CHAPTER 3

INCLUSION AND EDUCATION

Sites for Disciplinary Power

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a theoretical context, acknowledging the increasing emphasis on 'inclusive' education, with 'participation' (Barton, 1997) as an underpinning concept. This has significance here since it provides a structure for developing an argument that there are pupils who are culturally excluded by particular concepts of participation. Here this is explored via drawing from observation, a skill by which particular abilities in art might be defined, since this highly individualised technology is used to assess pupil performance against culturally defined norms relating to both representation and participation.

The range of literature relating to concepts of inclusion in education reflects a complex and changing field (Lawson et al, 2006; Graham and Slee, 2008), evolving from the recognition of a specific area of learning defined as 'special educational needs' and the ways in which specific categories of children are educated. This field is also characterised by, conflict and dilemma (Ainscow, Booth and Dyson, 2006; Norwich, 2008; Armstrong, 2003), with pupils, parents, teachers and a range of agencies negotiating shifts in policy at personal and local level as well as from the perspectives of national and international moves to implement change (UNESCO, 1994). The field of special education is recognised as an equally complex set of social processes (Tomlinson, 1982; Barton, 1988). Much of the discussion around inclusion has been located around practical strategies for including children in mainstream schooling, yet the complication relates to the production of a concept of inclusive education and the ways in which we 'explicate the discourses of inclusion' (Graham and Slee, 2008:279). The challenges are therefore philosophical and conceptual as well as practical.

INDIVIDUALISATION, NORMALISATION AND THE CREATION OF THE ABNORMAL

Inclusion and education are inextricably linked, and these combined terms provide a complex site for negotiation between the individual and the social body. This book, sitting uncomfortably as it does across observational drawing practice, art education and dyspraxia as a 'learning disability', must take into account some discussion of 'special' education and contemporary discussions relating to inclusive education. In this chapter I explore some of these complexities by introducing a theoretical framework for this book based on processes of 'individualisation',

'normalisation' and the creation of the 'abnormal' in relation to education as a 'disciplinary method', adapted from Foucault's writing about punitive mechanisms in *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1991).

Read (1970) suggests that recognition of individual difference and the contributions that they might make, because of their 'individuality', is central to a concept of democratic education. He suggests that there is a choice:

> … between variety and uniformity: between a conception of a society of persons who seek equilibrium through mutual aid: and a conception of society as a collection of people required to conform as far as possible to one ideal. In the first case, education is directed towards encouraging the growth of a specialized cell in a multiform body: in the second case, education is directed towards the elimination of all eccentricities and a uniform mass…In democratic practice each individual has his [sic] birthright: he[sic] is not material to be poured into a mould and given a hallmark. (1970:2–4)

This hypothesis, described as the 'educator's dilemma', centres on the role of the individual, conformity and difference as central and inseparable aspects of this philosophical discussion about education. It could be argued that our philosophies of education are shaped by our understanding and positioning in relation to these key principles which also underpin the development of inclusive practices.

The tension between the social and individual is at the heart of inclusion, a term which encompasses a range of concepts from technical organisation and provision, to philosophies regarding social organisation. However, to describe it as a binary may be simplistic due to the composite sites that form this discourse (Marks, 1999). A central concern of this book is the production of inclusive, and exclusive, practices by the social organisation of educative systems based on identification of the 'norm' in relation to observational drawing as a specific practice, and the creation of the 'dyspraxic ideal' (discussed more fully in Chapter 4) which exists in relation to a standard or 'normal' concept of human physical and cognitive development.

Ideas that are central to the theoretical framework of this book are introduced in this chapter, specifically 'individualisation', 'normalisation' and the 'abnormal' (Foucault, 1991). These three related themes, connected by the ways in which society and the individual interact, can be considered as part of the 'political technology of the body' in which, Foucault suggests, 'might be read a common history of power relations and object relations' (Rabinow, 1984:171). Power relations are central to the political imperatives that connect education and inclusion. Who will be included and in what? What types of 'technologies' exclude and how? Who decides on the rationale for inclusion and who has the power, the will, or the knowledge to include are significant points for consideration in this work.

Foucault discusses the role that the 'political economy of the body' has within complex social functions such as education where the individual can be shaped or moulded and where particular types of control, he argues, can be exerted over 'the body':

> … power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs.

> This political investment of the body is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use; it is largely as a focus for production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination… the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body. (Foucault, 1984:173)

Within such a framework for production, the individual body may be subjected to both inclusive and exclusive practices as it is shaped by disciplinary discourses into becoming productive. Read celebrates the individual as a 'specialised cell' to be nurtured, but Foucault's discussion of individualisation provides a different reading. The 'docile body' is described as one which 'may be subjected, used transformed and improved' (Rabinow, p. 180), and the methods of control are enacted in subtle ways on the individual rather than *en masse* via disciplinary coercion. Foucault describes the emergence of these disciplinary methods in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as sites of power and domination. He says:

> The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, or at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely. (Foucault, 1984:182)

Education as a disciplinary power, works on the 'docile' or malleable body of the individual where it becomes an object and target of power. Significantly, special education discourses, with their own vocabulary and systems of identification and remediation, can also be identified as specific sites of exclusionary power within the broader frame of education (Dunne, 2008). The ways in which obedience and usefulness are defined within this discourse are also significant here in the creation of particular types of educable subjects. Inclusive education aims to include the excluded and works within this discourse as a compensatory accommodation for those individuals who are identified as less obedient or less useful to the particular discipline of education and to the social body as a whole. In discussing some of the principal ideas related to the social organisation of inclusion, Graham and Slee (2008) recognise that acknowledgement of inclusion must, by implication, create the excluded (see also Slee and Allan, 2001).

Normalisation with a focus on the individual resonates with concepts of inclusion as the exertion of disciplinary power:

> Instead of bending all its subjects into a single, uniform mass, it separates, analyses, differentiates, carries its procedures of decomposition to the point of necessary and sufficient single units…Discipline makes individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise. (Foucault, 1984:188)

Individualisation becomes a technology by which differences can be identified and adaptations to training or education made as part of the processes of normalisation where the individual can be measured against a norm or average.

The identification of dyspraxia, explored fully in Chapter 4, by comparisons against age related norms for physical and cognitive development, is a useful example

of such processes. Average or 'normal' developmental characteristics provide a backdrop for the observation of the 'abnormal' identified within a further disciplinary regime, child health (Foucault, 1980:166). The obedience and usefulness of subjects within this discourse relate to their individual characteristics, which are set against a 'norm' as a 'pupil ideal', a set of characteristics that embody a learner that is ready, willing and able to learn (sat up straight and still and displaying attentiveness by eye contact indicating both listening and observation, for example), personifying an ideal learner who is largely compliant to hegemonic learning systems and practices. This 'pupil ideal' allows for the creation of disaffection, unwillingness and inability to learn where a range of personal characteristics might be read as evidence of the spaces between the individual and the ideal or desirable, and which may as easily be based on social and cultural differences as concepts of individual difference.

What is also significant in this consideration of observational drawing practice is the opportunity for a parallel discussion of the role that observation has as a technology for individualisation and identification of the abnormal within these disciplinary regimes (Rabinow, 1984:189; Foucault, 1991). Observation appears as central to the power knowledge discourses within education, expressed by Foucault as hierarchical observation systems which allow for scrutiny by others as well as self regulation. This is exemplified by Bentham's panopticon prison design, where the observer, situated in a central observation tower, is surrounded by individual cells allowing for the observation and subsequent self-regulation of the subject (Foucault, 1991:200). The interchange between the observer and the observed is significant, as are particular ways of seeing. The presumption that there is a 'shared' or universal view ignores the positioning of the observer and the role that hegemonic ways of seeing have within discourses of power such as child health and education, as the 'normalising' lens becomes the 'normalised' lens. Slee and Allan (2001:178) discuss the extension of schooling as a 'significant force for disablement' via these mechanisms for observation. They suggest:

> Schools are cartographic police. Exclusion proceeds through deep structural and broad cultural mechanisms to invigilate a shifting spectrum of diversity. Generally speaking, the boundaries in this sub-map are sharpest along the lines of disability, race, gender, class, sexuality, bilingualism, ethnicity, and geographic position.

The personal attributes of the 'other', individuals or particular groups in society, are offered to bridge the gaps that are generated by educational practices which generate and reinforce hegemonic values. The role of observation will be developed more fully in Chapter 5 in relation to ocular-centrism (Jay, 1993), but the connections between observation as the basis of 'scientific' knowledge underpinned by particular concepts of vision and visuality, is also recognised here as a technology implicated in the definitions and conceptions of inclusion.

INCLUSION AND 'SPECIAL' EDUCATION

Recent moves towards inclusion in education have grown out of a wider, international movement for social change outlined in the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994).

This could be described as a significant catalyst for more recent moves towards inclusion in education promoted as an early objective identified by the then new Labour government in 1997, resulting in guidance for schools to support this mission (DfES, 2001; DfES 2004). However, discussions of inclusive approaches in education often centre on debates regarding spatialisation (Armstrong, 2003) and the dilemmas regarding the physical re-integration of pupils into mainstream education (Ainscow, Booth and Dyson, 2006). By considering the role of specific art practices, this book explores exclusive approaches to teaching and learning in art education.This relates to the ability of all pupils to be able to participate effectively in their learning, specifically in mainstream education, with a focus on what Booth (1996) describes as 'participation in the culture and curricula of education'.

Concepts of inclusion, although with significant origins in social equity, have become almost synonymous with discussions about the ways in which 'special' education is provided and the dilemmas that exist in offering the most effective means of educating a physically, socially and culturally diverse student population. Ainscow, Booth and Dyson (2006:15) suggest that inclusion is often referred to in the context of the needs of disabled pupils, but they refer to 'diversity among all learners' rather than locating the focus on a specific group. Rather than inclusion centring on a recognition of difference however, it is more frequently located within the 'special education' discourse whereby pupils are identified as different, grouped accordingly and taught in different ways and in different locations. However, a simplistic interpretation of the practical arrangements for educational provision may fail to confront the nature of socially constructed attitudes towards 'special education' and disability (Riddell and Watson, 2003) that emerge from the processes of normalisation within systems of education, which are also located around issues of race, gender and 'the politics of masculinities' (Slee and Allan, 2001:175).

Barton (1998) and Norwich (2008) identify participation as a key concept in any discussion of inclusive education. Barton says: 'inclusive education is about the participation of *all* children and young people and the removal of *all* forms of exclusionary practice'. However, 'the removal of all forms of exclusionary practice' is problematic when located within the special education discourse, originating from 'benevolent humanitarianism' (Tomlinson, 1982) or 'liberal pluralism' (Benjamin, 2002) which situate learning problems with the individual. This acknowledges a power dynamic where individuals, recognised as having a learning deficit according to concepts of a 'norm', are identified by professionals in positions of power. Educational Psychologist reports, teachers' comments within reviews and the views of medical practitioners may all be considered in relation to this. Interventions are introduced in order to assist the individual in order that they might participate more fully in their learning. Inclusive practices become part of a process of normalisation where individualised interventions (via an Individual Education Plan (IEP), for example) can be accommodated through very specific measures that identify deficit and subsequent remediation that connect the individual with an ideal.

Although Barton identifies participation as a key concept in relation to inclusion, this is problematic since participation can still be discussed from this seemingly benign position. Tomlinson (1982) argues that 'Special Needs' education,

is considered within a concept of 'enlightened and advanced' forms of caring for weaker members of society, yet this concept of inclusion recognises that those to be included are already excluded. This drive to , identify, label and intervene, forms the real dilemma discussed by Norwich (2008), where recognition of the specific needs of the individual can be described as a form of exclusion, but where failure to act can deny participation. What are central to this discussion of inclusion through participation are the decisions about what constitutes *meaningful* participation and how this is legitimised. Particular sites for learning, for example, designed to maximise participation via alternative and specialised provision, do not necessarily legitimise the types of learning that occur within those places (Armstrong, 2003; Collinson and Penketh, 2010). Similarly activities can be open to participation in action, in that the individual may be able to take part in a particular activity, yet the 'outcomes' may remain marginal and illegitimate by processes of assessment. For example, a pupil may physically participate in a drawing activity, yet the drawing product may be assessed as below the standard expected for a pupil of that age in comparison to others in the class. Physical participation via the location of learning does not necessarily legitimise the learning that is taking place. Within this discussion, 'participation' appears to be aligned with hegemonic practices that favour the few, and the inability to participate becomes identified with failure or a 'disability' in respect of learning. The identification of the 'abnormal' is a necessary aspect of those systems designed to identify those who are 'more able' or academically elite (McHoul and Grace, 1993:72).

Foucault argues that social organisations, such as the compulsory education sector, demand the identification of the 'normal' and the 'abnormal' (Foucault, 1991). The identification of special educational needs and the expanding discourse surrounding this field appears to be built around the rights of the individual to an appropriate education, yet there is a social dimension to the need to identify and separate different types of learners, since such practices comprise the ways in which hierarchical structures are required to function. The identification of conditions such as dyspraxia or dyslexia is aligned with a political imperative to have a functionally literate workforce as a means of contributing effectively to economic development. The need to train this social body generates a need to identify those who might not be trained as effectively. Foucault (1980:172) suggests that:

> … the body – the body of individuals and the body of populations – appears as the bearer of new variables, not merely as between the scarce and the numerous, the submissive and the restive, rich and poor, healthy and sick, strong and weak, but also as the more or less utilisable, more or less amenable to profitable investment, those with greater or lesser prospects of survival, death and illness, and with more or less capacity for being usefully trained.

McHoul and Grace (1993:68), discussing 'normalisation' in the work of Foucault, suggest that social organisation and administration demands that we 'investigate the dividing line between the 'normal' and the 'abnormal''. Following this argument, the construction of the terms such as 'able' and 'disabled', for example, is essential in order for individuals to be identified for the way in which they might fit within

a social organisation. It is possible to argue that such social organisations create disability (Oliver, 1988) or that disability would not exist if it were not for these systems. For example, a society that bases academic ability on specific principles of literacy is, it could be argued, disabling pupils, by increasing age-related expectations of what it is to be literate. In the same way, an education system that demands a high degree of fine motor control in very young children, for the 'early' learning of writing, for example, would need to identify those whose skills have not developed in relation to a specified age related expectation. This can be extended from these specific skills to other generic learner dispositions such as eagerness, attentiveness and personal organisation in the creation of the ideal pupil as one who is compliant to educational contexts (Graham, 2007). Skills and abilities that develop differently with the individual can therefore be problematised and created as a learning disability or deficit.

Florian (2005:97) suggests that not all 'disabilities' result in a special educational need, suggesting that 'learners are located along a multidimensional continuum of the human condition and these locations change over time'. The existence of a norm does not reflect a fixed and clearly defined centre, as Graham and Slee (2008) explain, but one that is fluid and is itself regulated in the ways in which it defines those who are 'normal'. There is therefore a tension when flexible aspects of individual learner identity are set within the concrete of systemic and cultural practices that have fixed approaches to age related ability (for example) and this is of particular significance to the creation of dyspraxia set as it is against age related expectations for specific aspects of 'child development'. The emphasis on 'developmental dyspraxia' stresses the transient nature of this 'Specific Learning Disability' (Sigmundssen, Hansen and Talcott, 2003).

Much of the discussion still emphasises provision for the individual as the location of tensions between integration and separation and how the individual might best be accommodated within the education systems. It is rarely the curriculum and the cultural relevance of subjects that is questioned in relation to potentially exclusive practices in education. Dudley-Marling (2004) attempts to shift the locus of deficit and offers a useful discussion in this respect, suggesting an alternative conception of how learning might be considered. He suggests that 'Learning and learning problems dwell in activities and cultural practices situated in the context of social relations rather than in the heads of individual students' (p. 482). He goes on to describe school structures and organisations as 'neither natural or normal' places for effective learning to take place where systemic failure is rationalised as a failure of the individual (p. 484), suggesting also that 'learning disabilities' (more specifically a US term), created by inappropriate school structures, would not exist without the school context.

ART EDUCATION AND EXCLUSIVE PRACTICE

Art education will be explored more fully in Chapter 5, but it is useful to make the connections between some specific characteristics of art as a site for learning and the principles of inclusion that are being discussed here. In considering art education and specific approaches to drawing, it is possible to discuss how a critique of

inclusion through participation might be applied. Such a discussion, I suggest, reveals something of the embedded nature of exclusive cultural practices in the discipline when it is positioned as a subject in compulsory education. However, there are elements of art education and more particularly drawing practice that are sympathetic to a reading of exclusive individualising practice outside of formalised systems of education.

As a starting point for a consideration of 'inclusion' in respect of art education, curriculum guidance suggests the existence of a reactive approach to 'provision'. The following discussion of the national curriculum for art provides a useful exemplification of this positioning of inclusion as 'postscript' rather than 'preface'. A retrospective discussion based on 'what to do for those who are already excluded' appears to come relatively late in curriculum guidance. It could be argued, for example, that the guidance for inclusion offered to support the art and design curriculum for Key Stages 1 and 2 'additional inclusion information for art and design' (QCA, 2009) was designed to promote participation for those pupils who might not otherwise have the opportunity to engage fully with the curriculum. However, the advice offered immediately positions the learner as one who needs 'special treatment', since it advises:

> To overcome any potential barriers to learning in art and design, some pupils may require:
>
> alternative tasks to overcome any difficulties arising from specific religious beliefs relating to ideas and experiences they are expected to represent
>
> access to stimuli, participation in everyday events and explorations, materials, word descriptions and other resources, to compensate for a lack of specific first-hand experiences and to allow pupils to explore an idea or theme
>
> alternative or adapted activities to overcome difficulties with manipulating tools, equipment or materials

The guidance indicates that it is the pupil who 'may require alternative tasks' or 'alternative or adapted activities to overcome difficulties' and this requires that such pupils be identified in order to be accommodated, including those of an 'other' religious belief, those whose observational experiences need compensating for, and those who may be less able to manipulate materials or tools. These accommodations have within them implicit and hegemonic understandings of appropriate skills for working with materials and tools, 'difficult' or apparently restrictive religions, and socially determined perceptions of valid observational experiences.

The guidance acknowledges that learners might face barriers to learning and that 'special' arrangements might be required in order for full participation to take place. The barriers for learning are situated with the individuals and their 'differences' that need to be compensated for. The suggestion that 'some pupils may require…' positions the individual in need of additional support where it might otherwise have offered the opportunity for a critique of the curriculum, as a culturally defined set of practices. All pupils, for example, have some kind of observational experience yet the guidance suggests that these experiences are valued differently and that

some are in need of compensation. 'Exclusion' could therefore be described as existing out of a model for non-participation. In the context of art education, this could be discussed in terms of curricula and teaching based on hegemonic practices that also underpin assessment decisions that come to define concepts of pupil 'ability'. The 2009 orders for art and design at Key Stages 3 and 4 offer an alternative statement for inclusion, and the QCA website provides guidance on 'Equalities, diversity and inclusion in art and design (QCA, updated 2009) under a number of headings including:

– identifying and teaching gifted and talented learners
– planning, teaching and assessing the curriculum for pupils with learning difficulties

Both imply the identification of the exceptional and 'abnormal'. The guidance included under 'planning for inclusion' confirms the separation of particular pupils whilst acknowledging that 'planning an inclusive curriculum means shaping the curriculum to match the needs and interests of the full range of learners.' The following groups become exceptional by their identification in order to be included in the curriculum:

– the gifted and talented
– those with special educational needs and disabilities
– pupils who have English as a second language
– the different needs of boys and girls

The identification of these groups requires the intensification of procedures for identification and surveillance related to the previous discussion of this aspect of Foucault's work.

The limitations of the competitive education system, Barton (1997) argues, appear to create an increasing demand for the recognition of those who are at variance with an ever decreasing definition of what it is to be 'normal'. However, I would also argue that the specific nature or characteristics of some art education practices are defined by being exclusive and, as a result, can act in defining and excluding certain types of learners.

Woodrow (2007) discusses Western education systems that prioritise individual knowledge and individual rights and autonomy rather than the role of expert, authority and traditional concepts of knowledge, yet I would suggest that the role of authoritative expert is highly relevant in secondary art education, with its adherence to the 'artist' as a model of the talented individual. Art, as a school subject, is derived from and informed by fine art, design and craft, each located differently within social and cultural practices and all, to some extent, varying in the levels of participation desired and encouraged by different societal demands. For example, some elements of art, influenced by 18th century fine art practices, are necessarily based on elitist principles, with work produced by the few for the enjoyment or moral and religious redemption of the many. Craft and design are suitably different, drawing on the role of the artisan, with work produced having a utilitarian as well as aesthetic role. The positioning of art as a taught subject is based on a model that prioritises the exemplary work of the individual defined as uncommonly gifted, and such an adherence to elitist principles align it with exclusionary practices as a means of preserving a set of specific qualities.

Graham (2006) discusses the existence of a centre as a significant concept for 'inclusion' since the word 'include' suggests 'bringing in'. Graham and Slee (2008:284) continue:

> It would be reasonable to argue that there is an implicit centred-ness to the term 'inclusion', for it discursively privileges notions of the pre-existing by seeking to include the Other into a pre-fabricated, naturalised space.

There are however a number of centres, and the existence of specific disciplinary practice in respect of art education is significant here. Observational drawing practice based on hegemonies of representation (Jay, 1993) and explored more fully in Chapter 5 also create a centre to which pupil performances might be drawn or from which they might be repelled.

Bourdieu (1993) offers a useful frame for discussing inclusive and exclusive practices related to the role of culture in the reproduction of social structures. Art education offers a compelling context within which to consider the symbolic capital of art production within the cultural power relations of educational practices. Art in compulsory education can be considered as a 'concrete social situation governed by a set of objective social relations' (p. 6). Within such a social system, technical skill and accomplishment can be viewed as a form of 'symbolic power'. Individuals can be perceived of as having a form of 'capital' by the physical talents they display. This can be understood as a form of 'habitus' where players become legitimated by their physical practices:

> to enter a field (philosophical, scientific, [artistic] – my addition) to play the game, one must possess the habitus which predisposes one to enter that field …one must also possess at least the minimum amount of knowledge, or skill, or 'talent' to be accepted as a legitimate player (p. 8)

Within this discussion inclusion takes place via participation, yet it is the nature of participation that is significant since it has to be the type of participation that ensures legitimate inclusion. To take part in the activity is not sufficient to ensure meaningful participation since the 'quality' of the participation and degree of talent or skill is also important.

The individualised role of the Western artist, depicting religious, royal and cultural events, or as the talented, tortured individual, commenting on but also removed from society, creates the artist as the 'other'. The focus on the artist as celebrity (Bourdieu, 1993) can be described as contributing to the elite principle of the talented individual, with the focus closely aligned to concepts of authenticity and quality in the work produced. Eisner (1972) suggests that there is something particular in the way we discern ability in art, suggesting that this 'concept of talent has caused mischief' in art education. He says:

> Whereas one would not want to deny that some people have great ability in an area of study or practice, the concept 'talent' has all too often been conceived of as dichotomously distributed ability, something that one either has or does not have. Yet there is hardly a human ability I can name that is so distributed.

> The overwhelming majority of man's [sic] abilities are developed in different degrees. (p. 115)

The concept of ability or talent in art defined here is particularly problematic in relation to this aspect of education which appears to mark art education out for special consideration. Art practice can thus be viewed as a technology for defining the individual and exceptional.

The inclusion of a range of cultures and a range of historical periods, as well as contemporary art practices, (the move to ready-mades, installations and the adoption of technologies, for example) potentially moves art education, production and consumption to a more democratic, inclusive or participative domain, yet the cultural resonance of such practices creates conditions where they remain 'on the edge' by transgressing 'conventional forms' (Grenfell and Hardy, 2007:177). Contemporary drawing practices, for example, are distinctive in the way they resist or subvert 'the centre' and seek to exclude themselves from acceptable and accepted practice. Downs, Marshall, Sawdon, Selby and Tormey (2007:ix) offer a collection of contemporary drawing that 'touches the limits of drawing' and challenges 'what drawing can be'. Cornelia Parker's 'Pornographic Drawing' (2005) made from a dissolved confiscated video tape offers a useful exemplification of this discussion.

Bourdieu's discussion of 'disgust at the facile' (Bourdieu, 1984) allows for a consideration of exclusionary practices in the production of art as culturally desirable. The socially acceptable, easily understood or aesthetically unchallenging, too easily claimed and understood by a mass population, is described as 'facile' and excluded from a centre which is defined more by what might be considered remarkable than what is accepted as the 'norm'. It would seem that the closer art practice comes to the centre as potential for mass participation, understanding and assimilation, the more distant it becomes from being defined as 'credible' art practice. There is a significant space between contemporary art practices and the curriculum for art as it is currently taught in UK secondary schools which may offer a clearly defined and conservative centre of practices based on the development of specific technical skills (Downing and Watson, 2004).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Barton (1997:232) argues that within any discussion of inclusion 'the purpose and social function of schooling are crucial issues demanding serious exploration.' My extension of this would be with regard to the purpose and social function of art education. I argue here that art education can be constructed on elitist principles resulting in the meaningful participation of the few. If the subject is defined for pupils as based on the ability to master specific technical abilities, pupils might well decide that it has no real relevance for them. It is potentially the discipline itself that becomes excluded by the interest and participation of a minority (Hughes, 1998). Although promoted as a central learning activity (Canatella, 2004) drawing from observation, within this context, may become marginalized and limited in terms of its capacity for promoting learning.

In framing this book around the experiences of participants identified as having coordination 'difficulties', I am potentially de-centering them from the 'norm' (Graham, 2007; Graham and Slee, 2008). From the outset the intention was not to marginalise or contribute to the exclusion of these individuals but to consider the role that observational drawing can have as a technology for constructing particular pedagogic identities. The focus on technical accomplishment in art education has made me consider the implications for such individuals, yet it is the specific cultural practices that are subject to scrutiny. The narratives included in this book provide stories of the ways in which cultural practices in art education are experienced. As such this enquiry is justified in an attempt to explore the need for the type of cultural reconstruction advocated by those seeking to move inclusion beyond political rhetoric and into the lived experience of education and society (Slee, 1999:127; Benjamin, 2002).

In exploring aspects of the theoretical framework directly related to the complex concepts of inclusion, this chapter has provided a partial context for the book. This has also allowed for more specific arguments related to inclusion in compulsory art education to be introduced. The nature of art, observation and representation as exclusionary technologies will be developed more fully in Chapter 5. The next chapter outlines the ways in which the 'dyspraxic ideal' is represented in a range of literature and offers a further dimension for understanding the potential for the de-centred nature of individual experiences.