
Broadening the notion of participation in inclusive education: A social justice approach

Ampliando el concepto de participación en la educación inclusiva: un enfoque de justicia social

Abstract

Inclusive education is a global movement with different perspectives and local angles. In recent years inclusive education has been framed using principles of social justice such as fair redistribution of education, recognition of all cultures, languages and abilities, and political representation in individual and collective educational decision-making. Our aim in this theoretical paper is to synthesise the most important points of both perspectives (inclusive education and social justice) and, through an intersectional analysis, look in-depth at how they apply to a foundational concept of inclusive education: participation. Participation is strategic to building fairer educational and social practices and can act as a central core between redistribution, recognition, and representation.

Keywords

Participation, inclusive education, social justice, critical race theory, disability.

Resumen

La educación inclusiva es un movimiento global con diferentes prismas y ángulos locales. En los últimos años se ha definido la educación inclusiva desde la justicia social. Así, se viene vinculando la inclusión con la justa redistribución de la educación, el reconocimiento de todas las culturas, lenguajes y habilidades, y la representación política en la toma de decisiones educativas individuales y colectivas. Nuestro objetivo en este trabajo es sintetizar los puntos más importantes de ambas perspectivas (educación inclusiva y justicia social) y profundizar en cómo se aplican a un concepto fundacional de la educación inclusiva: la participación. La participación resulta estratégica para construir prácticas educativas y sociales más justas y puede actuar como un núcleo central entre la redistribución, el reconocimiento y la representación.

Palabras clave

Participación, educación inclusiva, justicia social, teoría crítica de la raza, discapacidad.

Marta Sandoval Mena

<marta.sandoval@uam.es>

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
España

Federico Waitoller

<fwaitoll@uic.edu>

University of Illinois Chicago. USA



Para citar:

Sandoval, M. y Waitoller, F. (2022). Broadening the notion of participation in inclusive education: A social justice approach. *Revista Española de Discapacidad*, 10(2), 21-33.

Doi: <<https://doi.org/10.5569/2340-5104.10.02.02>>

Fecha de recepción: 01-03-2022

Fecha de aceptación: 22-11-2022



1. Introduction

In recent years, education for social justice and inclusive education have become undisputed frameworks for rethinking and transforming education systems with the aim of contributing to the development of equally just and inclusive societies. The aspiration for more inclusive education and education for social justice both share the moral purpose of wanting to contribute to the development of a more equitable society. That is, a society where personal capabilities and the framework of social relations of all kinds are not associated with unacceptable parameters of inequality, disadvantage, discrimination or disregard. A more equitable society clearly depends on many other factors that are found “beyond the school gates” (Ainscow *et al.*, 2006, p. 32), but a just and inclusive school can contribute to laying the foundations for building and sustaining a just and pluralist society. In this regard, the following question arises: is it possible to have an inclusive school that operates in a social context that is not inclusive?

In any case, it is clear that not all teaching staff (or academics) rebel against the glaring inequalities we live with and that “not just a few” accept these inequalities without questioning them or they accept structural inequalities as inherent in any kind of society. Echeita (2019) reminds us that, as educators, we have an unequivocal and important responsibility to ensure that what we do inside schools (in collaboration with other educational agents) is part of the solution and not part of the problem. Thus, those involved in teaching need to agree on the approach from which to identify just and unjust situations.

In our view, inclusion is a social justice practice by definition. However, advocacy for inclusive education as an essential and socially just practice could benefit from theoretical approaches to social justice. In this regard, some authors have applied Nancy Fraser’s three-dimensional model to strengthen the conceptualisation of inclusion as a component without which education for social justice cannot be understood (Fraser, 2008; e.g., Christensen and Rizvi, 1996; Waitoller and Artiles, 2013; Domingo-Martos *et al.* 2022). Fraser’s model refers to three dimensions: economic redistribution, cultural recognition and political representation. This approach is particularly relevant and useful for identifying fair and unfair situations within the school framework. Learners may experience forms of exclusion due to complex forms of marginalisation based on maldistribution, misrepresentation, and misrecognition.

Inclusive education is based on guaranteeing equal opportunities for all. This involves equal access to quality learning as well as the recognition of student differences, which must be reflected in educational content, teaching designs and assessments and participation which should highlight the importance of learning and collaborating with other classmates and allude to the need to care for the personal and social well-being of students.

Traditionally, the development of inclusive education has been linked to the education of students with disabilities. However, in the last decade there has been an intellectual push for inclusive education focused on intersectional forms of exclusion. Intersectionality is a form of structural oppression produced by the interaction of two or more forms of oppression, leading to a new form that is quantitatively and qualitatively different from the mere sum of various causes of discrimination (Crenshaw, 1991).

Sometimes people suffer double and triple discrimination due to various cultural factors (religion, language, cultural affinity, etc.), but also due to their socio-economic, administrative (legal status) situation and, of

course, gender. Thus, from this approach, inclusive education needs to identify and dismantle injustices generated by the interactions of disability, racism and other 'isms' and be enriched by approaches such as **Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory** (DisCrit) (Annamma *et al.*, 2013). This theory is rooted in Critical Race Theory (Bell, 1976), which explains how racism affects education systems (Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995). Thus, in order to move towards a more just education, it is essential to approach the complexities of educational injustices located at the intersection of race, disability and other forms of social difference from the perspective of redistribution, recognition and representation.

Based on the premise that inclusive education is inextricably linked to social justice, the aim of this paper is to make some proposals that contribute to overcoming the structural resistance of education systems and related agents that hinder the implementation of policies and practices that promote increasing levels of equity.

Defining or delimiting the term participation is not a simple matter, since it is a polysemic concept which, as Trilla and Novella (2001) point out, can refer to multiple actions: being present, making decisions, being informed, giving an opinion or managing or carrying out an action. All these interpretations of participation can be identified within the axes of social justice as outlined by Nancy Fraser (redistribution, recognition and representation). Waitoller and Artiles (2013) also relate participation to three meanings in the field of inclusive education: 1) Sharing classroom and school common spaces and the ability to learn together (redistribution), 2) emotional well-being, the feeling of belonging to a group and the ability to participate critically in the construction of knowledge (recognition), and 3) involvement in decision-making as a basic component for action (representation). These three meanings are logically interlinked, and it is difficult to understand the real dimension of each of them unless it is in a dialectic relationship with the others.

In the following sections of this paper, we will discuss how Fraser's model can be used as a conceptual basis for participation in inclusive education. In line with the work of Annamma and Handy (2020), the discussion of these semantic overlaps is expanded and enriched by an intersectional analysis that has tended to be omitted from literature on inclusive education. Specifically, we will refer to those of disabled activists belonging to ethnic or cultural minority groups, such as women of African descent in the United States or gypsy women in Spain, among others. We will focus particularly on the work of Mia Mingus (2011; 2017) and Talila Lewis (2016; 2017).

2. Participation and redistribution

Distributional principles have framed equity and schooling policies in education reforms in a number of countries for a long time. According to Jost and Kay (2010, p. 145) "social justice proposals as a matter of (re)distribution focus on actions aimed at distributing, regardless of whether they are social goods, material or cultural resources. Their central point revolves around the criteria to choose when and where special resources or services are distributed".

The principle of redistribution is reflected in the Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2015), in particular in number 4, dedicated to Quality Education, which calls for ensuring access to inclusive and

equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all learners as a fundamental basis for sustainable development. Furthermore, Article 24 of the UN International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) calls for “an inclusive education system, ensuring access on an equal basis, as well as reasonable adaptations and supports as required”. From this perspective, inclusive participation begins with providing access for all learners to spaces and activities where school resources are distributed equitably and fairly.

However, redistribution as a model of justice has also been criticised. Those who defend the meritocratic model point out that schools offer equal opportunities and that quality learning is conditioned by the effort and tenacity of students. Nevertheless, as Brantlinger (1997) highlights, this assumption is based on the consideration that schools are neutral and although many people express their concern for disadvantaged students, they do not ask themselves how this influences the behaviour of students, nor how it can generate exclusion through its daily practices, which are often openly exclusive.

In this regard, Dubet (2005) identifies the need to introduce “the principle of difference”, aimed at marginalised pupils, because it is the fairest way of counteracting the meritocratic model. According to this sociologist, inequalities can only be legitimate if they help the most disadvantaged group. Rawls (2001) also establishes two principles, namely compensation and positive discrimination or affirmation policies, with the purpose of “compensating for natural inequalities or inequalities of birth” (Rawls, 2001, p. 123). Equitable distribution is based on differentiation, but it can mean neither assimilation nor stigmatisation. In this way, the redistributive model tends not to recognise the hierarchies associated with constructions of difference. Minnow (1990) reminded us that difference is not natural, nor accidental, but arises from the ways in which society creates and assigns categories (e.g. Hispanic, female, low-income) to deny or enable inclusion and full participation in activities, such as education, that have been designed for dominant groups. The problem is that difference has historically been associated with deviance and deficit (Du Bois, 1960) and, in diverse societies, treating difference as deviant and deficient has serious consequences for achieving educational equity.

The principles of redistribution in education are all too often translated into educational policies and practices framed in the field of compensatory education (an obsolete term that reproduces terminology associated with the deficit model), that fail to reduce such inequalities but, perhaps because of that, most of the time perpetuate them (Corujo *et al.*, 2018; González, 2002; Rodríguez, *et al.*, 2018). For example, this can be seen in the implementation of support activities in differentiated times and spaces, which are predominantly carried out outside the classroom group. Another example can be found in the intrinsically exclusive approach of so-called “compensatory education”, which by default considers immigrant students to have “linguistic deficiencies in the vehicular language”, instead of considering them to be in the process of becoming bilingual or multilingual.

Firstly, fair redistribution requires transcending individual characteristics of students and approaching this phenomenon from more global and systemic positions. Secondly, action must be taken quickly, since most of these actions are offered to students after a slow process of diagnosis and labelling, and when they finally arrive, their disengagement from school is so significant that it is extremely difficult to reverse it.

In these “special education” and/or “compensation” programmes, diversity is typified in exclusive categories based on assessments that determine whether or not students are deserving of one or another type of action. Furthermore, there is often no questioning of the quality of the educational experiences they offer to their participants. In this regard, González (2002) stated that when students disengage from the education

process, they also disengage from the activities and events that are part of the school system in which they are immersed. Therefore, it is essential that schools assume their responsibilities and refocus their practices to offer richer and more relevant experiences for everyone.

Thus, distributional approaches are important but not sufficient (Fraser, 1997), as they may be narrowly concerned with eliminating or domesticating difference and may have collateral effects for the populations they are trying to include. Such compensatory approaches have also been criticised by disability activists whose work is based on intersectional justice. In this regard, Lewis (2016; 2017) argues that access to social goods is not enough and what we understand as humanity needs to be transformed and expanded to achieve fairer redistribution. Mingus (2017) argues that access to such goods, for example education, is not enough as they tend to be individualistic and assimilationist approaches. A student may be “included” but feel isolated because the spatial and ideological context in which he or she is included does not value his or her identity and humanity. Thus, Mingus (2017) proposes justice based on liberatory access, interdependence, and intimacy that replaces the myths of independence and individualism. This author defines access intimacy as the comfort one has when someone deeply understands accessibility needs without having to explain them or fight for them.

The value of “access intimacy” stems from all people feeling involved and comfortable in all areas of life related to community socialisation, and also that no specific disability spaces are specifically made available for people with disabilities. Therefore, empowering access means valuing that people depend on each other and can take more collective and intersectional community action to break down social, cultural and spatial barriers.

This requires eliminating those understandings of inclusion that relate to adaptations or adjustments for persons with disabilities only if it is convenient or not too costly to do so. This occurs in many situations, such as in the least restrictive environment clause in the US legal system (Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 2004) or when “specialised classrooms” in mainstream settings do not guarantee the creation of fully democratic educational environments, as the schooling of students with disabilities or other learning difficulties in segregated classrooms would be establishing a dual education system that does not respond to the principles of truly inclusive education.

Authors such as Mingus (2011; 2017), Lewis (2016; 2017), Waitoller and Annamma (2017), Waitoller *et al.* (2019), and Annamma and Handy (2020) argue that redistribution needs to be intersectional. That is, it must consider and act on the structural factors that determine an unfair distribution that particularly affects people whose identities are built on overlapping social differences (e.g. race and disability). For example, an African American student with a disability may be discriminated against because of the simultaneous interaction of structural factors such as lack of economic resources, attending a segregated school on the basis of his or her being African American, and being identified for special education services on the basis of his or her disability and place in more restrictive environments.

When we refer to redistribution in an inclusive school, rather than providing access to a special educational service, it would facilitate quality learning for all students. To this end, it is essential to question the hierarchies established by compensatory models of redistribution. Inclusive participation therefore requires education within interdependent communities that reject individualistic and stereotypical models of humanity.

3. Participation and cultural and identity recognition

The transfer of the principle of recognition into the framework of inclusive education is fundamental to building fairer political systems and school practices. Focused on a cultural dimension of justice, recognition has become a central dimension of social justice, as Honneth (2009) highlighted:

“For some time now, the place of this influential idea of justice has been replaced by a new vision: the normative goal no longer seems to be the elimination of inequality, but the prevention of humiliation or contempt; the central categories of this new vision are no longer fair distribution or equality of goods, but dignity and respect” (Honneth, 2009, p. 10).

Nancy Fraser herself coined the concept of “misrecognition”, to refer to situations when people are represented by institutional patterns in which underlying cultural values prevent them from being full members of society. Thus, there is a risk of transferring the assessment of the ineffectiveness of these institutions to an inability “of these people” to benefit from what they offer. When existing conflicts between different identities at school are avoided or neutralised in the classroom, the school institution becomes a mere socialising agent of legitimising identities, forcing these boys and girls to assume a system of values, norms, and meanings which, although legitimised by the hegemonic groups, are often unfair and do not satisfy their material or symbolic needs. In this regard, institutions become a place of domination, where people suffer reprisals (through the production system and the specific sanctions the school develops through the teaching staff) if they do not adapt or if they resist the cultural patterns defined there.

At the opposite end of the spectrum from recognition are the most severe forms of mistreatment due to abuse of power, carried out by those with whom one should live in a climate of respect and affection. Children and adolescents who are vulnerable, with disabilities, from ethnic, linguistic or cultural minorities and from migrant or refugee communities are at increased risk of violence and bullying (UNESCO, 2017). The consequences of school bullying are significant and are not only social. Bullied children face an increased risk of physical and mental health problems and suicidal thoughts (UNESCO, 2017). In particular, the bullying of immigrant students has been analysed, as they are the ones who often experience several layers of oppression (Elame, 2013). UNESCO (2017) has denounced the specificity of “bullying that targets another person’s immigration status or family immigration background in the form of mockery and slurs, derogatory references to the immigration process, physical aggression, social manipulation or exclusion on the basis of immigration status” (p. 17).

However, sometimes lack of recognition is less visible and obvious, as it is expressed through interactions with teachers and the peer group. Sometimes these aggressions can be very subtle, so it is particularly necessary to detect the use of *micro-aggressions*. In this context, Sue (2010) identifies three kinds of microaggressions. The first are those that are explicit racial references, characterised mainly by verbal and non-verbal behaviour aimed at hurting the victim through insults, blatant isolation or intentional discriminatory actions. The second are microinsults, which are characterised by more indirect verbal and non-verbal behaviour that convey stereotypical beliefs. The third are micro-invalidations, which occur in communications that exclude, deny or negate the thoughts, feelings or experiential reality of a racial-ethnic minority individual.

This lack of recognition can lead to opaque, even unconscious discrimination on the part of teachers (Gillborn and Youdell, 2000; Krull *et al.*, 2018) and requires being alert to situations that go unnoticed.

The politics of recognition are undermined by the way teachers perceive differences. In some cases, certain differences may signify superiority or inferiority and provoke a variety of emotional responses such as fear, hostility or, more positively, curiosity (see Fraser and Honneth, 2006; Young, 1990). Similarly, in some cases it leads to the denial of difference in the pursuit of justice, this is what Taylor (1992) calls “difference-blindness”, although following the advice of Annamma *et al.* (2017) we prefer the term “color-avoidance”. Indeed, non-recognition can cause exclusion and oppression (Taylor, 1992, p. 25) if the power hierarchies associated with the construction of difference do not change.

In this regard, inclusive participation requires connecting with non-dominant biographies, cultures, contributions and perspectives through the curriculum and other educational practices (Keddie, 2012). Slee (2001, p. 200) refers to “pedagogies of recognition” in which students need to acknowledge their own social and familial experiences and identities in the curriculum. In the United States, such pedagogies are embodied in “Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies” (CSP) (Ladson Billings and Tate, 1995). Thus, student participation as recognition is related to “recognising and valuing” their previous learning, their background knowledge and their identity. If a school or an education has little meaning for students, it is unlikely that they can achieve academically.

It should be noted that such recognition needs to embrace disability as an identity, which is something that pedagogies often omit. Disability is part of students’ identity and cultural heritage and so should be recognised as a social identity (Waitoller and Thorius, 2016). Mitchell (2015, p. 5) states that “meaningful inclusion is only dignified if disability is fully recognised as providing alternative values for life, rather than simply ratifying prevailing concepts of normality”. People with disabilities have developed diverse cultural patterns and identities in response to social, economic, and cultural contexts and struggles. For example, the autism spectrum disorder community has become an excellent example of such cultural patterns and identities. Autistic writers, bloggers, musicians, filmmakers and academics have asserted that autism is a culture and an identity (Strauss, 2013). In inclusive participation, these identities should be supported and should explicitly guide teachers and other learners to explore alternative ways of being and of navigating the world.

Participation in terms of recognition implies active engagement with what is learned and taught and therefore means that students gain recognition and self-acceptance. Furthermore, this acceptance makes them perceive themselves as competent and legitimised to act or make decisions in specific school matters within their competence. It is this feeling of belonging that allows them to feel part of an institution and face situations or develop actions to solve problems they assume to be their own. In this regard, participation transforms students, since as a person participates, he or she is transformed by the reality or event in which he or she participates (Sandoval, 2013).

In terms of fair recognition, the possibilities for inclusive participation are inextricably linked to practices aimed at personalising teaching. These practices imply mobilising the full potential of learning environments (also in extra-curricular activities) where learners can develop their multiple capacities. Tedesco *et al.* (2014, p. 534) also highlight this connection. They explain that “personalising education means respecting, understanding and building on the uniqueness of each person, within a collaborative framework of environments seen as learning communities, where everyone is necessary, and everyone supports each other”.

This involves moving the focus of analysis from the student to educational practices. A clear example of this mode of recognition can be seen in the participation models linked to universal design for learning (UDL), which provides a framework for designing learning activities where multiple forms of participation and demonstration of knowledge are offered.

Struggles for justice based on recognition tend to frame group differences as essential without considering group diversity, which is central to understanding young people and adults with disabilities. For example, most work and research on inclusive education in the US have focused on differences in ability, including students with disabilities in mainstream education classrooms. However, the historical links between race, language and disability have been and continue to be ignored (Artiles and Kozleski, 2007). Consequently, efforts towards inclusive education have benefited some students more than others. In fact, those from ethno-cultural and linguistic minorities continue to be disproportionately represented in special education, despite decades of efforts aimed at eliminating this state of inequity (Voulgarides *et al.*, 2017, Sandoval *et al.*, 2022).

Furthermore, although the amount of time students with disabilities spend in mainstream classrooms has increased over the years in the US, minority students, such as African American and immigrant students, continue to be placed in more segregated settings than their white peers with the same disability diagnosis (United States Department of Education, 2020). This phenomenon is exacerbated among low-income students (LeRoy and Kulik, 2004).

Therefore an intersectional approach to recognition is needed, as misrecognition or oppressive recognition of difference is amplified when racism, ethnocentrism and ableism are intertwined. Lewis (2016) argues that we can neither avoid disability nor race in victims of abuse, as the intersections of these make them more susceptible to violence. Applying her argument to education, it can be said that structural forms of oppression based on racism and ableism interact, leading to the devaluation and marginalisation of the identities of students with disabilities who come from already excluded minorities.

Participation in inclusive education involves designing and practising policies and pedagogies that value students' complex identities in which various forms of social difference interact. The axis of inclusive participation is the one that best brings together pedagogies of ability and cultural difference. For example, Waitoller and Thorius (2016) propose weaving a pedagogical fabric by threading culturally sustaining pedagogies (CSP) to the universal design for learning approach. The aim is to emphasise universal teaching approaches by fostering linguistic and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling.

4. Student representation in centres of power

Based on the political dimension of justice, the principle of representation is also fundamental to inclusive education. Having active and equitable social representation is an issue of social justice which recognises human groups that have traditionally been excluded because of their gender, ethnicity, religion, physical and/or mental condition, sexual orientation, education, or economic situation, among others. Honneth (2009) suggests referring to justice as representation, considering that one of the ways in which people are undervalued is directly related to their lack of democratic participation.

Fraser (2008, p. 78) also states that “there is no redistribution or recognition without active, direct and justice-oriented representation”. According to this author, overcoming injustice also means removing those barriers from institutions that prevent some people from participating with full rights. She points out that, apart from

the distribution of resources which ensures that voices exist and are recognised, they must have sufficient social status, by being represented in the decision-making process. She also states that representation is a political prerequisite for democratic participation and sees it as the meaning and materialisation of the other two axes:

“By establishing the criteria of social membership, and by determining who qualifies as a member, the political dimension of justice specifies the scope of the other two dimensions: it tells us who is included in and who is excluded from the circle of those entitled to fair distribution and mutual recognition” (Fraser, 2008, p. 41).

This dimension is linked to the right to be heard and considered in educational decisions that concern everyone, individually or collectively, as part of a community. Schools must provide opportunities (or lack of them) to participate in the decision-making instances, whether in the classroom itself, in formal decision making bodies (school councils, student delegations, spokespersons, etc.), or informal situations.

Participation in representative areas of the school community is a dimension that can only take place if the school creates daily and systemic opportunities to do so. The opportunities for participation in schools may be present in different forms and degrees depending on various factors and can be identified in diverse areas, such as in the management of the school itself, in academic or curricular activities, or in extracurricular and community activities. For example, with regard to management, students can be involved in school facility maintenance tasks, as well as the management of services, the library, the playground, artistic activities and conflict resolution. In the curricular area, students can participate in the definition of content and subjects as well as cooperative learning methods with their peers and act as interpreters, among others. Students are not only involved because they are entitled to it, but also because their participation improves the functioning of schools. Finally, representation is reflected both through student participation in their school communities and also through activism.

Fair representation should address the nuances that intersections of difference create and avoid generalisations. For example, the views of reality of a child from an African American background or from a Latin American country differ completely from the experiences of another child, even if they come from neighbouring countries. Returning to Mingus (2017), representation and activism in inclusive education requires participation that focuses on interdependence and personal and collective access. Moreover, it should be based on the understanding that independence and individualism are myths and fighting for a fairer school requires solidarity and interdependence.

It is important to note the relevance of affirmative action measures in schools as they constitute a necessary instrument, albeit of a temporary nature, aimed at combatting social inequalities and promoting civic participation, although these measures have often been a source of controversy. In this regard, like Fraser (1997) we cannot fail to recognise that these measures are proposed in order to compensate for inequalities, however they do not aim to change the structures that promote or reproduce these inequalities. Thus, the author argues that:

“Solutions should be transformative, aimed at transforming and constructing thinking beyond the prevailing binary conception of good and bad, homo and hetero, men and women, black and white, able-bodied and disabled, and aimed at replacing networks of hierarchical relations with networks of intersecting and constantly changing multiple differences” (Fraser, 1997, p. 51).

5. Conclusions

Throughout the text, the contributions of the dimensions of social justice; redistribution, recognition, and representation in participation, conceived as a broad construct, have been identified as the epicentre of inclusive and intersectional education. Historically, students with disabilities, immigrants, indigenous people or those who belonged to a culture other than the dominant one have been and are unfairly treated.

The contributions of this text are important for policy makers and teachers. This article has challenged some practices in inclusive education that represent unfair situations for many students. Firstly, because of the (re)distributive views of students and resources, which have been disguised as compensatory models and have been shown to have serious limitations in the field of education. Thus, Artiles *et al.* (2006) argue that redistributive models have given rise to different schooling routes, such as special education, which have not been effective in guaranteeing quality education for all and have helped to maintain the status quo of the system by focusing on the shortcomings of the most disadvantaged social sectors or the students themselves. These models of redistribution of access completely omit the analysis of factors such as school organisation, the curriculum, planning or the criteria for sectorisation and the creation of schools, among many others. The response to pupils' needs should not trigger an act of marginalisation or uniform action.

Secondly, the traditional view of recognition has been linked to one-off and even folkloric events in schools, rather than examining ideological and historical conceptions of difference and analysing teaching approaches to address diverse forms of learning and abilities.

Teaching approaches for all learners based on individual differences across social history, everyday life, and cultures as the norm rather than the exception stand out in this respect. In addition, the substantive participation of families in decision-making in education should also be noted.

Finally, there is a need to establish the conditions for individuals to be represented in learning and assessments of that learning, thus making their sense of belonging to their school community more meaningful. Schools need to challenge the commodification of particular "categories" attributed to particular groups of students by bringing to the fore the importance of personal identities.

Although reflective teaching must identify and correct educationally unjust situations, we cannot ignore the fact that the wider social context can undermine school and community efforts to eliminate gross inequalities. Commitment to social justice must also involve political activism (Larson and Ovando, 2001; Calderón and Ruiz-Román, 2016), to change the systems that perpetuate exclusion. That is, it is not only necessary to identify and have criteria to respond justly to unjust situations, but also to denounce social structures that perpetuate the marginalisation of at-risk groups based on their perceived lack of merit. The contributions of community service learning, based on activist, not just active, pedagogies can offer exceptional opportunities to develop general and specific attributes of inclusion and social justice disciplines in future teachers. Therefore, there is a clear need to cultivate a much more equitable and socially just approach to inclusion, to help teachers better understand what these practices might look like and to challenge entrenched discriminatory practices. An inclusive approach requires distributing, recognising, and representing multiple student and teacher identities.

Bibliographical references

- Ainscow, M. *et al.* (2006). *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. Routledge.
- Annamma, S. A. *et al.* (2013). Disability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and disability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.730511>.
- Annamma, S. A. *et al.* (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 20(2), 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248837>.
- Annamma, S. A. y Handy, T. (2020). Sharpening justice through DisCrit: A contrapuntal analysis of education. *Educational Researcher*, 50(1), 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20953838>.
- Artiles, A. y Kozleski, E. (2007). Beyond convictions: Interrogating culture, history, and power in inclusive education. *Journal of Language Arts*, 84(4), 351-358.
- Artiles, A. *et al.* (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead. *Theory into Practice*, 45(3), 260-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4503_8.
- Bell, D. A. (1976). Serving two masters: Integration ideals and client interests in school desegregation litigation. *Yale Law Journal*, 85(4), 470-516.
- Brantlinger, E. (1997). Using Ideology: Cases of Nonrecognition of the Politics of Research and Practice in Special Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(4), 425-459. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067004425>.
- Christensen, C. y Rizvi, F. (1996). *Disability and the dilemmas of education and justice*. Open University Press.
- Calderón-Almendros, I. y Ruiz-Román, C. (2016). Disadvantaged Identities: Conflict and Education from Disability, Culture and Social Class. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 48(9), 946-958.
- Corujo, M.C. *et al.* (2018). Valoración de los Programas de Mejora del Aprendizaje y del Rendimiento desde la visión de sus protagonistas en cuatro poblaciones de la provincia de Sevilla. *Tendencias Pedagógicas*, 32, 31-48.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>.
- Domingo-Martos, L. *et al.* (2022). Broadening the view of inclusion from a social justice perspective. A scoping review of the literature, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2095043>.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1960). "Whither now and why?" A speech to the Association of Negro Social Science Teachers (1868-1963, March 31, 1960; W. E. B. Du Bois papers, MS 312). University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries.
- Dubet, F. (2005). *Repensar la Justicia Social. Contra el mito de la igualdad de oportunidades*. Gedisa.
- Echeita, G. (2019). A la Espera de un fructífero cruce de caminos entre quienes hoy circulan en Paralelo por los Caminos Educativos de la Equidad, la Justicia Social, la Inclusión, la Convivencia, la Cultura de Paz o la Ciudadanía Global. *Revista Internacional de Justicia social*, 8(2), 7-17.
- Elame, E. (2013). *Discriminatory Bullying: A New Intercultural Challenge*. Springer.

- Fraser, N. (1997). *Iustitia Interrupta*. Editorial Siglo del hombre.
- Fraser, N. (2008). *Escalas de justicia*. Herder Editorial.
- Fraser, N. y Honneth, A. (2006). *¿Redistribución o Reconocimiento? un debate político filosófico*. Ediciones Morata.
- Gillborn, D. y Youdell, D. (2000). *Rationing education: policy, practice, reform and equity*. Open University Press.
- González, T. (2002). Agrupamiento de alumnos e itinerarios escolares: cuando las apariencias engañan. *Educación*, (29), 167-182.
- Honneth, A. (2009). *Crítica del poder: fases en la reflexión de una teoría crítica de la sociedad*. Machado Libros.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20. United States Code, section 1400 (2004).
- Jost, J. T. y Kay, A. C. (2010). Social justice: History, theory, and research. En S. T. Fiske et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 1122-1165). John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Keddie, A. (2012). Schooling and social justice through the lenses of Nancy Fraser. *Critical studies in Education*, 53(3), 263-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2012.709185>.
- Krull, J. et al. (2018). Does social exclusion by classmates lead to behavior problems and learning difficulties or viceversa? A cross-lagged panel analysis. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 33(2), 235-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2018.1424780>.
- Ladson-Billings, G. y Tate, W. (1995). Toward critical race theory in education. *Teacher College Record*, (97), 47-68.
- Larson, C. y Ovando, C. (2001). *Confronting Biases: The Color of Bureaucracy*. Taylor & Fran Ladson Billings, 1995.
- LeRoy, B. y Kulik, N. (2004). *The demographics of inclusion: Final report materials for U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education*, Wayne State University.
- Lewis, T. (22 de julio de 2016). *Honoring Arnaldo Rios-Soto and Charles Kinsey: Achieving liberation through disability solidarity*. TALILA A. LEWIS. <https://www.talilalewis.com/blog/achieving-liberation-through-disability-solidarity>.
- Lewis, T. (28 de enero de 2017). *Emmett Till and the pervasive erasure of disability in conversation about White supremacy and political violence*. TALILA A. LEWIS. <https://www.talilalewis.com/blog/emmett-till-disability-erasure>.
- Mingus, M. (12 de febrero de 2011). *Changing the framework: Disability justice*. Leaving Evidence. <https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2011/02/12/changing-the-framework-disability-justice/>.
- Mingus, M. (12 de abril de 2017). *Access intimacy, interdependence and disability justice*. Leaving Evidence. <https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2017/04/12/access-intimacy-interdependence-and-disability-justice/>.
- Minnow, M. (1990). *Making all the difference. Inclusion, Exclusion and American law*. Cornell University Press.
- Mitchell, D. (2015). Inclusive education is a multi-faceted concept. *Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 5(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.151>.
- Naciones Unidas (2006). *Convención sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad*. ONU. <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/documents/tccconvs.pdf>.
- Naciones Unidas (2015). *Transformar nuestro mundo: la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible. A/RES/70/1*. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ares70d1_es.pdf.

- Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Belknap Press [traducción al español (2001). La justicia como equidad. Una reformulación. Paidós Ibérica].
- Rodríguez, R. et al. (2018). *Los dispositivos de atención educativa al alumnado de origen extranjero a examen*. Edición Bellaterra.
- Sandoval, M. (2013). La participación de los alumnos como palanca en los procesos de transformación escolar. En G. Echeita et al. (Eds.), *Cómo fomentar las redes naturales de apoyo en el marco de una escuela inclusiva: propuestas prácticas* (pp.35-53). Eduforma.
- Sandoval, M. et al. (2022). La evolución de la escolarización del alumnado en Educación Especial en España a 25 años de la Declaración de Salamanca. *Aula abierta*, 51(4) (en imprenta).
- Slee, R. (2001). *The Inclusive School*. Falmer Press.
- Strauss, J. N. (2013). Autism as culture. En L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 460-484). Routledge.
- Sue, D. W. (Ed.). (2010). *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact*. Wiley.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism: "The politics of recognition": An essay*. Princeton University Press.
- Tedesco, J. C. (2014). *Educación en la sociedad del conocimiento*. Editorial Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Trilla, J. y Novella, A. (2001). Educación y participación social de la infancia. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 26, 137-164. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie260982>.
- UNESCO (2017). *School Violence and Bullying: Global Status Report*. UNESCO.
- United States Department of Education (2020). *2018 annual report to Congress on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Departamento de Educación <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/2020-annual-report-congress-idea/>.
- Voulgarides, K. et al. (2017). Pursuing Equity: Disproportionality in Special Education and the Reframing of Technical Solutions to Address Systemic Inequities. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 67-87.
- Waitoller, F. R. y Annamma, S. A. (2017). Taking a spatial turn in inclusive education: Understanding complex equity issues. En M. Tejero Hughes y E. Talbott (Eds.), *The handbook of on diversity in special education* (pp. 23-44). John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Waitoller, F. R. y Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research in inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 319-356.
- Waitoller, F. R. et al. (2019). Hacia una educación inclusiva interseccional: El caso de los estudiantes Afroamericanos y Latinos con discapacidades en Chicago. *Revista Publicaciones* 49(3), 37-55.
- Waitoller, F. R. y Thorius, K. K. (2016). Cross-Pollinating Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy with Universal Design for Learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for student dis/ability. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(3), 366-389.
- Young, I. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press [traducción al español: La Justicia y la Política de la Diferencia, Ediciones Cátedra].