepherd *et al*., 2001). Because these criteria capture very general

aspects of quality, they were proposed for assessing the quality of any type of educational research. The eight criteria were as follows:

1. Adequacy of the description of the context of the study
2. Sufficiency of the justification for the way the study was conducted
3. Clarity of the reporting of the aims of the study
4. Adequacy of the description of the sample used in the study and how it was recruited
5. Adequacy of the description of the methods used for data collection and analysis
6. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data collection tools
7. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data analysis tools
8. Sufficiency of original data included in terms of enabling mediation between data and interpretation

Each study was assessed according to these criteria. In practice, however, they did not prove straightforward to use in making judgements about study quality for two reasons. First, the data extraction guidelines do not attempt to indicate the relative weightings of individual criteria in judging the overall quality of a study. Such a judgement is therefore guided by the criteria but cannot be determined by them. Second, in practice, reviewers frequently found it difficult to make a categorical decision as to whether a particular criterion had or had not been met and wished to qualify their opinion. It was agreed that this should be signalled by the use of the word 'partially' to qualify 'yes' and 'no' answers, with reviewers explaining their qualifications more fully with additional comments.

Reviewers were also asked to comment on the extent to which they considered that each study illuminated our review question. Although all of the studies had met our inclusion criteria for the review, there was some variation in how fully they did so. In particular, studies might have focused heavily on one or other aspect of diversity, action or participation, making only passing reference to more holistic perspectives. In other words, reviewers were asked to consider how 'central' the study was for answering our review question.

The studies varied considerably in terms of quality and centrality judged in this way, to the extent where we were reluctant to build the findings of the review as a whole on studies about which reviewers had significant reservations. We therefore used these two dimensions to identify those studies that were central to answering our review question and of a high methodological quality.

Three members of the review team re-examined the original reviewers' assessments of quality and centrality. For methodological quality, the number of criteria each study had been judged to meet and the original reviewers' qualifying comments were examined. Based on this, studies were categorised according to whether reviewers had expressed 'serious reservations' about study quality (e.g. met few of the eight quality criteria and/or many qualifying statements in application of the criteria), 'some reservations' about study quality (e.g. met some of the eight qualifying criteria with some qualifying statements in the application of the criteria), or whether they judged them to be of 'high quality'. Studies were only judged to be of 'high quality' when the original reviewers' comments indicated the study to be of good quality (e.g. few qualifying statements in the application of the eight quality criteria) *and* when they met at least six of the eight criteria. The three members of the review team categorised each study in this way

independently and then met to compare decisions. Disagreements were resolved through discussion.

For centrality to the review question, the original reviewers' comments in relation to this issue were also re-examined. In many cases, these contained unequivocal statements as to the study's relevance. Where these comments were ambiguous or missing, reviewers then considered the study's aims and findings as reported in the proforma, in relation to the review question and, in particular, to the original inclusion criteria. Each study was categorised according to whether its centrality to the review question was 'low', 'medium', or 'high'. Again, the three members of the review team categorised each study in this way independently and then met to compare decisions. Disagreements were resolved through discussion.

This categorisation process, requiring as it did the exercise of guided judgement, was intended to be robust but not necessarily authoritative. Its purpose, however, was not to locate particular studies unequivocally in particular categories, but to identify a small group of 'key' studies which were most likely to have a good deal to say in relation to our review question and in whose findings we could reasonably place some confidence. We were then able to begin the synthesis process with these studies. Not only did this give us a more manageable number of studies to work with, but also reduced the risk that the overall findings of the review would be distorted by marginal or methodologically weaker research. All the other included studies were also used in the synthesis process, but at a later stage (see section 3.5). These categorisations did *not* therefore act to exclude studies from the review.

3.4.2 Adding 'appropriateness of study type for answering review questions' to methodological quality and centrality to review question

During the completion of the systematic review, the EPPI-Centre introduced a new tool for assessing the quality of studies. This tool was developed partly in response to feedback from all the Review Groups involved in the 'first wave' of the EPPI-Centre initiative on making judgements about study quality. It continued to be under development as this report was finalised, but in the version available to us had three dimensions which aimed to facilitate a structured assessment of the 'weight of evidence' to give to the findings of each study in a systematic review. These were as follows:

- A: Soundness of method apparent from the research reports (i.e. the extent to which a study is carried out according to accepted best practice within the terms of that method)
- B: Appropriateness of study design and analysis to answer the review question/sub-question(s) (i.e. the extent to which the methods used in the study are well suited to answer the review question or sub-question(s)
- C: Relevance of the topic focus of the study to the review question/sub-question(s) (i.e. the extent to which the concepts and measures used in the study address the review question(s) and sub-question(s))

The tool requires that studies are judged against each of these dimensions using a scale of 'high', 'medium' and 'low'. An overall assessment is then made to give an overall judgement on the weight of evidence that can be attributed to the results of each study. Again, this is done on a scale of 'high', 'medium' and 'low'.

Dimensions A and C are very close to the judgements we made about methodological quality and centrality to the review question. Indeed, our experiences directly fed into the development of this new tool. We therefore decided to re-examine our original judgements on quality and centrality in order to cross-check our original assessment to see how they translated within the three dimensions of the new tool.

3.5 Synthesising findings

An issue for this review, as for all others, was how best to organise and synthesise the findings from the individual included studies to answer the review question. One commonly-used method is to put together findings from studies of the same type (outcome evaluations, process evaluations, and so on). However, the current EPPI-Centre category system for study types was not well suited to the majority of studies we found which were ethnographic or quasi-ethnographic case studies. We were therefore reluctant to use this method of differentiation. Moreover, we faced the dilemma that, although our included studies were broadly similar in type, they differed one from another in ways which made it difficult to treat their findings as complementary or cumulative in any simple way. Specifically, most of our studies were case studies of 'inclusive' schools, yet they tended not to refer to a common theoretical or empirical literature, nor did they refer to each other.

Moreover, they were diverse in terms of the settings on which they reported (types of school, national system, and so on). Findings from individual studies were therefore not reported in a way which was immediately complementary to each other or cumulative in terms of other studies. Accordingly, it was necessary to synthesise findings from different studies around inductively-derived themes. Themes were identified in the first instance from the key studies whose findings were both relevant and trustworthy. Three members of the review team identified themes independently, compared their results and reached agreement around a common set of themes.

These themes were then used to interrogate the findings of the remaining studies. The three team members reviewed the findings from each study to determine whether it supported, elaborated or contradicted the themes from the key studies. They then compared their results and reached agreement.

3.6 Quality assurance

All members of the reviewing team underwent training in data extraction and quality-assessment procedures. They also participated in trials to check for congruence in their understanding of methods and quality criteria. These trials resulted in agreements as to how data extraction questions which had proved problematic should be interpreted. These agreements were incorporated into additional guidance which was provided to all reviewers along with an exemplar based on an agreed version of a data extraction exercise.

All studies meeting the inclusion criteria were sent to two members of the review team for independent review. The team included two members of the EPPI-Centre staff who were paired with five members of the Review Group to enable the group to monitor consistency in the use of the data extraction tools. A particular issue was that some of the reviewers' own research was included in the review since, not surprisingly, their work is centrally concerned with the review

question and related issues. As a safeguard, therefore, team members and their immediate associates were not allowed to review their own work and all studies were subjected to precisely the same interrogation and tests of quality[1].

Individual reviewers were asked to deposit copies of their completed data extraction proformas with the Project Co-ordinator at Newcastle as well as exchanging them with their partners. Pairs of reviewers then compared findings, reached consensus where possible and prepared an agreed final version. Provision was made for a third reviewer to become involved in cases where consensus could not be reached (though this did not prove necessary in practice). A copy of the agreed version of the data extraction exercise for each of the studies was sent to Newcastle to inform the synthesis.

[1] In the event, six studies by review team members were included in the review but only one was regarded as a 'key' study around which the findings of the review are based.

4. RESULTS: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY

In this chapter, we present the results of our search, application of inclusion criteria, data extraction and quality-assessment strategies. Our aim is to give a clear picture of the sorts of studies we accessed, the sort of data they contain and their methodological strengths and weakness. Our review of the substantive findings of studies will then be presented in Chapter 5.

4.1 Identification of studies

The search of databases produced 14,231 citations and that of websites 412 citations. A further 49 citations, including those relating to 'grey' literature, were identified through requests for references, citations in known publications, handsearching of journals and through personal contacts, raising this number to 14,692 citations. These were screened to identify citations that seemed to meet the inclusion criteria and to eliminate any duplicates. The full texts of the remaining 336 citations were ordered and by the deadline for obtaining full copies, 325 of these had been received. Full reports[2] were screened and some 49 which met the inclusion criteria went forward to data extraction. These reports related to 33 studies. Eight reports (on six studies) were excluded during data extraction itself (Table 1).

Table 1: Citations, reports and studies remaining at each stage of the review

Total number of citations identified from databases, websites and other sources	14,692
Number meeting inclusion criteria on basis of abstract and/or title	336
Full number of reports obtained during time available	325
Number meeting inclusion criteria on basis of full report	41*
Number of studies described in 41 reports	27

***Note:** This figure was originally 49 reports relating to 33 studies. However, at the data extraction stage a further eight reports describing six studies were subsequently excluded upon further examination as they did not meet the inclusion criteria.

Table 2 provides shortened bibliographic details for the 27 studies which were included in the review. Studies are also given an identifier number which is specific to this review. The reference here is to the report which gives the fullest account of the study (the 'primary' report); full bibliographic details of these and all other reports relating to included studies are given in Appendix D.

[2] In this context, the term 'report' refers to any text (journal article, conference paper, book etc.) reporting a research study. Its use includes, but is not confined to, the end-of-project reports which many research studies produce.

Table 2: Unique identifiers and bibliographic details of the 27 included studies

Study ID number	Bibliographic details of primary report (abbreviated)
158	Ainscow M (1995) Special needs through school improvement; school improvement through special needs
89	Ainscow M (1999) Understanding the development of inclusive schools
207	Ainscow M, Booth T, Dyson A (1999) Inclusion and exclusion in schools: listening to some hidden voices'
188	Alderson P (1999) Learning and inclusion : the Cleves School experience
99	Ballard, K McDonald T (1998) New Zealand: Inclusive school, inclusive philosophy
128	Black-Hawkins K (1999) Close encounters of the cultural kind: the significance of culture in understanding processes of inclusion and exclusion in schools
157	Bonal X, Rambala X (1999) The recontextualisation process of educational diversity: new forms to legitimatise pedagogic practice
103	Booth T, Ainscow M, Dyson A (1998) England: inclusion and exclusion in a competitive system
183	Campbell E (1996) The tensions within: diversity in a multi-everything secondary school'
210	Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A, Skidmore D (1997) New directions in special needs: innovations in mainstream schools
168	Corbett J (2001) Teaching approaches which support inclusive education: a connective pedagogy
209	Davies GL (2001) An inclusion story (exploring aspects of educational inclusion in Birmingham 1996-2000)
156	Deering P (1996) An ethnographic study of norms of inclusion and cooperation in a multi-ethnic middle school'
186	Dyson A, Millward (2000) Schools and special needs : Issues of innovation and inclusion

Table 2: Unique identifiers and bibliographic details of the 27 included studies (cont'd)

Study ID number	Bibliographic details of primary report (abbreviated)
151	Ferguson D (2001) Schools on the move: stories of urban schools engaged in inclusive journeys of change: Benito Martinez Elementary School
152	Florian L, Rouse M (2001) Developing inclusive education at Rawthorpe High School: final report of the second phase of the evaluation
187	Gillborn D, Youdell D (2000) Rationing education: policy, practice, reform and equity
143	Heckman P, Peterman F (1996) Indigenous invention: new promise for school reform
205	Hunt P, Hirose-Hatae A, Doering K, Karasoff P, Goetz L (2000) 'Community' is what I think everyone is talking about
206	Kratzer C (1997) Community and diversity in an urban school: co-existence or conflict?
142	Kugelmass J (2001) Collaboration and compromise in creating and sustaining an inclusive school
130	Parilla A (1999) Educational innovations as a school answer to diversity
184	Pickett R (1994) The relationship between school structure and culture and student views of diversity and inclusive education: a comparative case study of two middle schools
132	Rouse M, Florian L (1996) Effective inclusive schools: a study in two countries
208	Slee R (1991) Learning initiatives to include all students in regular schools
203	Stickney J (1996) School culture and student learning: case study of a self-renewing school
189	Wang M, Oates J, Weishaw N (1995) Effective school responses to student diversity in inner-city schools: a co-ordinated approach

The sources of the 27 studies which form the basis of the review are to be found in Table 3.

Table 3: Number and proportion of studies found within the different sources of the search strategy (N=27)

	N	%
Bibliographic databases	20	74
Handsearching journals/reference lists/ personal contacts	4	15
Websites	3	11

The majority of studies were found on bibliographic databases (74%). Of these, the most productive were COPAC, on which we identified seven studies; and ECO, PsycINFO, and ZETOC, on which we identified five studies each. The British Education Index and ERIC were slightly less productive, identifying three studies each. We only identified one study each on Dissertation Abstracts, Education Abstracts, and Papers First. Seven of the 20 studies found on bibliographic databases were found on more than one database. However, four studies were uniquely identified on COPAC, three studies were only found using PsycINFO, two studies were only found on ERIC, and the following all contributed one unique study each: BEI, Dissertation Abstracts, ECO, and ZETOC. This illustrates the importance of searching across a range of different databases.

Despite the productiveness of searching on bibliographic databases, other sources made a significant contribution to the number of studies that were included in the review. Handsearching key journals, scanning the reference lists of already identified reports, and personal contacts identified a further four studies not already found on electronic databases. Searching the web identified a further three studies not identified through any other source. This illustrates the potential drawback for systematic reviews of relying solely on searching in bibliographic databases.

4.2 Characteristics of included studies

Appendix C, Synthesis Table 1 sets out some of the principal characteristics of studies included in the review. These are elaborated in the following sections.

4.2.1 Focus of studies

Given the focus of our review question on wide-ranging school action, it was not surprising to find that the majority of included studies were either of schools which were in the process of, or had undergone, change through their engagement with specific school improvement initiatives or their adoption of policies designed to improve schools' responses to student diversity. Twenty five studies investigated the structures and practices of schools through single or small number case studies involving fieldwork in the schools themselves. Two studies (reference identifiers [RIs] 130 and 157) conducted an investigation of the impact of national education policy 'at a distance' through a survey of teachers' views (RI 130) and an analysis of teachers'

understandings of policy and how these might impact on practice in schools (RI 157).

4.2.2 Settings of studies

Twenty-six of the 27 studies specified the type of schools in which they were carried out: eight were conducted exclusively in elementary/primary schools, four in elementary and or middle schools, ten exclusively in secondary/high schools, three in primary/elementary and secondary/high schools and one in primary/elementary, secondary/high and special schools. All 27 studies specified their national location: nine were conducted in the USA, ten in the UK, two in Spain, one in New Zealand, one in Australia, one in Canada and three studies gathered evidence in a number of different countries. In the latter group, one study (RI 132) was a comparative study carried out in the UK and USA.

4.2.3 Types of study

As indicated earlier, the categorisation of study type as suggested in the EPPI-Centre data extraction tool cannot readily be applied to studies which are concerned with 'whole-school development', 'improvement' or 'change'. With some hesitation, therefore, we identified three studies as outcome-and-process evaluations, five as process evaluations and nineteen as descriptive studies. The distinctions between these types was not as clear as we would have liked. However, with these caveats in mind, we report the principal characteristics of each below.

Outcome-and-process evaluations

All three studies that fell into this category sought to evaluate the effectiveness of particular interventions and to shed light on the implementation process. In two cases (RIs 143, 189), the study reports a 'packaged' change initiative – in other words, one which is developed outside the school, is given a 'brand' name and is offered to a range of schools. The third (RI 152) reports a local education authority project which is located in a single school but is not developed in or wholly owned by the school itself. In each case, it is possible to distinguish between the ongoing life of the school and the change initiative which constitutes a bounded intervention in that life. The studies can, therefore, investigate the process of 'implementation' of the change initiative and are (in principle at least) in a position to identify specific outcomes from the initiative.

Process evaluations

These studies similarly attempted to track the responses of schools to some particular intervention. However, they differed from the first group in two ways: first, their main focus was judged by reviewers to be on the processes of change within the school, even though some of them (RIs 168, 188, 209) might also report outcomes; second, and perhaps linked to this, the 'interventions' tended to be somewhat broader than those in the first group. One of the studies (RI 209) reports a 'packaged' intervention, though this is part of a range of initiatives in which schools were involved over an extended (four-year) period. The remainder (RIs 130, 168, 186, 188) are concerned with school responses to local and national education policy. In these cases, it is therefore somewhat more difficult both to distinguish between the 'intervention'

and the ongoing life of the school and to identify outcomes which can unequivocally be attributed to the intervention.

Descriptive studies

The high number of descriptive studies arises from the relatively narrow definition of intervention which we adopted. This should not be seen as a pejorative ('*merely* descriptive') categorisation. Many of these studies were in fact analytic in that they attempted to trace complex within-school processes.

Studies in this category tended to be concerned with understanding schools which were judged already to have achieved a level of inclusiveness or to be in the process of development towards greater inclusion. There may well have been some event (e.g. the appointment of a new headteacher) which triggered a process of change in these schools, but there was no single 'intervention' as such. All studies in this group identified features of schools' structures and practices that promote student participation. In some cases (e.g. RIs 89, 103, 132, 142, 156, 158, 183, 187, 208, 210), however, they went further and attempted to identify the conditions and factors which support or inhibit the development of these 'inclusive' features.

4.2.4 Aspects of diversity, participation and school action covered by the included studies

The review-specific questions aimed to establish the range of diversity in student population to which schools were responding, the aspects of participation they sought to promote and the range of school action being taken towards this end. We set out below the extent to which the studies reviewed were able to answer these questions. In particular, it was important to distinguish between studies which reported superficially on some aspect of diversity, action or participation, and those which presented data in more detail. This is because we encountered some studies in which claims were made for the inclusiveness of a school but where the data that might constitute evidence for this claim were largely missing. For instance, studies might report that schools had a diverse student population without setting out the characteristics of the population in any detail. Likewise, they might report that school action was leading to increased student participation without showing what actions were producing what level of increase in what specific forms of participation.

School responses to diversity per se

Many of the included studies focused on schools with a diverse intake and where school action purported to address diversity. Some studies, moreover, presented data relating to a very wide range of students (notably RIs 156, 184, 205, 206). By and large, however, studies reported population composition in outline, but presented detailed data only on one or a limited number of distinct student groups and on how schools were responding to these groups (see Table 4).

The majority of studies included a focus on students with special educational needs (22 studies) and disabilities (12). However, the number that actually presented data on the participation of these groups in any detail was somewhat smaller (15/22 and 5/12). Studies also commonly focused on schools' responses to ethnic (16 studies), cultural (11) and linguistic (13) groups. The number of studies which presented data regarding the

participation of these groups was once again much lower (6/16, 5/11, 5/13). All US, Canadian and New Zealand studies of schools (other than those deemed to be responding to diversity *per se*) included a focus on ethnic, cultural and linguistic groups. This was not a feature of all studies conducted in the UK, Australia or other unspecified countries. The issue of gender was a focus in only five studies and in only two of these (RIs 156, 187) was data relating to the participation of gender groups presented.

Table 4: Number of studies according to the groups of commonly marginalised students on which studies report and the number of studies which present detailed data on these groups (N = 27*)

Aspects of student diversity	**Number of studies reporting on this aspect**	**Studies which presented detailed data on these groups**
Special educational needs	22	128, 130, 132, 142, 151, 152, 156, 168, 184, 188, 189, 205, 206, 208, 210
Disability	12	99, 168, 184, 207, 209,
Ethnicity	16	156, 184, 187, 205, 206, 209,
Cultural diversity	11	156, 168, 184, 205, 206
Linguistic diversity	13	151, 156, 184, 205, 206
Socio-economic status	14	142, 156, 168, 184, 187, 205, 206
Gender	5	156, 187
Attainment	10	103, 130, 156, 183, 184, 189,
Behaviour	10	103, 168, 184
Other	7	130, 189, 203
Not clear	1	

***** Number of studies does not add up to 27 as studies could focus on more than one group of commonly marginalised students.

Participation

Studies reported on participation most frequently in terms of school intake (22 studies), student learning (25), the presence of all students in ordinary classrooms (22 studies), access to mainstream curriculum (22), and student involvement in shared learning activities (21 studies). However, only some of the studies provided detailed data regarding these forms of participation (9/22; 12/25; 9/22; 11/22; 7/21 respectively; see Table 5). Other forms of participation for which data were presented included staff-student relationships (10/20), student-student relationships (8/17), students' sense of acceptance and being valued (7/20) and the presence of the full range of students in school (5/16).

Table 5: Aspects of participation focused on in the studies showing the number of studies according to those which *report* on these aspects of participation and those which present *detailed data* (N = 27*)

Aspect of participation	**No. of studies reporting this aspect**	**Studies which present detailed data on participation**
School intake	22	99, 142, 152, 168, 184, 187, 188, 205, 207
Maintaining the presence of the full range of students in school	16	152, 168, 184, 188, 205,
Presence of students in ordinary classrooms	22	99, 142, 151, 152, 168, 184, 188, 205, 207,
Access to mainstream curriculum	22	99, 130, 142, 151, 152, 207, 168, 184, 186, 188, 205
Involvement in shared learning activities	21	99, 152, 168, 184, 187, 205, 207
Student learning	25	99, 128, 142, 143, 151, 152, 158, 207, 168, 184, 187, 205
Progression from school	2	184, 187,
Staff-student relationships	20	99, 128, 142, 143, 152, 156, 168, 184, 187, 207,
Student-student relationships	17	99, 151, 152, 156, 184, 187, 205, 207,
Students' sense of acceptance and being valued	20	99, 142, 152, 168, 184, 187, 205,
Other	6	188

*** Note:** The number of studies does not add up to 27 as studies could focus on more than one aspect of participation.

School action

Table 6 shows how the studies reported on a range of action which schools were taking to promote student participation.

Table 6: Number of studies according to which aspects of school action (linked to student participation) are reported on (N = 27*)

Aspect of school action	**No. of studies reporting this aspect**
Espoused policies	17
Staff attitudes and values	25
Staff interactions	14
Staff skills and capacities	16
Staff development processes	15
Leadership	18
Curriculum content and structure	21
Pedagogy	25
Student grouping	23
Organisational structures	20
Physical environment	8
Funding and resourcing	12
Internal student support structures and practices	20
Links with external student support structures and practices	10
Links with external school support and development structures and practices	7
Other	4

*** Note:** The number of studies does not add up to 27 as studies could focus on more than one aspect of school action.

The most commonly reported aspects of school action were staff attitudes and values (25 studies), pedagogy (25), student grouping (23), curriculum content and structure (21), organisational structures (20) and internal student support structures and practices (20). Other slightly less commonly featured aspects related to leadership (18), espoused policies (17), staff skills and capacities (16), staff development processes (15) and staff interactions (14). Funding and resourcing was mentioned in 12 studies, links with external student support structures and practices in 10, the physical environment featured in eight and links with external school support and development structures and practices in seven studies.

We did not extract data from studies about the detail in which school action was reported. Instead, we asked in what way and to what extent the link between school action and student participation was established. Since the answer is bound up with the methodological quality of studies, we discuss it in the following section (see 'Depth of study' in section 4.2.5).

4.2.5 Methodological issues

In this section, we identify the principal methodological characteristics of our included studies and report our judgements as to their quality.

The extent to which studies met the quality criteria specified in the EPPI-Centre data extraction tool is set out in Synthesis Table 4 (Appendix C). As we explained above, these criteria were difficult to apply in a straightforward way to studies of types for which they were not primarily designed. However, there were not any obvious alternatives. The largely 'descriptive' studies with which we were faced did not fall neatly into 'types', each with its own clear-cut quality criteria. Researchers were to some extent designing studies that were specific to particular sets of research questions pursued in particular settings. It follows that 'fitness for purpose' was the most important criteria of quality. This could be understood not as compliance with the pre-specified rules of a standardised study design but as the capacity of a particular study to generate trustworthy knowledge in relation to particular research questions pursued in a particular context.

The new EPPI-Centre tool for assessing the weight of the evidence from studies takes greater account of this issue than the original data extraction tool. This became available to us as a means of cross-checking our initial assessments. While it did not change any of those judgements, it made their basis more explicit and therefore the outcomes from both tools are reported together below.

In the following sections, we seek both to describe the main methodological characteristics of our included studies and to raise issues about methodological quality (broadly interpreted) in relation to those characteristics. This will enable readers better to judge the trustworthiness of the findings presented in the following chapter. However, it will also put us in a position to comment on the overall strengths and limitations of research in this field and to set out in more detail what a 'good' study in relation to our review question might look like. This is a task we shall undertake in Chapter 6.

Overall assessment

The full results of reviewers' assessments of quality are presented in Appendix C, Synthesis Table 4. In summary, in the original data extraction process, reviewers regarded six studies as being of high quality, expressed some reservations about 13 studies and serious reservations about a further eight. Applying the new EPPI-Centre tool for assessing the weight of the evidence from studies yielded the frequencies shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Quality assessment: frequencies from the 'weight of the evidence' tool

Dimension/ Grading	A: Soundness of method	B: Appropriate-ness of design to review question	C: Relevance of topic focus to review question	Overall weight of evidence
Low	11	6	3	13
Medium	10	19	9	8
High	6	2	15	6

Although this categorisation is necessarily somewhat crude, some interesting patterns emerge. The relatively high grades for 'relevance' suggest that the inclusion and exclusion criteria had operated well in selecting studies that were likely to help answer the review question. However, amongst the included studies, only two were graded 'high' in terms of the appropriateness of their design to answering the review question and, in each of these cases, the decision was a borderline one. This would not necessarily be a criticism of the studies if they were judged to be 'sound' on dimension A (that is, if they were of high quality in terms of accepted practice relating to that research design). However, less than a quarter (6) were graded as high in this respect and over a third (11) were graded as 'low' on this dimension.

Taken together, this means that, despite the high relevance of most of the studies, we were able to identify only six where we felt that the weight of the evidence they were able to contribute to the review question was high. The following sections set out some of the methodological characteristics, strengths and (more commonly) limitations of the studies which underlie these judgements.

The position and role of researchers

Inclusive education is a field which is defined, in part at least, by certain values and principles (participation, equality, valuing of difference, and so on). The ideological position of researchers and their relationship to schools which espouse such values and principles emerged as a matter of some concern. The data extraction questions made it possible to identify the roles of the researcher *vis à vis* developments in schools and this information was frequently elaborated through the free text comments of reviewers.

Studies varied considerably in this respect, and this affected the nature and range of data upon which the study was based. The majority of studies were carried out by an 'outsider' evaluator/researcher, though in a minority of studies 'insiders' – the headteacher/senior management, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, pupils/students, governors, LEA/government officials – were involved in data generation and other aspects of the research process. This disguises, however, the high number of studies in which the researcher was something of an insider rather than outsider. In some studies, the researchers, rather that standing in critical relationship to the development, were themselves the main agents of development (RIs 143, 189, 203, 209); in others, there are indications that the researcher was committed to (rather than critical or neutral towards) the direction of development and/or otherwise

involved in the development process (RIs 89, 99, 130, 132, 142, 151, 152, 158, 168, 183, 205, 206, 208, 210).

'Insider' or 'committed' research of this kind is not, of course, in itself necessarily problematic. However, it does behove researchers who are so positioned to consider explicitly the implications for the data that they are able and willing to generate and report. This was rarely done. Only in a relatively small group of studies did the researcher adopt a critical (in the sense of 'questioning' rather than 'negative') position with respect to the substantive issues and the development of inclusive practice (RIs 103, 156, 157, 184, 186, 187, 205, 207).

The role and range of theoretical positions

The range of theoretical positions referenced by studies was relatively narrow. It is possible to describe this range in terms of four theoretical groupings based on whether they draw on the literatures of (i) organisational change processes, (ii) school effectiveness, (iii) inclusion and inclusive education, and (iv) notions of power. There are clearly overlaps between these four theoretical groups and some studies fit into more than one of them. These groupings indicate both the variation which exists in terms of theoretical orientations and the limited theoretical basis of many studies.

- *Theoretical models of change in schools* were referenced in many studies (RIs 130, 143, 151, 158, 183, 184, 186, 203, 209, 210). These models drew on school improvement literature, but also on wider literature on the implementation of innovations, viewing schools as organisations and as institutions. Some authors made explicit use of the concept of the system as a context for change; one considered developments in systems from the point of view of complexity theory (RI 209).

- *School effectiveness literature* was referenced by researchers who assume and explore the nature of the relationship between effective and inclusive schools (RIs 132, 207, 208), making claims, for example, about the applicability to all children of pedagogical processes designed with special needs in mind.

- Other researchers positioned their work in relation to *the philosophical and ethical debates around the concept of inclusion*, making use of notions of inclusion as culture and linking with theory about the meaning of community. Co-operation and collaboration were to varying degrees explored as forms of interaction which embody this position in practice (RIs 103, 142, 156, 188, 205, 206). One study attempted to conceptualise the relationship between the individual child or teacher and the system in terms of pedagogy in practice (RI 168).

- There is a set of studies which were more or less explicitly positioned in relation to *theoretical notions of power* as it operates through discourse, shared values and beliefs (RIs 142, 157, 183, 187). One study (RI 142) showed how teachers in inclusive schools are required to compromise with external imperative – but also how collaborative cultures empower them to offer some resistance to such imperatives. One study attempts to show the way pedagogic and official discourses contort the concept of 'diversity' in a school system (RI 157). Another study (RI 187) explored the way in which educational discourses (such as 'ability' and 'need') support schools in offering unequal educational opportunities to their students; yet another

invited further consideration of tensions in the various aims of education (RI 183).

Each of these theoretical stances has much to offer studies which address our review question. By and large, however, studies either had no clear theoretical basis or were wedded to one or two of these positions, or drew on these theoretical positions in a somewhat superficial manner. They therefore did not systematically explore the full range of available theoretical resources or consider how they might explain or illuminate their findings in different ways.

Sampling issues

There were issues about the samples of schools that were studied. In nine studies (RIs 99, 142, 151, 158, 168, 183, 186, 188, 208), schools were selected because they were identified as 'inclusive' on criteria which lay outside the research process itself. Frequently, schools were nominated by their heads or by informed outsiders such as LEA officers (e.g. RIs 130, 132, 207, 208, 209), not least because they espoused inclusive values. The investigation then took that inclusiveness for granted, or corroborated it through some rather superficial indicators (e.g. the presence of students with disabilities) and focused on explaining how this school had come to be the way it was. The issue of the *actual* inclusiveness (i.e. as judged by other criteria) of the school tended therefore not to be investigated.

Sources of data

Table 8 indicates the sources of data studies most commonly used in investigations.

Table 8: Sources of data on student participation

Source of data	Frequency
Intake data	18
Student perceptions	15
Staff perceptions	23
Parental perceptions	8
Other stakeholder perceptions	11
Learning outcomes	13
Student progression data	4
Disciplinary exclusion/non-exclusion data	4
Attendance data	5
Student grouping data	10
Curriculum analyses	5
Socio-metric data	3
Classroom observation data	18
Out of classroom observation data	13

Table 8: Sources of data on student participation (cont'd)

Source of data	Frequency
Documentary analysis	11
Other	3

Some studies (e.g. RIs 156 and 206) used a range of data and then went on to triangulate these sources. This seemed to be an important way to increase the trustworthiness of findings. Other studies (e.g. RIs 130, 143, 157) relied on a much more limited range with correspondingly fewer opportunities for triangulation. Another group of studies relied on sources of data that were not only limited, but were drawn particularly from participants who might be held to have a vested interest in presenting particular images of schools. For instance, a number of studies (e.g. RIs 130, 143, 157, 183, 203) relied on 'insider' accounts, largely uncorroborated by other kinds of data (e.g. documentary, observational). Some studies relied particularly on headteacher and staff accounts, with limited evidence of any probing of these accounts; these might be thought of as *'merely'* descriptive in that they simply 'tell the story' of a school. In others, it was not clear that 'dissident' views had been sought. Parental views (8 studies) and student views (15) were under-represented in the review. This is particularly significant when compared with the number of studies which report staff perceptions (23).

The lack of disconfirmatory evidence, identified as a cause for reservation by reviewers in five studies (RIs 99, 128, 187, 203, 206), appeared sometimes as a product of a limited methodological range. One study (RI 205), for example, relied heavily on focus groups which, reviewers felt, may have inhibited dissident voices. Where disconfirmatory evidence was explicitly sought (RI 156), it was in the context of a study whose conduct and reporting attests to a high methodological quality.

Depth of study

Few studies (notable exceptions being RIs 156 and 187) went beyond an investigation of actions that schools had taken to present data regarding the *outcomes* those actions had had in terms of student participation. The difficulties of assessing participation accounts for this to some extent, but nonetheless the evidence was heavily skewed towards professional accounts and justifications of actions on the apparent assumption that, if the actions were directed towards greater participation, such participation must inevitably have resulted.

Table 9: Grounds on which the link between school action and student participation are inferred

Grounds for link	Frequency
A descriptive account of the association of these factors and indicators of student participation in one or more schools	16
A detailed analysis of the interactions between these factors and indicators of student participation in one or more schools	6
Stakeholder accounts	13
Other	1

The links between particular actions and the participation of students (Table 9) were not fully analysed. The majority of studies relied on a descriptive account of those links (RIs 89, 103, 143, 158, 188, 99, 128, 142, 151, 152, 189, 203, 205, 207, 208, 210) and/or stakeholder perceptions (RIs 103, 130, 132, 142, 151, 156, 157, 183, 184, 187, 188, 206, 207). In some cases, given the preponderance of professional views in the data, this amounted simply to a reporting of what professionals thought they had done which increased participation.

The quality of reporting

A complicating factor in judging the methodological quality of some studies was the quality of reporting. In 17 studies, reviewers felt they did not have sufficient information on methodological questions to make this judgement. The reports that we reviewed were sometimes concerned simply to present findings with important policy or practice implications, or to use findings to support theoretical development. They were therefore by no means all written to include a well-defined minimum set of methodological information.

There is also the possibility that the lack of detailed methodological reporting reflects the fact that, within the time constraints under which we were operating, it was not possible to locate fuller reports of studies. However, in some instances, where we contacted researchers to obtain fuller reports, it transpired that these did not exist and that somewhat schematically written journal papers were the most that was available.

There are some interesting patterns in our analysis of how different aspects of the research process were reported. The aims of the study were considered clearly described in 26 studies. Other areas of strength were found in the reporting of the context of the study (20 studies) and the rationale for methods chosen (18). Less well reported was information on the sample and recruitment (17) and the adequacy of the description of data collection and analysis methods (17). In only twelve studies did reviewers consider that sufficient original data had been included to make it possible to mediate between data and interpretation.

Rigour in the research process

In addition to more general criteria relating to methodological quality, there is a particular issue about the rigour and systematicity of some studies. Given the

complex and subtle processes on which student participation depends, mechanistic approaches to describing actions and measuring outcomes are probably inappropriate. Not surprisingly, most researchers used qualitative methods within an interpretive framework and many of these were attracted to the possibilities of narrative in research. The consequence is that some studies presented the 'stories' of schools as told by insiders or by the researcher after extensive contact with the school. Such accounts can be revealing of subtle and complex processes which might escape other forms of investigation. However, in some cases (e.g. RIs 188, 203, 209) it was difficult to see how these accounts had been or could be challenged and therefore how trustworthy they might be. This was compounded by a more general weakness in ensuring the reliability and validity of data collection and analysis methods. Only eight studies were deemed to have reported sufficient attempts in either category.

There is also an issue to do with the scale of studies. Typically studies focused on a small number of schools (see Synthesis Table 1 in Appendix C). The issue of generalisability to which this gives rise is well debated. However, given the tendency to study schools which were pre-identified as being 'inclusive', it does mean that the evidence base overall is drawn from a small number of possibly atypical schools and we know little or nothing about how any findings might relate to other schools.

Overall, then, there were certainly some studies which were of high methodological quality. However, there were many others which were lacking in scale, methodological rigour, range of data and theoretical resources. When this is added to the tendency in some studies to report data in detail only on a limited number of aspects of diversity, action and participation, there are inevitable doubts about the extent to which the studies were able to answer our review question robustly and comprehensively. It is for this reason that we chose to begin our synthesis with the studies we judged to be most central and trustworthy. The outcomes of this synthesis are reported in Chapter 6.

5. RESULTS: SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

In this chapter, we present the substantive findings of our studies as they relate to our review question. We begin by presenting the main findings of the six 'key' studies. We then present the themes which we derived from these studies and which we tested and elaborated in terms of the other included studies; further details on all studies are presented in Synthesis Table 1 in Appendix C.

5.1 The key studies

We describe below the focus, methods and findings of each of the key studies in turn, together with an assessment of its methodological quality and the extent to which it demonstrates a link between school action and student participation. Further details of these studies can be found in Synthesis Table 2 in Appendix C and readers may particularly wish to refer to this table to see more clearly where the focus of each study lies in terms of its presentation of detailed data. This detailed presentation of each study is followed by an overview of the findings of the studies in section 5.2.

Pickett (RI 184) investigated the ways in which students view diversity and inclusive education and the relationship between these views and the organisational structures and cultures of their schools. His study is located in two middle schools in two different school districts in the mid-western USA. One of these schools espoused a commitment to inclusion and one was more 'traditional' in its approach. He undertook six focus group interviews with students in each of the schools (12 hours in total, involving 62 students) together with in-depth interviews with 18 administrators, teachers and support staff. There is also reference in the report to some limited use of observation, though this appears to have been somewhat opportunistic.

Pickett reports that the relationship between organisational structures and cultures on the one hand and student views of diversity on the other was strong. In the traditional school, students held negative stereotypes of those with disabilities and segregated themselves and peers into rigid groupings, unanimously agreeing that inclusion was a 'potential disaster'. On the other hand, students in the inclusive school had a broader, more positive concept of diversity and, despite noting problems, felt inclusion to be workable.

The study identified structural and organisational difference between the schools. Structurally, the inclusive school adhered to the principle of 'natural proportions' of children with disabilities in its intake more than did the traditional school; paradoxically, the latter had a higher proportion of such children but they were 'imported' from outside the area. Similarly, it maintained students with disabilities in regular classrooms for a higher proportion of their timetable, there was a higher level of collaboration between regular and special education, interactive instructional strategies were more likely to be used and there was a stronger alliance with parents. Culturally, although both schools claimed to be supportive of inclusion, only the inclusive school had operationalised this commitment through an ongoing process of research and collaborative planning, supported by its school district. In the traditional school,

not all personnel supported the inclusion of all students in the regular classroom. Most saw school climate as an issue of concern in terms of the unfair treatment of some groups and the creation of separate and competitive groups.

Despite these differences, however, Pickett is cautious about claiming that a link between organisational structures, cultures and student views of diversity can be established conclusively. He grants that a wide range of variables may contribute to these views. Moreover, there are important similarities between the schools. Although levels of collaboration were higher in the inclusive school, in neither were they formalised in terms of regular collaboration and integrated curriculum developments. Similarly, the interactive instructional strategies in the inclusive school did not play a *significant* role in teaching and the school still retained some mixed-ability teaching and 'pull-out' provision. In addition to the traditional school's commitment to inclusion (albeit unoperationalised), students in the school continued to believe in the importance of belonging and the worthiness of supporting their peers.

Reviewers regarded this study as being methodologically sound and well reported. Its particular significance for this review is that it is one of the few studies to have set out systematically to elicit the views of students and to relate these to 'actions' in our sense that the school has taken. It is also one of the few studies which attempts to understand the characteristics of 'inclusive' schools by direct comparison between more- and less-inclusive institutions. However, it is worth noting that the data from students is neither longitudinal nor extensive (given the complexity of the issues under investigation) and that the relative dearth of observation means that what people *say* happens in the school cannot be triangulated systematically against what the researcher *sees* happening.

In the light of these caveats, our reviewers were inclined to agree with Pickett that he was not able to demonstrate a link between school action and student participation. However, Pickett's caution relates to the inherent difficulty of this task, given the complex processes through which such links might be mediated. In fact, the use of contrast between a more- and a less-'inclusive' school strengthens the implication (to put it no more strongly) that the differing characteristics of each might well be linked to differing forms and levels of student participation.

Although these are undoubtedly important issues, the study held up well in the judgements we reached when we cross-checked our original judgements with the new EPPI-Centre tool. This study was judged to be 'high' on 'soundness of methods', 'high' on 'the appropriateness of the design to answer the review question' (though this was a borderline judgement), and 'high' on 'relevance of topic focus'. Overall the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to give to the results of this study for answering the review question.

Kratzer (RI 206) also investigated the impact schools have on the views and attitudes of the people within and around them. Her study of an urban neighbourhood elementary school focuses on the extent to which the school is able to create a sense of 'community' amongst heterogeneous populations. She collected a range of data over the period of a school year, including interviews with students, teachers, administrators and parents, school documentation and a substantial amount (250 hours) of participant

observation of classrooms, staff and governance meetings, and parents' meetings.

She reports that the school which is linguistically, ethnically, socio-economically and religiously diverse, responded to this diversity by making provision for language differences and for special educational needs, and by developing variety in its pedagogical approaches, such as student grouping, collaborative learning and collaborative teaching. Child-centred constructivist approaches, she reports, were particularly in evidence. Teachers were aware of the need to respond to diversity, took it for granted that they would teach students with multiple levels of ability and tailored their teaching practices accordingly.

In structural terms, the school had virtually eliminated all vertical hierarchy and had embraced horizontal decision-making. Shared leadership, a commitment to shared values that were deliberately kept broad and symbolic, and support for minority viewpoints kept what Kratzer calls 'the dark side of community' in check. The school encouraged divergent opinions, and hence encouraged its staff both to explore different instructional approaches and to establish a sense of ownership over their own professional development. The school was also responsive to the individual needs of parents.

Kratzer's conclusion is that community and diversity do not need to be in opposition. In this school, the celebration of diversity and the recognition of the plurality of voices reduced the need for individuals and groups to defend their 'turf', increased their willingness to share with one another and enabled them to find better solutions to complex problems.

Reviewers judged this study to be of high methodological quality. It is a relatively substantial study of a school which draws on a range of data, including student views and observation of what actually happens in the school. However, there are some caveats. The report we were able to access presents only a limited amount of the primary data, so that the reader is required to rely almost exclusively on the researcher's interpretations. In particular, students' voices are not directly represented. Moreover, reviewers note that, despite the emphasis on diversity, dissident voices and conflicting views are absent from the report itself. On cross-checking with the EPPI-Centre tool, the study was rated as high on quality, medium on appropriateness of design to the review question and high on relevance of topic focus. Overall, the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to the review question.

Reviewers were happy to conclude that this study was one of those which had gone some way towards establishing a link between school actions and student participation but added that this was done in a rather weak manner. In essence, Kratzer describes a series of school characteristics, provides some limited evidence of student participation and assumes a link between the two. There is, in particular, no rigorous attempt to identify student outcomes (in terms of participation) or to link these to particular forms of school action.

Kugelmass (RI 142) studied the developmental processes in an inclusively-oriented American elementary school, focusing particularly on how collaborative cultures can be built in support of inclusive approaches. The study originated in the participation of five teachers from the school on a course run by the researcher, who began visiting the classroom of one of

these teachers. From this beginning, the researcher progressed to other observations around the school, more formal interviews with eight other teachers and with the principal, and the collection of school documentation. The study lasted for some four years.

The school in question was economically, ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse and included children eligible for special education in mainstream classes. It had developed a 'blended services' (as opposed to separate programmes) model of provision, involving collaboration between teachers with different specialisms in order to meet diverse learning needs in classrooms, with other structures and practices designed to support this priority. Indeed, Kugelmass finds that collaboration was 'at the core of everyday operations' (2001: 53) of the school and that the commitment of the teachers to progressive reform, to inclusion and to constructivist pedagogies was reflected in curriculum, policy and practice. In particular, they had redefined what they mean by 'child-centredness' in order to consider how they might meet the needs of diverse students in their classrooms. The strong leadership and commitment of the principal were important in this development but the transformation of the school had been a collective endeavour, involving a wide range of participants.

Despite this positive account, Kugelmass also finds that the school had had to develop within the context of a bureaucratic system which it was relatively powerless to change. As a result, teachers had to make compromises, adopting both skills and processes and modifying curriculum and assessment in order to take account of pressures for performance standards. Kugelmass concludes that no single individual can create an inclusive school; a commitment to supporting diversity requires the development of collaborative processes that in turn require compromises such as these so that the inclusive culture of the school can be maintained.

Reviewers judged this study to be methodologically sound. Amongst other things, it is unusual for researchers in this field to have an engagement with a school over such a lengthy period and this enabled Kugelmass to collect a range of data and to develop a detailed knowledge of the school. However, the principal caveat entered by the reviewers was regarding the 'self-confirming tone' of the report we accessed. Too little primary data are presented for readers to reach independent judgements about the school and there is doubt about the extent to which the research process is sufficiently systematic to uncover conflicting views and disconfirmatory evidence. Moreover, typically of many studies in the review, the case-study school is chosen because of its self-proclaimed 'progressive' character and because the values espoused by its teachers match those of the researcher. On cross-checking with the EPPI-centre tool, the study was rated as high on quality, medium on appropriateness of design to the review question, and high on relevance of topic focus. Overall, the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to the review question.

As with the Kratzer study, reviewers concluded that Kugelmass had gone some way towards establishing a link between school action and participation, but had not done so entirely convincingly. Again, the study relies heavily on association – the school has particular characteristics, students participate, therefore one must cause the other – and, particularly, on assertions by adult stakeholders. Kugelmass herself acknowledges the absence of student voices

in her study and the lack of data relating to student outcomes makes any firmer establishment of a participation-action link difficult.

Hunt *et al.* (RI 205) investigated two schools which had developed a 'blended services' model of provision for diversity, uniting, to a greater or lesser degree, mainstream classroom provision with programmes for bilingual and special education. The investigation focused particularly on one of the schools, which is described as an urban elementary school in the USA, and data collection mainly took the form of focus group interviews with some 36 participants, drawn from general education teachers, specialist teachers, principals, parents and other school staff. Some (unspecified) observation and informal interviewing also took place.

The interviewees identified academic and social benefits for students, particularly in terms of an enhanced understanding and acceptance of difference together with a sense of cultural pride and equality. The crucial factor in sustaining this reform was the development of a sense of community, experienced by staff, parents and students. The principals had advocated for this change, empowered their staff and sought out the resources to make the new approach possible. However, teachers had played a major part in setting up blended services provision and parents had been active as partners with them and with community members.

The presence of specialist teachers in mainstream classrooms and collaboration between them and general education teachers were key elements in the unification of programmes. Teaming, collaboration and mutual trust were necessary in order that responsibility for all students could be shared. Multiple strategies were developed to support the more inclusive approach: curricular adaptation (including the acknowledgement of cultural diversity), the development of a social curriculum and conflict-resolution procedures, pedagogical adaptation and collaborative learning amongst students. Despite this, however, teachers continued to find that meeting diverse needs posed a challenge. Likewise, school personnel felt that district administrators did not understand or support the school and the limited financial resources to support collaboration remained a barrier.

Reviewers judged this study to be of high methodological quality. Unusually, it seeks to elicit the views of parents (of whom there were 17 amongst the focus group interviewees) and there is a particularly high level of rigour in the conduct of the research which makes its findings trustworthy. However, the study is also rather limited in its focus, concentrating exclusively on adult perceptions and, moreover, on a sample which appears to be somewhat self-selecting. Limitations to this study are marked by the lack of engagement with students, the absence of systematic observation, of data relating to outcomes for students and of any longitudinal dimension and the uncertainty as to whether contradictory views have been sought. On cross-checking, the study was again rated as high on quality and on relevance of topic focus, but medium on appropriateness of design to the review question. Overall, the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to the review question.

These caveats meant that reviewers were reluctant to conclude that this study had demonstrated a link between school action and student participation. Certainly, stakeholders in the school *believed* such a link to exist, but there was no corroborating evidence for their beliefs and reviewers were uncertain as to how representative participants were of the full range of stakeholders.

Deering (RI 156) started from the premise that the espousal of inclusive values by a school may actually conceal "undercurrents of indifference, hostility and stratification at the implicit level of the school culture" (1996: 25). He undertook an ethnographic study of an ethnically-mixed, American middle school serving a predominantly working class area. The range and extent of data, collected over 18 months, are substantial: 30 interviews with adults, 28 with students; 77 days of observations in classrooms, around the school and in the community; photographic evidence and audio recordings of meetings, school ceremonies and events; and a wide range of documentation.

The study found a high level of inclusion and co-operation, attributable to the strong leadership of the principal and the congruity of norms and values between the principal and other stakeholders in the school. Deering reports that the school had a family-like atmosphere with teachers reaching out to students in formal and informal ways, and with key indicators of inclusiveness: staff members who spoke Spanish, female principal and maths teachers, and a Latino assistant principal. In order to realise the inclusion of all students, teachers worked as a team and shared in decision-making. Likewise, competition amongst students was moderate and there were only limited tendencies to form exclusive peer groupings. Parents too were strongly supportive of co-operation and inclusion and parental involvement came from a wide variety of ethnic groups.

On the other hand, Deering reports some evidence of exclusive 'undercurrents': the teaching staff were segregated into teams by ethnic group; the relatively high levels of failure amongst Caucasians and boys went unremarked; and there was some evidence of 'ethnic sorting', of sorting by programme and of a gang culture amongst students. Deering concludes that the congruence between the principal's values and those of staff, students and parents in this school holds out hope for the ability of other schools to run counter to dominant social values of individualism and competition. However, he also highlights the extent to which there are different levels of social organisation in the school, forming a complex context within which an inclusive culture has to be developed.

Reviewers judged this study to be of high methodological quality. The evidence base is substantial, the data sources are diverse, the methods are clearly reported and the researcher demonstrates a high level of reflexivity in relation to his role as participant in the school. Unusually, there is clear evidence of a search for disconfirmatory evidence and an attempt to triangulate participants' accounts of the school against other sources of evidence. Deering also engaged in a process of feeding back interim findings to the participants and using their responses as further data. This is, however, a study of a single and avowedly inclusive school, making no comparisons with other schools and with only a limited longitudinal dimension. Moreover, despite the methodological sophistication of the study, reviewers questioned how thoroughly conflict within the school had been explored. On cross-checking, the study was rated as high on quality, high on appropriateness of design to the review question (though, as in the case of Pickett, this was a borderline judgement), and high on relevance of topic focus. Overall, the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to the review question.

Deering's search for disconfirmatory evidence and his triangulation of stakeholder accounts against other data led reviewers to conclude that he had

indeed established a link between school action and student participation. The study is unusual in not only eliciting stakeholder (particularly teacher) accounts, but in investigating how far these accounts match what can be observed of school practice and then tracing some of the impacts on students. The lack of contrasting sites or of a substantial longitudinal dimension reduces the study's ability to link particular actions to particular outcomes in terms of student participation. Nonetheless, the establishment of links is as convincing in this study as in any that we reviewed.

The theme of complexity figures prominently in **Dyson and Millward's** (RI 186) study of four English secondary schools. Like Deering, they focused on various 'levels' of social organisation – in this case, the relationships between espoused policy, the practices through which that policy is or is not realised and teachers' understandings. They spent some 16 months studying four schools in a mixture of urban and rural settings. The schools were selected because there was *prima facie* evidence that they were moving or seeking to move in an 'inclusive' direction. Data were collected through formal interviews with a 25% sample of staff in each school, recurrent interviews with 'key players' (headteacher, special educational needs co-ordinator [SENCO]), informal interviews with 27 members of staff, 38 observations of classrooms and meetings (with follow-up interviews), a day's tracking of each school's SENCO and the collection of school documentation.

Dyson and Millward report evidence in all four schools to support the theoretical accounts of Ainscow and Skrtic about the ways in which schools become inclusive. Each school operationalises its commitment in a somewhat different way. Nonetheless, there are important respects in which each school was 'moving' or 'adhocratic': specifically, a dismantling of traditional segregating structures, an espousal of inclusive values from staff in leadership positions, and evidence of staff collaboration and joint problem-solving.

The complexity in these schools arises from practices and understandings which seem not to be inclusive but which co-exist with the espoused policy of inclusion. In one school, there was evidence of a surprising level of disciplinary exclusion; in others, traditional practices (setting by 'ability', withdrawal, basic skills teaching) persisted alongside more inclusive approaches; in others again, the head had apparently failed to carry all staff with him in support of an inclusive policy; and in all, student behaviour was a major, unresolved issue. Dyson and Millward conclude that these complexities can be explained partly by inadequacies in the management of change and partly by the failures of the school to become entirely 'moving' or 'adhocratic'. However, they also argue that micropolitical issues need to be taken into account in understanding these schools and that all schools face irresolvable dilemmas in trying to reconcile the contradictory imperatives of delivering a common education to all students and responding to the individual differences of each.

Reviewers judged this study to be of high methodological quality in terms of the range of data collected, the use of theoretical frameworks to inform analysis and the detail in which methodological issues are reported. The study is unusual in triangulating different accounts of the school against each other and against other kinds of data. It is also unusual in addressing issues of conflict directly and in being able to contrast a number of different schools with each other. However, reviewers note the relative absence of students' (and indeed parents') voices or data relating to outcomes for students. Moreover, although the schools differ from each other considerably, all of them were

selected because they were avowedly inclusive. On cross-checking, the study was rated as high on quality, medium on appropriateness of design to the review question and high on relevance of topic focus. Overall, the study was rated as high in terms of weight of evidence to the review question.

The caveats about design led reviewers to conclude that this study does not succeed in establishing links between school action and student participation. Given, in particular, that the observational data is not extensive, this remains essentially a study of what teachers in 'inclusive' schools *say* about their schools rather than of how those schools impact on their students.

5.2 The themes

Clearly, even within the key studies, selected because of their methodological strengths and their centrality to the review question, there is considerable variation in terms of how firmly they establish links between action and participation, and of the methodological caveats that have to be entered. To some extent this is reflected in the judgements on 'appropriateness of study design to the review question' in the new EPPI-Centre tool for weight of evidence. This variation is multiplied considerably when other included studies are considered.

Nonetheless, some common themes emerge across the key studies which suggest (to put it no more strongly) the sorts of actions schools can take to promote student participation. The process whereby we identified these themes – and then tested and elaborated them in relation to the other included studies – is described in section 3.5. We are confident that the themes themselves are robust in that they are a good representation of what our studies are saying and that they are derived initially from the studies in which we have most confidence. However, the caveats and limitations by which they are surrounded should also be born in mind and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

Synthesis Tables 1 and 3 in Appendix C indicate which of the themes can be found in the findings of which study on a study-by-study and theme-by-theme basis respectively.

5.2.1 The importance of school culture

A theme running strongly through all studies is the importance of cultural factors in promoting (or inhibiting) student participation. By 'culture' in this sense, we mean the norms, values and accepted ways of doing things in schools.

The development of more inclusive approaches does not emerge from these studies as a mechanical process in which specific organisational restructurings or the introduction of particular practices generates increased levels of participation. Rather, the evidence suggests that an 'inclusive' culture produces an overall enhancement in 'participation'. Even the studies which take the notion of a homogeneous school culture as problematic – the studies by Dyson & Millward (RI 186) and Deering (RI 156) – nonetheless provide evidence of a dominant culture in 'inclusive' schools which is itself supportive of inclusion.

Given the problematic nature of the notion of culture, however, it is important to unpack what it means in the studies reported here. One aspect of culture seems to be *the values and attitudes held by school staff*. The extent to which these values include the acceptance and celebration of difference and a commitment to offering educational opportunities to all students, coupled with the extent to which they are shared across the staff relates to the extent to which students actually are enabled to participate in the schools. Kratzer's study of a diverse middle school (RI 206) and Hunt *et al*'s study of schools operating 'blended services' models (RI 205) are cases in point. However, many other studies emphasise the central role of staff values. Importantly, so too do the small number of 'negative' studies – that is, those studies which seek to understand why schools develop *exclusive* practices. Dyson & Millward (RI 186), for instance, find a complex mixture of inclusive and exclusive values amongst staff producing equally complex practices, while Gillborn and Youdell (RI 187) analyse the way in which national policy generates attitudes amongst staff which favour what they call the 'rationing' of education.

A second aspect of school culture is the finding that a *culture of collaboration* is associated with enhanced student participation. This is a central theme in Kugelmass' study (RI 142) where the willingness and ability of staff with different specialisms to work together is essential to 'blending' services in the mainstream classroom. As with many of the findings in this review, the detailed mechanisms which link collaboration to participation are difficult to identify. However, at least two strands are indicated. One, as in the Kugelmass study, is the role of collaboration as a form of practice through which different specialisms are brought together so that the capacity of the mainstream classroom to respond to difference is enhanced. The other is staff collaboration as a manifestation of the inclusive values of a school and as part of the attempt to create a community in which all individuals – staff and students – are valued. Hunt *et al*. (RI 205), for instance, make little distinction between the practice of collaboration and the sense of community and of mutual trust within which it is embedded.

An extension of collaborative practice is the notion of *collaborative learning*. In Pickett's study (RI 184), for instance, a key difference between the more and less inclusive schools is that, although both have a notional commitment to inclusion, the former has engaged in a process of research and collaborative planning. Likewise, Dyson & Millward (RI 186) report 'joint problem solving' as a feature of their case-study schools and both Kugelmass (RI 142) and Hunt *et al* (RI 205) talk in terms of the collaborative development in which school staffs have engaged. The argument would appear to be that responding to student diversity requires teachers to move beyond established practices, that this in turn demands a process of learning about new practices and that such a process takes place most effectively within a collaborative context. Such an argument is, of course, familiar from the work of Ainscow (RI 158) but many other studies report similar findings and Heckman (RI 143) also reports how this process can be facilitated by a 'critical friend' from outside the school.

Some studies also report *student-student collaboration* as a feature of schools in which there are high levels of participation. Amongst the key studies, Hunt *et al* (RI 205) are explicit on the role of collaborative learning *per se*, but Deering (RI 156), Kugelmass (RI 142), and Kratzer (RI 206) all report to some extent that students share the sense of community in their schools. Again, the detailed processes are difficult to trace but, as with teacher collaboration, there

appear to be two interactive aspects of student collaboration. One is an underlying sense of mutual acceptance amongst students and the other is the specific practice of collaborative learning as a means of managing the diversity of classrooms.

Similar findings emerge in relation to *collaboration between school staff* on the one hand *and parents and community* on the other. Hunt *et al.* (RI 205) in particular report that parents have been actively involved in the development of inclusive approaches in their case study schools and Kratzer (RI 206) argues that the responsiveness of the school to parents' needs and its willingness to encourage community to express their views were crucial in enabling a sense of shared community to emerge, despite the diversity (and potential divisions) of the external community within which it was located.

Indeed, Kratzer's report of a school culture in which different and potentially conflicting viewpoints could be tolerated alerts us to a final strand in the findings on this theme. Some studies (Deering RI 156, Dyson & Millward RI 186) draw attention to *the complexity of school cultures*. In particular, they emphasise the multi-dimensional and multi-level nature of culture which means that values and practices need not be consensual or universal. None of these studies argues that the sorts of characteristics of cultures we have set out above do not exist or do not promote student participation. However, whereas other studies focus more or less exclusively on such characteristics, these identify ways in which other characteristics coexist alongside them, undermining the schools' attempts to be inclusive. They see schools as characterised by tensions and contradictions, therefore, rather than by consensus and homogeneity.

5.2.2 Leadership and decision-making

The collaborative nature of school cultures in these studies has implications for the nature of leadership and decision-making. First, as Kugelmass (RI 142) and Hunt *et al* (RI 205) make clear, strong school leaders, committed to inclusive values, are crucial to the development of more inclusive schools. Dyson & Millward (RI 186) provide examples of what happens both when such leadership is present and – an important test – the damaging effects when it is absent. However, given the importance of collaborative processes, studies tend also to report the importance of distributed leadership and participative decision-making. The strong leaders in Kugelmass' (RI 142) and Hunt *et al.*'s (RI 205) schools are therefore not autocrats but, rather, supporters and enablers of their staffs who are engaged in a collaborative process of school development. Similarly, Deering (RI 156) reports that it is the congruence between the principal's values and those of the rest of the school community which make for success. Again, Dyson & Millward (RI 186) report what happens when leaders simply *assert* their values without establishing that consensus and gaining authority through the consent of other stakeholders.

5.2.3 Structures and practices

Both key studies and others report examples of organisational structures and classroom practices which appear to be associated with student participation. However, given that these studies tend to be single or small-*n* case studies, it is difficult to be sure whether particular structures and practices are what generate participation or whether they have emerged as characteristics of schools in which

underlying cultural factors are actually what matter. The 'dual role' of staff and student collaboration as both cultural manifestation and facilitative practice is a case in point.

Nonetheless, some common features can be identified. For instance, all the key studies report, to a greater or lesser extent, some degree of restructuring in their schools. In particular, traditional structures which maintain distinctions and segregation between members of the school community – particularly separate programmes and forms of provision – are replaced by more flexible and integrated structures: 'blended' services, cross-specialist staff teams, in-class support, and so on. Therefore, no single model of school organisation emerges from these studies, but the principle of moving from segregating to integrating structures is well supported.

The studies similarly support some form of pedagogical development as a means of promoting participation, without going so far as to specify particular approaches. Kugelmass (RI 142), for instance, reports the use of 'constructivist pedagogies' and 'child centred' approaches'; Kratzer (RI 206) reports the exploration of a range of instructional approaches; and Hunt *et al.* (RI 205) report multiple strategies, including curriculum development. However, it appears to be the diversity and flexibility of approaches which are reported rather than any particular set of techniques. The implication (and it is no more than that) seems to be that the cultural factors set out above – in particular, the willingness of staff to reach out to all learners, the high level of staff and student collaboration and the engagement in collaborative learning – will generate a range of teaching approaches which will be flexible and responsive to individual difference.

5.2.4 The policy context

A number of studies in both the key and 'other' groups consider the relationship between actions taken by schools and the policy context within which schools are located. Kugelmass (RI 142) and Dyson & Millward (RI 186), for instance, show the ways in which staff compromise such inclusive values as they may have in line with less-inclusive policy environments, and Hunt *et al.* (RI 205) show how local policy can be experienced by teachers as a constraint. Moreover, there is an extensive literature on critical policy analysis, which we did not seek to include in this review, but which is reflected in some of our 'non-key' studies, such as Gillborn (RI 187), Ballard (RI 99) and Black-Hawkins (RI 128). Although most studies point to the undermining effect of hostile policies, some (Parilla [RI 130], for instance) demonstrate the ways in which pro-inclusion policies can support schools.

Dyson & Millward (RI 186) make a case for seeing the impact of the policy environment as a factor in the multi-dimensional nature of school culture. Other factors can be added to this. For instance, Hunt *et al* (RI 205) report that, even in a school which has moved a long way towards inclusive approaches, responding to diversity remains a challenge to teachers, and both Deering (RI 156) and Kratzer (RI 206) report the (not altogether positive) impact of social norms in the communities surrounding the school. The implication would seem to be that, even where schools develop 'inclusive' internal culture, they cannot divorce themselves from the policy and wider social contexts and the effects of these contexts complicate the school's attempts to respond to student diversity.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Shared designs and assumptions

It will be evident from the previous chapter that the studies which were included in this review saw cultural factors as fundamental to the development of 'inclusive' schools. They suggest that the attitudes and values shared by the staff, the level of collaboration and mutual trust, the sense of community and the capacity of leaders within the school to establish these cultural norms are crucial in determining how far a school will facilitate the participation of all its students. Insofar as such participation also demands particular strategies and approaches to organisation and classroom practice, these will emerge out of the culture in specific ways in individual schools.

The methods which our key (and indeed, the majority of other) studies used to generate these findings tend to have a good deal in common. All of the key studies can be described as case studies of one or a small number of schools. The data predominantly take the form of interviews with teachers and other stakeholders, augmented by a limited amount of (generally unstructured) observation. Typically, interviewees are asked to characterise their schools – particularly in terms of their 'inclusiveness' – and to explore what sustains those characteristics. Overwhelmingly, therefore, what we are presented with in these studies are the perceptions of stakeholders about the cultures of their schools.

Moreover, there appears to be a high level of congruence in terms of both findings and methods between the key studies, which are methodologically sound, and our other included studies which, in some cases, are considerably less sound. The similarities between studies can be taken as a sort of reliability and validity check. If different researchers, in different contexts construct similar studies and reach similar conclusions, then the chances that the methods or findings of any one study are idiosyncratic are much reduced. Although this therefore tends not to be a field in which studies consciously set out to replicate each other, there is a relatively high level of *de facto* replication and mutual confirmation.

However, there are other possible explanations for this level of congruence. It may be that the design of studies has had some unanticipated impacts on what they have found. Although, for instance, the included studies (and even the smaller group of key studies) are diverse, they nonetheless share common features which together may have produced such effects:

- Studies tend to be located in schools which have been identified (by the researcher, by some key informant or by the schools themselves) as inclusive. Typically, such schools have an explicit policy of inclusion.

- Most studies are single or small-*n* case studies. Where more than one school is studied, it is usually because all have been identified as 'inclusive' (as in Dyson & Millward RI 186 and Hunt *et al*. RI 205). Only Pickett (RI 184) studies a school which is not identified as inclusive and compares this school with an 'inclusive' school.

- Interviews with stakeholders tend to be a major source of data. Some studies include data from student interviews (RI Pickett 184) or parents (Hunt *et al*. RI 205). Others include observation data (Hunt *et al*. RI 205, Deering RI 156). However, the tendency is for teachers' voices to predominate in the data that are presented (see also Synthesis Table 2 in Appendix C).

- Data on outcomes for students (in terms, say, of their attainments or of their participation in cultures, curricula and communities) are sometimes absent (Dyson & Millward RI 186) or reported by adults (Hunt *et al* RI 205) or inferred from an account of teacher practices (Kugelmass RI 142). Direct reports of outcomes data are rare.

- Some studies understand school culture as complex and contradictory (Dyson & Millward RI 186, Deering RI 156). These studies search for contradictions between different discourses in the school and between the espousal of inclusion on the one hand and non-inclusive practices on the other. In the majority of cases, however, the underlying assumption seems to be that culture is monolithic and that there is no need to seek out 'dissident' voices or contradictory practices.

- Studies tend to be cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. Attempts to characterise schools in a non-inclusive state and contrast this with an earlier or later inclusive state are therefore rare.

- Studies report the claims (and to some extent, the evidence) that schools are inclusive and also describe the characteristics of those schools' cultures. However, the extent to which they trace systematically and in detail the causal links between particular characteristics and particular aspects of inclusiveness is variable. In particular, studies tend not to make clear distinctions or identify links between the attitudes and values of members of the school community, the structures and practices in the school (which might be more or less in accord with those attitudes and values) and the outcomes for students (which might or might not include enhanced participation). As Pickett (RI 184) argues, tracing such links is a highly complex matter. However, in the majority of included studies, links are asserted rather than demonstrated (see Synthesis Table 2, Appendix C) and the assumption seems to be that the strong assertion of inclusive values by teachers leads inevitably and unproblematically to greater inclusion for students.

These matters are not issues of research quality so much as of research design and, in particular, the inevitability that any design will have in-built assumptions which shape what the investigation can and cannot discover. The body of research which is constituted by our included studies is very strong in eliciting the views of teachers in avowedly inclusive schools as to what it is that makes their schools inclusive. Not surprisingly, therefore, it foregrounds the role of teacher attitudes and values, teacher practices and leadership styles in promoting inclusion. However, the research is less strong in interrogating claims to inclusiveness, listening to dissident voices and seeking disconfirmatory evidence, or in identifying and tracing the impact of other potential causal mechanisms. It is therefore difficult for studies to conclude that schools which seem inclusive may not be so, or that school culture is not homogeneous, or that the apparent cultural underpinnings of inclusiveness do not in fact lead to enhanced student participation. It is for this reason that it

was difficult to regard most studies as being high on the 'appropriateness of design' dimension (dimension B) of the new EPPI-Centre tool.

6.2 An alternative approach?

It may well be that the limitations of these shared design features go some way towards explaining why both high- and less high-quality studies tend to reach remarkably similar conclusions. However, there are some studies which, although they subscribe in broad terms to the design features described above, have other characteristics which allow them to break out of this consensus. Amongst the key studies, for instance, are the following:

- Deering (RI 156) explores the gap between policy and practice and triangulates teacher accounts against other sorts of rich data, involving teachers themselves in this process of triangulation.

- Pickett (RI 184) conducts a case study of an inclusive school which is similar to those undertaken in other studies. However, he also elicits students' views and, crucially, seeks to understand the distinctive characteristics of his inclusive school by contrast with a less-inclusive school.

- Dyson & Millward (RI 186), have little to say about students and undertake only a limited and exploratory form of observation. They do, however, seek to triangulate teachers' (and particularly headteachers') accounts of what makes their schools inclusive against other accounts which point to non-inclusive practices and tensions within the schools' 'espoused' policies.

What makes studies such as this stand out is that the most obvious explanations as to why a school is inclusive – particularly those provided by teacher accounts, espoused policies and relatively superficial observation – are *problematised* through other sorts of data. In this respect at least, they avoid the danger of 'circularity' (i.e. of building findings into the design of the research itself) to which many other studies succumb. They also make it possible to outline what a study would look like that avoided this danger more fully.

We therefore suggest that, in order to answer our review question fully and without in-built circularity, a study would need to have the following features:

- It would need to provide robust evidence as to the extent to which any school was 'inclusive' and specifically (for our question), the extent to which it sustained the participation of students in the school's cultures curricula and communities.

- Such evidence might include, but could not be confined to, the dominant views of teachers and other adults, superficial observations of classrooms, or overviews of the school's structures, policies and practices. This evidence would need to be extended by the views of students and by an exploration of a range of views from stakeholders, including those of 'dissident' individuals and groups. Crucially, the evidence would also have to relate to *outcomes* for students; that is, the impact of the school's policies and practices on student participation.

- The study would have to explore and demonstrate the link between particular school 'actions' (as our review question puts it) and student participation. Demonstration in this sense would involve more than simply describing school characteristics and student participation and *assuming* a causal link from one to the other. In particular, it would need to differentiate between the attitudes and values of stakeholders (particularly teachers) in the school, the structures and practices in the school, and the outcomes for students.

- Some tracing of causal chains would be involved; for instance, seeing how some form of action impacts on teacher thinking and practice, and how this in turn impacts on one or other aspect of student participation. This suggests that a substantial amount of fieldwork in the school would be necessary.

- The study would need to test whether particular 'actions' were indeed linked to participation through a process of contrast – perhaps by contrasting an 'inclusive' with a 'non-inclusive' school, as Pickett (RI 184) does, or by a temporal contrast as a single school moves through more and less inclusive phases, or by contrasting more and less inclusive aspects of the school at a given point in time. Without such a contrast, there can be no certainty that the actions which appear to produce inclusive outcomes (staff collaboration, consensual values and assertive leadership, for instance) might not, in a different context, result in exclusion.

The study would need to meet all the standard criteria for high-quality research in terms of its methodology and its use of previous research and theory. In particular, given the danger of circularity which we have identified, it would need to be particularly rigorous in its search for disconfirmatory evidence and alternative explanations. The exploration of a range of theoretical perspectives and even the deliberate use of diversity of position within the research team might be helpful. The study would also need to be replicated in some meaningful form and to an adequate extent before its findings could be entirely trusted.

The fact that none of the studies in this review entirely meets these criteria should not be seen as a criticism of what these studies *do* achieve. Past studies have not necessarily set out to answer the question our review poses – or at least not to answer it with the degree of rigour we are demanding. Indeed, it is arguable that much of the research we have reviewed is illustrative and illuminative in character, meeting the needs of a relatively new field of inquiry and practice. Its aim, in other words, is to *illustrate* the ways in which more inclusive approaches might be developed and to *illuminate* the understanding of inclusion by researchers, practitioners and policy-makers. The power of many of the studies we have reviewed lies in their capacity to open up new forms of thinking and of practice, rather than in the problematisation and critique of the evidence base on which such new forms are based.

However, these studies also reflect the conditions under which research in this field is currently being carried out. The majority are small-scale, short-term case studies, many of which are unfunded and undertaken by single researchers or small teams. It may be that the researchers would not have had the resources to carry out the sort of study we are advocating, even if they

had wished to do so. Such a study would require substantial and sustained investment of a kind which may well have been inaccessible to researchers in this field in the past.

Moreover, a study of the kind we envisage would require a development in the field itself. Insofar as researchers have chosen (rather than been constrained) to work in the limited way already described, this may well be because inclusive education is (at least in its current form) a relatively young field which is in the process of establishing itself. This process involves both the development of the field's conceptual underpinnings and the identification 'on the ground' of the sorts of practices which it seeks to advocate. Under these circumstances, illuminative and illustrative research have a vital role to play. However, if the field is to advance, this sort of research has to be accompanied increasingly by research which tests empirical claims against empirical evidence and which delves deeper into the sorts of processes which sustain inclusive practices. In other words, the field has to be prepared to undertake the sorts of careful empirical studies and fundamental critical analyses of its own preferred practices that it has deployed so powerfully against traditional special education.

6.3 The limits and possibilities of systematic reviews

The strengths of the systematic reviewing process in this context are clear. Systematic reviews are a powerful means of disentangling trustworthy empirical evidence from the advocacy, theorisation and conceptual development in which such evidence is often (and often quite legitimately) embedded. In a field which is characterised by claim and counter-claim, systematic reviews can act as a searchlight, picking out what empirical evidence there is (or, indeed, is not) for these claims.

However, we have also learned something about some of the limits of the systematic review process. We are aware that the field of systematic reviewing is developing rapidly and, as the EPPI-Centre initiative exemplifies, is coming to terms with a wider range of substantive fields and forms of inquiry. Since systematic reviewing is, in essence, simply about being rigorous in and explicit about the reviewing process, there is no reason in principle why its range should be restricted by any one set of tools and procedures. Indeed, we hope that this review will contribute in some small way to this development. Nonetheless, our review was undertaken with a specific set of tools and procedures – helpful in many respects, but less so in others – and it is on these that we now wish to comment.

As we have indicated at various points in this report, the tools used in this review presupposed a certain range of study types which can be analysed and whose quality can be assessed in predetermined ways. By and large, the studies we reviewed did not fit neatly into these types and the tools we used were not entirely appropriate for analysing and judging these studies. There was a particular danger that inappropriate tools would lead to inappropriate judgements being made on studies – in other words, that the failure of the tools to capture the strengths of a study might be taken as a weakness in the study itself. The continued development of tools which are more appropriate for a wider range of studies is clearly essential.

Moreover, the systematic reviewing methodology which was available to us has not yet developed detailed coding frameworks for all theoretical and conceptual research. As already suggested, a good deal of the literature in inclusive education is concerned primarily with such issues as developing concepts of inclusion, critiquing historical practices, investigating current practices in particular sites from a critical perspective, and so on. Insofar as such work is 'purely' theoretical and conceptual, there is still a need for a rigorous reviewing process to bring a diverse and sometimes dispersed literature together. However, it is frequently difficult to disentangle theoretical and empirical issues in the way in which the current systematic review process requires and which indeed, is one of its strengths. For instance, we came across a good deal of literature which uses relatively small amounts of opportunistically collected data as the basis for detailed – and powerful – critical analysis and theoretical development. Reviewed against quality criteria for empirical research, such reports look weak. However, their contribution to the field is sometimes considerable.

There are also issues about the different – and equally legitimate – purposes which different kinds of review serve. Literature reviews in our own field have a somewhat distinctive character. Recently, for instance, the Scottish Executive commissioned a narrative review of the literature on inclusion, organised around a series of themes (particularly the inclusion of particular marginalised groups) and with each theme authored by a specialist scholar in that field (Campbell *et al.*, 2000). Introductory and concluding sections give an overview of the whole body of research evidence. We might compare this with Lipsky and Gartner's review of the American evidence on inclusion (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997) or with Hegarty's edited review of the evidence on integration (Hegarty, 1993), although in both these cases, the focus is exclusively on children identified as having 'special educational needs'. Here, too, a wide range of literature is reviewed in terms of a series of themes and groups of children, and some attempt is made to offer a coherent overview.

This approach to reviewing may be typical of a developing field. A wide range of issues is scanned and evidence collected from each; this is then brought together and some sort of synthesis is attempted. The evidence relates to different groups of children, but also to different issues which, it is argued, are relevant to inclusion. In the Scottish study, for instance, one chapter investigates the links between school effectiveness and improvement research and inclusion, just as Lipsky and Gartner explicitly link their review to issues of school 'reform'. The review process, in other words, is one of synthesis, in which disparate elements are brought together and links between them sought. The assumption would seem to be that the 'new' field of inclusion can be developed by gleaning evidence from a wide range of other fields and by drawing analogies between those fields and the concerns of inclusive education. Put simply, what we know about students with special needs might have implications for children from ethnic minorities, and vice versa; likewise, what we know about 'improving' schools might have implications for making schools more inclusive.

This form of synthesis is very important for a field that has not had time to develop fully its own historical evidence base or conceptual framework. It enables the field to map out its territory and make use of the best available evidence, even if that evidence does not fit precisely with its own concerns. For instance, the lack of an inclusive education evidence base *per se* became very apparent in our searches. We found a great deal on specific groups at

risk of exclusion and on specific actions that schools could take in respect of these groups, but relatively little that dealt directly with the more wide ranging actions schools could take to respond to the full range of student diversity. In a narrative review, we could have been more flexible in generalising from the specific findings in respect of one or other group to our own wider concerns. However, this process is difficult to undertake within systematic reviews procedures given their (understandable) emphasis on tight delineation of review topic, requirement for clear a priori criteria for what forms of evidence can be included and current lack of procedures for 'analogical' synthesis. There is also the practical issue of managing a very wide ranging review within a limited timescale and budget.

How far these problems are due to fundamental limitations of systematic reviewing as a methodology and how far they are simply artefacts of the particular tools and procedures that were available to us remains to be seen. It seems that there are two options for systematic reviewing in our field. One is to see the methodology as comprising one set of research tools amongst many and, indeed, as one kind of reviewing amongst many. This would require some limited development of currently-available tools and procedures of the sort which is already ongoing and which is represented, for instance, by the production of the 'weight of evidence' tool which became available towards the end of the reviewing process. Such an option would give systematic reviewing a place as a powerful corrective in a field such as inclusive education but would not give it the privileged position of defining what should count as reliable evidence in the field.

The other option is to pursue current attempts by the EPPI-Centre and others to find ways of reviewing systematically and synthesising creatively a wide range of inquiry. This would mean holding fast to the principles of rigour and explicitness whilst moving some way beyond the sorts of tools and procedures which we used. The trick may be to explore this avenue as fully as possible without losing the distinctive benefits which the form of systematic reviewing used here seems to bring.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 What do we know?

Given the limited number of 'key' studies which we were able to identify and the caveats with which even those studies have had to be surrounded, what do we now securely know about the relationship between school action and student participation and what are the implications of this knowledge for policy, practice and research? Our suggestion is that what we know is limited, but is not negligible. It can, perhaps, be summarised in the following way:

- **We know that some schools are characterised by what we might call an 'inclusive culture'**. Within such schools, there is some degree of consensus amongst adults around values of respect for difference and a commitment to offering all children access to learning opportunities. This consensus may not be total and may not necessarily remove all tensions or contradictions in practice. On the other hand, there is likely to be a high level of staff collaboration and joint problem-solving, and similar values and commitments may extend into the student body and into parent and other community stakeholders in the school.

- The extent to which such 'inclusive cultures' lead directly and unproblematically to enhanced student participation is not entirely clear. However, **some aspects of these cultures can be seen as inherently participatory**. For instance, respect from teachers towards diverse students is itself a form of participation by students in the school community. Moreover, in schools characterised by such cultures, there are also likely to be forms of organisation (such as 'blended services') and practice (such as constructivist approaches to teaching and learning) which could be regarded as inherently participatory.

- **Schools with 'inclusive cultures' are also likely to be characterised by the presence of leaders who are committed to inclusive values** and to a leadership style which encourages a range of individuals to participate in leadership functions.

- **Such schools may also have good links with parents and with their communities**.

- **The local and national policy environment can act to support or to undermine the realisation of schools' inclusive values**.

7.2 Implications for policy and practice

On the basis of what we now know, a number of specific, if qualified, recommendations for policy and practice can be made:

- **If 'inclusive' schools (in our sense) are characterised by particular cultural features, then it is reasonable to suppose that attempts to develop such schools will need to pay attention to the development of 'inclusive' cultures and, particularly, to the building of some**

degree of consensus around inclusive values in the school's community. The implication is that schools may not become more inclusive by the adoption of specific organisational or pedagogical practices, nor by a process of imposed reform *alone* – though such processes may have a part to play if managed appropriately. This finding would seem to be in line with what we know about the content of educational change and its 'meaning' for participants more generally (Fullan & with Stiegelbauer, 1991).

- **Headteachers and other school leaders may be particularly important in the development of 'inclusive' schools**. Their own commitment to inclusive values and their capacity to lead in a participatory manner and to build consensus across the organisation could be significant. This has implications for the criteria on which school leaders are selected and for the sort of training they receive. **There would therefore seem to be a case for reviewing the extent to which inclusive values and approaches permeate the various leadership training initiatives that emerge from time to time, the TTA standards for school leaders and the work of the National College for School Leadership.**

- The external policy environment can help or hinder schools' attempts to enhance student participation and studies speak particularly of the compromises teachers have to make with the non-inclusive implications of policy. Concerns about conflicts between inclusive education and national policy priorities go back in this country at least as far as 1988. However, this review lends weight to the view that **policy needs to be compatible with inclusive developments if it is to support rather than to undermine schools' efforts**.

- Although it is difficult to argue that specific forms of school organisation or classroom practice emerge from this review as crucial to the enhancement of student participation, there are some general principles which can be followed. One is that **structural barriers between different groups of students and staff need to be reduced.** The maintenance of separate programmes, services and specialisms runs counter to the notion of participation and has been discontinued with apparent success by some schools through, for instance, the 'blended services' approach adopted by some American schools or the reconstruction of special educational needs approaches in some UK schools. **Dismantling structural barriers in turn implies an increase in the level of staff collaboration as an alternative to segregated specialisation.** It also implies **the adoption of pedagogical approaches which enable students to learn together rather than separately.** These might include constructivist approaches in which students are encouraged to make their own sense of learning activities and to develop their understanding with the facilitation of their teachers but also through interaction with their peers. Again, however, there are national policy issues, given the encouragement of schools in recent years to establish setting systems and alternative curriculum pathways, together with the content-heavy and standards-driven nature of much of the curriculum.

- School-parent relations have long been a focus of policy attention in special needs education and are increasingly important in wider education policy. The implication of this review is that **schools should build close relations with parents and communities based on developing a**

shared commitment to inclusive values. This will be far from straightforward in many cases, but Kratzer's study (RI 206) suggests that allowing different viewpoints to be aired may be more important than striving for absolute uniformity of views. Again, there may be implications for national policies which cast parents in the role of proxy consumers of education on behalf of their own children rather than as members of a wider community with shared interests and priorities.

7.3 Recommendations for research

- We have set out in previous chapters what we see as the strengths and limitations of the research we reviewed and, in particular, have outlined the sort of study/ies which would be necessary to answer our review question effectively. A key recommendation, therefore, is that **at least one such study be undertaken and, preferably, that a number of complementary studies be undertaken for the purposes of replication and the grounding of the evidential base in a range of school and system contexts.** Amongst other things, such studies would make it possible to test the soundness of the recommendations for policy and practice made above. We emphasise that such studies would require depth, if not scale, and that they would therefore demand appropriate levels of funding. It is an opportune time to move beyond the relatively small-scale, superficial and low-cost studies which we have encountered repeatedly in our review.

- The prevalence of these small-scale studies, the methodological limitations of much that we reviewed and the scant reporting of methodological details in many studies lends support to some of the criticisms of education research which have been made in recent years. We have suggested some reasons why these limitations might be apparent, in terms, for instance, of the development of the inclusive education field and the different (and entirely legitimate) uses of research and research-like activities. Nonetheless, the absence of substantial and trustworthy studies in a field of such considerable relevance to current policy and practice is worrying. What is most striking is the apparently *ad hoc* and individual-researcher-driven nature of research in this field, with no evidence of systematic, cumulative and co-ordinated attempts to address priority issues. This is true, it would appear, on both sides of the Atlantic. **There would seem to be a need, therefore, for a more programmatic approach to research,** in this field at least, though we fully acknowledge the difficulties and complexities which the development of such an approach would encounter.

- More specifically, the lack of detail about methodology in much of the literature suggests that **practices of research reporting need to change**. This would require change in the expectations of researchers as to what detail they will provide and this might be facilitated if journal editors were routinely to insist that certain minimum reporting standards had to be met. This might not be the only route. With an increase in electronic journal publication and the multiplication of researcher websites, it might also be possible for detailed technical reports to be available electronically and to be referenced in those journal articles where there are space constraints or where conceptual or policy issues are the immediate focus.

- Our reflections on the systematic review process itself also lead us to make recommendations about how it might be developed. Our experience of the power of the process to separate out the different kinds of research and quasi-research and, therefore, to identify and test claims for empirical evidence, leads us to argue that **systematic reviewing should become more firmly established amongst the research methodologies in education**. However, **the methods for systematic reviewing to which we had access are in need of considerable development** if they are to be useful across a wider range of legitimate inquiry in education. We are also aware that systematic reviewing has its critics and that those critics are concerned that it might come to be seen as the *only* way to engage legitimately with research literature – indeed, that it might come to determine what counts as legitimate research itself. We therefore recommend, therefore, that **the limitations of systematic reviewing in its current form be made as clear as its strengths and that the claims that are made for it are based on a sense of its place in a wide range of equally legitimate, but somewhat different methodologies.** In particular, whilst we think that systematic reviews usefully identify some 'safe knowledge' on which policy and practice can be based, we resist any implication that this is the only sort of knowledge which is fit for this purpose, or that the development of policy and practice have to wait for evidence from systematic reviews before they can change.

7.4 Recommendations for the field

- We have argued above that inclusive education is (in its current form, at least) a relatively young field which inevitably lacks a well-established empirical research base and which in any case has somewhat distinctive ways of using research to aid its development. **We recommend that such a base be developed and suggest that it may demand a more co-ordinated approach than has hitherto been adopted**. Although we do not think that the development of more inclusive policies and practices should be have to wait for more trustworthy research evidence to be available, we are concerned at how little evidence is currently available to inform developments.

- We have also commented on indicators of maturity in the field. We understand entirely why there has been an emphasis on the critical deconstruction of exclusive practices (for instance in special education), on the conceptual development of the notion of inclusion and on illustrative studies of apparently inclusive practices and schools. We also understand the interest of scholars in exploring research methodologies which avoid some of the unproblematised positivist assumptions which characterised earlier attempts to research issues around student diversity. Nonetheless, the literature is filled with empirical claims: that 'inclusive' schools , for instance, have particular characteristics or that particular classroom practices lead to greater student participation, or that particular change processes lead schools towards greater inclusivity. **Where such empirical claims are made, they need to be tested empirically.** In particular, where the exploratory work of one scholar leads to such claims being made, other scholars need to be prepared to undertake the testing so that some sort of cumulative development of a robust evidence base becomes possible.

- We note the powerful role which critical perspectives have played in the development of the field, particularly in their analyses of how responses to diversity are shot through with issues of interest and power. However, we also note that similarly critical perspectives are much less evident in attempts to reconstruct an inclusive alternative to special education and other segregating practices. **We therefore recommend that these attempts be subjected to critical scrutiny.**

- More generally, we have commented on the extent to which research in this field is characterised by a certain circularity in which there is often little in the research process which could bring into question the assumptions that are built into the research design. **We suggest that it would be a mark of growing maturity in the field if inclusive education researchers were more willing to engage in such problematising work.** This would involve a greater willingness to test claims of inclusivity, focus on outcomes for students (as opposed to teacher accounts of values and practices), triangulate different kinds and sources of data, search for disconfirmatory evidence and pursue alternative theoretical explanations of findings. Our view is that, whilst we understand concerns that some scholars may have about jeopardising hard-won ground, such an approach would strengthen the field rather than otherwise.

8. REFERENCES

Ainscow M (1994) *Special needs in the classroom: a teacher education guide*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers/UNESCO Publishing

Ainscow M (1999) *Understanding the development of inclusive schools*. London: Falmer Press

Blunkett D (1999) Social exclusion and the politics of opportunity: a mid-term progress check, a speech by the Rt Hon David Blunkett MP. London: DfEE

Booth T, Ainscow M, Black-Hawkins K, Vaughan M, Shaw L (2000*) Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education

Campbell C, Gillborn D, Lunt I, Robertson P, Sammons P, Vincent C, Warren S, Whitty G (2000) *A review of developments in inclusive schooling: a report to the Scottish Executive Education Department*. London: Institute of Education University of London

Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A (1995) Towards inclusive schools: mapping the field. In Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A (eds) *Towards inclusive schools?* London: David Fulton Publishers

DfEE (1997) *Excellence for all children: meeting special educational needs*. London: The Stationery Office

Dyson A (1999) Inclusion and inclusions: theories and discourses in inclusive education. In: Daniels H, Garner P (eds) *World yearbook of education 1999: Inclusive Education*. London: Kogan Page

EPPI-Centre (2001) *Guidelines for extracting data and quality assessing primary studies in educational research (version 0.94).* London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit

Fullan M, Stiegelbauer S (1991) *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassell

Harden A, Oakley A, Oliver S (2001) Peer-delivered health promotion for young people: a systematic review of different study designs. *Health Education Journal* 60: 339-353

Hegarty S (1993) Reviewing the literature on integration. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 8(3): 194-200

Lipsky DK, Gartner A (1997) *Inclusion and school reform: transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H Brookes

Ofsted (2000) *Evaluating educational inclusion*. London: Ofsted

Pijl SJ, Meijer CJW, Hegarty S (eds) (1997) *Inclusive education: a global agenda*. London: Routledge

Sebba J, Sachdev D (1997) *What works in inclusive education*. Ilford: Barnardo's

Shepherd J, Garcia J, Oliver S, Harden A, Rees R, Brunton G, Oakley A (2001) *Barriers to, and facilitators of, the health of young people*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit

Skrtic TM (1991) *Behind special education: a critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Denver, US: Love

UNESCO (1994) *Final Report: world conference on special needs education: access and quality*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

APPENDIX A: Search strategy

1. Sources

The search strategy combined a number of sources to identify potentially relevant studies. These are listed below.

1.1 Personal contacts

Mel Ainscow, Manchester University
Julie Allan, Stirling University
Alfredo Artiles, Vanderbilt University
Amanda Barlow, Wensley Fold Primary School, Blackburn (ESRC)
Tony Booth, Christ Church Canterbury
Anne Connor, School Improvement Officer, Blackburn with Darwen LEA
Paul Dukes, Gillbrook School (ESRC)
Alan Dyson, Newcastle University
Pat Elton, Redcar and Cleveland LEA
Jennifer Evans, London University, Institute of Education
Peter Farrell, Manchester University
Jo Frankham, Manchester University
Frances Gallannaugh, Newcastle University
Paul Greenway, SEN Manager, Blackburn and Darwen
Andrew Howes, Manchester University
Joseph Kisanji, Open University of Tanzania
Robina Mallett, NAGSEN
Alan Millward, Newcastle University
Nithi Muthukrishna, University of Durban
Amanda Naisbett, Redcar and Cleveland LEA
Brahm Norwich, Exeter University
Caroline Roaf, Support for Learning
Barbara Roberts, Newcastle University
Darshan Sachdev, Barnardo's and latterly Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Health Authority
Judy Sebba, Department for Education and Skills
Roger Slee, University of Western Australia
Dame Dela Smith, Beaumont Hill Special School, Darlington and NAGSEN
Roy Smith, Christ Church Canterbury
Sally Tomlinson, University of Oxford
Carrie Weston, Christ Church Canterbury
Vanessa Wiseman, Langdon School, Newham and NAGSEN

1.2 Handsearching of the following journals

British Educational Research Journal (January 1997-March 2001) 16(1) – 27(3)
British Journal of Educational Psychology (1990-2000) 60(1) – 71(1)
British Journal of Special Education (March 1974-September 2001) 1(1) – 28(3)
European Journal of Special Needs Education (March 1993-June 2001) 8(1) – 16(2)
Exceptional Children (September 1979-Spring 2001) 46(1) – 67(3)

International Journal of Disability Development and Education (1997-2000) 44(1) – 47(4)
International Journal of Inclusive Education (January 1997-March 2001) 1(1) – 5(1)
Journal of Learning Disabilities (January 1991-June 2001) 24(1) – 34(3)
Journal of Special Education (Spring 1980-Spring 2001) 14(1) – 35(1)
Remedial and Special Education (January 1984-June 2001) 5(1) – 22(3)
Support for Learning (August 1986-May 2001) 1(1) – 16(2)

1.3 Electronic databases

Database	Date	Location
Article First (OCLC index of articles from the contents pages of journals)	1990-	First Search
BPLC (British Library Catalogue)		Web
BOPCAS (British Official Publications Current Awareness Service)	1995	Web
British Education Index	1986-2001	Ovid
Conference Papers Index	1982	CSA
COPAC (merged online catalogues of Consortium of University Research Libraries CURL)		Web
Dissertations (Dissertations Abstracts 1861and Index to Theses 1970)	1861	First Search
ECO (Electronic Collections Online) an OCLC collection of scholarly journals	1995	First Search
Education Abs (Leading publications in the field of education)	1983	First Search
ERIC (Journal articles and reports on education topics)	1966	First Search
ERIC digests	2000-2001	Web
GPO (US Government publications)	1976	First Search
Papers First (Conference Papers all subjects)	1993	First Search
Proceedings (Conference Proceedings all subjects)	1993	First Search
PsycINFO	1967	CSA
SIRS Researcher	1988	First Search
UKOP On-line (United Kingdom Official Publications)	1980	Web
ZETOC	1993	Web

Note: All databases were searched from their inception until August 2001.

1.4 Websites of organisations commissioning or holding research in educational and social inclusion

ABI/INFORM Global: http://www.umi.com/proquest/global.html
AERA: www.aera.net
ANBAR Electronic Intelligence Library: http://www.anbar.com/MCB/index.html
Barnardo's: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/About Barnardos/publications
BERA: http://www.bera.ac.uk
British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTA): http://www.becta.org.uk/index.cfm
Caredata Web: http://www.nisw2.org.uk/cdweb/webmenu.html
CEDAR (Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research): http://www.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/CEDAR/pubs.html
Centre for Longitudinal Studies – Institute of Education: http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/Research/research.htm
CSIE (Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education): http://www.inclusion.uwe.ac.uk/csie.csiehome.htm
Department of Education Northern Ireland: http://www.deni.gov.uk/index.htm
Education-line: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol
ERA (Educational Research Abstracts): http://www.catchword.co.uk/era
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation: http://www.efct.org.uk/links.html
European Union: http://europa.eu.int/
Government sources: http://www.open.gov.uk
International Bureau of Education: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/Links/linkhome.htm
JRF: http://www.jrf.org.uk
Learning and Skills Development Agency: http://www.feda.ac.uk/mainpage/
National Institute of Urban School Improvement Resource Database: http://www.edc.org/urban
NFER: www.nfer.ac.uk/research
NISS: www.niss.ac.uk/search.html
Northern Ireland Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment: http://www.ccea.org.uk/pubs.htm
OECD: www.oecd.org/cer
REGARD (ESRC funded research): http://www.regard.ac.uk/regard/home/index-html
Scottish Council for Research in Education: http://www.scre.ac.uk/
Scottish Executive Education Department: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/hmis/edru.asp
Teacher Training Agency: http://www.canteach.gov.uk/
UK Data Archive (ESSEX): http://www.data-archive.ac.uk
UNESCO: www.unesco.org/iiep
Voluntary organisations: www.vois.org.uk not yet available

1.5 Circulation of a letter to all LEAs (and equivalent bodies) in the UK and to charitable bodies known to have an interest in social and educational inclusion requesting unpublished research.

1.6 Citations identified through the initial screening of full reports and from other reviews.

2. Search terms

Search terms were devised for individual databases in accordance with the categorisation used in the thesaurus of each. They are shown in the tables below. The search strategy developed has common key terms with specific modifications to individual databases dependent on the subject headings or descriptors used within each. Where subject headings were available, these were used in combination with agreed free text terms. Where no subject headings existed, a common agreed set of free text terms was used. 'Wildcards' (e.g. 'inclusi* inclusion/inclusive) were used to search for words in some databases. Where these were not accepted by databases, all alternatives of the word were entered.

Search terms by database

Article 1st and ECO

free text term (ftt)	limited by ftt	limited by ftt
mainstreaming *or* inclusi* *or* diversity *or* participation *or* equal education	school*	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

BOPCAS

free text terms
inclusive education

BPLC

subject heading	free text terms
mainstreaming in education	inclusive education inclusive school inclusive schools

British Education Index

subject headings (sh)	limited by sh
mainstreaming *or* participation *or* equal education *or* special educational needs *or* special education teachers	educational practices *or* educational change *or* educational policy *or* educational principles *or* change strategies *or* educational improvement *or* educational innovation *or* school organisation *or* school policy *or* school management *or* school effectiveness *or* school systems

Conference Papers Index

free text terms (ftt)	limited by ftt
inclusi* *or* mainstreaming *or* diversity *or* involvement *or* participation	school*

COPAC

subject heading	limited by ftt
mainstreaming in education	inclusive schools and inclusive education

Dissertations

free text terms (ftt)	limited by ftt	limited by ftt
mainstreaming *or* inclusi* *or* student diversity *or* student participation *or* equal education	school*	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

Education Abstracts

subject heading (sh)	**limited by sh**	**limited by ftt**
mainstreaming *or* student diversity *or* student participation	schools	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

ERIC

subject heading (sh)	**limited by sh**	**limited by ftt**
inclusive schools *or* mainstreaming *or* equal education *or* diversity *or* participation (student)	schools	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

GPO

subject headings	**limited by ftt**
mainstreaming in education *or* inclusive education	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

Papers First

free text terms (ftt)	**limited by ftt**
inclusi* *or* mainstreaming *or* diversity *or* participation *or* involvement	school *or* schools *or* schooling

Proceedings

free text terms (ftt)	limited by ftt
inclusi* *or* mainstreaming *or* diversity *or* participation	school *or* schools *or* schooling

PsycINFO

descriptors (d)	limited by ftt	limited by ftt
Mainstreaming (educational) *or* equal education *or* participation	school* *or* inclusi* *or* diversity	culture *or* policy *or* principles *or* effectiveness *or* practice* *or* strateg* *or* development *or* improvement *or* innovation *or* change

SIRS Researcher

subject heading
mainstreaming in education

UKOP

free text terms
student participation *or* student diversity *or* inclusive schools *or* inclusive education *or* research

ZETOC

free text terms (ftt)	limited by ftt
inclusion *or* inclusive *or* mainstreaming *or* diversity *or* participation *or* equal education	schools

APPENDIX B: Review-specific questions

Section A Questions

A.1. Does the study present evidence relating explicitly to participation of groups of commonly marginalised students?	**A.1.1** Yes **A.1.2.** No
A.2 What are these groups? *Write in details.*	**A.2.1** Special educational needs **A.2.2** Disability **A.2.3** Ethnicity **A.2.4** Cultural diversity **A.2.5** Linguistic diversity **A.2.6** Socio-economic status **A.2.7** Gender **A.2.8** Attainment **A.2.9** Behaviour **A.2.10** Sexuality **A.2.11** Other **A.2.12** Not clear
A.3 Is detailed evidence provided for each of these groups? *If NO, please state for which group/s the evidence is most detailed.*	**A 3.1** Yes **A.3.2.** No
A.4 Does the study provide evidence of student participation (or lack of participation)?	***A.4.1*** *Yes* ***A.4.2*** *No*
A.5 To what aspect/s of student participation (or lack of participation) does the evidence relate? *Write in details.*	**A.5.1** School intake **A.5.2** Maintaining the presence of the full range of students in school **A.5.3** Presence of all students in ordinary classrooms **A.5.4** Access to mainstream curriculum **A.5.5** Involvement in shared learning activities **A.5.6** Student learning **A.5.7** Progression from school **A.5.8** Staff-student relationships **A.5.9** Student-student relationships **A.5.10** Students' sense of acceptance and being valued **A.5.11** Other **A.5.12** Unclear
A.6 Is detailed evidence provided for each of the above mentioned aspects of participation?	**A.6.1** Yes **A.6.2** No

If NO, please state on which aspect/s of participation the evidence is the most detailed.	
A.7. What data on student participation is presented? *Write in details.*	**A.7.1** Intake data **A.7.2** Student perceptions **A.7.3** Staff perceptions **A.7.4** Parental perceptions **A.7.5** Other stakeholder perceptions **A.7.6** Learning outcomes **A.7.7** Student progression data **A.7.8** Disciplinary exclusion/non-exclusion data **A.7.9** Attendance data **A.7.10** Student grouping data **A.7.11** Curriculum analyses **A.7.12** Socio-metric data **A.7.13** Classroom observation data **A.7.14** Out of classroom observation data **A.7.15** Documentary analysis **A.7.16** Other

Section B Questions

B.1 Does the study demonstrate a link between aspects of school action and student participation?	**B.1.1** Yes **B.1.2** No
B.2 Which of these aspects are linked in this way? *Write in details.*	**B.2.1** Espoused policies **B.2.1** Staff attitudes and values **B.2.3** Staff interactions **B.2.4** Staff skills and capacities **B.2.5** Staff development processes **B.2.6** Leadership **B.2.7** Curriculum content and structure **B.2.8** Pedagogy **B.2.9** Student grouping **B.2.10** Organisational structures **B.2.11** Physical environment **B.2.12** Funding and resourcing **B.2.13** Internal student support structures and practices **B.2.14** Links with external student support structures and practices **B.2.15** Links with external school support and development structures and practices **B.2.16** Other **B 2.17** Not clear
B.3 On what ground are these links inferred? *Write in details.*	**B.3.1** A descriptive account of the association of these factors and indicators of student participation in one or more schools **B.3.2** A detailed analysis of the interactions between these factors and indicators of student participation in one or more schools **B.3.3** A correlational analysis of the relationships between changes in these factors and changes in indicators of participation in one or more schools **B.3.4** Stakeholder (teacher, student, parent etc) accounts **B.3.5** Other **B.3.6** Not clear
B.4 Is the evidence sufficient for the links to be considered to be adequately demonstrated?	**B.4.1** Yes **B.4.2** No *Write in justification.*
B.5 Do you have any other comments on how far this study illuminates our review question?	**B.5.1** Yes **B.5.2** No *Write in details.*

Appendix C

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
89 Ainscow (1999)	Descriptive	This 'study' uses data from various settings to construct the case for a particular form of school development which it is argued constitutes as well as promotes 'inclusion'.	Many countries (e.g. UK, China, Ghana, Australia, Nicaragua)	Not stated	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)
99 Ballard (1998)	Descriptive	This is a quasi-ethnographic case study of an inclusive school with the researchers spending periods of time over one year in school, interviewing key stakeholders and carrying out observations.	New Zealand	Primary	Culture: Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Tensions and contradictions Leadership/distributed leadership Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support) Positive outcomes for students
103 Booth (1998)	Descriptive	This is a longitudinal study of a high school's response to the diversity of its student body carried out by three experienced researchers. It explores the contradictory pressures on and within schools and the processes of inclusion and exclusion at work.	England	High/ community	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
128 Black-Hawkins (1999)	Descriptive	This paper is based on an ethnographic study of a UK secondary school and focuses on the theme of 'managing power'. It presents a reflection on the significance of culture in the understanding of processes of inclusion and exclusion in schools.	UK	11-18 comprehensive	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Leadership/distributed leadership Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
130 Parilla (1999)	Process evaluation	This is the first phase of a two-phase research project designed to study and collaborate with schools developing inclusive practice. This first phase involves a survey of 'innovative schools' and an analysis of the educational innovations resulting from policy directives.	Spain	Infant schools (3-6), infant primary (3-12), primary-middle (3-14), primary-secondary (6-16), high (14-18)	Culture: Staff collaboration Structures and practices: restructuring Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
132 Rouse (1996)	Descriptive	This study is a cross-cultural analysis using data from a two-year study of inclusive schools in Utah and a subsequent one-year study in Newham, London. The intention was to identify similarities and differences in characteristics of such schools and to point out features which support or obstruct progress towards inclusiveness.	USA and England	Elementary, middle and secondary in USA, primary in UK	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Tensions and contradictions Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Pedagogical development Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
142 Kugelmass (2001)	**Descriptive**	**This is a longitudinal ethnographic case study of an inclusive school carried out in two phases and concerned with describing the evolution of the school and the role of collaboration in its successful reform.**	**USA**	**Elementary**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)** **Staff collaboration** **Student collaboration** **Parent /community collaboration** **Collaborative learning amongst staff** **Tensions and contradictions** **Leadership/distributed leadership** **Structures and practices: Restructuring** **Pedagogical development** **Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)** **Positive outcomes for students**
143 Heckman (1996)	Outcome/ Process evaluation	This study describes the implementation process and outcomes of a school change initiative 'Educational and Community Change' (EEC) Project carried out in a number of schools. It attempts to describe the effectiveness of a facilitative process, which helps schools and their communities reflect on current practice and improve student outcomes.	USA	8 elementary and 1 middle	Culture: Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Structures and practices: Restructuring Positive outcomes for students

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
151 Ferguson (2001)	Descriptive	This study attempts to document the changes in one of a number of schools engaged in change and renewal as they move towards the development of an inclusive culture. It is based on a two-day data-collection visit, involving observation and interviews with stakeholders including a group of students.	USA	Elementary	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Pedagogical development Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
152 Florian (2001)	Outcome/ Process evaluation	This is a two-phase 'longitudinal' evaluation of a jointly funded LEA and Charitable Body inclusive education project. The study seeks to evaluate the project against its stated aims and to illuminate processes.	England	11-16 comprehensive	Leadership/distributed leadership Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support) Positive outcomes for students
156 Deering (1996)	**Descriptive**	**This is an ethnographic study conducted over 18 months which focused on the cultural norms regarding inclusion and co-operation at one middle school. The study uses multiple data sources to explore the implicit and explicit interpretations of these norms.**	**USA**	**Middle (10-14 yrs)**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Tensions and contradictions Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Restructuring Positive outcomes for students**

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
157 Bonal (1999)	Descriptive	This study makes use of Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse in an exploration of the recontextualisation process of educational diversity in the context of recent educational policy changes in Spain. It uses evidence from an empirical research project which combined an analysis of educational policy documents and pedagogic texts with teacher and headteacher interviews.	Spain	4 secondary (2 public, 2 private)	Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
158 Ainscow (1995)	Descriptive	This report draws on the findings of three large studies in which action research has been used to explore innovatory ways in which teachers respond to student diversity.	Several schools in developed and developing countries: named examples in UK and India	Primary, secondary and special	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Restructuring Pedagogical development Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
168 Corbett (2001)	Process evaluation	This is a small case study focusing on the pedagogical and organisational implications of an inclusive orientation to education. The study was carried out over one term by the researcher observing and talking with participants across the institution.	UK	Primary	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Parent /community collaboration Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Pedagogical development Policy context (impact of policy/ management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support) Positive outcomes for students
183 Campbell (1996)	Descriptive	This is a case study of a single school which focuses on the tensions between responding to student diversity, emphasising students' socialisation needs and teaching according to the academic curriculum. The main aim of the study seems to be to examine the philosophical differences amongst teachers within a school operating a policy of inclusion	Canada	Secondary	Culture: Tensions and contradictions Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
184 Pickett (1994)	**Descriptive**	**This study explores students' views of diversity and inclusive education in two contrasting schools (one described as inclusive the other as traditional) and relates these to other evidence about the school to discover how students' attitudes may be linked to the organisational structures and cultures of their schools.**	**USA**	**2 middle schools**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Tensions and contradictions Structures and practices: Restructuring Pedagogical development Positive outcomes for students**

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
186 Dyson (2000)	**Process evaluation**	**This is a 'longitudinal' study encompassing three academic years of how a number of case study schools constructed policies of inclusion and translated them into practices. It focuses on dissonances within such schools.**	**UK**	**Comprehensive**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)** **Staff collaboration** **Collaborative learning amongst staff** **Tensions and contradictions** **Structures and practices: Restructuring** **Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)**
187 Gillborn (2000)	Descriptive	This study attempts to identify the mechanisms that give rise to educational inequity, particularly in relation to GCSE outcomes, by carrying out an in-depth study over a period of two years of the processes at work in two case study schools. There is a particular and initial focus on GCSE 'tiering' but this is widened to include an investigation of how reforms more broadly were being experienced and how they affected issues of equity in school.	England	1 comprehensive and 1 grant maintained secondary school	Culture: Tensions and contradictions Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
188 Alderson (1999)	Process evaluation	This study describes one school's attempts over the last decade to respond to the sometimes contradictory challenges of inclusion and raising educational standards. The researcher presents material gathered from interviews and written accounts.	UK	Primary with nursery	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Student collaboration Structures and practices: Pedagogical development Positive outcomes for students

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
189 Wang (1995)	Outcome/ Process evaluation	This study uses three examples of inner city schools to investigate the feasibility of programme implementation and positive outcomes for students within the first year of the Learning Cities Program (LCP) school improvement initiative. There is no investigation of the programme implementation process	USA	2 elementary and 1 middle	Culture: Staff collaboration Parent /community collaboration Structures and practices: Restructuring Pedagogical development Positive outcomes for students
203 Stickney (1996)	Descriptive	This is a reflective narrative case study and analysis of a 'self-renewing' school. Its purpose was to understand the school and add to the literature on school renewal.	USA	Primary	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Student collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Structures and practices: Restructuring
205 Hunt (2000)	**Descriptive**	**This study uses focus group research methods to investigate the alignment of special education with other reform efforts at a targeted urban school. It explores the structures, practices, and perspectives that promoted and supported such reform and the contribution of programmes to the academic and social benefit of all students.**	**USA**	**Elementary**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Student collaboration Parent /community collaboration Collaborative learning amongst staff Tensions and contradictions Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices:**

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
					Restructuring **Pedagogical development** **Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)** **Positive outcomes for students**
206 Kratzer (1997)	**Descriptive**	**This is a single site case study conducted over one year which used a combination of data sources including 250 hrs of participant observation. Its purpose was to discover how the school used its diversity to foster community.**	**USA**	**Elementary**	**Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)** **Staff collaboration** **Student collaboration** **Parent /community collaboration** **Tensions and contradictions** **Leadership/distributed leadership** **Structures and practices: Restructuring** **Pedagogical development** **Positive outcomes for students**
207 Ainscow (1999)	Descriptive	This study which formed part of a larger international comparative study uses unstructured group interviews to explore students' experiences of school as the pertain to participation.	England	Secondary	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Tensions and contradictions Structures and practices: Restructuring Positive outcomes for students

Synthesis Table 1: Characteristics of included studies (cont'd)

Note: The six studies in bold are 'Key studies'.

Study ID	Study type	Characteristics of studies	Country	Type of school	Themes identified from findings
208 Slee (1991)	Descriptive	This study used a self-report survey of a number of identified inclusive schools to ascertain school factors relating to successful inclusion. A sample of these schools was then visited and a list of significant issues derived from an analysis of the evidence.	Australia	Primary and secondary	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Staff collaboration Structures and practices: Restructuring Pedagogical development Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)
209 Davies (2001)	Process evaluation	This study attempts to understand inclusionary changes that took place over four years in several case study schools. The author was committed to a research position that assisted in the change process.	UK	High schools (mainly)	Culture: Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community) Leadership/distributed leadership Structures and practices: Pedagogical development
210 Clark (1997)	Descriptive	This is a case study of a 'whole school' attempt to transform its approach to special needs in an effort to realise principles of equity and participation. It describes the extent to which the school has been successful and the tensions and difficulties experienced.	England	Comprehensive	Culture: Tensions and contradictions Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)

Synthesis Table 2: Characteristics of key studies

ID	Range of diversity to which school responds	Groups for which detailed evidence is provided	Aspects of participation to which study relates and (in bold) for which detailed evidence is provided	Source of data on participation	School actions linked to participation	Ground on which the link is inferred	Link established?
184	SEN Disability Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic status Attainment Behaviour	SEN Disability Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic status Attainment Behaviour	**School intake** Maintaining the presence of the full range of students in school The presence of all students in ordinary classrooms Access to mainstream curriculum Involvement in shared learning activities **Student learning** **Student progression** **Staff-student relationships** **Student-student relationships** **Students' sense of acceptance and being valued**	Intake data Student perceptions Staff perceptions Others perceptions Learning outcomes Student grouping data Classroom observation data Out of classroom observation data Documentary analysis	Espoused policies Staff attitudes and values Staff interactions Staff skills and capacities Curriculum content Pedagogy Student grouping Physical environment Funding and resourcing Internal student support structures	Stakeholder accounts and a comparison of views and policies/practices in an inclusive school and a traditional school	No. The author acknowledges that the findings are only speculative in relation to the link.
186	SEN Behaviour	SEN Behaviour, but a narrow range of evidence generated	School intake Maintaining the presence of the full range of students in school The presence and involvement of all students in ordinary classrooms Access to mainstream curriculum Involvement in shared learning activities	Intake data Staff perceptions Others perceptions Student progression data Student grouping data Classroom observation data	Espoused policies Staff attitudes and values Staff interactions Staff skills and capacities Staff development Leadership Curriculum	A detailed analysis of the interactions between these factors and indicators of student participation	No. Insufficient attention to observable practice to be confident of the theorised link

Synthesis Table 2: Characteristics of key studies (cont'd)

ID	Range of diversity to which school responds	Groups for which detailed evidence is provided	Aspects of participation to which study relates and (in bold) for which detailed evidence is provided	Source of data on participation	School actions linked to participation	Ground on which the link is inferred	Link established?
			Student learning Staff-student relationships		content Pedagogy Student grouping Organisational structures Funding and resourcing Internal student support structures		
156	SEN Disability Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic status	Most detailed for Ethnic, Cultural and Linguistic groups in terms of School Gender Attainment Behaviour	School intake The presence of all students in ordinary classrooms Access to mainstream curriculum Involvement in shared learning activities **Staff-student** intake. For peer relationships, detailed for SEN, Ethnicity, Cultural, Linguistic, Gender, Attainment and Behaviour.	Intake data Student perceptions Staff perceptions Parental perceptions Others perceptions Learning outcomes Student progression data **relationships** **Student-student relationships** **Student learning** Parental involvement and staff-community involvement in school leadership	Espoused policies Staff attitudes and values Staff interactions Staff skills and Capacities Student grouping data Socio-metric data Classroom observation data Out of classroom observation data Documentary analysis	Stakeholder accounts and a detailed analysis of the interactions between these factors and indicators of student participation Staff development Leadership Curriculum content Pedagogy Student grouping Organisational structures Physical environment Internal student support structures	Yes

Synthesis Table 2: Characteristics of key studies (cont'd)

ID	Range of diversity to which school responds	Groups for which detailed evidence is provided	Aspects of participation to which study relates and (in bold) for which detailed evidence is provided	Source of data on participation	School actions linked to participation	Ground on which the link is inferred	Link established?
						Links with external student support structures	
205	SEN Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic status	SEN Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic status	**School intake** **Maintaining the presence of the full range of students in school** **The presence of all students in ordinary classrooms** **Access to mainstream curriculum** **Aspects of participation to which study relates and (in bold) for which detailed evidence is provided** **Involvement in shared learning activities** **Student learning** **Student-student relationships** **Students' sense of acceptance and being valued**	Intake data Staff perceptions Parental perceptions Student grouping data Links with external school support structures Parents playing a role as key supporters of development.	Staff attitudes and values Staff skills and capacities Leadership Curriculum content Pedagogy Student grouping Organisational structures Funding and Resourcing Internal student support structures	A descriptive account of the association of these factors and indicators of student participation in one or more schools	No. Strong evidence that stakeholders believe the link exists. However, reviewers are not convinced of the representative-ness of the views expressed.

Synthesis Table 2: Characteristics of key studies (cont'd)

ID	Range of diversity to which school responds	Groups for which detailed evidence is provided	Aspects of participation to which study relates and (in bold) for which detailed evidence is provided	Source of data on participation	School actions linked to participation	Ground on which the link is inferred	Link established?
142	SEN Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic	SEN	**School intake** **The presence of all students in ordinary classrooms** **Access to mainstream curriculum** **Student learning** **Student-student relationships** **Students' sense of acceptance and being valued**	Intake data Staff perceptions Others perceptions Learning outcomes Classroom observation data Out of classroom observation data Documentary analysis	Espoused policies Staff attitudes and values Staff interactions Staff skills and capacities Staff development Leadership Curriculum content Pedagogy Student grouping Organisational structures Internal student support structures Links with external student support structures	Stakeholder accounts	Presents supportive evidence for link but no attempt to question links or provide alternative reading of data

Synthesis Table 2: Characteristics of key studies (cont'd)

ID	Range of diversity to which school responds	Groups for which detailed evidence is provided		Source of data on participation	School actions linked to participation	Ground on which the link is inferred	Link established?
206	SEN Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic	SEN Ethnicity Cultural Linguistic Socio-economic	**School intake** **Access to mainstream curriculum** **Involvement in shared learning activities** **Student learning** **Staff-student relationships** **Student-student relationships** **Students' sense of acceptance and being valued** **Internal student support structures** **Valuing diverse skills of staff**	Intake data Student perceptions Staff perceptions Parental perceptions Others perceptions Learning outcomes Student grouping data Curriculum analyses Classroom observation data Out of classroom observation data Documentary analysis	Espoused policies Staff attitudes and values Staff interactions Staff skills and capacities Staff development Leadership Curriculum content Pedagogy Student grouping Organisational structures	Stakeholder accounts	Yes, but associative

Synthesis Table 3: Analysis of findings – key themes

Identified themes	Related key studies	Related other studies
Culture		
Values and attitudes (inclusive valuing of all/shared vision/sense of community)	184, 205, 206, 142, 156, 186	158, 132, 188, 99, 209, 103, 168, 151, 207, 208, 203, 128
Staff collaboration	184, 206, 142, 205, 156, 186	158, 168, 207, 130, 132, 151, 208, 189, 128
Student collaboration	205, 156, 142, 206	158, 99, 143, 203
Parent/community collaboration	184, 206, 142, 156, 205	158, 188, 99, 128, 168, 151, 143, 189
Collaborative learning amongst staff	186, 184, 142, 205	89, 158, 99, 203, 168, 151, 143
Tensions and contradictions	206, 142, 184, 205, 156, 186	99, 128, 183, 210, 103, 187, 207, 132
Leadership/distributed leadership	206, 142, 205, 156,	158, 99, 128, 209, 168, 151, 152, 132
Structure and practices		
Restructuring	184, 206, 142, 205, 186, 156	158, 143, 207, 130, 208, 203, 189
Pedagogical development (quality of teaching/curriculum/staff development/group work/constructivist pedagogy)	184, 206, 142, 205	188, 209, 168, 132, 151, 208, 189, 158, 99
Policy context (impact of policy/management and adequacy of resources/impact of political support)	142, 205, 186	158, 99, 157, 183, 168, 151, 187, 152, 132, 208, 128, 210, 130
Positive outcomes for students	184, 206, 205, 142, 156	188, 99, 168, 151, 143, 207, 152, 189

Synthesis Table 4: Quality assessment – outcomes of reviewers' gradings and cross-checking with EPPI tool

Study ID	Quality criteria met (1-8) see Key* / Reviewers' assessment of quality	Grading on dimension A: soundness of method	Grading on dimension B: appropriateness of study design	Grading on dimension C: relevance of topic focus	Weight of evidence =D
89 Ainscow (1999)	None met/Some reservations	Low	Low	High	Low
99 Ballard (1998)	1, 3, (7), 8 / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
103 Booth (1998)	1, 2, 3, 4, (5), (8) / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
128 Black-Hawkins (1999)	(2), 3, 4, (5) / Serious reservations	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
130 Parilla (1999)	1, 2, 3, (4), 5, 6/ Some reservations	Medium	Low	Low	Low
132 Rouse (1996)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
142 Kugelmass (2001)	**1, 2, 3, (4), (5), (6), (7) / High quality**	**High**	**Medium**	**High**	**High**
143 Heckman (1996)	1, 3, / Serious reservations	Low	Low	Low	Low
151 Ferguson (2001)	3, (8) / Serious reservations	Low	Medium	High	Low

*** Key**

Brackets indicate reviewers suggested that this criterion was met 'partially'.

1. Adequacy of the description of the context of the study
2. Sufficiency of the justification for the way the study was conducted
3. Clarity of the reporting of the aims of the study
4. Adequacy of the description of the sample used in the study and how it was recruited
5. Adequacy of the description of the methods used for data collection and analysis
6. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data collection tools
7. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data analysis tools
8. Sufficiency of original data included in terms of enabling mediation between data and interpretation

Synthesis Table 4: Quality assessment – outcomes of reviewers' gradings and cross-checking with EPPI tool (cont'd)

Study ID	Quality criteria met (1-8) see Key* / Reviewers' assessment of quality	Grading on dimension A: soundness of method	Grading on dimension B: appropriateness of study design	Grading on dimension C: relevance of topic focus	Weight of evidence =D
152 Florian (2001)	(1), (2), 3, (4), (5) / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
156 Deering (1996)	**1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 / High quality**	**High**	**High**	**High**	**High**
157 Bonal (1999)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 / Some reservations	Medium	Low	Low	Low
158 Ainscow (1995)	(2), 3, (7) / Some reservations	Low	Medium	High	Low
168 Corbett (2001)	1, 2, 3, 4, (5), (8) / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
183 Campbell (1996)	3 / Serious reservations	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
184 Pickett (1994)	**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 / High quality**	**High**	**High**	**High**	**High**
186 Dyson (2000)	**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, (6), 7 ,8 / High quality**	**High**	**Medium**	**High**	**High**
187 Gillborn (2000)	1, 2 ,3, (4), (5), 8 / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
188 Alderson (1999)	(1), 2, 3, 4, (5), 8 / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

*** Key**

Brackets indicate reviewers suggested that this criterion was met 'partially'.

1. Adequacy of the description of the context of the study
2. Sufficiency of the justification for the way the study was conducted
3. Clarity of the reporting of the aims of the study
4. Adequacy of the description of the sample used in the study and how it was recruited
5. Adequacy of the description of the methods used for data collection and analysis
6. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data collection tools
7. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data analysis tools
8. Sufficiency of original data included in terms of enabling mediation between data and interpretation

Synthesis Table 4: Quality assessment – outcomes of reviewers' gradings and cross-checking with EPPI tool (cont'd)

Study ID	Quality criteria met (1-8) see Key* / Reviewers' assessment of quality	Grading on dimension A: soundness of method	Grading on dimension B: appropriateness of study design	Grading on dimension C: relevance of topic focus	Weight of evidence =D
189 Wang (1995)	(1), 3, (5), (6) / Serious reservations	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
203 Stickney (1996)	1, 2, 3/ Serious reservations	Low	Low	High	Low
205 Hunt (2000)	**1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 / High quality**	**High**	**Medium**	**High**	**High**
206 Kratzer (1997)	**1, 2, 3, (4), (5), 6/ High quality**	**High**	**Medium**	**High**	**High**
207 Ainscow (1999)	(1), (2), 3, 4, (5), (7), 8 / Some reservations	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
208 Slee (1991)	1, 2, 3 / Serious reservations	Low	Low	Medium	Low
209 Davies (2001)	3, (4), 8 / Some reservations	Low	Medium	High	Low
210 Clark (1997)	3, 4/ Serious reservations	Low	Medium	Medium	Low

*** Key**

Brackets indicate reviewers suggested that this criterion was met 'partially'.

8. Adequacy of the description of the context of the study
9. Sufficiency of the justification for the way the study was conducted
10. Clarity of the reporting of the aims of the study
11. Adequacy of the description of the sample used in the study and how it was recruited
12. Adequacy of the description of the methods used for data collection and analysis
13. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data collection tools
14. Sufficiency of attempts made to establish the reliability and validity of data analysis tools
15. Sufficiency of original data included in terms of enabling mediation between data and interpretation

APPENDIX D: Bibliographic details of reports of included studies

Ainscow M (1995) Special needs through school improvement; school improvement through special needs. In Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A (eds) *Towards inclusive schools?* London: David Fulton Publishers (study 158)

Ainscow M (1998) Reaching out to all learners: opportunities and possibilities. Paper presented at 'Keys to Learning', North of England Education Conference (study 89)

Ainscow M (1999) *Understanding the development of inclusive schools*. London: Falmer Press (study 89)

Ainscow M, Booth T, Dyson A (1999) Inclusion and exclusion in schools: listening to some hidden voices. In Ballard K (ed) *Inclusive education: international voices on disability and justice.* London: Falmer Press (study 207)

Ainscow M (2000) Reaching out to all learners: some lessons from international experience. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 11(1): 1-19 (study 89)

Ainscow M (2000) Developing inclusive schools: implications for leadership. National College for School Leadership: ncslonline (study 89)

Ainscow M (2000) Reaching out to all learners: some opportunities and challenges. In Daniels H (ed) *Special education reformed: beyond rhetoric?* London: Falmer Press (study 89)

Alderson P (ed) (1999) *Learning and inclusion: the Cleves School experience*. London: David Fulton Publishers (study 188)

Ballard K, McDonald T (1998) New Zealand: inclusive school, inclusive philosophy. In Booth T, Ainscow M (eds) *From them to us*. London: Routledge (study 99)

Black-Hawkins K (1999) Close encounters of the cultural kind: the significance of culture in understanding processes of inclusion and exclusion in schools. Paper presented at British Educational Research Association Annual Conference: University of Sussex (study 128)

Bonal X, Rambala X (1999) The recontextualisation process of educational diversity: new forms to legitimatise pedagogic practice. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 9(3): 293-313 (study 157)

Booth T (1996) A perspective on inclusion from England. *Cambridge Journal of Education. Special Issue: International Developments in Inclusive Education* 26(1): 87-99 (study 103)

Booth T, Ainscow M, Dyson A (1997) Understanding inclusion and exclusion in the English competitive education system. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 1(4): 337-355 (study 103)

Booth T, Ainscow M, Dyson A (1998) England: inclusion and exclusion in a competitive system. In Booth T, Ainscow M (eds) *From them to us*. London: Routledge (study 103)

Booth T, Ainscow M (1998) *From them to us: an international study of inclusion in education*. London: Routledge. (study 103)

Campbell E (1996) The tensions within: diversity in a multi-everything secondary school. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 42(3): 280-292 (study 183)

Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A, Skidmore D (1997) *New directions in special needs: innovations in mainstream schools*. London: Cassell. (study 210)

Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A, Robson S (1999) Inclusive education and schools as organizations. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 3(1): 37-51 (study 186)

Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A, Skidmore D (1995) Dialectical analysis, special needs and schools as organisations. In Clark C, Dyson D, Millward, A (eds)*Towards Inclusive Schools?* London: David Fulton Publishers (study 210)

Clark C, Dyson A, Millward A, Robson S (1999) Theories of inclusion, theories of schools: deconstructing and reconstructing the 'inclusive school'. *British Educational Research Journal* 25 (2): 157-177 (study 186)

Corbett J (2001) *Teaching approaches which support inclusive education: a connective pedagogy*. London: Routledge Falmer (study 168)

Corbett J (2001) Teaching approaches which support inclusive education: a connective pedagogy. *British Journal of Special Education* 28(2): 55-59 (study 168)

Davies GL (2001) An inclusion story: exploring aspects of educational inclusion in Birmingham 1996-2000. Unpublished PhD thesis. School of Education, University of Birmingham (study 209)

Deering P (1996) An ethnographic study of norms of inclusion and co-operation in a multi-ethnic middle school. *Urban Review* 28(1): 21-40 (study 156)

Dyson A, Millward A (2000) *Schools and special needs: issues of innovation and inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman (study 186)

Dyson A (2000) Questioning, understanding and supporting the inclusive school. In Daniels H (ed) *Special education reformed? Beyond rhetoric*. London: Falmer Press (study 186)

Ferguson D (2001) Schools on the move: stories of urban schools engaged in inclusive journeys of change: Benito Martinez Elementary School. National Institute of Urban School Improvement Resource Database. http://www.edc.org/urban (study 151)

Florian L, Rouse M. (2001) Developing inclusive education at Rawthorpe High School: final report of the second phase of the evaluation. Kirklees: Kirklees LEA and Barnardo's (study 152)

Gillborn D, Youdell D (2000) *Rationing education: policy, practice, reform and equity*. Buckingham: Open University Press (study 187)

Heckman P, Peterman F (1996) Indigenous invention: new promise for school reform, *Teachers College Record* 98(2): 307-327 (study 143)

Hunt P, Hirose-Hatae A, Doering K, Karasoff P, Goetz L (2000) 'Community' is what I think everyone is talking about. *Remedial & Special Education* 21(5): 305-317 (study 205)

Kratzer C (1997) Community and diversity in an urban school: co-existence or conflict? Report by the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles (study 206)

Kugelmass J (2001) Collaboration and compromise in creating and sustaining an inclusive school. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 5(1): 47-65 (study 142)

Parilla A (1999) Educational innovations as a school answer to diversity. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 3(2): 93-110 (study 130)

Pickett R (1994) The relationship between school structure and culture and student views of diversity and inclusive education: a comparative case study of two middle schools. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Wisconsin (study 184)

Rouse M, Florian L (1994) Becoming effective and inclusive: cross-cultural perspectives. Paper given at 'School reform and special educational needs' Anglo-American symposium, July 1994, Cambridge (study 132)

Rouse M, Florian L (1996) Effective inclusive schools: a study in two countries. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 26(1): 71-85 (study 132)

Sebba J, Ainscow M, Lakin S (1995) *Developing inclusive education at Rawthorpe High School: Report of the first phase of the evaluation*. Kirklees, Kirklees LEA and Barnardo's (study 152)

Slee R (1991) Learning initiatives to include all students in regular schools. In Ainscow M (ed) *Effective schools for all*. London: David Fulton Publishers (study 208)

Stickney J (1996) School culture and student learning: case study of a self-renewing school. Unpublished PhD thesis. Graduate School of the University of Oregon (study 203)

Wang M, Oates J, Weishaw N (1995) Effective school responses to student diversity in inner-city schools: a co-ordinated approach. *Education and Urban Society* 27(4): 484-503 (study 189)