

Cite this article

Calderón-Almendros, I., Moreno-Parra, J. J., & Vila-Merino, E. S. (2024). Education, power, and segregation. The psychoeducational report as an obstacle to inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(11), 2424–2437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2108512>

**Education, power, and segregation Education, power, and segregation.
The psychoeducational report as an obstacle to inclusive education**

Ignacio Calderón-Almendros^{a*}, Jesús J. Moreno-Parra^b and Eduardo S. Vila-Merino^c

^a*Department of Theory and History of Education, University of Málaga, Málaga, Spain, ica@uma.es*; ^b*Department of Didactics and School Organisation, University of Málaga, Málaga, Spain*; ^c*Department of Theory and History of Education, University of Málaga, Málaga, Spain*

*Department of Theory and History of Education & R.D.M.E. Faculty of Sciences of Education. University of Malaga. Campus de Teatinos s/n. 29071-Malaga (Spain). E-mail: ica@uma.es

Education, power, and segregation. The psychoeducational report as an obstacle to inclusive education

Abstract

This article is the result of research carried out by a group of activists who advocate for the rights of children with disabilities. They are exploring new approaches to both school counselling and the fight against segregation in order to improve the situation of children in the Spanish education system. It focuses on how the psychoeducational report is a key tool for legitimising school segregation, and how deconstructing it is essential for building inclusive schools. The data analysed were collected from 100 people from all over Spain who took part in a Participatory Action Research project focused on emerging narratives on inclusive schooling. The aim of the project was to gather accounts of the experiences of pupils, families, and activist professionals who are engaged in a determined struggle to make schools inclusive. Participants were able to share their experiences, conduct their analysis through assemblies and cooperative groups, and use networking to transform existing policies, cultures, and practices. The information obtained indicates that the labels used by current psychoeducational reports are based on a clinical model and are focused on children's deficiencies. They provide limited knowledge about the individuals involved and exercise strong social and symbolic control over them and others.

Keywords: inclusive education; segregation; disability; school counselling; equality; psychoeducational report

Introduction

Twenty-seven years after the UNESCO Salamanca Statement (UNESCO 1994) was issued and thirteen years after the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations [UN] 2006) was ratified, the Education System in Spain continues to violate children's right to high-quality inclusive education. This assertion is based on the Report prepared by the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2017) and the research conducted at the University of Malaga (Calderón-Almendros 2018). Institutional exclusion exists in most Spanish schools, as illustrated by a series of accounts included in the research project that can be accessed on <https://bit.ly/2OYREGL>

[Accessed 20 November 2021].

The psychoeducational report is a fundamental tool for classifying and subsequently segregating an important number of schoolchildren. Official educational counselling legitimises inequality, which is embodied in the significant curricular adaptations that separate individuals from their peers and prevent them from obtaining qualifications, as well as in exclusionary modes of schooling. These reports are used by the education authorities to decide whether a given pupil can remain in an ordinary classroom or not. Even if it is decided that the child should remain in an ordinary classroom, their educational processes are often distorted, as learning expectations, opportunities for participation, and achievements are constrained by the report's limitations. This inertia in schools means that many children are irremediably doomed to segregation and/or to experience a sense of failure at school. However, the use of segregated special-needs education with specialised methods for particular categories of learners has received little empirical support (Ainscow, Dyson and Weiner 2013; Hehir et al. 2016).

As we proposed elsewhere (Calderón and Habegger 2017; Calderón and Calderón 2016; Calderón and Ruiz 2016), schools use their power to legitimise and justify the inequalities resulting from segregation so pervasively that individuals are ultimately subjectivised to them. This biopower (Foucault 2008) gives greater legitimacy to this form of public discourse, as the subject becomes an agent that participates in the categorisation created by the institutions. In this way, the victim begins to interpret their situation as their own fault, and the school's stigmatising discourse is uncritically internalised (Calderón and Ruiz 2015).

Numerous international reports, including the 2020 Global Education Monitoring Report on Inclusion and Education (UNESCO 2020), have highlighted the extent of inequality in Spanish schools, which takes many forms and ultimately affects all children. The issue of what constitutes *normality* is at the core of this form of inequality. Questioning this assumption is crucial for building an inclusive school that recognises the value of difference and diversity. Under this *normalcentric* view, which considers everything that deviates from the normal to be pathological and undesirable, social and educational exclusion is turned into an individual problem. This is the basis for focusing on segregated individualised and specialised attention, which relegates learners who do not fit the norm to the school's margins (Echeita and Calderón 2014). This is a special

education approach that only refers to the individual characteristics of learners, as stated by UNESCO in a recent report:

There is, therefore, a need to move away from ways of thinking that focus on what certain individual learners lack, towards a focus on the contextual barriers that are limiting the participation and progress of many children. (UNESCO 2020, 12)

In theory, the psychoeducational report was developed to guarantee the right to education; however, it has become an exclusionary tool that is used to prevent this right from being exercised. Psychoeducational reports use labels and provide diagnoses based on what are deemed to be individual child's deficiencies from a medical and psychological perspective. Nevertheless, a prerequisite for the right to education is presence, which is meaningful if it is transformed into a pedagogy of presence that is strongly engaged with ethics and interculturalism (Vila 2005); in other words, a pedagogical vision of what the presence of differences in the classroom entails. This pedagogy of presence is incompatible with the exclusion of educational space and time that is often associated with inadequate models related to the psychoeducational report.

In addition to presence, inclusion requires participation and learning (Ainscow, Dyson, Goldrick and West 2012). Moreover, it means understanding that learning happens thanks *to the other*, to someone who is different. Research has provided conclusive evidence that shared educational processes not only benefit learners who have been diagnosed and labelled as different, but that they are valuable for all learners equally (Cologon 2019, 2020; Hehir et al 2016; Hehir, Grindal and Eidelman 2012; Justice, Logan, Lin and Kaderavek 2014). This contrasts with the lack of evidence suggesting that segregated education may be beneficial (Cologon 2019; Hehir et al. 2016).

It is essential to understand that all educational processes take place 'in a given context'. Failing to consider this results in an ontological problem linked to the psychoeducational report, which should be transcended. In other words, the perspective currently adopted in psychoeducational reports is more of a problem than an opportunity, because it constitutes the lion's share of the role of school counsellors and legitimises segregated education. Therefore, the current model of school counselling fails to respect the human right to education, which should be understood as the right to inclusive education (UN 2006; UN Human Rights Council 2013).

This article is the result of research conducted by a group of activists who are exploring new approaches to both school counselling and the fight against segregation to improve the situation of children in the Spanish education system. It focuses on how the

psychoeducational report is a key tool for legitimising school segregation, and how deconstructing it could provide new approaches to engaging in a humanist and revolutionary project: an effective struggle for inclusive education.

Methods

In February 2018, around one hundred people from all over Spain participated in a workshop held at the University of Malaga. It was part of a research project entitled “Emerging narratives on inclusive schooling based on the social model of disability: resistance, resilience and social change”, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities. The aim of this project was to gather accounts of the experiences of activist families and professionals who are engaged in a determined struggle to make schools inclusive. These activists showed that there was a systematic violation of many children's right to inclusive education solely because of their disability.

This research project seeks to understand the experiences of individuals and groups whose constructions are not often legitimised and enable them to voice issues that they are concerned about. The project is transformational in itself, as it becomes a tool for social change.

The project is part of an action-oriented endeavour framed methodologically within Participatory Action Research (PAR). PAR can play a catalytic role in this process. As noted by Brydon-Miller and Maguire (2009), research is a form of political engagement, critically examines power and privilege, and highlights the importance of collaborative relationships as a framework for effective practice. Collaborative work and participation are solutions to find ‘unwelcome truths’ and investigate the most substantial issues confronting education and our societies today (Kemmis 2006, 474).

According to Kemmis (2006, 471), critical educational PAR must rely on three main pillars: addressing important problems for education, for the good of each person and for the good of society; undertaking research with and for the communities in which they are located; and exploring themes of social interest that generate conflict, contradictions and uncertainties, as well as issues about educational practice to learn from the consequences and changing the individual practice of professional practitioners.

Analyses should move from the micro-level to the macro-level, as there are forces at both levels that have an impact on the teaching and learning experience (Esposito and Evans 2007, 232). As indicated by several authors, change in one of these spheres does

not take place without referring to the individual, organisational and systemic contexts in which it is situated (Hargreaves and Fullan 1992; Grindle 1997).

The spaces generated by PAR such as the one discussed here enable an act of communication to occur in which individuals encounter each other (Habermas 1984, 2003) without transcending, obliterating or negating each person's subjectivity (Kemmis 2006, 466). Participants come together to participate in an act of communication involving discussion and debate. A PAR project can therefore involve creating a space for communication (Habermas 1996; Kemmis and McTaggart 2005; Kemmis 2006) in which agreements and disagreements can be problematised and openly explored. Participants use these spaces to exercise their freedom to express themselves and develop a sense of solidarity, while attempting to keep a balance between the intellectual and emotional dimensions entailed in every innovation (Elmore 1995; Evans 1997). In turn, participation can be used 'to establish the legitimacy and validity of knowledge claims and action aimed at making social practices more rational and reasonable, more productive and sustainable, and more just and inclusive' (Kemmis, McTaggart and Nixon 2014, 4).

Guided by these ideas, a 12-hour work session was held using a systematic structure and recorded by a research team from the University of Malaga as part of a broader participatory action research process. Three weeks before the meeting, brief video-recorded accounts of pain and joy related to educational counselling experienced by families and professionals were launched on social media. This led to an open public debate that generated a collective construction enabled by the sharing of experiences. The participants were invited to reflect on all the previous narratives shared online, which were the starting point of the workshop. The meeting was streamed live so that people who were not physically present could participate. This was hugely popular and became a trending topic on *Twitter Spain*. Face-to-face work was conducted in plenary assemblies and small group workshops for each node that emerged from the assemblies. Participants produced their own categories, identified rationales for situations occurring in the school and made proposals for interpretation and resistance. All of this was transcribed and analysed, and resulted in actions for school intervention, for mobilising public debate and for political impact at the highest level. Several research-action cycles emerged from the participatory assessment conducted at the workshop, which focused on three types of narratives:

- *Biographical narratives*, including life stories of activists (pupils, family members and professionals) who denounced exclusion and challenged the inaction and politically correct discourse surrounding inclusion;
- *Participatory collective narratives*, which have reached the Spanish Parliament and the Ministry of Education with a view to having an impact on public education policies;
- *Action-oriented narratives*, including campaigns and cinema pieces that expand the collective imaginary about schooling, exclusion and inclusion, participatory construction of guidelines to promote better practices, and PAR projects in schools that illustrate how to implement a radical inclusive education.

The psychoeducational report as an obstacle to inclusive education

The labels created by psychoeducational reports limit the knowledge about a person. Their role is to convey the impression of knowing what a person is like, without ever truly understanding them. Even with the best of intentions, the diagnostic category is far from being objective; it is a subjective construction which comes between the subject and the world. This definitely plays a part in socially controlling the labelled person and acts as an insurmountable barrier for that person and their peers. A mother's assertion was particularly graphic and devastating: 'My son did not exist. It wasn't Nico' (Mónica, mother). Cloaked in objectivity and neutrality, the label applied in the report objectified the child, a subject who lost part of his humanity in the eyes of the institution:

I remember that after the counsellor had made her report, she told me: 'As Nico doesn't have a diagnosis yet, I don't know which category I should use for him.' And I told her that this wasn't very important. Because... what is the purpose of the report? I understand that what you are aiming for is how to best meet my child's educational needs. And she told me: 'No, the thing is I have to classify him as something, they force me to place him somewhere in the computer system, so which category should I use?' (Mónica, mother).

Professionals are compelled by the school system to use a diagnostic label that bypasses the person and have learnt to do so. Another criticism of the is that it fails to take contexts into account. These are the two main issues identified by the participants to articulate the dangers of the psychoeducational report. It is framed as an individual's problem that is confined to the child's body and justifies a therapeutic response. The child is deficient in adapting to the pedagogy offered. In these cases, there is a protocol for

everything: the diagnosis involves depersonalising the individual. In this process, curriculum aspects such as organisation, methodologies, activities, materials, learning spaces and timetables that can be a barrier to inclusion are left unquestioned. This creates a whole parallel school universe for those who do not conform to the minimum standard of functionality set by the institution.

The report holds the subject responsible for these alleged deviations from the norm and serves to certify deficiencies. Numerous accounts have framed the psychoeducational report within the deficiency paradigm, as reports underline all those abilities, aptitudes, and ways of being in the world that deviate from what has been established as *normal*, thus devaluing any other abilities and rendering them invisible:

Héctor differs little from his peers. He can read, write, add, write his own stories... So, I am aware of all the positive things. Héctor even goes to after-school music activities and playgroup. Everybody can see his positive qualities. Sometimes I find that the counselling teams try to convey to us everything that he is not able to do, rather than what he is actually able to do. (...) because if Héctor has managed to do everything he has done until now, it's because it can be done, and he deserves enormous credit for that. (Paula, mother and activist)

Héctor's mother confirmed how the school looked for deficiencies. Her analysis rescued the child from that category by truly looking at her son; by acknowledging his abilities, what he can do, what makes him unique, the importance of the contexts and points of view, the overcoming of the diagnostic category, and the credit he deserves. In other words, Héctor's mother reframed the existing public discourse: 'differing little' versus 'being different,' 'ability' versus 'inability' (and reality versus a prediction), 'singularity' versus 'category' (Héctor versus autism), 'subject' versus 'object', 'credit' versus 'incompetence'.

In a similar vein, a participating teacher noted the importance of ensuring that ability and potential is at the core of their work:

And don't you think that when we're working to meet our students' needs we should do it by relying on their strengths? Relying on their strengths, and they do have strengths. Don't you think this is something that should be part of the report? How can I address those needs if I don't know what to rely on? (Rosa, teacher)

This account showed the importance of focusing on enabling children as opposed to focusing on any barriers to their learning. In other words, the psychoeducational report should start from what they know and encourage 'scaffolding' for their inclusion (Wood,

Bruner and Ross 1976). This requires coordination between the teachers involved, and moving away from the clinical, shortfall-based model and the exclusion it provokes.

The psychoeducational report is necessary if the idea is to use it to meet a child's needs; but if they're looking for an opinion, an opinion is superfluous, it's not necessary at all. If the psychoeducational report is used to segregate a child, the assessment should also be superfluous. (Susana, mother and activist)

This was published a few months later by the UN Committee as part of its research into the Spanish education system:

The system focuses on the pupil's failings and deficiencies, resulting in their being stigmatised as unfit for mainstream education. Instead of exploring all possible ways of including the pupil, the diagnosis prevents mainstream schools from providing support measures and reasonable accommodation. (UN CRPD 2018, 9)

Psychoeducational reports are standardised and inflexible. Assessments are subject to administrative processes that lack an educational purpose. These reports are often based on an underlying concept of intelligence that is obsolete; they are conducted under pressure and out of context; they are conceived as something closed and static and are only used for those children suspected of disability, but have limited usefulness in improving the teaching-learning process. This is alien to any educational aims (Calderón and Habegger 2017; Calderón 2018): 'Clinical diagnosis is one thing; the assessment of the educational process is quite another' (Cristina, mother). In addition, psychoeducational reports are an obstacle to inclusion (Echeita and Calderón 2014) because they catalogue students through supposedly objective tools (mainly psychometric tests) and 'become prescriptive evidence' in educational, administrative, and judicial processes: 'Legally, the report is a sentence. For our children, it's a social death sentence....' (Alejandro, father and activist)

Two years later, Alejandro (Rubén's father) received the Views adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which stated that Spain had failed to fulfil its obligations under several articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It was the first time the CRPD had issued a Decision on the failure by a State party to comply with its obligations regarding inclusive education. These Views were consistent with the analysis carried out here:

The report mentions Rubén's 'disruptive behaviour', 'psychotic outbreaks' and a general developmental delay 'associated with Down syndrome'. This terminology is more appropriate to clinical psychology than to a psychoeducational report. (UN CRPD 2020, 3)

Ruben's father was named a champion for inclusive education in UNESCO's GEM 2020 Report (<https://bit.ly/3ntRR7z> [Accessed 20 November 2021]). His words showed the profound social isolation that children experience every time they are objectified, that is, when schools use a diagnostic label to hide the person's true presence. This is against what any form of inclusive education assessment should be, as it results in segregation.

The overall goal of inclusive assessment is that all assessment policies and procedures should support and enhance the successful inclusion and participation of all pupils vulnerable to exclusion, including those with SEN. (ADSNE 2007, 47)

However, this procedure has become completely naturalised in Spanish schools. It is unusual for families to be able to question that this is now a socialised process, as they did in the participatory workshop. Whereas their proposals for resistance are far-reaching, they will require a major effort in terms of collective cohesion and scientific argumentation:

What I propose is that we refuse to have our children assessed, and demand the right that they have, like any other child, to a personalised and individualised education.

If we demand this there should be no need for a diagnosis. (María José, mother and student)

In order to address the core of the problem, it is necessary to challenge the legitimacy of some modes of schooling (in ordinary classrooms, in special classrooms or in special education centres). This should also include questioning practices that promote parallel pathways disguised as being pedagogical or compensatory, which in fact make learning and participation difficult or impossible for all children together. Therefore, families and professionals committed to inclusive education need to articulate arguments and promote actions against these segregationist initiatives. Their analysis is focussed on the recognition of the right to inclusive education for all children, endorsed by international human rights instruments. It is based on the knowledge generated by their own experiences, in which the value of differences is recognised firsthand.

Nobody should be placed in special classrooms; everyone should have the right to be in the same classrooms, all together, because when this is not the case they are pushed aside and this means taking away the opportunity for the rest of the people to get to know them and learn to live together, and to understand them. (Susana, ONG educationalist)

This involves questioning the very purpose of schools, which inclusion advocates see as an opportunity for the construction of democratic citizenship. Although these are activist perspectives that are not part of the dominant pedagogical ideology in Spain, they are strongly related to the scientific evidence provided by international research. The literature review conducted by the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (EADSNE 2018) showed the social benefit of inclusive education for learning, employment, and community building. The meta-research by Hehir, Grindal and Eidelman (2012), which reviewed over 280 research studies conducted in 25 countries, concluded that there is ‘consistent evidence that inclusive educational settings—those in which children with disabilities are educated alongside their non-disabled peers—can confer substantial short- and long-term benefits for children's cognitive and social development’ (Hehir, Grindal and Eidelman 2012, 26)

In addition, there is a clear link between the hegemonic school model, the practices related to the psychoeducational report and segregated organisation: ‘it is not only a matter of knowledge, it is a matter of school culture, it is related to textbooks, it is about having everyone at the same level, of homogeneity, and all these kinds of things.’ This is a school based on contents disguised as skills, which clings to an anachronistic approach obsessed with efficiency (Gimeno 2008; Pinar 2014).

There may be fewer psychoeducational reports in schools where they have a different methodology; perhaps another issue would be the school's pedagogy, which can be more inclusive, committed to diversity, to the use of a much more open methodology. (María José, mother and student)

In other words, the educational model is directly related to counselling practices and the consequent psychoeducational reports:

The traditional method is difficult to combine with inclusive education; but at the same time, I wonder what prevents us from changing the method. Because a problem that I think we have as teachers is defeatism, something I have always found exhausting. Basically, saying that we don't have enough resources and that we are a traditional school. If you want to stop being a traditional school, nobody is going to do it for you. (Ainhoa, head teacher)

The psychoeducational report has become a key element in the maintenance of the current system. As the system questions those who are outside the norm, the assessment process is spared review:

In order to have true inclusion in schools, we must break away from traditional schooling, from the issue of evaluation, from the issue of measuring, from the issue

of marking, because going down that road will not get us anywhere, because what we need is a mindset change. (Ángela, mother)

Moreover, segregationist practices have been dressed up in polite and politically correct language. Over the last two decades, the meaning of the term 'inclusion' has shifted from 'being part of' (Parrilla 2002) to including some practices in segregated environments. The inclusion discourse has been hollowed out. A recent parliamentary debate on the new Education Act in Spain showed how the banner of inclusive education is raised by all kinds of political parties, even with the slogan 'Support for inclusive education, for special education too.' In academic forums, segregated practices are advocated as being inclusive. In this atmosphere of ambiguity and manipulation of research evidence, everything is left to relying on the 'goodwill' of the professionals who happen to cross the path of a child's school years. Showing 'goodwill' involves holding a complex, highly exposed position, which requires engaging in resistance, confrontation and disruptive practices, because, as one participant said: 'the law promotes these reports and opinions; if there were no law in place to protect the different models of schooling, there would be no reports' (Alejandro, father and activist). Therefore, pupils are ultimately left to chance, and this uncertainty weighs heavily on families:

We basically hope that professionals will have a heart, regardless of whether they are counsellors or teachers. We hope that in their heart they will empathise with what we want. (Rocío, mother)

The protection of a fundamental human right that is underpinned by scientific evidence is therefore subject to chance. There are many forces working against it, including teacher training.

In teacher training [...] there is very little room for envisaging a different type of school. So, when training continues to reproduce [this mindset] about transmission of knowledge in the faculty, and continues to be passive and futile, what tends to happen is that this hegemonic model is reproduced and there's no change. So, when people finish their degrees and get to the classroom, they end up reproducing what is there, which they have inherited from culture and society. (Arasy, Master's degree student)

The certainty provided by techniques, mainly psychometric tests, is in stark contrast with the uncertainty inherent in the task of educating children. However, the certainty of protocols, tradition and the administrative framework that underpins current educational counselling does not remove the personal anxiety of the practitioner:

And in all this turmoil, I keep asking myself: who am I to give opinions and make judgements? How can I promote more inclusive and humane spaces and timetables? How can I modify belief systems to support the view that everyone can do things? And I am constantly in contradiction with what I am expected to do. (Macarena, school counsellor)

Training for inclusive schooling requires questioning how we look at the other and how we relate to them (Vila 2019). This includes the context of assessment and its consequences for improving educational processes. As one teacher put it: ‘The psychoeducational report should guide me in my interaction with my students. Otherwise, it creates and maintains barriers.’ One participant described it as follows:

My saying that you have cerebral palsy, that you have whatever disorder, does not help me or the teacher to find new answers; new answers come from understanding you; and here’s an example of a social model of disability. (Ignacio, university researcher)

The accounts collected showed how the psychoeducational report prevents presence, which is a prerequisite for the right to education. This creates a legal paradox: although the CRPD has been ratified by Spain, the lower-level legislation administratively and legally supports the current psychoeducational report, which violates the right to inclusive education.

In schools [...] we are teachers and counsellors, not clinicians. Our task in making an assessment is not to issue an opinion and make a diagnosis; that is a task which, if it is needed at all, should be done somewhere else, from my point of view. The purpose of school is to determine what needs students have, how we can meet those needs, and to enable learning, and therefore, development, for each and every person in the school. Therefore, our job is not to diagnose. (Diana, teacher and educational therapist)

An additional perversion of the system in terms of counselling is making resources conditional on how children are labelled. This practice is controlled by the computer tools that schools are required to use to apply for resources, in particular for special education specialists and hearing and speech therapists. This is a very narrow approach to the idea of supporting inclusion, as was graphically described by a school counsellor: ‘Instead of making resources match children, children are made to match resources’ (Raúl, school counsellor). This is a back-to-front logic: children become the means to achieve what is supposed to be good for them, and this goal is to be met by engaging in a very harmful

labelling process that justifies segregated schooling practices. These dynamics can be resisted through knowledge:

We have not given any medical reports on my son to the school since his second or third year of primary school. It was the neurologist himself who gave me the idea: medical diagnoses are private, and therefore this report doesn't have to be given to the school if you don't want to; they can't demand a diagnosis from you. The school's diagnosis has to be pedagogical, not clinical. (Estela, mother and activist)

An outlook change can be seen in the creation of partnerships between professionals and families. Empowerment comes from a mindset change by building close relationships and getting to know the real person, unmediated by labels. A viewpoint that makes it possible to question 'that we are very different from those who are normal' (Virginia, mother) and is an invitation to question practices that are not ethically driven. Families who experience the school counselling process involved in the psychoeducational report, which is dominated by opacity and ignorance, must play a leading role in the process. They have the key resources to show teachers and counsellors different ways of working and providing alternatives. One thing that became clear in the participatory experience was that some of the practices to be implemented in the school are employed at home by many families on a daily basis. There are many useful resources that professionals sometimes do not allow themselves to think about. This is in line with the view that 'schools know more than they use' (Ainscow et al. 2012). They should be open to questioning the rationale that shapes their current practices; to questioning contexts (psychoeducational reports focusing on systems and on barriers to participation) rather than people:

There's a solution that I have used in my schools. When making the initial assessment, I have produced a psychoeducational report on each class and on the classroom, not on particular children. In other words, what the furniture is like, if the classroom is cosy or not, if it is possible to have different activities organised in different classroom areas, if it is more or less flexible, whether there is harmony or disharmony, the type of affectivity, how they relate, how the class is managed, what type of methodology is used, if the children are sitting down all the time... because different types of problems will be highlighted depending on the type of classroom organisation. (Raúl, school counsellor)

There is selective attention even in the way that regulations are approached. Current regulations contain some unfair provisions, but also opportunities:

The regulations that define the psychoeducational report say that it must meet two requirements: it must be based on an analysis of the child but, above all, on an analysis of the context. And this is the rule, but it is broken. (Antonio, teacher and educational therapist)

There is also a counter viewpoint that is now largely held by schools, professionals, inspectors, and management. Peripheral elements must become central; context cannot be considered to be a supplementary aspect but must be recognised as the central element that it is.

Conclusion

In recent decades, there has been much international research underpinning the concept of inclusive education, which has become one of the major challenges facing education systems around the world. Making our schools spaces where citizenship is built through equality and inclusion was enshrined in the latest human rights instrument that qualified the right to education as the right to inclusive education (the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities). It has been placed as Sustainable Development Goal No. 4 of the 2030 Agenda, which gives an idea of the challenge ahead. This process builds on international research that has shown the social and educational value of inclusive education. UNESCO (2020), for its part, has highlighted educational, social, and even economic reasons for inclusion. Inclusive education is therefore supported by reason, justice, and people's willingness to make it happen. Despite the existing commitment to transform school systems, but there are still serious obstacles to that change across the globe.

The psychoeducational reports that account for a large part of the work of school counselling teams are one of the key factors that hinder the progress of inclusive education in Spain. The voices of one hundred activists in a highly participatory process helped us to understand how these assessments can become stigmatising procedures that are precursors to segregation. This participatory project has contributed to deconstructing disability in schools (Danforth and Rhodes 1997), which has been supported by various reports from international organisations in recent times.

The analyses, arguments and approaches generated in the workshop sought to place the psychoeducational report at the service of the right to education, not of segregation. A starting point is enhancing the conditions in which presence occurs in schools. This process should focus on the periphery of current school projects, on the

voices of the community, on everyone's ability to grow, and on the necessary review of the system's limitations. Professionals should work to nourish their ability to be reflective and critical, thanks to the contribution of the silenced voices within schools; and to collaboratively resist those silencing mechanisms (Hooks 1989) that even today allow a form of cultural genocide that denies the legitimacy of difference (Slee and Allan 2001).

The work conducted by the network of activists created on the occasion of the workshop analysed here is having a strong impact in Spain. It has encouraged new individual and collective accounts to emerge that have the potential to disrupt the status quo. These narratives transform the internal processes within the subject and have structural effects, as they build critical analyses and new imaginaries for inclusion. All this comes to show that collective analysis and collaborative intention that is systematically and ethically oriented have the ability to resist deeply-ingrained tools of assessment, namely, psychoeducational reports. These reports build symbolic borders around reality and are a strongly deterministic element in the lives of many children. These power narratives reify individuals, who are in turn subjectivised to these power narratives. However, they can be challenged through proposals that reverse the current logic. A new reality can be collectively constructed through new narratives that enable individuals to reclaim their ability to be subjects.

References

- Ainscow, M., A. Dyson, S. Goldrick, and M. West. 2012. "Making schools effective for all: Rethinking the task." *School Leadership and Management* 32 (3): 1-17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2012.669648>
- Ainscow, M., A. Dyson, and S. Weiner. 2013. "From Exclusion to Inclusion: a review of international literature on ways of responding to students with special educational needs in schools." *En-clave pedagógica: Revista Internacional de Investigación e Innovación Educativa* 13: 13-30.
- Brydon-Miller, M., and P. Maguire. 2009. "Participatory Action Research: Contributions to the Development of Practitioner Inquiry in Education." *Educational Action Research* 17 (1): 79-93. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790802667469>
- Calderón-Almendros, I. 2018. "Deprived of human rights." *Disability & Society* 33 (10): 1666-1671. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1529260>

- Calderón-Almendros, I., and Calderón-Almendros, R. 2016. “‘I open the coffin and here I am.’ Disability as oppression and education as liberation in the construction of personal identity.” *Disability & Society* 31 (1): 100-115. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2015.1133400>
- Calderón-Almendros, I., and Habegger, S. 2017. *Education, Disability and Inclusion. A Family Struggle against an Excluding School*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Calderón-Almendros, I., and Ruiz-Román, C. 2015. “Education as liberation from oppression: personal and social constructions of Disability.” In *Inclusive education twenty years after Salamanca*, edited by Florian Kiuppis and Rune Sarromaa Hausstätte, 251-260. New York: Peter Lang.
- Calderón-Almendros, I., and Ruiz-Román, C. 2016. “Disadvantaged Identities: Conflict and Education from Disability, Culture and Social Class.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 48(9): 946-958. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1118613>
- Cologon, K. 2019. *Towards Inclusive Education: A Necessary Process of Transformation*. Children and Young People with Disability Australia, Melbourne. <https://bit.ly/39OkB5U>
- Cologon, K. 2020. Is inclusive education really for everyone? Family stories of children and young people labelled with ‘severe and multiple’ or ‘profound’ ‘disabilities’. *Research Papers in Education*. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2020.1849372>
- Danforth, S., and W.C. Rhodes. 1997. “Deconstructing disability. A Philosophy for inclusion.” *Remedial and Special Education* 18(6): 357-366. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259701800605>
- Echeita, G., and Calderón-Almendros, I. 2014. “Obstáculos a la inclusión: cuestionando concepciones y prácticas sobre la evaluación psicopedagógica.” *Àmbits de Psicopedagogia i Orientació*, 41.
- Elmore, R. 1995. Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice. *Harvard Educational Review* 66(1): 1-26. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.g73266758j348t33>
- Esposito, J., and V. Evans-Winters. 2007. “Contextualizing Critical Action Research: Lessons from Urban Educators.” *Educational Action Research* 15(2), 221-237. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790701314775>
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. 2007. *Assessment in Inclusive Settings: Key Issues for Policy and Practice*. Odense: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. <https://bit.ly/3aA6uke>

- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. 2018. *Evidence of the Link Between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion A Review of the Literature*. Odense: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. <https://n9.cl/n1z6k>
- Evans, R. 1997. *The Human Side of School Change: Reform, Resistance, and the Real-Life Problems of Innovations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Foucault, M. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gimeno-Sacristán, J. 2008. *Educación por competencias, ¿qué hay de nuevo?* Madrid: Morata.
- Grindle, M. 1997. *Getting Good Government: Capacity Building in the Public Sectors of Developing Countries*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. 2003. *The Future of Human Nature*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hargreaves, A. and M. Fullan. 1992. "Introduction". In *Understanding Teacher Development*, edited by A. Hargreaves and M. Fullan, 1-19. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hehir, T. et al. 2016. *A summary of the evidence on Inclusive Education*. São Paulo: Alana Institute.
- Hehir, T., T. Grindal, and H. Eidelman. 2012. *Review of special education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. Boston, MA, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. <https://n9.cl/sabuy>
- Hooks, B. 1989. *Talking Black: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. New York: Routledge.
- Justice, L.M., J.A.R. Logan, T.J. Lin, and J.N. Kaderavek. 2014. "Peer Effects in Early Childhood Education Testing the Assumptions of Special-Education Inclusion." *Psychological Science* 25(9): 1722-1729. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614538978>
- Kemmis, S. 2006. "Participatory Action Research and the Public Sphere." *Educational Action Research* 14(4): 459-476. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790600975593>
- Kemmis, S., and R. McTaggart. 2005. "Participatory Action Research: Communicative Action and the Public Sphere." In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 559-603. New York: Sage Publications.

- Kemmis, S., R. McTaggart and R. Nixon. 2014. *The Action Research Planner: Doing Critical Participatory Action Research*. Singapore: Springer.
- Lewin, K. 1946. "Action research and minority problems." *Journal of Social Issues* 2(4): 34-46. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x>
- Parrilla, A. 2002. "Acerca del origen y sentido de la educación inclusiva." *Revista de Educación*, 327: 11-30.
- Pinar, W.F. 2014. *La teoría del currículo*. Madrid: Narcea.
- Slee, R., and J. Allan. 2001. "Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 11(2): 173-192, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210100200073>
- UN. 2006. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations. <https://bit.ly/3nSkvka>
- UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2017. *Inquiry concerning Spain carried out by the Committee under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention*. CRPD/C/20/3. Geneva: United Nations. <https://bit.ly/2QP1S2J>
- UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2020. *Views adopted by the Committee under article 5 of the Optional Protocol, concerning communication No. 41/2017. CRPD/C/23/D/41/2017*. Geneva: United Nations. <https://bit.ly/2QtSGRx>
- UN Human Rights Council. 2013. *Thematic study on the right of persons with disabilities to education*, A/HRC/25/29. <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/25/29>
- UNESCO. 1994. *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris: Unesco.
- UNESCO. 2020. *Towards inclusion in education: status, trends and challenges: the UNESCO Salamanca Statement 25 years on*. Paris: Unesco.
- Vila, E.S. 2005. "Mundo de la vida y cultura: la educación como acción ética e intercultural." *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 17: 81-96.
- Vila, E.S. 2019. "Repensar la relación educativa desde la pedagogía de la alteridad." *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 31(2): 177-196. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14201/teri.20271>
- Wood, D.J., J.S. Bruner, and G. Ross. 1976. "The role of tutoring in problem solving." *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology* 17(2): 89-100.