A Common Education-for-All & Life-Long Learning?

Reflections on Inclusion, Integration and Equity

Sangeeta Bagga-Gupta

Introduction

> Social justice is a feature of all human relationships and is present in all societies. How one talks to it and about it, however, is notoriously difficult because implicit in the language one uses and the assumptions which underlie one's language are frameworks of reference which inevitably find their origins in one or other understanding of the world and the people who are within it. The discursive construction of social justice, thus, is informed by conceptual webs of meaning, which not only condition experiences of social injustice but also respond to them (Sayed, Soudien & Carrim, 2003: 231).

Two important reasons are often presented to account for the significant organizational shift at the *compulsory educational level* and for ways in which *continuing education* is conceptualized in many parts of the world in the post-World War II period. These reasons encompass ideologies related to a "common education-for-all" and a "life-long learning" perspective. They have had far reaching consequences for both individuals and collectives. Even though access to schooling and learning opportunities over the life-span are unevenly distributed across the globe, a major transition has occurred over the past five-six decades: doors to formal education have become a feasibility (if not a reality) for *all* members of society. Formal education became a possibility for groups that were previously marginalized, including, for instance, girls, functionally disabled, economically disadvantaged, individuals in rural areas, immigrants, etc., and for the post-school and college attending sections of the population.

Education provided for all young people, including the life-long learning movement, is understood in different ways as constituting fundamental principles that many democracies currently uphold. These conceptual traditions, based upon the notions of *equity* and *human rights*, have specific implications regarding (i) what is understood as legitimate in the conceptualization of *human diversity* and (ii) *concomitantly* how teaching and learning are organized for groups that previously stood outside the educational system/s. In other words, how human difference when conceptualized *has* a bearing upon how communities have historically organized education and/or provision for "different" groups.[46] In addition and more significantly, as will be argued, what is meant by *learning* plays an important role in how education is organized for *some groups* within the framework of a "common education-for-all".

This chapter takes the discourse of equity and rights as a point of departure in order to discuss how education for different groups of young people and adults in the post-World War II period has been organized, particularly in the contexts of the Global North. Issues related to human diversity, the meanings subscribed to different identity categories or constructs (for instance, immigrants, functional disability and gender) and the ways in which learning for different groups is framed are of focal interest here. My aim here (and in current academic work) is to theorize what can be termed the "didactics of inclusion-equity-integration". Thus, one point is to understand the basis on which education for different groups has been argued for and organized. Given that learning and instruction were organized differently for different groups in the pre-World War II era, it is interesting to try and extract the ways in which exclusion and segregation currently get played out, particularly in the contexts of the Global North. What kinds of knowledge about *human diversity* are seen as important, privileged and relevant in educational contexts? What understandings of *learning and instruction* guide the organization of education and everyday practices in educational contexts? In other words, what are the *didactics of inclusion, integration and equity*? These constitute some of the issues that are explored in this article.

---

46.   For some empirically driven examples and discussions, see Bagga-Gupta (1995, 2007, 2012), Färm (1999), Hjörne and Säljö (2008), Sundkvist (1994), Weiner (1995).

Reflections on the themes attended to here arise from my previous and ongoing studies in relation to different projects.[47] The cumulative empirical work this article draws upon can be understood in terms of different long term ethnographically oriented projects that are framed within sociocultural and postcolonial perspectives and that furthermore, invite cross-sectional analysis. In addition to these empirically driven research projects, the issues I raise here draw upon experiences from both large scale school development projects and national level work for Governmental and policy organisations since the mid-1990s.

Operationalizing a *common* education-for-*all*. A didactics of diversity?

> It is remarkable that those who live around the social sciences have so quickly become comfortable in using [category terms] as if those to whom the term is applied have enough in common so that significant things can be said about them as a whole. […] there are categories of persons who are created by students of society, and then studied by them (Goffman, 1963: 140).

Discussions in academic literature regarding tensions in the processes of creating and sustaining equity in educational practices appear to be most evident in domains commonly conceptualized as "gender", "special education", "class" and the education of "immigrants and minorities". These tensions often get played out between a rhetorical or ideological position on the one hand and a praxis-institutional level on the other (see for instance Alm et. al., 2010; Sayed, Soudien & Carrim, 2003). Thus, while *inclusion* is prescribed for the young with functional disabilities within the framework of a one-school-for-all position in the Global North, evidence from the praxis-institutional level has made visible the parallel excluding nature of everyday life therein.[48] Similarly, *integration* strategies for immigrants and minorities – both young people and adults – are

---

48. For historical and analytical discussions on this theme see Haug (1998), Hjörne and Säljö (2008), Macht (1998), Varenne and McDermott (1998), Winzer (1993), Winzer and Mazurek (2000).

often said to fail short of the expectations formulated in policies.[49] Gender and class *equality* are other areas where a mismatch is claimed to exist between goals and visions subscribed to in policies drawn up to deal with marginalization and the ways in which these get practiced or played out in educational and other institutional contexts. What can be surmised is the growing awareness that despite concerted efforts over a relatively long period, a number of pupils receive education in segregated settings *within* the regular educational system for a variety of reasons. Haug (1998) highlighted this situation in terms of "segregated-integrated" (my translation).

Highlighting this tension allows us to probe further into the provision of the *common education-for-all* parallel to the provision of *different education for different groups*. Institutionalized activity systems like, "special education" and different solutions for different categories raise pertinent issues from a range of positions – not least democratic and economic ones from individual and societal perspectives (see the work of the Institute of Future Studies, http:// www.framtidsstudier.se/eng/redirect.asp?p=1602, December 2010). For present purposes, it can be noted that human diversity becomes translated in the one-school-for-all education in terms of different solutions for different groups – immigrants/minorities within the "common education-for-all", individuals with reading and writing problems within the "common education-for-all", deaf children within the "common education-for-all", etc.

There are two interrelated issues that I wish to raise with regards to the problems noted in the operationalizing *from* policy arenas *to* everyday life arenas discussion above. The *first* of these is the necessity of paying attention to these very tensions from an analytical framework, instead of the more common corrective lens position. Recognizing the analytical nature of such tensions allows us to shift focus from claims to better-superior methods and models of teaching to more fundamental issues where the *doing of learning* and the *playing out of identity* in human social practices comes centre-stage. Thus for instance, opportunities to learn *or* get socialized *or* become a member of a community – be it a language area in the curriculum or mathematics or physical education or history – within the institution of schooling becomes framed not merely in terms of a methodological issue for the learner in a specific content area in a language, or a subject area like mathematics, but more importantly in terms of the reasons

---

49.   For analytical discussions in this area see Beach, Gordon and Lahelma (2003), Jacob and Jordan (1993), Mehan et al (1996), Peterson and Hjerm (2007), Rosén (2013).

for focusing on the specific content and membership issues in a learning community. In other words, issues of the "how" of learning get compounded with issues of the "what", "who" and "why" of learning. While this expanded understanding vis-à-vis didactics has been highlighted in both the academic literature and institutional educational field for some time, a further amplification and (re)positioning of learning can be called for.

From an analytical point of departure, two initial differentiations can be made: *firstly*, institutionalized education and instruction are not the equivalent of learning in some neutral sense; in other words, learning is an embedded aspect of all dimensions of human life; *secondly*, empirically studying peoples' conceptualizations of (or "talk about") social practices is not the equivalent of studying the same social practices. Thus analytically, the interactional spaces of communities of practices and practitioners are significant and need focusing upon from didactic points of departure. Recognizing these spaces as sites where learning *gets* done and where participants, including newcomers, both receive and afford opportunities to one another in the process of getting socialized into the "ways-of-being-with-words" (Bagga-Gupta, in press) of specific communities of practices needs to be noted. Recognizing this potential shifts focus away from normative and instrumental ways of conceptualizing meaning making and human identity. Recognizing the significant didactical relevance of these interactional spaces has far reaching implications: for instance, recognizing the inherent fallacy of viewing these spaces as sites that require implementation of better models or methods of instruction for specific groups. Focusing upon interactional spaces allows for understanding human encounters, dialogues and the very journey of the 'doing' of learning. Accounting for these doings and spaces becomes significant both for what goes on inside and outside institutional arenas like schools, higher education, health services, work places, etc. and for theoretical-methodological implications in the human sciences generally and the educational sciences specifically.

A *second* issue related to the tension inherent in the operationalizing of policies at the praxis-institutional level or the reported mismatch between the ideological-institutional fields relates to *representations of diversity*. My interest here relates to the linguistic-turn position which, among other things, centre-staged the fact that our communication and symbol usage in itself shapes and (co)constructs human understandings and realities. This position (not always highlighted in research arenas where human identity is focused) implies that segregated identity research projects or fields themselves (co)create specific

understandings of human identity and diversity. Having said this, an important *politics*-of-representation position that has been established in the academic literature[50] is not my *prime* agenda here. Rather, it is an empirically situated analytical position with a particular interest on *an intersectional focus on representations* themselves that is my focus.

Until recently, diversity was, not uncommonly, associated with an immigrant/minority position. Today, markers of difference other than ethnicity or race are, both in policy arenas and within research, increasingly accepted as falling within the notion of diversity. Thus, diversity is not uncommonly understood as encompassing human difference marked by traditional categories such as class, gender, sexual orientation, age and various types of functional disabilities. This shift in understanding – from *difference as marginalization* to *difference as diversity* – potentially allows for newer positions and (re)conceptualizations in different academic arenas and institutional fields.

However, an explicit homogenizing dimension continues to flourish when human difference gets framed in and through traditional identity constructs such as gender, functional disability, class, ethnicity, age, etc. The *talking about* human difference in terms of these categories, thus in itself creates boundaries vis-à-vis identity. This heuristic conceptual double-edged function of language which both creates and essentializes categories – is not always recognized.[51] Such categorizations become normalized and pre-theorized. The problematic issue here is an analytical one, since these categories are not composed of real, core elements; rather, they are important historical constructs that are (re)created and (re)produced in human interaction within different communities of practices and practitioners. Furthermore, norms about Selfhood are implicitly taken as points of departure in the processes involved when Otherness is focused upon (Ajagán-Lester, 2000). Positions of ethno- and Euro-centrism continue to mark our existence despite having come under serious criticism, not least from post-colonial perspectives. The point that is important for present purposes is that it is through the focus on the Other that an individual or group creates a sense of normality of its own routines and ways-of-being. It is in the very description of Others' ways-of-being that conceptual and interactional spaces are created for making possible a (re)construction of oneself.

---

50.   See for instance Doty (1996), Gomes et. al. (2002), Lott (1999), Mehan (1996), Taylor (1992).
51.   For a further elaboration on these issues, see "The Boundary-Turn" in Bagga-Gupta (2013).

A postcolonial position, among other important issues, made evident the fact that dominant communities of practices and practitioners have privileged possibilities for framing and voicing their agendas. Such communities thus wield the power to make visible specific characteristics of *other* groups who are then further marginalized in a range of ways. To illustrate my point, let us look at the following quote where I have removed key identification word items:

> _____ have been placed outside the societal arena in Sweden, not least in political discussions and when different policy decisions are made for the _____ group. Research that has been conducted has, for instance, often been research on the _____ not with the _____. _____ have themselves not been an active part either in giving the research a direction, the planning of the research or in discussions of the research results" (my translation, see last reference at the end of the reference list for source).

Initially, we can speculate upon and consider numerous subject positions or groups that could fit the blanks. A number of identity constructs could easily fit the message that is presented in the example above: immigrants, deaf, mentally ill, homosexuals, girls, etc. Furthermore, significant issues regarding Otherhood can be raised here. A specific issue concerns another postcolonial point of criticism, i.e. the analytical presence/absence of the Other in the processes and products of research. Democratization *for the Other*, emancipation *of the Other* remains a dominant tendency in both research and development oriented work the world over. While this is not the case in most gender-related work (especially in the Global North), the situation is quite different as far as minorities, immigrants, functionally disabled, and other groups are concerned. The *in and through*, the participation of the Other in the position and role of producers and stakeholders of change, participation in the very processes that research and/or policy work encompass, remains a bone of contention.

Returning to the issue of dominant identity positions, one can also see that these constructs receive support and legitimacy in and through policies, not least since they have historical currency and are structurally easy to focus upon, albeit one at a time. In a similar manner and as implied above, research consolidation around different identity categories – for instance handicap research, gender research, ethnicity research contributes to legitimizing human identity *in singular*. The significant point is that while every human being can potentially lay claim to a number of significant constructs, it is not a routine case that only one of these is evoked at any given juncture in the flow of practices that comprise human life. A *woman* (itself an important historical identity construct) can make claim to her immigrant*ness* or her *differently*-abled status or

her sexual-*orientation* or her biological *age* or a combination of these at differ-ent moments implicitly and/or explicitly in a range of interactional spaces in different communities. However, compounding more than any one of these at any given moment immediately raises complex issues with regard to a politics of recognition and an analytical stance. What is thus mundane in interactional everyday life spaces is often a problem for the research community and policy-makers, one can say! This, however, is an essential truth of what constitutes life for the members of communities of practices.

The normative and naturalized core of any one construct lends credibility to a selective, but strong, idea whereby each is understood in terms of a homogenous entity. Despite the increased recognition accorded to the problems inherent when identity is approached from an essentialistic "mono" position, it is not dif-ficult to understand the seemingly un-eroded position of singularly conceived identity positions. Regarding policy or administrative scales, it is pragmatic to zoom into the complexities of human identity from a compartmentalized posi-tion, since this enables the formulation of support strategies for the equality *of women*, the integration *of minorities*, the inclusion *of functionally disabled*, etc. when compared to formulating tangible support for a *middle-aged, immigrant, functionally disabled, lesbian* who finds herself displaced in a new Global North context. Furthermore, the (re)search enterprise seems reluctant to give up the comfort zone of compartmentalized academic areas.

Emic perspectives, intersectionality and post-colonialism

Complex heterogeneity emerges when the everyday lives of seemingly homog-enized groups or individuals are studied empirically.[52] Attempting to attend to the intersecting and fluid nature of human identity in interactional spaces, the agency of human subjects-in-situ and the playing out of diversity on the scale of praxis-institutions is a complex enterprise. Recently an intersectional position arose within research in order to attend to the mismatch between the singu-lar construct of gender and the lived experiences of scholars who themselves focused upon gender, but who also attended to (an)other prominent identity-construct(s) or subject position(s). *Intersectionality* brought some equilibrium within an area of identity related research in that it racialized and ethnicized

---

52.   See Mykkänen (2001) for a striking critical biographical account relevant to the present discussion.

gender in newer ways (Crenshaw, 1995; De los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005; McCall, 2005). Simultaneously, and from a similar vantage point, postcolonial scholars challenged the tensions inherent in their academic discussions and personal life experiences (Bhabha, 1994). Such contributions to the academic literature were and are made, not least since these researchers themselves can be "understood as paying allegiance to a number of different representations simultaneously. […] postcolonial theorists are migrants in their personal lives and […] are often situated at the crossroads of different academic disciplines as well" (Bagga-Gupta 2007: 6). Racializing and ethnicizing gender on the one hand and living within the boundaries of intellectual and academic disciplines opened up the proverbial Pandora's Box. Theorizing human identity and identification processes is no longer seen as a task reserved for the field of Gender/Woman Studies or Postcolonial Studies within academic scholarship. Both analytically and academically, individuals as well as academic disciplines need to be understood in terms of historically situated identity trajectories that do not easily (or only) belong to any one category, community or construct.

While emic and intersectional positions vis-à-vis identity lie closer to social experiences and realities, they are by no means easy to deploy in research that takes the linguistic-turn or a boundary-turn position as a point of departure (Bagga-Gupta, 2013); these positions analytically recognize the didactical significance of interactional spaces. Furthermore, as noted earlier, an intersectional point of departure is harder to conceptualize and operationalize at the policy or organizational levels. For instance, many of the ombudsman offices have been instituted in Sweden along the lines of singular identity constructs: the Justice Ombudsman, JO in 1809, the Equal (Gender) Opportunities Ombudsman, JÄMO in 1980, the Ethnic Discrimination Ombudsman, DO in 1986, the Children's Ombudsman, BO in 1993, the Disability Ombudsman, HO in 1994 and the Gay and Lesbians (or Sexual Orientation) Ombudsman, HomO in 1999. In January 2009, JÄMO, DO, HO and HomO were integrated into a new joint ombudsman "Discrimination Ombudsman, DO". JO and BO currently constitute independent ombudsman institutions outside DO. The recent integration of the older singular identity ombudsman institutions is perhaps illustrative of the tensions inherent in the complexities of attending to citizens' lived experiences on the one hand and democratically oriented communities' attempts to provide equity related support for its members on the other. While tension in the organization of the new DO institution has already surfaced, one can ask whether such a shift enables a community/state to attend to the *intersecting*

fluid identity of the fictive example illustrated above: a middle-aged, immigrant, functionally disabled, lesbian displaced in a new Global North context.

Inclusion-equity-integration? Some closing reflections on didactics and identity

> One of the difficulties for those of us who, for whatever reason, feel outside the central discourses is that we remain ill-identified when we defy definition by the modernist doctrine. [we are] the 'pilgrims' of modernism, with [our] life-plan journey, as opposed to the 'nomads' of postmodernism/deconstruction who remain nebulous in identity (Corbett, 1996: 100).

Provision of education over time can be understood in terms of different waves: *from isolation to integration* and *from integration to inclusion*. The history of special education had until the 1980s been conceptualized in terms of a shift: "from isolation to integration" (Winzer, 1993). Concepts such as *inclusion* and *integration*, often linked to the branch of education that is called special education and immigrant education, are in fact borrowed from discourses of *equity* (see also Sayed, Soudien & Carrim, 2003).

As noted above, all children and young people today have in principle access to a common education-for-all. Thus, previously marginalized groups currently have access to a common education (at least in the Global North). While gender segregation in school settings can be observed in both Global North and South contexts, such segregation in schools is uncommon in Scandinavian settings. Similarly, while merit based academic streaming can be observed in both the Global North and South, it is less conspicuous in present day Scandinavia. Educational provision for functionally disabled young people is probably an area that is particularly challenging when it comes to assuming a common education-for-all position. For instance, in Sweden almost all types of functional disabilities are accommodated (at least) physically within the common education-for-all provisions. While this is far from the case in many other geopolitical contexts, the following issues can be noted and discussed.

Accommodating young people with and without functional disabilities in the same physical space is not the equivalent of a common education-for-all provision. Academic discussions during recent decades and shifts in policies from an *integration of* the functionally disabled to an *inclusion of* functionally disabled in educational institutions both captured and attended to this continuing marginalization and need for (re)accommodation. That is, accommodating

needs of *differently*-abled young people in educational settings together with able-bodied young people was recognized as a way of going beyond a mere physical co-existence in institutional interactional spaces.[53] Studies of social practices in institutional settings, however, continue to highlight that (i) inclusion remains an elusive vision, and (ii) different types of education are made available for different groups of young people within the same physical spaces. Here the following conceptual point can be raised.

No parallel shift in the academic or institutional discussions can be noted in the instance of education for minorities and immigrants. Immigrants – young children, youth and adults, regardless of their entry points into educational systems – are expected to be *integrated*. Accommodating the needs of the wide range of experiences (linguistic, community-based, life-based, to name a few) of people who move voluntarily or find themselves displaced into settings where the norm is a national language and a geopolitically framed idea of a homogenous culture, continues to be framed in terms of integration in institutions like schools, workplaces and general society. A similar case can be made for the situation of minorities like the Sami, Finns and Roma in a national geopolitical context like Sweden. While political recognition is accorded to the latter, and in the case of the Sami and Finns language profiled general educational provisions exist in some parts of Sweden, it is the norm of a national majority language and the myth of a homogenous monolithical culture that upholds the ideology of a one-way integration for immigrants in general, including officially recognized minority groups (see also Hult, 2004). The significant issue here is the linguistically framed organizational principle and role accorded to a national language in the common education-for- all provision.

Another illustrative example of the tension surrounding equity lies in the organization of educational provision for deaf children and young people in Sweden. Sweden remains the only country in the Global North that provides a segregated education for its young deaf population and has done so since the establishment of a common education-for-all in the 1960s. Despite the parallel and dichotomized view of deaf human beings in terms of non-hearing functionally disabled on the one hand, and as members of unique language communities on the other, deaf young people have had access to a physically segregated educational provision in Sweden since the end of the nineteenth century. Different models of education based upon oral and manual methodo-

---

53.   See Corbett (1996) for a differently-abled critical analytical contribution to the literature.

logical ideologies over the past 150 years notwithstanding, deaf young people in Sweden have, in other words, had and continue to receive their education today in physically segregated schools.[54] A central policy shift in the 1980s, when Swedish Sign Language was decreed a *language of instruction* in this segregated educational system, was seen as conferring a linguistic minority status to deaf children (and adults). Apart from the language specifications, a national curriculum and achievement goals (similar for deaf and hearing pupils) are seen as representing an inclusive perspective in an otherwise compensatory segregated school system. The Swedish schools for the deaf thus represent a fundamental paradox between on the one hand an inclusive democratically based one-school-for-all framework, and on the other a physically segregated institution that currently rests upon a linguistically organizational principle and a compensatory-categorical idea. Accordingly, a linguistic minority status, including the parallel categorical-compensatory situation that legitimizes the continuing segregation of educational provision for this group, constitutes a paradox. Furthermore, addressing the needs of this group within the framework of other institutionalized special educational provision is seen as difficult. Academic discussions regarding the deaf are also segregated from both general and special educational domains. Metaphorically, the organization of educational provision for this group in Sweden can thus be understood as being situated at the crossroads between special educational services, disability provision and support for marginalized minority groups.

Didactically relevant implications regarding what is conceived of in terms of education-for-all thus gets played out in terms of the *inclusion* of some, the *integration* of others and the diffuse but tangible *segregation* of a few. This can be further illustrated through the comparison of the language learning contexts that are conceptualized and created in the common education-for-all for the immigrant child/adult (or the national minority Sami child) and the language learning contexts that are created for the national ethnic-majority adolescent who experiences difficulties with the national language, Swedish in the school context. The *didactics of integration* in the first case has, for instance, given rise to a large number of specialized institutional activities in schools and teacher education programs, and has created both pupil identity positions (e.g. Sami, immigrant, Roma, "blatte", etc.) and professional identifications (e.g. teachers of

---

54.   For empirical and theoretically driven discussions on this school system in Sweden, see for instance Bagga-Gupta (2002, 2004), Holmström (2013).

a second language for adults, teachers of first language(s), teachers of [national] minority language(s), bilingual researchers, second language researchers, etc.). Similarly, the *didactics of inclusion* can be said to have contributed to specialist institutional activities in schools, within teacher education programs and both pupil identity (e.g. deaf, disabled, etc.) and professional identity positions (e.g. special needs educators, teachers of the deaf, disability researchers, special needs educational researchers, deaf researchers, etc.).

The compartmentalization of discussions vis-à-vis language didactics in different academic arenas – language issues for immigrant children/adults, language issues for the deaf or the language impaired national ethnic majority adolescent – can be raised (see also Bagga-Gupta, in press). Another notable characteristic that is common to both the areas of integration and inclusion in academic writings is the (pre)theorizing vis-à-vis learning, or rather the absence or simplification of the same. In the domain of learning illustrated here – i.e. language learning – specialized knowledge for the specialist professional (for instance, special education for the language impaired, teacher of the national language for the immigrant child, teacher of "Swedish as a second language of the deaf") is not uncommonly conceived instrumentally in terms of the learning of language structures. One can say that a monological perspective on language (Linell, 2009) and language learning has arrived at centre-stage when integration of immigrants – children and adults – and inclusion of functionally disabled children and young people (language impaired, the deaf) are concerned.

The ways-of-being and the ways in which the organization of and/or the representation of diversity occurs in educational contexts – through the management of provisions for different groups, as exemplified above, constitute aspects of the didactics of representation. In addition, the ways in which identity constructs are framed in and through the interactional spaces of educational provision and how identifications emerge in the curriculum and classroom texts are aspects of this didactics (see Bagga-Gupta 2004, 2012, in press). Learning gets back-staged when pupils are for any reason viewed as being weak – learning gets relegated to a normative "applied" position, and the thrust of didactics as the science of learning risks getting reduced to issues of methodologies where a "mono" identity is focused upon.

As a final point – attending to the complexities of human existence currently in the Global North at the compulsory school level also raises parallel issues at post-college level education for older citizens within the framework of life-long learning. Inclusion, integration and equity constitute fundamental ideas in

societies' democratization at institutional learning arenas here, too. Traditional identity categories including age are, as I have argued, significant and need to be accounted for analytically. The subtle ways in which identity constructs are framed and enacted in these arenas is an analytical enterprise that has a bearing on the didactics of diversity. The changed context of educational provision – *from* a provision for a few *to* the provision for all and *from* a provision for a particular age group *to* provision that encompasses the entire life-span – is both dramatic and has far-reaching consequences for society. This article contributes to ongoing discussions as to how this changed landscape, including the tasks entrusted to educational institutions, need to be critically approached from what has been termed 'the didactics of diversity'. How we attend to issues of diversity and social exclusion in (i) society-at-large, including institutional arenas, and (ii) the analytical enterprise of research itself highlight complexities of attending to and the risks of (co- and re)producing specific identity positions. This constitutes a fundamental dimension of not only the provision of education but also the research enterprise itself.

References

Ajagán-Lester, L. (2000). *"De Andra": afrikaner i svenska pedagogiska texter (1768–1965)"* ["The Other": Africans in Swedish educational texts 1768–1965]. Studies in educational sciences 31. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm University, Sweden.

Alm, S., Bäckman, O., Gavanas, A. & Kumlin, J… (2010). *Utsatthetens olika ansikten – Bergreppsöversikt och analys* [The different faces of social exclusion – a conceptual review and analysis]. Working paper 2010:13, Institute for Future Studies. Sockholm.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (1995). *Human Development and Institutional Practices. Women, Child Care and the Mobile Creches*. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 130. Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University, Sweden.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2002). Explorations in Bilingual Instructional Interaction. A sociocultural perspective on literacy. *Journal of the European Association on Learning and Instruction*, 5(2), 557–587.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2004). Visually Oriented Language Use. Discursive and technological resources in Swedish Deaf pedagogical arenas. In: M. V. Herreweghe & M. Vermeerbergen (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics in European Deaf Communities*. Vol 10. The Sociolinguistics in Deaf Communities Series. 171–207. Washington DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2007). Aspects of Diversity, Inclusion and Democracy within Education and Research. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. 51(1), 1–22.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2012). "Privileging identity positions and multimodal communication in textual practices. Intersectionality and the (re)negotiation of boundaries." In A.

Pitkänen-Huhta & L. Holm (Eds.) *Literacy Practices in Transition: Perspectives from the Nordic countries* (pp. 75–100). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2013). "The Boundary-Turn. Relocating *language*, *identity* and *culture* through the epistemological lenses of *time*, *space* and *social interactions*." In I. Hasnain, S. Bagga-Gupta & S. Mohan (Eds.). *Alternative Voices*: *(Re)searching Language, Culture and Identity…* (pp. 28–49). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bagga-Gupta, S. (in press). "Languaging.Ways-of-being-with-words across disciplinary boundaries and empirical sites." In H. Paulasto, L. Meriläinen, H. Riionheimo & M. Kok (Eds.). *Language contacts at the crossroads of disciplines*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Beach, D., Gordon, T. & Lahelma, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Democratic education. Ethnographic challenges*. London: Tufnell press.

Corbett, J. (1996). *Bad-Mouthing. The language of special needs*. London: Falmer Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1995). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of colour. In: K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller & K. Thomas (Eds.). *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Informed the Movement* (pp. 357–383). New York: New York Press.

De los Reyes, P. & Mulinari, D. (2005). *Intersektionalitet: kritiska reflektioner over (o)jämlikhetens landskap* [Intersectionality: critical reflections in the (non)equity landscape]. Malmö: Liber.

Doty, R.L. (1996). *Borderlines. Imperial encounters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Färm, K. (1999). *'Social problem' eller 'som andra och i gemnskap med andra' – föreställningar om människor med utvecklignsstörning* [A social problem or like others and in the community of others – How mentally retarded persons, their capacities and limitations have been pervieved]. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 201. Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University, Sweden.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gomes, N. B., Bigestans, A., Magnusson, L. & Ramberg, I. (Eds). (2002). *Reflections on Diversity and Change in Modern Society. A Festschrift for Annick Sjögren*. Botkyrka, Sweden: Mångkulturellt centrum.

Haug, P. (1998). *Pedagogiskt dilemma: Specialundervisning* [Educational dilemma: special education]. Stockholm: Swedish Agency for Education.

Hjörne, E. & Säljö, R. (2008). *Att platsa i en skola för alla. Elevhälsa och förhandling om normalitet i den svenska skolan* [To find a place in a school for all. Pupil wellbeing and negotiations of normality in the Swedish school]. Finland: Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.

Holmström, I. 2013. "'Learning by hearing'. Technological Framings for Participation." Örebro Studies in Education 42. Doctoral dissertation, Örebro University, Sweden.

Hult, F. M. (2004). Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden. *Language Policy*. 3, 181–201.

Institute of Future Studies, http://www.framtidsstudier.se/eng/redirect.asp?p=1602, December 2010.

Jacob, E. & Jordan, C. (1993). *Minority Education: Anthropological perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing corp.

Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically. Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lott, T. L. (1999). *The invention of race. Black culture and the politics of representation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

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

Macht, J. (1998). *Special Education's failed system. A question of eligibility*. London: Bergin & Garvey.

Mehan, H. (1996). Beneath the skin and between the ears: A case study in the politics of representation. In: S. Chaiklin & J. Lave (Eds.). *Understanding practice. Perspectives on activity and context*. (pp. 241–268). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mehan, H., Villanueva, I., Hubbard, L. & Lintz, A. (1996). *Constructing school success. The consequences of untracking low-achieving students*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mykkänen, P. (2001). *Exist. Det blinda seendet* [Exist. The blind vision]. Stockholm: Carlsson.

Peterson, A. & Hjerm, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Etnicitet. Perspektiv på samhället* [Ethnicity. Perspectives on society]. Mälmö: Gleerups.

Rosén, J. (2013). *Svenska för invandrarskap? Språk, kategorisering och identitet inom utbildningsformen svenska för invandrare*. [Swedish for immigrantness? Language, Categorization and Identity in the educational program Swedish for immigrants]. Örebro Studies in Educational Sciences with a focus on Didactics 7. Doctoral dissertation. Örebro University.

Sayed, Y., Soudien, C. & Carrim, N. (2003). Discourses of exclusion and inclusion in the south: limits and possibilities. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4(3), 231–248.

Sundkvist, M.(1994). *De vanartade barnen. Mötet mellan barn, föräldrar och Norrköpings barnavårdsnämnd 1903–1925* [Delinquent children. Conflicts and cooperation between children, parents and the children's welfare board in Norrköping 1903–1925]. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 112. Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.

Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the politics of representation*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Varenne, H. & McDermott, R. (1998). *Successful failure. The school that America builds*. Colarado: Westview Press.

Weiner, G. (1995). *De räddade barnen. Om fattiga barn, mödrar och fäder och deras möte med filantropin i Hagalund 1900–1940* [Neglected children and their saviours. Philanthropic work among poor children and their parents in Hagalund 1900–1940]. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 113. Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.

Winzer, M. A. (1993). *The History of Special Education. From Isolation to Integration*. Washington DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Winzer, M. A. & Mazurek, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Special Education in the 21st Century. Issues of Inclusion and Reform*. Washington DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Delegation with Gypsies and Sinter, http://www.romskadelegationen.org/Delaktighet. html, August 2010