

QUESTIONING THE COMMON IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

*Egle Pitton
Fabiana Demarco*



ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a research study on including students with disabilities in schools in the city of Buenos Aires. This study aimed to investigate practices oriented toward inclusive education. This research followed case study guidelines, conducting interviews with students, families, teachers, and school administrators. Classes and breaks were observed and analyzed, which allowed for addressing the complex interactions between policies, regulations, and pedagogical practices.

The first phase of the fieldwork provided visibility to the effects of incorporating inclusion support agents from both Special Education and the healthcare system in classrooms. The monitoring of the school trajectories of three students with disabilities at the time of transition between educational levels contributed to understand the complexity of this topic. The analysis of the transition from primary to secondary school for two blind students contributed to conceptualizing teaching as a structuring axis in articulating actions between regular and special education teachers. Finally, the school experience of a teenager with motor and cognitive disabilities allowed for a critical reflection on the idea of regular school as the only desirable goal to consider in the schooling of students with disabilities.

This chapter aims to contribute to the debate on the conditions of schooling for students with disabilities in regular schools and serve as a bridge for dialogue between Special Education and inclusive education.

INTRODUCTION

Policies and practices aimed at the inclusion of students with disabilities in common education²⁶ schools have spanned more than 30 in the city of Buenos Aires. In recent years, conceptual transformations regarding disability, advances in the rights of people with disabilities, and the social mandate to achieve inclusive schools have generated significant changes in the educational system. The most evident aspects of these transformations include the development of regulations to guarantee access

26 In Argentina, the term “common” applied to the modalities of the Educational System is equivalent to the term “regular” used in most education systems in the region.

to students with disabilities to regular school, a sustained increase in the number of those students in institutions, and the incorporating of health professionals into the school dynamics. These processes are supported by a new paradigm of inclusive education that promotes the right to schooling and, therefore, the full participation of children and teenagers—whether they have disabilities—in regular education schools. This model proposes an educational system with schools that reject any form or mechanism of selection and segregation and reflect on the problems associated with these processes to avoid their reproduction.

Recognizing the need to focus on practices as one of the conditions to dismantle logics of exclusion, the research from which this article includes part of its final report focused on school practices that promote the participation of all students in the issues addressed in the classroom. Thus, the study aimed to gain an in-depth understanding of the inclusion processes in primary and secondary common schools of state management in the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires. The systematization and analysis of the educational trajectories of three students with disabilities have allowed for the identification and comprehension of the forms that their schooling may take, which results from a complex regulatory framework, jurisdictional and institutional policies, institutions of regular and special education, healthcare institutions, teaching practices, and family decisions.

The conditions of schooling in the seventh grade, where these three students were enrolled, changed substantially—in terms of institutions, resources, approaches, and practices—compared to those they encountered in the schools where they continued their studies. In this regard, although the study focused only on these three cases, the data collected during fieldwork allowed to compare approaches, pedagogical conditions, and support mechanisms, which opens up the range of possibilities for reflecting on:

- the institutional conditions that promote educational inclusion processes;
- the role of teaching as a structuring axis on which actions between regular and special education schools are articulated using the figure of the inclusive teacher;
- questioning the critical examination of the regular school's idea as the only desirable destination to think about the schooling of students with disabilities;
- the identification of conditions, practices, and mechanisms of special education schools that contribute to democratizing and reforming the field to facilitate in-

clusive education (Ocampo González, 2016). It understands that such reformation cannot ignore knowledge about institutional practices in these schools. General criticisms of this sector are based on a monolithic view of special education as an offer incompatible with inclusive education. This research analyzes assumptions and pedagogical practices of teachers in these schools that question the hegemonic idea and state that special education as a whole is structured under the logic of a discriminatory and segregationist model.

Finally, special education is systematically criticized for segregating students from regular education and having deficiency-focused approaches rather than educational ones. This study provides elements to question these generalized ideas, as the research has shown pedagogical solid intentionality as a guideline for teaching practices in the studied institutions.

Methodology

The research adopts a qualitative approach aimed at reconstructing institutional practices related to the schooling processes of three students with disabilities: M and F, two blind adolescents, and T, a student with motor and intellectual disabilities, during the transition from the regular primary level to the next stage of schooling.

Through a case study, it was sought to systematize and analyze these practices from the perspective of various actors (supervisors, professionals involved in school orientation, school principals, teachers from regular and special education, families, and students), specifically focusing on the transition from primary education to secondary school for M and F and to the Comprehensive Interdisciplinary School (EII in Spanish) under the Directorate of Special ducation for the case of T.

The fieldwork was conducted between 2017 and 2018, involving institutions and agents from regular and special education, and those schools recognized for their educational inclusion trajectory were selected. Given the interest in analyzing the transition between educational levels, fieldwork began in 2017 in a seventh-grade section where the three students with disabilities attended. It continued in 2018 at the institutions where these students continued their educational path.

The information collection strategies mainly consisted of in-depth interviews with various actors involved in the research schooling processes and classroom observation. As for the observations, it should be noted that two researchers carried them out: one focused primarily on recording the classroom atmosphere and the interaction between teachers and students regarding the teaching content, while the second focused on interactions between teachers, integrative teachers, and students with disabilities, and their classmates. Audio recordings, written records, and photographs of student work during classes were made.

In 2017, 23 interviews were conducted with the school management, teachers from various areas, the integrative teacher, Non-Teaching Personal Accompanying, the security guard, families, and students. Six classroom observations were conducted in the language practices, mathematics, social sciences, physical education, English, and plastic arts courses. Additionally, two interviews were held with specialists in the educational inclusion field to contrast preliminary analyses with their experiences in the inclusion work in educational system schools.

During 2018, fieldwork was carried out at the high school where M and F attend and at the EII where T attends. Eight interviews and three classroom observations were conducted at the high school, two in the language and one in the mathematics courses. The interviews were conducted with teachers of these courses, instructors, tutors, the management team, the pedagogical advisor, the inclusion support teacher (MAI, in Spanish), and the secondary-level supervisor. In the EII, four interviews were conducted with the school management team, the teaching team of T's group, the speech-language therapist, and the psychomotor therapists, and basic subject classes and breaks were observed.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND THE REDEFINITION OF THE COMMON

The first experiences and integration projects in Argentina began in the second half of the last century and were aimed at students with visual and motor disabilities. From their beginnings until today, these practices and their respective regulations and policies have taken different meanings as they have responded to various paradigms.

Similarly, the schooling of students with disabilities in regular schools has a long history in the Buenos Aires²⁷ educational system. The studied experiences express the issue's complexity by highlighting the difficulties that inclusion practices have experienced throughout different periods. They also reflect the strategies of the actors involved in aligning these practices with the various paradigms leading up to the current level of inclusive education.

Not long ago, the term integration was used to refer to the educational processes of students with disabilities in regular schools while the term "inclusion" was reserved for policies aimed at socially disadvantaged groups.

Beyond the terminology used, both integration and inclusion reveal the exclusion processes of the individuals. In the last two decades, there has been a change of perspective in the educational system regarding the schooling of students with disabilities, which advocates for quitting the integration paradigm. This change overlaps with full inclusion policies aimed at student populations exceeding those with disabilities. It is crucial to theoretically differentiate between these two movements, as it is more complex in practical terms, often leading to confusion or overlap.

Therefore, it is necessary to consider the theoretical developments established as references within the educational inclusion field of students with disabilities to reduce how the different categories that constitute it are applied.

In the literature on the inclusion field, two key moments are usually identified based on international conferences, which established guidelines adopted by the educational community for the schooling of students with disabilities at various educational levels. However, school integration of these students in regular schools has already been a frequent practice in many European and American countries for decades. The first moment refers to the Declaration of the World Congress on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality (Salamanca, 1994), and the second milestone is the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (New York, 2006).

From the first to the second moment, the concept of *Special Needs Education* was replaced by the notion of *Barriers to Learning and Participation*, as adopted in the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth and Ainscow, 2000, 2008). The adoption of this new terminology

27 In the case of blind students, the first integrations began in the 1960s, following the 3rd Pan-American Congress for the Blind, which addressed the integration of blind or visually impaired children into regular schools.

shifted the focus from students' learning difficulties to the interaction between policies, cultures, institutions, contexts, and individuals.

In line with this perspective, the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities proposed, as far as education was concerned, the abandonment of the integration paradigm, which involves an individual intervention focused on the integrated student and the adoption of the social model for full inclusion aimed at reducing the barriers present in the context.

It is necessary to briefly clarify both terms to highlight the underlying concepts in each of them. The concept of integration is centered on the individual and stems from the idea of normalization inherent in the medical paradigm of disability. In this framework, the individual—with the help of a special school— “must” adapt to the operational rules of common schools (Parrilla Latas, 2002; de la Vega, 2010). In contrast, the inclusion paradigm, emerging from the social paradigm of disability, focuses on the changes that must occur within society and institutions. In this case, educational institutions—as part of an educational system—are responsible for creating the necessary conditions to eliminate any form or mechanism of selection or segregation. Similarly, they are responsible for being an object of reflection before problems associated with these processes, thus avoiding their reproduction.

This paradigm places the inclusive education concept as its core, a term that emerged in 1990 in Jomtien (Thailand) during UNESCO's World Conference on Education for All.

Based on the international regulatory requirement in Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the subscribing states reconfigured their national education laws in alignment with the inclusive education paradigm. Additionally, theoretical developments and research in the field of inclusion focused on analyzing the forms that inclusion processes took, emphasizing the barriers that prevent them (Echeita, 2006; López Melero, 2011).

However, it can be observed that the prolific production of recommendations and materials developed by international organizations and authors representing official inclusive education discourses has not significantly impacted practices or the educational community's perceptions about inclusion. Experiences indicating a change in approach are relatively scarce, even though different terms are used in the regulations and international, regional, and national documents.

As noted by authors from various disciplines, theoretical currents, and perspectives (Sinisi, 2010; Skliar, 2005; Kiel, 2018; Ocampo, 2018), the gap between these principles and practices may originate from the fact that the ideas and guidelines regarding inclusive education do not challenge the core of the educational system and fail to question the established notions surrounding inclusion processes. As a result, these recommendations continue to manifest in practices that reinforce the intervention paradigm on the individuals to be included rather than addressing the logic of the constitution of school collectives that consider the various ways of participating in classrooms.

From the years following the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the present, various authors, including those mentioned above, have worked on highlighting the complexities of implementing inclusive policies, both in their theoretical works and in their dialogue and exchange with the educational community.

In recent theoretical works, Laura Kiel (2018) and Aldo Ocampo (2018) bring visibility to critical issues within the field of inclusive education. On the one hand, the paradoxes generated in practices due to the coexistence of the integration and inclusion paradigms. On the other hand, there is a lack of investigations addressing the topic from an epistemological perspective that delimits a disciplinary field specific to inclusion.

The authors agree on the need to think about the inclusive education field from an epistemological perspective that transcends disciplinary limits, appealing to interdisciplinary to build and generate new knowledge, which is not conceived as a sum of already established knowledge. Instead, it is proposed that the limits and gaps of disciplines be worked at (Ocampo, 2018), which puts tension on the framework of the Educational Sciences (Dubrovsky, 2019) without denying the inherent impossibility of educational action. Embracing the dimension of impossibility at the center of interdisciplinary exposes, in the production of scientific knowledge, the absurd pretension of *knowing all knowledge* (Kiel, 2018).

At this point, it is evident that the use of new terminology, adherence to international agreements, and standardized recommendations are insufficient to make education truly inclusive. As verified in the context of this research, the uncritical incorporation of prescriptive guidelines carries the risk of creating regulations and practices that generate effects contrary to those intended; i.e., in the name of inclusive education, different forms of segregation are produced instead of inclusion. Such is the case of the incorporation of accompanying figures that reinforce the intervention on the student to be included, leading to effects of “inclusive segregation” (Castel, 1997) or

the indiscriminate use of *reasonable accommodation* resources as occurs in the City of Buenos Aires with the growth of Individual Pedagogical Projects (PPI in Spanish).

Avoiding paradoxical effects requires focusing on the barriers that prevent learning and fundamentally elucidating the logic that structures school collectives and how differences are addressed within them. In other words, the focus should be on coexistence and living conditions in school environments, not concerning each student but the collectives (Kiel, 2018).

This requires researching the collective logics to identify and analyze the matrix on which the social links are set. This matrix accounts for what is considered *for everyone* in a certain collective, from which the common emerges.

Thus, the common would not be something prescribed by a higher authority for all institutions but that which can be shaped by the contingency and particularity of each collective (Alemán, 2012).

The notion of the *common* or *the common* has been broadly studied in the social sciences in general and, in particular, in education. It is used to address a variety of topics. Thus, the concern about the meanings attributed to the common and the processes involved in its definition must be one of the main objectives of an interdisciplinary epistemological field of inclusive *education* in order to avoid the risk that its meaning slips toward *the normal* or *the universal* understood as complete and equal for everyone (Terigi, 2008; Diker, 2008).

In this regard, as Gabriela Diker and Laura Kiel point out from different perspectives, we should delve into the operations involved in defining the common, always bearing in mind that it also involves other logical operations as a counterpart. They include differentiation, exclusion, and segregation. Hence, it is key to elucidate the relations between the universal and the common.

Given these warnings, it is concluded that the tendency to standardize inclusion practices, that is, expecting them to be the same for all individuals without questioning the conditions under which collectives are formed, is a strategy that risks producing segregative effects.

As an inclusive concept, education requires questioning the declamatory meanings assigned to the universal to investigate its logics and propose approaches where the common constructed respects the singular dimensions of each individual,

in unavoidable tension with the particularity of the collective, which should not necessarily be totalizing.

SCHOOL TRAJECTORIES

For more than two decades, the study of the school trajectories of children and adolescents has been the subject of quantitative research and macro analysis. They address the issue of the gap between what the education system expects students to enter, stay, and graduate from compulsory levels and the path they achieve in the particular forms and times it demands to them. However, conceptualizing the problem of the mismatch between theoretical and real trajectories as a systemic issue—and not as individual responsibility—came later and led to school trajectories becoming a subject of pedagogical reflection (Terigi, 2007).

The conceptualization of school trajectories has made it possible to overcome the concept of school failure, which is so widely questioned both for designating very diverse phenomena—such as grade repetition, older people, low performance, and dropout—and for being interpreted from the individual pathological model.

The homogenizing model's difficulty in successfully educating specific groups of subjects has been widely studied and characterized from different perspectives (Padawer, 2008; Terigi, 2009). As is well known, since its inception, the homogenizing and normalizing model has been unable to educate everyone. Regarding individuals with disabilities, the creation of special schools for students with specific deficiencies is evidence of this. In Argentina, the first special school for deaf-mutes was established in 1857, and the first for blind children in 1887. In other words, from its beginnings, regular education achieved homogenization by segregating those who deviated from what was expected.

At the beginning of the 20th century, psychology was used as a science to provide the parameters of normality to classify those who, despite not having any organic deficiency, were unable to attend school successfully. Tests and intelligence tests were expected to provide scientific evidence of a student's intellectual development, which would explain their difficulties in learning at school (Terigi, 2009). This individual pathological model for addressing the issues of students who do not meet school expectations, was functional—as mentioned—the homogenizing and normalizing model of modern

school by providing explanations that did not question the conditions or assumptions under which pedagogical practices were developed.

The potential of the concept of school trajectories lies in linking two levels of analysis that were separated in educational research: the structural aspects—the homogenization produced by the institutionalized school—and the biographies of individuals, incorporating into the analysis the institutional conditions of schooling (Terigi, 2018).

This concept is central to this study, as it makes it possible to think about the schooling conditions required for students with disabilities to learn what allows them to advance in their autonomy and define their own life project. Likewise, it can be a theoretical tool to overcome the *regular education-special education* dichotomy, as the theoretical and political concern should focus on the institutional, pedagogical, and didactic conditions that need to be generated so that each and every student can learn in school, rather than on the system modality in which they do it. In other words, this concept allows for analyzing the limits and potentialities of each of the paths that students with disabilities may take according to their social, family, and subjective conditions that the system can offer at different stages of their schooling.

The study aimed to characterize and analyze real school trajectories of students with disabilities, intending to question the idea of standardizing desirable paths.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM IN ARGENTINA: CENTRAL FEATURES AND REGULATIONS DRIVING INCLUSIVE PRACTICES IN THE AUTONOMOUS CITY OF BUENOS AIRES

The Argentine educational system is governed by the National Education Law (LEN in Spanish) 26.206, enacted in 2006. It established education as an individual and social right while also defining one of its objectives as guaranteeing educational inclusion. The law comprises state-run and privately managed educational services, as well as cooperatively and socially managed services across all jurisdictions in the country.

The educational offer is organized into four levels of education: early childhood education, primary, secondary, and higher education —tertiary and university— of which the first three are compulsory from 4 years of age. Additionally, there are eight education

modalities, with special education being one of them. Educational modalities are defined as:

Organizational and/or curricular options of regular education within one or more educational levels. They aim to respond to specific training requirements and address characteristics of a permanent or temporary nature, personal and/or contextual, to guarantee equality in the right to education and comply with the legal, technical, and pedagogical requirements of the different educational levels (LEN, Article 17²⁸) [Translated quote from its original in Spanish].

Based on the data relevant to this article, it should be noted that, at the compulsory education levels, the Buenos Aires education system has regular and special education schools under both types of management.

State-run special education schools are institutions that guarantee the schooling of students with disabilities at the early childhood, primary, and post-primary levels²⁹. Likewise, they are also responsible for the integration teachers accountable for the inclusion processes in the regular school. These schools fall within the Directorate of Special Education and are organized into two categories based on the specific needs of their students³⁰. Category B groups schools whose students —with or without disabilities— experience learning difficulties and require flexible teaching methods. Their goal is for these students to be able to enter or re-enter common primary schools before completing the level.

28 Article 17 of the LEN establishes the structure of the National Educational System by levels and eight modalities: Technical-Professional Education, Artistic Education, Special Education, Continuing Education for Youth and Adults, Rural Education, Bilingual Intercultural Education, Education in Contexts of Deprivation of Liberty, and Home and Hospital Education.

29 It should be noted that the state-run subsystem does not have special education schools that accredit the secondary level.

30 The Directorate of Special Education is also responsible for door-to-door and hospital schools, which serve children and teenagers with or without disabilities who are unable to attend school due to health reasons. These schools are grouped under category A in the education ranking system.

Category C schools serve students with motor, hearing, visual, and cognitive disabilities, severe personality disorders, and multiple disabilities. According to the official website of the Ministry of Education of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires (CABA in Spanish)³¹, these schools guarantee early care (initial or primary care) education for children and young people with disabilities aged 45 days and 14 years through the development of pedagogical projects according to the particular needs of each student or school group.

In the case of sensory disabilities (blindness, visual impairment, deafness, and hearing loss), primary-level education is also provided for youth and adults without age limits. Additionally, special education schools offer comprehensive training for young people and adults aged 13 to 30 with mental, visual, and/or hearing disabilities.

As previously mentioned, for more than three decades, the Ministry of Education and the special education institutions of the CABA have been promoting policies that address the various issues associated with educational exclusion processes, including those aimed at the school integration of students with disabilities. Despite the extensive international and national regulations directed toward educational inclusion, the research reveals its realization's complexity.

THE SCHOOL TRAJECTORIES OF M, F, AND T: PATHWAYS BETWEEN COMMON AND SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS

As discussed in another section, the concept of *school trajectory* enables the reconstruction of the educational paths and forms adopted by the students' schooling. The study of the school trajectories of three students with disabilities has allowed identifying and characterizing the pedagogical conditions that make it possible for these students to access their right to education through meaningful learning. For further analysis, we will present the trajectories of M and F, blind students, and then the trajectory of T, a student with motor and intellectual disabilities.

M and F school trajectories are developed between regular and special education schools. Both students attended the same grade section of a primary regular

31 <https://www.buenosaires.gob.ar/educacion/estudiantes/inscripcionescolar/especial>

education school recognized by various systems actors as “open-door,” which, over the past decade, has been increasingly incorporating students with different disabilities (School A). During the school day, a teacher who supports inclusion (MAI), assigned by the special education school, accompanies them within the grade four times a week, and in the afterschool session, they attend the special education school for blind children (School B), which F has been attending since the age of six and M since the age of eleven. Schools A and B have been working together for more than ten years.

As the term “school support service for inclusion” suggests, this afterschool session aims to provide the necessary support to assist students in their primary school education, where they will receive accreditation for their learning. It is important to clarify that these institutions also have a key role in relation to the included students³² by offering specific curricular instances of the education modality to teach skills that enable them to achieve independent living.

In the morning session, they participate in all the common grade-level activities. The MAI’s pedagogical work aims to transcribe instructions, texts, and the work of M and F from alphabetic to Braille and vice versa. They also aim to make educational materials —maps, graphics, etc.— accessible, and eventually, clarify instructions or explain specific topics.

The teachers of the four core subjects (Mathematics, Language Practices, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences) state that M and F can follow the classes without any difficulty. Therefore, from the perspective of the classroom teachers, there is no need to adapt their proposal or review the selected contents. The teachers’ concern focuses on verbalizing what is written on the blackboard and being attentive to language expressions such as those that are not sufficiently descriptive or that rely on images as references.

In contrast, in Physical Education, for example, the teacher adapts the teaching to the particular needs of the group. According to him, when he was assigned to the class of F and M, he had discussions and counseling with a teacher from the same discipline at School B.

32 The educational proposal of both special schools are extensive, and their actions are diverse because the needs of their students are also varied: from those who complete all their schooling exclusively in the Special Education school to young people and adults who have not finished primary school or those who acquire a disability as adults.

Upon completing primary school, F and M continued their studies together: attending a regular high school in the morning (School C) and, in the afternoon, a Special Education school for young people and adults with visual impairment (School D). The MAI from the latter institution supports both students' schooling with an intervention model different from that of elementary school: the primary interlocutors are not the students but the teachers of each subject. This mode of intervention favors the creation of a *support configuration* as a working logic among teachers.

At the time of defining the 1st-year courses for M and F, the pedagogical advisor (School C) and the MAI (School D) decided that both students should be in separate groups to encourage interaction with their classmates and prevent them from exclusively associating with each other. Another significant difference from previous years is that the MAI, when working with the teachers, is not present or directly intervenes in the classes unless there is a special need or a prior agreement with the subject teacher. Finally, M and F voluntarily attend the support classes at School D according to their study needs.

During fieldwork at School C, it was observed that both students navigated the different areas of the institution with ease, could keep up with the pace of the class, communicated weekly with the MAI during recess, began to connect with some classmates, and their performance was on par with or even above the average of their group, in F's case.

According to the interviewed teachers at the school—the pedagogical advisor, Language and Mathematics teachers, tutors, and monitors of both divisions—educational inclusion is a central objective of the school's pedagogical project. In recent years, the presence of blind students has involved the challenge of teaching these students with the support of the MAI, both for planning the teaching and for text transcription.

The transition for F and M from primary to secondary education—new schools, new classmates, changes in work mode and the support of the MAI—was a manageable challenge for the students, despite the uncertainties it caused for both the students and the primary school teachers.

T's school journey began in the nursery school of Early Childhood Education. At the end of the 5th grade, the school guidance team under the Ministry of Education proposed that T stay another year at this level.

In the transition from Early Childhood Education to primary school, the school guidance team recommended that T continue his schooling in a Special Education institution. However, T's family, supported by regulations and evaluations from health professionals who had been treating him since early childhood, decided to enroll him in a nearby state-run Common Primary School (School A).

This family decision to ensure T's right to an education in a mainstream school was possible thanks to the support from the private health system and Special Education support. As a result, T attended primary school with the assistance of two adults—a supervisor and a Personal Non-Teaching Assistant—who provided “full-time” support in mobility, transfer, and learning assistance. Although the external support professional is a non-teaching staff member, they functioned as an integrative teacher in practice, responsible for planning and developing the teaching proposal in T's later years of schooling.

Opposition to the orientation of the interdisciplinary education team marked a certain imprint on the family's vision of T's ideal educational path, which initially seemed to confirm their expectations. A turning point that shook the foundation of this decision was directly related to the fact that, from 4th grade onwards, the school, family, and professionals observed no progress in T's initial literacy process.

In the last two years of primary school, a tailored proposal was created for T, consisting of alternating school days between Common School and Special School at a state-run Interdisciplinary Comprehensive School (EII in Spanish) for students with motor and intellectual disabilities (School E). This alternation allowed T to experience new ways of “experiencing school”: different times, spaces, relationships with adults, and autonomy within the school without an abrupt break from the valued connections formed at his primary school. It also enabled the family to find a trustworthy and suitable environment for T in this institution. At the end of 7th grade, T expressed his desire to continue at the EII.

After finishing primary school, T attended School E³³ full-time, maintaining the peer group he had been with for the previous two years.

33 School E is a full-time institution. Almost half of the population attends the institution, and the other half attends primary and secondary schools with inclusion projects accompanied by the institution's MAI. In these cases, inclusion is implemented through devices that vary according to the student's requirements, the characteristics of the school they attend, and the support that is configured.

A distinctive feature of EIs is the flexibility in their institutional proposals, allowing them to modify their offerings and create programs based on the needs of their population. This flexibility is evident in the criteria used to define student groupings, reflecting the importance given to subjective factors in organizing learning groups. That is, not only chronological age and academic progress are considered but also students' affinities. Additionally, each group is made up of a small number of students and is always led by two teachers.

T's group consists of eight teenagers, only two of whom have achieved literacy. At the start of the school year, the two teachers aimed to create conditions for forming a learning group based on the students' ages and interests and the challenge of integrating them into written culture to advance in the literacy process.

Finally, one of the distinctive aspects of schooling at School E is the students' ability to move freely through the spaces, as they are equipped with the dimensions, furniture, and resources needed for students to develop with the greatest possible autonomy in both educational and recreational times without needing adult assistance.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the schooling of all students—whether they have disabilities or not—requires analyzing the characteristics of the pedagogical situation within the context of the jurisdiction's school system. Following Terigi (2009), it is necessary to reflect on teaching from the constraints faced by graduated schools in including all students.

The author emphasizes the need to build a pedagogical response to the problems that the school encounters in teaching certain students. This implies moving away from disciplinary *solutions* imposed from an application-based logic, ignoring the complexity of school processes and the educational field's own knowledge production.

Based on the analysis of the school paths of the three students with disabilities and the conditions of their schooling³⁴, it is interpreted that generating adequate pedagogical and didactic conditions for all students to learn is linked to at least three issues: the

34 The full analysis of trajectories is not included in this article. It will be available in the final report of the research to be published on the UEICEE website. Ministry of Education of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires.

features of school grammar—the grammar of Common Education and Special Education—the institutional culture of the school where teachers develop their teaching practice, and the position assumed by the teachers in charge of a certain group of students, which is influenced, among other factors, by their professional background and biography.

The concept of school grammar by Tyack and Cuban (2001) refers to the set of stable rules that define how schools structure time and space, classify students into specific classes, determine what should be taught, and how it should be assessed. This grammar—like language grammar—gives stability to the system and makes it resistant to attempts at change.

Despite policies, regulations, and pedagogical discourses aimed at breaking the homogenizing logic of graduated schools, Common Education schools maintain the core features of the modern school grammar. Examples include simultaneous teaching, one teacher responsible for a large group of students, standardized assessments, alignment between teaching content and grade level, and exclusively individual approaches to students with disabilities or those who do not learn within the expected timeframe.

These more or less visible rules regulate the pedagogical practices of teachers, even when they are called upon to work towards inclusion. As seen in the Common Education school attended by the three students with disabilities, the individual approach—enhanced by the presence of the MAI, APND, and supervisor providing constant support—should be understood within these coordinates. This approach hinders the student's participation in class activities and interactions with peers and teachers about the content to be learned as their classmates do.

In contrast, as observed in the Interdisciplinary Comprehensive School, other rules, such as forming small groups with two teachers, facilitate the inclusion of all students in the group's learning, as it operates with a school grammar—specific to the Special Education Scale B—that considers both the group and the individual situations of each student.

Although the creation matrix of Special Education schools aligns with the medical model, organizing them by disability (sensory, motor, cognitive, multiple disabilities),

the logic operating in the studied school is pedagogical: teaching curricular content based on each student's uniqueness within a group dynamic.

Regulations promoting processes towards inclusive education—that is, attempting to impact and modify the homogenizing grammar of schools—become tools for action when the institutional culture is underpinned by principles directing practices towards the rights of children and adolescents.

In the case studied, it is significant to question how adolescents with disabilities are conceived in the schools attended. In the institutions where the students continued their education after primary school, teachers think about the class by linking the content to be taught with the students, considering them as adolescents—with their interests, needs, and particularities—rather than focusing solely on their disability. This approach emphasizes the students' possibilities over their limitations. These limitations are considered when designing teaching situations to generate meaningful learning conditions.

In other words, the principle of inclusion is not *established* or institutionalized by decree but is interwoven with organizational and institutional conditions, broadly speaking, which serve as support and scaffolding.

The study of the trajectories of the three students allows for a re-evaluation of the concept of full inclusion as a universal mandate that *all students should attend common education schools*; that is, as the only alternative for all individuals with disabilities and the sole way to approach inclusive education. In this discursive and normative context of *full inclusion*, questions arise about the unintended effects produced when the conditions of teaching and the students' particularities are not addressed. Additionally, analyzing the potential of Special Education schools to create experiences for their students that are *similar* to those experienced by students without disabilities is inspiring, understanding that commonality is defined by experiences that, by being *shared*, equalize.

Regarding schooling, the experience that equalizes diverse subjects is the ability to participate in what happens in the classroom; in other words, having the opportunity to be a student, which involves, among other things, being able to participate in the classroom conversation. When students cannot interact with their peers and teachers about the content—despite efforts from both sides to include them—it is necessary to

reconsider the universal mandate that *all students should attend common education schools*, as it may overlook the particularities and needs of individuals. The universalizing mandate risks standardizing inclusion practices, expecting them to be the same for all subjects without questioning the conditions of group formation.

In Common Education schools attended by students with disabilities, teaching practices can become the structuring axis of support configuration when the intervention of the MAI or the APND is part of a collective working logic, considering both the role of adults in the classroom—who conceive work as a task to be developed with others—and the place of the student with a disability as part of the school group.

In contrast, when the prevailing logic is an individual approach to teaching and solitary work, the presence of support professionals in the classroom impedes joint work between teachers, a condition that allows approaching the idea of support configuration understood as scaffolding and support for inclusion processes. The one-on-one work of the support professional reinforces the perception among classroom teachers that the Special Education teacher or even the APND is the appropriate person to take care of students with disabilities while they focus on the *rest* of the class, which is understandable in large classes. On the other hand, the one-on-one relationship favors the support professional acting as a crucial element in communicating content between students with disabilities and the classroom teacher and vice versa. However, as they act as a *prosthesis*—providing, for example, their eyes to blind students—they reinforce the illusion that these students are *the same as the rest of the class*, reaffirming the homogenizing perception that expels subjective differences.

Observing practices, analyzing them, and producing knowledge from them helps dismantle linear arguments based on prescriptive discourses and normative references about how inclusion should be implemented. It provides the opportunity to understand the inherent complexity of the processes involved in the schooling of students with disabilities, identifying the institutional modes in which these practices are intertwined and the effects they produce.

When institutional conditions are built from a political-pedagogical positioning of the management and teaching team that places the rights of children and adolescents at the center, empowering and subjective institutional practices are generated for all students. This positioning accounts for a logic that moves away from the inclusion-exclusion, common-special, or ability-disability binarism, ensuring that the interaction between the subjects' organic deficiencies (sensory, motor, and intellectual) and the environment does not reproduce disabling views and approaches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alemán, J. (2012). *Soledad: Común. Políticas en Lacan*. Capital Intelectual.
2. Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2000). *Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
3. Booth, T. y M, Ainscow. (2008). *Guía para la evaluación y mejora de la educación inclusiva. (Index for inclusion), Desarrollando el aprendizaje y la participación en las escuelas*. CSIE y Consorcio Universitario para la Educación Inclusiva. http://www.cepcampgib.org/noveles/files/anexos/Index_for_inclusion.pdf
4. Casal, V. (2018). *Políticas públicas y prácticas de inclusión educativa en el nivel primario* [Tesis de maestría. Facultad de Psicología (UBA)]. https://www.academia.edu/39037576/Pol%C3%ADticas_p%C3%BAblicas_y_pr%C3%A1cticas_de_inclusi%C3%B3n_educativa_en_el_nivel_primario
5. Castel, R. (1997). *La metamorfosis de la cuestión social*. Paidós.
6. De la Vega, E. (2010). *Anormales, deficientes, especiales, genealogía de la Educación Especial*. Noveduc.
7. Diker, G. (2008). Cómo se establece qué es lo común. En G. Frigerio y G. Diker (comp.) *Educación: Posiciones acerca de lo común*. Del estante editorial.
8. Dubrovsky, S. (2019). Prólogo. En T. Vinacur y J. M. Bustos (comp.) *La inclusión escolar de niños, niñas y adolescentes en situación de discapacidad en la escuela común: aportes y reflexiones del tercer seminario de investigación UEICEE*. CABA, Ministerio de Educación del GCABA-OEI. https://www.buenosaires.gob.ar/sites/gcaba/files/ueicee-oei_la_inclusion_escolar_de_los_ninos.pdf
9. Echeita, G. (2006). *Educación para la inclusión o educación sin exclusiones*. Narcea Ediciones S. A.

