

Pedagogy of Inclusion: A Quest for Inclusive Teaching and Learning

TM Makoelle

Department of Educational Psychology, University of Johannesburg
tmakoelle@uj.ac.za

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n20p1259

Abstract

Since the advent of the philosophy of inclusion and the inception of inclusive education, following a number of international developments such as the signing of the Salamanca Statement in 1994, attempts worldwide to define the elusive concept of inclusive pedagogy have been largely unsuccessful. This qualitative study therefore seeks to highlight the state of current debates around the development of the notion of inclusive pedagogy, its definition, conception and operationalization. A detailed review of the current literature was conducted to synthesise a conceptual framework. Interviews were conducted with six purposefully selected inclusive practitioners in secondary schools in one education district of South Africa. An inductive analytical framework was used to analyse the data. The main findings of the study indicate that there is no universally accepted definition of inclusive pedagogy but that its meaning is contextually, philosophically and operationally determined. The study demonstrates that more research is required to redefine the notion of inclusive pedagogy.

Keywords: Behaviouristic teaching, inclusion, inclusive pedagogy, constructivist teaching.

1. Introduction

From a global perspective, the notion of inclusion seems to be conceptualised differently as countries have varying contexts which influence how it is understood and implemented (Artiles and Dyson, 2005; Dyson, 2001; Florian and Kershner, 2009; Nel et al., 2011). The concept is regarded as context-bound and there is confusion about its use and meaning. (Clough and Corbett 2000; O'Brien 2001). Ainscow (2010) refers to inclusion as a process of reorganising the school to be responsive to the needs of all its learners, while other researchers conceptualise inclusion as a way of achieving the goal of creating an inclusive society (Artiles and Kozleski, 2007).

Attempts have been made to universalise the definition of inclusion. For example, UNESCO (2001: 8) states that inclusion acknowledges that all children can learn and that all need some form of support for learning. The UNESCO understanding of inclusion seems to converge with the elements of definitions referred above in the sense that, in both instances, prominence is given to aspects such as the notion of equality, access to and provision of education to all regardless of background, and a curriculum responsive to the needs of all learners. These aspects seem to transcend the definitions of inclusive education worldwide, despite the varied and diverse contexts referred to earlier.

These different interpretations have made it impossible to formulate a universal definition of inclusion. The multitude of definitions of inclusion have resulted in different practices of inclusion at pedagogical level, thus prompting questions about the nature of inclusive *pedagogic practice*, a question which is pertinent to this study. For example, there is a perspective by Farrell (1997), Rief and Heimburge (2006) and others that inclusion involves applying special-education strategies within the mainstream schools; however, there is a counter-argument that inclusion is an alternative approach to special education, goes beyond such strategies, and draws on the creativity and novelty of teachers to enhance meaningful learning (Ainscow, 2010; Ballard, 1999).

As a result of the arguments discussed above, five main theoretical positions are dominant in the literature. The different perspectives on inclusion have been influenced by the way any given society construes the meaning of inclusion. Over the years, this has been looked at from different angles and in terms of various approaches or models. According to Clough and Corbett (2000:34), the main dimensions of inclusive perspectives are the following:

Curriculum approaches model: This model involves viewing the curriculum as having the potential to act as a barrier to learning by itself if the curriculum is not inclusive and not targeted towards a diverse learner population (Mara and Mara, 2012).

School improvement strategies model: The way the school is organised could act as a barrier to learning as well. For example, there is a growing tendency to focus on pass rates, ostensibly in the interests of raising standards, and to exclude those whose performance is perceived to be weak (Ainscow et al., 2012).

Disability model: The physical or psychological attributes of the learner render him or her a victim of exclusion; for example, learners with perceived physical or psychological disabilities (e.g. the deaf) are deliberately excluded (Barnes & Sheldon, 2010; Walmsley, 2001).

Pedagogical model: This approach stems from the medical deficit model, in terms of which teaching and learning are designed to address the learners' medically diagnosed shortcomings. According to this model, the learner is perceived to have a handicap which hampers effective learning.

Socio-ecological model: This model, which developed as a critical response to the medical deficit model, perceives the learner's social context as being at the core of accepting diversity and allowing his or her participation regardless of individual differences (Ainscow and Cesar, 2006; Landsberg, Kruger and Swart, 2011; Reindal, 2008).

The research literature indicates that there has been a steady shift from the medical to the socio-ecological model. However, despite these developments and paradigm shifts, there remains the highly contested issue of how full participation and inclusion can be achieved, resulting in further debates about the existence of an inclusive pedagogy. The different philosophical positions mentioned above have resulted in divergent definitions of inclusion and therefore divergent pedagogies; for example, Klibthong (2012: 46), quoting Booth et al., and Kalambouka et al. (2012) presents a helpful synthesis of the definitions of inclusion from various leading authors in the field of inclusion and demonstrate how they have an effect on the nature of pedagogy, namely:

Full inclusion: Typically, this form involves developing all children, including those with additional needs, to participate fully in a programme or service that caters for all.

The cluster model: A group of children with additional needs participate in a programme that operates alongside a mainstream programme.

Reverse inclusion: A few typically developing children participate in a programme that caters largely for children with additional needs.

Social inclusion: Children with additional needs are catered for in special settings and come together with typically developing children at times for social experiences (Guralnick cited in Kennedy et al., 2011: 39). The different kinds of definitions mentioned above are derived from thought orientations as quoted from Clough and Corbett (2000). However, these variations and contestations about what inclusion is and is not have invited a critique of the notion of inclusion and whether the pedagogy can be purely inclusive. For instance, Thomas and Loxley (2001: 41), echoed by Knight (1999), provide a critique of inclusion by arguing that there is inconsistency between the principle of inclusion and evidence that it works.

Virtually identical sentiments have lately been echoed by Hornby (2012). In responding to Warnock's (2005) report, Hornby (2012) articulates negative comments about inclusion, in a recent publication, Farrell (2010) similarly critiques the notion of inclusion, thus raising doubts and questions about the merits of inclusive education as opposed to those of special needs education. The varied philosophical positions and definitions have an effect on the manner in which inclusive pedagogy is constructed in the classroom. This conundrum prompts the following questions:

Is there a pedagogy that is purely inclusive?

When can inclusive pedagogy enhance inclusive teaching and learning environments?

2. Understanding Inclusive Pedagogy

Inclusive pedagogy is defined as an approach intended to promote a culture of accommodating all and ensuring practice based on the use of diverse teaching strategies (Corbett, 2001). It is associated with a connective pedagogy—that is, connecting learners with their own learning first, and then connecting their learning to the curriculum (Corbett, 2001). Inclusive pedagogy is a process whereby the learners constantly engage with the learning material, drawing on their experiences (Nilholm & Alm, 2010). The material is presented as close as possible to reality and the learners are not passive recipients of knowledge but are allowed to attach subjective meaning to it.

In this article, *inclusive pedagogy* refers to the totality of teaching methods, approaches, forms and principles that enhance learner participation. Teaching inclusively is central to this approach. Furthermore, inclusive pedagogy is also assumed to encompass beliefs and conceptions about what constitutes inclusive teaching and learning. However, there is still a debate raging around the question whether there is a pedagogy that is purely inclusive (Florian, 2009). Many UK authors such as Florian (2007), Farrell (1997), Nind et al. (2003), and Rief and Heimburge (2006) and have written about the inclusive strategies of teaching learners with special educational needs while borrowing strategies from special-education discourse. By contrast, Engelbrecht (1999) (Republic of South Africa) and other UK authors such as Ainscow (2010), Ainscow and Booth (2002), Ainscow and Howes (2003), and Dyson (2001) and argue that inclusive practices could be developed by encouraging participation and collaboration. For example, the Index for Inclusion (Ainscow and

Booth, 2002) has served as a point of reference in this regard.

2.1 Traditional strategies-oriented view of inclusive pedagogy

The view that inclusion, as part of an inclusive education system, is about adopting certain teaching strategies derives from the traditional approach to teaching informed by the behaviouristic approach to pedagogy. This teaching approach is aimed at changing the behaviour of the learners. Learning is regarded as bringing about a change of behaviour in the learner (Bekele and Melesse, 2011; Merrett and Wheldall, 2012). Behavioural teaching is an approach that occurs within the context of three premises, namely *setting conditions*, *antecedence* and the *consequences*. It is a method that emphasises the objective curriculum and it is often criticised for not being suitable for all areas of the curriculum (Farrell, 1997). It denies the learners the right to choose the learning material and regards teachers as more knowledgeable than the learners in contradistinction to the notion of "self-advocacy", which is a critical process that ensures that all learners are included in the classroom. It does little to encourage interaction between the teacher and the learner.

According to Farrell (1997), in order to include all learners in a lesson, it would be helpful if teachers could use behavioural teaching activities such as prompting, reinforcement and task analysis (Moore, 2012). Motivation is one of the phenomena that teachers could employ to manipulate the behaviour of learners. Rewarding learners could ensure that all learners are engaged in a lesson. Learners should be encouraged to take their learning seriously and be in control of it. They should be given the opportunity to demonstrate how they have learned. The notion of "trial and error" (that is, trying to do things for oneself) is critical in encouraging learners to lead their own learning (Farrell, 1997).

Various teaching strategies intended to modify learner behaviour are applied to support learners in the teaching and learning process; for example, the differentiated approach to teaching; reciprocal teaching; scaffolding instruction; the use of technology to aid inclusion; multiple intelligence; multi-level instruction; and multi-sensory instruction. Teachers have to vary their teaching according to the needs of the learners.

Varying the available methods and technologies provides a good basis for including all the learners in the class. For instance, differentiated instruction is often defined as taking place in a general-education classroom that makes use of a wide variety of instructional options aimed at the increasingly diverse learning needs that typically characterise an inclusive class nowadays (Bender, 2008; D'Amico, 2010; Hart, 1996; Rief and Heimborge, 2006). To implement differentiated instruction, the "cubing" method is used. Cubing is a method that helps learners to look at a phenomenon from six different perspectives, depending on how difficult it is to accommodate learner differences. Differentiated teaching is a proactive method that it is designed to respond to the needs of all learners. As such, it may inform the teaching and learning material, flexible groupings, and varied teaching methods and approaches (Rief and Heimborge, 2006).

Reciprocal teaching is described as rotating the position of an instructional leader between the teacher and the learner (Bender, 2008). Even though the individual learner may be taught how to direct his or her own learning, the teacher may use scaffolding to aid the learning of all the learners. Scaffolding is the process of assisting the learner to acquire new knowledge using his or her prior knowledge as a foundation (Bender, 2008).

Modern classrooms are equipped with the required technological devices to aid instruction, and teachers have to use such devices to ensure that all learners have access to the teaching material. For example, two technologies that appear to be dominant in the inclusive research literature are computer-assisted instruction (CAI) and information-communication technology (ICT). The former (CAI) uses computers to conduct lessons, capture learner performances and give feedback about learner progress, while ICTs such as web quests, spreadsheets and graphic presentations are lately being used to support instruction.

Currently the *universal design* is popular. This is a framework used to adapt technology to the needs of all learners, for example modified keyboards, speech recognition, text speech, scalable fonts, and the virtual environment (Florian, 2007). Furthermore, the use of computer-assisted instruction highlights the significance of this kind of technology in building concept maps and organising study guides. Different software programs are being developed, and the use of multimedia technology in promoting learning is growing. Similarly, the use of the Internet makes it possible for learners to meet 'cyberpals', publish their work, search websites for information, receive online mentoring by experts, and share class projects with others. Most teachers regard technology as a tool to aid their work and not as a replacement for the teacher (Bender 2008). While it is important for teachers to plan how they would promote participation among the learners in their classrooms, learners should not depend on these devices to a degree that hinders the learning process (Nind and Kellett, 2003).

The theory of multiple intelligence developed by Gardner (1983) holds that intelligence manifests itself in nine different ways, namely verbal-linguistic, mathematical-logical, musical, visual-spatial, bodily-kinaesthetic, interpersonal,

intrapersonal, naturalistic and existential (Bartolo et al., 2007; Vayrynen, 2003). Not all learners are at the same level of the learning experience. Consequently, teachers have to determine the level of the learners' learning experiences in order to adjust and modify their teaching to suit the needs of all the learners. Multi-level instruction is a strategy that teachers may use in responding to the varied levels of the learners' learning experiences. This form of instruction allows the learners to work at their own level of experience (Vayrynen, 2003).

The use of the senses is regarded as one of the prominent practices of the teaching process. Multi-sensory instruction is described as teaching that involves all the senses; that is, seeing, hearing, tasting, touching and smelling (Rief and Heimburge, 2006). Since learners use different senses to learn, teachers have to ensure that they are given a chance to use these senses during the learning process. In language teaching, the learner depends primarily on the use of perception and cognition to process information (Combley, 2001). The retention of the information learned is consolidated through the use of the senses. Teachers therefore have to plan which learning and teaching aids to use to enhance the use of the senses by the learners. Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) draw attention to two different strategies which they purport enhance inclusion: (a) *Work choice* requires the classroom teacher to consult with colleagues to learn how to differentiate learning tasks so that specific accommodations for students with special educational needs can be made; (b) *Play zone* refers to an area of the classroom where a range of active play choices are provided. Teachers select activities that are matched to individual student needs.

Teaching is a process whereby teachers impart knowledge to the learners or facilitate their learning process. Booth (cited in Ainscow and Sebba, 1992) believes that traditional teaching styles could be used to enhance inclusion but points out that it requires a measure of flexibility and awareness to switch approaches in such a manner that the needs of all learners are responded to. Therefore a more constructivist approach to pedagogy is advocated.

2.2 Constructivist view of inclusive pedagogy

Modern constructivist approaches to teaching emphasise two-way interaction in the sense that learners are not the passive recipients of knowledge but also have to make a contribution to their own learning. Mujs and Reynolds (2001: 28) refer to the former approach as "direct instruction" and the latter as "interactive teaching"

Constant interactive analysis is an important aspect of curriculum delivery (Brandon, 2011). Such an interactive analysis occurs within the framework of an interactive teaching approach. For interaction to be effective in the class, teachers have to acknowledge questioning and elicit responses from the learner (Mujs and Reynolds, 2001). Interactive teaching: fosters inclusion because the learners are catered for in the curriculum rather than being compelled to adjust to the curriculum (Nind and Kellett, 2003); focuses on the participation of the learner and places less emphasis on the outcome; is essentially teaching which is not tightly structured but creates environments which allow the learners to learn through the spontaneous use of language, play and free exploration of their environments; is a natural way of learning in the absence of a prescriptive structure (Farrell, 1997).

Teachers use different teaching approaches to interact with learners. The choice of a particular teaching approach or strategy is guided by the nature of the learning material, type of learners, and the ability of the teacher to manage the process.

Every teacher adopts a particular teaching approach to teach specific subject material to a designated group of learners. Promoting inclusion in the classroom may require the teacher to analyse which strategies best promote inclusion. Sebba and Ainscow (1992) argue that the use of different teaching approaches could enhance inclusion. For instance, collaborative teaching is seen as an important prerequisite for inclusion to take place (Boyle et al., 2012; Loreman, Deppeler and Harvey, 2005; Walsh, 2012).

The cornerstone of collaboration is communication, which requires a voluntary, mutual and creative decision-making process on the part of the teacher for it to occur effectively (Loreman et al., 2005). Collaborative teaching is described as teaching by two or more teachers delivering instruction to a diverse class of learners (Florian, 2007). Teachers should be willing to establish professional communities of learning with shared goals. They should be prepared to plan and share the responsibility of teaching (Leonard and Leonard, 2003; Murawski and Dieker, 2004; Smith 2004). The advantage of collaboration is that the expertise, knowledge, experiences and the abilities of all teachers can be effectively utilised. It reduces the load of the individual teacher since the work is shared by the team. It also has a positive effect on the esteem and the confidence of the teacher. More experienced teachers assist their less experienced colleagues, thereby improving the chances of good classroom teaching and management.

The notion of promoting partnerships with the learners to foster collaboration between teachers and learners is important because it fosters mutual learning (Jelly, Fuller and Bryers, 2000). Collaboration and cooperation between the teacher and the learner may have a profound effect on the thinking ability of the learner (Savolainen et al., 2012). The

work of Reuven Feuerstein's instrumental enrichment (IE)—which has a positive influence on aspects such as the self-esteem of learners, improved behaviour in the class and better attainment—is a good example in this regard. The learners are taught to think critically and solve problems, which helps them to reach their learning destinations quickly and saves the teacher a great deal of hard work (Balshaw and Farrell, 2002; Jelly and Bryers, 2000).

On the other hand, facilitating learning also becomes significant in a constructivist view of inclusive pedagogy. *Learning* is regarded as a process by which learners acquire new knowledge and a process by which they retain knowledge acquired through learning processes. It is facilitated in different ways; therefore, to enhance inclusion during the learning process, teachers have to understand how learners learn. Learning is believed to mean different things to different learners. Therefore the concept has to be analysed because, when defined, it is an unjustive that is context-bound, as said before, and heavily influenced by the learner's experiences (Watkins, [Carnell and Lodge, 2007](#)). Learning may occur in three stages: *reception* (acquiring facts or knowledge), *construction* (making meaning out of knowledge), and *reconstructing* ('rebuilding' through interaction with others) and is influenced by the contact an individual is engaged in with others.

Several constructivist learning styles are found. For instance, collaborative learning is defined as a type of learning characterised by the identification and sharing of common reference points and models (Murphy, 1999). It involves sharing ideas and looking at the learning phenomenon from different perspectives. Collaborative learning is associated with what is called "classroom talk", which is the process whereby partners share information and plan together in presenting ideas explicitly and clearly enough to engage in joint reasoning, evaluation and decision-making (Murphy, 1999; Watkins et al., 2007). Collaborative activities give both the learner and the teacher feedback on their role during the learning process ([Walton, 2012](#)). The learning process has to be learner-centred and learners have to be in control of their own learning. Indeed, learning is meaningful when learners can relate what they have learned to what they already know (prior knowledge). [Cesar and Santos \(2006\)](#) refer to this collaboration as a "learning community" where learning is dependent on the communicative process, meaning is negotiated mutually, and knowledge is constructed collectively. This is closely related to what Miles (2007) calls "creative learning" where the success of the learner is dependent on the success of the group. Peer tutoring is a system of learning whereby proficient learners assist their less proficient peers with their school work in a mutual academic relationship ([Scruggs, Mastropieri and Marshak, 2012](#)). Peer support emanates from collaborative team work when learners share tasks ([Blanch, Duran, Valdebenito and Flores, 2012; Lorenz, 2002](#)). According to Meijer (2003), peer tutoring appears to be effective in both the cognitive and affective (socio-emotional) domains of learner development. Learners benefit from their peers and invest heavily in building sound human relationships with their fellow learners, family and teachers ([Blanch et al., 2012; Miles, 2007](#)).

3. Method

The research on which this article is based adopted a qualitative approach. Interviews were used to collect data from the six purposefully selected inclusive practitioners in secondary schools in one educational district of South Africa. The six inclusive practitioners were selected due to their interest and involvement in inclusive education. An interview schedule was used to ensure that all six practitioners were asked the same open-ended questions and were therefore free to express their own opinions. The interviews were transcribed for analysis. An inductive analytical framework was used to analyse the data, which were read several times to obtain a holistic picture of the depth involved. The data were then divided into categories from which the themes were derived. Meaning was assigned to the themes.

4. Results

The main findings depend on the extent to which the research questions were answered. I will therefore restate the research questions followed by a discussion of the findings.

4.1 Research question 1: Is there a pedagogy that is purely inclusive? The study has demonstrated the following:

4.1.1 Theme 1: Conceptualisation of inclusive pedagogy

The conceptualisation of inclusive pedagogy appears not to be universal but is dependent on the context in which it is defined and operationalized. For instance, the inclusive practitioners interviewed held divergent views as their understanding of inclusive *pedagogy* depended on how they understood inclusive *education*; for example, one of the practitioners stated: "*Inclusive pedagogy means facilitating the learning process to both able and disable learners in the*

same class". Another practitioner expressed a divergent view by referring to inclusive education as "*giving special support to learners with special needs within the mainstream class*". These quotations clearly demonstrate a lack of consensus about the meaning of the concept, which appears to be narrowly conflated with teaching strategies whereas pedagogy is broader and encompasses aspects of beliefs, attitudes and conceptions about the pedagogic process.

4.1.2 Theme 2: Special-needs versus full-inclusion philosophy

The notion of inclusive pedagogy is influenced by underlying philosophically derived mechanisms. There seem to be two divergent discourses: a special-needs discourse and a discourse of full inclusion which influence the understanding of what inclusive pedagogy entails and how inclusive it can be. This was clear when practitioners were asked what was meant by an inclusive pedagogy. Two divergent views emerged: one of special needs and the other of full inclusion. For instance, a special-needs discourse was evident when one practitioner remarked: "*Pedagogy is inclusive when learners with disabilities are taught in the same class with their peers but receive remediation when necessary in a separate setting that can provide support like a special school.*" Another practitioner's remarks gave credence to the notion of full inclusion when she stated: "*I believe that inclusive pedagogy means being able to deal with all the learners in the classroom, addressing all learners' needs within same pedagogic space.*" These statements indicate that inclusive pedagogy is understood according to more than one approach to the process of inclusion.

4.1.3 Theme 3: Strategy-oriented versus creativity and flexible teaching

In the operationalizing of pedagogy, the strategy-oriented special-needs discourse puts the teacher at the centre of pedagogic planning and practice, while full inclusion discourse tends to place the learner at the centre of pedagogic planning and practice. The two approaches consequently produce divergent thinking with regard to inclusive pedagogy. For instance, when practitioners were asked how they go about operationalizing inclusive pedagogy, it was evident from their answers that both views referred to previously were prevalent. For instance, one of the practitioners declared: "*I think knowing various strategies for learners with special needs is important, such as multi-level teaching and multiple intelligence.*" By contrast, another practitioner felt that the strategies do not necessarily work in all circumstances: "*There cannot be a one-size-fit-all in pedagogy, one has to respond to the context as it unfolds, and one must take the views of the learners into consideration when deciding [devising] classroom activities.*"

4.2 Research question 2: When can inclusive pedagogy enhance inclusive teaching and learning environments?

The research on which this article is based strongly suggests that pedagogy is pivotal for sustaining an inclusive teaching and learning environment. However, the sustainability depends on the specific approach to the operationalization of pedagogy.

4.2.1 Theme 1: Positivism versus constructivism

The approach to pedagogy can determine how inclusive the pedagogy is. It is apparent from the review that, if the conceptualization of inclusive pedagogy is derived from positivistic, behaviouristic or special-needs discourse, it is likely to be strategy-oriented and will thus articulate a position that seeks to find fault with the learner rather than with the pedagogic settings. For instance, there were constant references to strategies by those who articulated pedagogy as changing the behaviour of the learner by means of a particular strategy; for example, one of the practitioners stated: "*I apply the strategy of multi-level teaching to address diversity.*" By contrast, if the conceptualization is derived from the constructivist, interactive and full-inclusion discourse, it is likely to assume a stance that positions the learner at the centre of the pedagogic involvement and participation, thus becoming more inclusive and ensuring social justice for the vulnerable. For instance, another practitioner stated: "*My approach is learner-centred: I believe that learners construct their own meaning of the learning content and thus they should to a great extent influence how they should be taught.*" The two views show that it is apparent that an inclusive pedagogy can enhance social justice and create an inclusive environment when the pedagogic practice is not prescriptive and takes into consideration the contribution of learners to their own learning.

4.2.2 Theme 2: Teacher-centredness versus learner-centredness

If inclusive, the pedagogy is constructivist in approach, influences the participation of both learners and teachers in the process of learning, and thus makes learning an inclusive process. This was clear from the positions the practitioners mentioned as evidenced by statements such as: "... apply the strategy of multi-level teaching to address diversity ..."; "my approach is learner centred, I believe that learners construct their own meaning of the learning content and thus they should to a great extent influence how they should be taught".

5. Discussion

The literature indicate that inclusive pedagogy is understood differently and that several aspects have an effect on its conceptualization. For instance, variables such as context and underlying philosophical assumptions account for the two main orientations to or views of inclusive pedagogy; that is, special needs education, which is mostly positivist and advocates a change of behaviour in the learner; and full inclusion, which is more constructivist and privileges learning through discovery (Artiles and Dyson, 2005; Florian and Kershner, 2009).

It appears that philosophical assumptions influence teaching and learning approaches. This implies that teacher training in a special needs-oriented approach is positivist-behaviouristic, which means it is teacher-centred. The teaching seems strategy-oriented as teachers have more authority to determine the approach to teaching and learning. By contrast, the post-positivistic-constructivist approach to teaching and learning seems to be more learner-centred, thus providing the learner with the opportunity to be part of the teaching and learning process (Makoelle, 2013).

These two pedagogic positions influence how learning occurs and is facilitated. For instance, a teacher-centred approach encourages memorization and knowledge assimilation as learners are mostly the passive recipients of knowledge (Makoelle, 2013). By contrast, a learner-centred position advocates learnings through discovery and regards learners as contributors to their own learning.

6. Conclusion

While there is a broad consensus on what constitutes an inclusive pedagogy, it is apparent that its conceptualisation needs to be re-evaluated. The reason is that most teachers base their understanding of the concept on their own their individual interpretation of what it means, on their position within the philosophy of inclusion, and consequently on their own pedagogic philosophy and approach. This paper therefore lays the foundation for further discussion on the elusive and complex concept of inclusive pedagogy.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2010). *Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership*. London: Taylor & Francis
- Ainscow, M. & Booth, T. (2002). *Index of inclusion*. Bristol: Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education (CSIE).
- Ainscow, M. & César, M. (2006). Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21(3):231–238.
- Ainscow, M. & Howes, A. (2003). *Effective networking for inclusive development in school: Learning between communities of practice*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Effectiveness and School Improvement, January, Sydney.
- Ainscow, M. & Sebba, J. (1992). International developments in inclusive schooling *Cambridge journal of education* 26 (1): 5-8.
- Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Goldrick, S. & West, M. (2012). Making schools effective for all: Rethinking the task. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(3):197–213.
- Artiles, A.J. & Kozleski, E.B. (2007). Beyond convictions: Interrogating culture, history, and power in inclusive education. *Language Arts*, 84(4): 351- 357.
- Artiles, A.J. & Dyson, A. (2005). Inclusive education in the globalization age. *Contextualizing Inclusive Education*: 37–62.
- Ballard, K. 1999. *Inclusive education: International voices on disability and justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Balshaw, M.H. & Farrell, P. (2002). *Teaching assistants: Practical strategies for effective classroom support*. London: David Fulton.
- Barnes, C. & Sheldon, A. (2010). Disability, politics and poverty in a majority world context. *Disability & Society*, 25(7):771–782.
- Bartolo, P.A., Janik, J., Janikova, V., Hofsass, T., Koinzer, P., Vilkiene, V., Calleja, C., Cefai, C., Chetcuti, D., Ale, P., Mollous, A., Wetso, G. & Humphrey, N. (2007). *Responding to student diversity teacher handbook*. Amsterdam: Faculty of Education, University of Malta.
- Bhaskar, R (1998), *The possibility of naturalism*, 3rd edn, Routledge, London.
- Bekele, A. & Melesse, K. 2011. *Enactment of student-centered approach in teaching Mathematics and Natural Sciences: The case of*

- selected general secondary schools in Jimma zone, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 5(2) 29- 50.
- Bender, W.N. (2008). *Learning disabilities, characteristics, identification and teaching strategies*. London: Pearson.
- Blanch, S., Duran, D., Valdebenito, V. & Flores, M. (2012). The effects and characteristics of family involvement on a peer tutoring programme to improve the reading comprehension competence. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(1):1-19.
- Boyle, C., Topping, K., Jindal-Snape, D. & Norwich, B. (2012). The importance of peer- support for teaching staff when including children with special educational needs. *School Psychology International*, 33(2):167-184.
- Brandon, T. (2011). The lessons learned from developing an inclusive learning and teaching community of practice. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(1):165-178.
- Cesar, M. & Santos, N. (2006). From exclusion to inclusion: Collaborative work contributions to more inclusive learning settings. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21(3):333-346.
- Clough, P. & Corbett, J. (2000). *Theories of inclusive education: A student guide*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Combley, M. (2001). *The Hickey Multisensory Language Course*. Third edition. London: Tyrrell Burgess.
- Corbett, J. (2001). Teaching approaches which support inclusive education: A connective pedagogy. *British Journal of Special Education*, 28(2):55-59.
- D'Amico, J. (2010). *Differentiated instruction for the middle school science teacher: Activities and strategies for an inclusive classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Dyson, A. (2001). Special needs education as the way to equity: An alternative approach? *Support for Learning*, 16(3):99-104.
- Engelbrecht, P. (1999). A theoretical framework for inclusive education. In P. Engelbrecht, L. Green, S. Naicker & L. Engelbrecht (eds.), *Inclusive education in action in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik, 3-12.
- Farrell, P. (1997). *Teaching pupils with learning difficulties*. London: Cassel.
- Florian, L. (Ed.). (2007). *The Sage handbook of special education*. London: Sage.
- Florian, L. 2009. Towards inclusive pedagogy. *Psychology for Inclusive Education: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, 38-51.
- Florian, L. & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). *Exploring inclusive pedagogy*. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5):813-828.
- Florian, L. & Kershner, R. (2009). Inclusive pedagogy, in Daniels, H., Lauder, H. & Porter, J. in *Knowledge, Values and Educational Policy: A Critical Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 173-183.
- Florian, L. & Linklater, H. (2010). *Preparing teachers for inclusive education: Using inclusive pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning for all*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Guralnick, M.J. (2011). *Why early intervention works: A systems perspective*. *Infants and Young Children*. 24 (1): 6-28.
- Hart, S. 1996. *Beyond special needs: Enhancing children's learning through innovative thinking*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Hornby, G. (2012). Inclusive education for children with special educational needs: A critique of policy and practice in New Zealand. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 1(1):52-60.
- Jelly, M., Fuller, A. & Bryers, R. (2000). *Involving pupils in practice: Promoting partnerships with pupils with special educational needs*. London: David Fulton.
- Knight, B.A. (1999). Towards inclusion of students with special educational needs in the classroom. *Support for Learning*, 14(1):3-7.
- Klibthong, S. (2012). Reimagining inclusive education of young children: A 232 kaleidoscope of Bourdieuan theorization. *International Education Studies*, 5(4):71-79.
- Landsberg, E., Kruger, D. & Swart, E. (2011). *Addressing barriers to learning: A South African perspective*. Second edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Leonard, L. & Leonard, P. (2003). The continuing trouble with collaboration: Teachers talk. *Current Issues in Education*, 6(15). Available from: <http://cie.asu.edu/volume6/number15/indexhtml> [Accessed 24 January 2009].
- Loreman, T., Deppeler, J. & Harvey, D. (2005). *Inclusive education: A practical guide to supporting diversity in the classroom*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Lorenz, S. 2002. *First steps to inclusion*. London: David Fulton.
- Makoelle TM (2013). *Inclusive Pedagogy in Context: A South African Perspective*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing
- Mara, D. & Mara, E.L. (2012). Curriculum adaption in inclusive education. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46:4004-4009.
- Meijer, J.W. (2003). *Summary report: Inclusive education and classroom practice*. Middelfart: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Merrett, F. & Wheldall, K. (2012). British teachers and the behavioural approach to teaching. *The Behaviourist in the Classroom (RLE Edu E)*, 18-68.
- Miles, S. (2007). Feeling 10 feet tall: Creative inclusion in a community of practice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(4):505-518.
- Moore, A. (2012). *Teaching and learning: Pedagogy, curriculum and culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Muijs, D. & Reynolds, D. (2001). *Effective teaching evidence and practice*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Murawski, W.W. & Dieker, L.A. (2004). Tips and strategies for co-teaching at secondary level. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(5):55-58.
- Murphy, P. (1999). *Learners, learning and assessment*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Nel, N., Müller, H., Hugo, A., Helldin, R., Bäckmann, Ö., Dwyer, H. & Skarflind, A. (2011). A comparative perspective on teacher attitude-constructs that impact on inclusive education in South Africa and Sweden. *South African Journal of Education*, 31(1):74-90.
- Nilholom, C. & Alm, B. (2010). An inclusive classroom: A case study of inclusiveness, teacher strategies and children experiences. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 25(3):239-252.

- [Nind, M. & Kellett, M. \(2003\). Implementing intensive interaction in schools: Guidance for practitioners, managers and coordinators. London: David Fulton.](#)
- [Nind, M., Rix, J., Sheeny, K. & Simmons, K. \(2003\). Inclusive education: Diverse perspectives. London: David Fulton.](#)
- [O'Brien, T. \(2001\). Enabling inclusion: Blue skies... dark clouds. London: The Stationary Office.](#)
- [Reindal, S.M. \(2008\). A social relational model of disability: A theoretical framework for special needs education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23\(2\): 135-146.](#)
- [Rief, S. & Heimburge, J.A. \(2006\). How to reach and teach all children in the inclusive classroom: Practical strategies, lessons and activities. Second edition. London: Jossey-Bass.](#)
- [Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M. & Malinen, O.P. \(2012\). Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27\(1\):51-68.](#)
- [Scruggs, T.E., Mastropieri, M.A. & Marshak, L. \(2012\). Peer-mediated instruction in inclusive secondary social studies learning: Direct and indirect learning effects. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 27\(1\):12-20.](#)
- [Smith, D.D. \(2004\). Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of opportunities. Fifth edition. New York: Pearson.](#)
- [Thomas, G. & Loxley, A. \(2001\). Deconstructing special education and constructing inclusion. Second edition. Maidenhead: Open University Press.](#)
- [UNESCO. \(2001\). Understanding and responding to children's needs in inclusive classrooms. Paris: UNESCO.](#)
- [Vayrynen, S. \(2003\). Observations from South African classrooms. Kimberly: National Institute of Higher Education.](#)
- [Walmsley, J. \(2001\). Normalization, emancipatory research and inclusive research in learning disability. *Disability and Society*, 16\(2\):18-205.](#)
- [Walsh, J.M. \(2012\). Co-teaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 56\(1\):29-](#)
- [Walton, E. \(2012\). "They discluded me": Possibilities and limitations of children's articipation in inclusion research in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 29\(1\):83-92.](#)
- [Watkins, C., Carnell, E. & Lodge, C. \(2007\). Effective learning in the classroom. London: Sage.](#)