Learning for All: Exploring the Relationship Between Inclusion and Achievement in a Primary Setting

Lindsay Lobo, Glasgow City Council Educational Psychology Service
lindsay.lobo@glasgow.gov.uk

Katie Fisher, Glasgow City Council Educational Psychology Service
Katie.Fisher@glasgow.gov.uk

Paula Dudgeon, Glasgow City Council Educational Psychology Service
paula.dudgeon@glasgow.gov.uk

Abstract

All education practitioners have a responsibility to support the participation and achievement of all children within learning communities – particularly within increasingly diverse societies. Inclusive pedagogy allows an exploration of what education practitioners believe, know and do, alongside the research literature on inclusive approaches to teaching, to support this participation and achievement. By utilising the Framework for Participation (Florian et al., 2017), this research aims to understand how the concepts of inclusion and achievement are constructed within a local primary school recognised as being inclusive of its diverse population. This single-site case study incorporated multiple methods of data collection, within an iterative process, and utilised deductive thematic analysis to draw key themes around what practitioners and the school community believe, know and do. The Framework for Participation allowed for an in-depth socio-cultural exploration of inclusion and achievement, including tensions and contradictions, which are highlighted. Ways in which this research methodology can complement and extend the reflective development of inclusive practices in schools are discussed.

Keywords: inclusion, achievement, primary school, Framework for Participation, diverse population

Introduction

National Context

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (Incorporation) (Scotland) Act 2024 makes Scotland the first devolved nation in the world to directly incorporate the UNCRC into domestic law. This reflects a history of Scottish policy and legislation which respects, protects and fulfils children's rights, underpinned by values aligned to social justice and inclusive education.

Inclusive education should be of the highest priority for all those involved in education in Scotland (GTCS, 2022) and can be thought of as one in which a learner participates in school life, is accepted by peers, and progresses with learning (CIRCLE Collaboration, 2021; Scottish Government, 2019).

The Review *Support for Learning: All Our Children and All their Potential* (Scottish Government, 2020) highlighted that, with over 30% of children and young people now identified as having an additional support need, the concept of *mainstream* needs to be redefined and repositioned. When considering the concept of inclusion, the Review emphasised lived experience – informal and formal interactions and relationships, which combine to create the school community and culture.

Likewise, the concept of achievement has been crystalised within the Review with the recommendation that the successes and achievements of children and young people with additional support needs should be recognised, celebrated, and promoted, within a context of learning for life. The National Improvement Framework measures and sub-measures have been reviewed to ensure they provide an accurate understanding of the widest range of learners' achievements (Scottish Government, 2023), with individual progress, achievements and success measured from their own starting point. At the same time, the skills of professionals supporting these achievements should be made visible and recognised as valuable (Scottish Government, 2020).

Glasgow Context

Glasgow is a city host to around 30% of Scotland's most deprived areas, with almost 28,000 school-aged children and young people living in the most disadvantaged postcodes in Scotland (McKenna, 2020). It is also the most diverse city in Scotland, with the largest percentage of ethnic minority groups (12%) (Understanding Glasgow, 2011). The levels of poverty in the city, and subsequent attainment gap, provide a local context for the city's focus on nurturing approaches. The expectation across the city is that young people are educated in learning environments which are nurturing and inclusive.

Glasgow City Council Education Services Priorities for 2022-27 *All Learners, All Achieving*, outlines a vision where all learners in the city can participate, thrive, flourish and achieve. The local authority has committed to realising in practice Article 29 of the Convention of the Rights of the Child – prioritising the development of rights based, tolerant and respectful learning environments.

Therefore, both national and local policy promotes educational achievement and inclusion for all, with consideration turning to how meaningful participation might be evaluated. However, as Florian et al. (2017) reflect, the relationship between achievement and inclusion is complex.

Inclusive Pedagogy

Inclusive pedagogies reflect ideas about inclusion – but it is acknowledged to be a "messy" research concept (Koutsouris et al., 2023). Inclusive pedagogy extends the notion of teaching actions encapsulated by inclusive practice (Morina, 2020), to consider educators' knowledge, competence, actions, values and beliefs regarding pupils and the nature of teaching and learning, as well as social processes and influences (Alexander, 2004). Rouse's (2008) proposal that inclusion depends on what teachers know, do and believe was revisited by Florian (2014) who proposed an inclusive pedagogy model focused on what, how and why teachers engage in inclusive pedagogy.

Inclusive pedagogy has been defined as an approach to teaching and learning which provides meaningful education for all. As articulated by Florian et al. (2011), rather than an approach that works for *most* learners existing alongside something "additional" or "different" for those (*some*) who experience difficulties, inclusive pedagogy involves the development of a rich learning community characterised by learning opportunities that are sufficiently made available for everyone, so that *all* learners are able to participate in classroom life. This is a reaction to "bell-curve thinking" (Fendler & Muzaffar, 2008) which assumes an education system and curriculum designed for the majority – disadvantaging linguistic, cultural, cognitive and other kinds of difference (Florian, 2015;

Hitchcock et al., 2002). Standardised assessments, league tables and competition are symptomatic of this ideology (Brennan et al., 2021).

Thus, individual differences between learners should be expected (see GTC Scotland, 2021) and participation within a community of learners, should be valued over judgements about what pupils can and cannot do (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). However, inclusive pedagogy is an emerging area of research (Morina, 2020), and sits within a landscape rooted in definitional inconsistencies (Spratt & Florian, 2015) and subsequent limiting data-sets. As a response to this, the Framework for Participation (see Black-Hawkins, 2010, 2014) was developed. "This provides a systematic method for collecting detailed contextual evidence to explore the relationship between inclusion and achievement at the level of individual students, classes and schools, while taking into account the influence of broader issues of school cultures and values and beliefs" (Florian et al., 2017, p. 15).

Overall Aim of Project

Within this context of changing conceptualisations around inclusion and achievement it is timely to consider methodological work to produce new knowledge. This research sought to explore and understand the concepts of inclusion and achievement within a local primary school with a diverse population, committed to the task of becoming more inclusive and celebrating achievement.

The research aimed to explore the underlying values and beliefs which shape the cultures, policies, practices and everyday interactions of the school. Specifically, does the Framework for Participation capture the concepts of inclusion and achievement as understood and used by the community of X Primary School (XPS)?

It is hoped that interrogating the Framework for Participation in this way, will allow for others to use it when exploring their own inclusive environments and practices.

Introducing X Primary School

X Primary School (XPS) is a school for children in Glasgow. The school has a co-located provision for children with additional support needs – Class One, Class Two and Class Three, located alongside their equivalent mainstream stage in the school. Placement in the co-located provision is accessed through local authority processes. There are 300 children on the school roll and there are 14 classes within the school, including the three within the co-located unit.

Of the pupils who attend the school, 73.8% have English as an additional language. Attendance is 88.5% and currently there are no children in the school who are care experienced.

The school has 29.2% of their children who live in SIMD[1] Decile 1 and 2– however this statistic is used with caution, as a member of staff explained, "We have many families living in private-let flats, where the postcode is not representative of their socio-economic status".

Methodology

The research took a single-site case study approach that incorporated multiple methods of data collection, using the Framework for Participation (Florian et al., 2017) as a methodological lens to structure data collection and analysis.

---

[1] The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) (Scottish Government, 2020) is a tool to identify areas of concentrated deprivation.

The research was carried out over a period of 18 months in XPS. The school was selected for several reasons. Its co-located provision for children with additional support needs identifies, at a purely structural level, some pupils as different from the mainstream. However, staff at the school have strongly articulated their support of inclusive policies and practices – which was recognised in the school's Validated Self-Evaluation (VSE) Report, completed with Authority representatives in 2023. The researchers were keen to explore how, within these structural demarcations, the school cultivates a community of learning for all.

The researchers gathered key documentation from the school including: attainment data; attendance records; the School Improvement Plan (SIP); Inclusive Differentiation Framework and Guidance; School Vision, Values and Aims; insight tracking data; and the recent VSE for co-located provision.

Six structured observations during different learning experiences and contexts, and across all stages, were undertaken with classes in the mainstream school and the co-located provision. These classes were identified by the depute headteacher (DHT), in collaboration with the class teachers (CTs). Following the observations, individual semi-structured interviews were carried out with each of the CTs. This allowed us to ask follow-up questions and gave teachers an opportunity to talk about the rationale behind their practice.

Focus groups were carried out with the school's senior leadership team (SLT), CTs, support for learning workers (SfLWs) and parents/carers – each focus group had a similar structure and themes, but with specific questions tailored to the different groupings. Participants volunteered to take part through discussions with the school SLT. The CT focus group took place early in the new school term, to capture the views of newer staff members in terms of how the school ethos and belief system permeates.

A questionnaire was also distributed via Microsoft Forms to external partners who had connections with the school to gather their views. The use of a questionnaire for this group was due to time constraints and to reduce pressure on the school's SLT.

As part of the iterative process, the questions for the focus groups and questionnaires were derived from the observations, the semi-structured interviews with CTs, and the Framework for Participation. This ensured that questions and themes explored in the groups were relevant to the participants' context.

To access pupils' views, a variety of methods were used to ensure inclusivity – two separate groups of pupils from multiple stages across the mainstream school gave a school tour, pointing out spaces that were important to them. A different sample of pupils from the mainstream school attended a focus group which was interactive and multisensory to support communication needs. Pupils volunteered to be part of the group. After discussion with SLT and teaching staff, the views of the pupils in the co-located provision were gathered through the adults they were comfortable with, using a variety of communication methods based on the children's needs.

Notes were taken by the researchers during most methods of data collection. The SLT, CT, SfLW and parent/carer focus groups were all audio recorded to capture their words directly. One researcher facilitated in each of the groups, whilst the other(s) took note of the discussion. Researchers debriefed after each activity to triangulate the data collected and group under the main themes of the Framework for Participation.

Researchers used deductive thematic analysis to explore all data gathered. This utilised Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase process. Key areas were taken from the Framework for Participation to help understand the meaning behind the data, and themes were then moderated by the researchers.

Findings and Discussion

Inclusive pedagogy is a teaching and learning approach focused on beliefs, knowledge, design and actions, through which educators strive to include all pupils (Morina, 2020). All four elements are vital to gaining insight into what inclusive adults do, as well as how and why they do it. A parent of a child at XPS referenced the fact that, "as soon as you enter the school you get a feel of the values...the vibe...". Similarly, in a different forum, a new teaching member of staff to the school felt that "you get a feeling and a vibe and you just kind of mould yourself in". We found the Framework of Participation (Florian et al., 2017) to be a helpful constructivist tool in allowing us to build knowledge and understanding of how this "vibe" around inclusion and achievement is conceptualised and practiced in XPS.

Beliefs

Love and Safety Are Key

Staff, parents/carers, external organisations, and the pupils themselves, believed that the young people of the school were cared for, fully accepted and had something valuable to contribute to their learning. One of the key aspirations the Head Teacher (HT) spoke of was that all children feel loved and cared for in the school. Love is documented as the school's core value in the SIP and is felt by parents and carers – "...all staff show so much love" (Parent). It is apparent that pupils felt known and valued by staff members – "[the adults] take into consideration what we say to them about things like lessons and trips or other things" (Pupil); "the teachers make me feel respected by encouraging me and making me feel good about myself and my work" (Pupil); "They [adults] love us as we are" (Pupil).

XPS have a strong, unified SLT. The HT was often particularly mentioned as fitting the criteria of a *charismatic and transformational leader* – enabling staff to transcend self-interest and inspiring trust and risk-taking in pursuit of a compelling vision (Liao & Chuang, 2007). The HT spoke openly around an explicit expectation that staff give all of themselves to the school's children, whilst being very cognisant of staff's capacity to do this, and the impact it has on staff wellbeing and mental health – some staff mentioned that they thought about work late into the night. Indeed, this culture is so embedded within the school and its staff, both SLT and CTs made the observation that teaching staff who don't embrace it rarely stay long in the school, of their own choosing.

Parents said they, and their children, they felt "safe" in the school. Teaching staff identified feeling safe when seeking help and support and that they trusted their colleagues – "I feel safe here as a teacher. I feel trusted in my judgment as a teacher" (CT). Teachers highlighted that SLT actively support a culture of safety, trust and autonomy, advocating learning and collaborating with colleagues – "I am able to be a teacher in my own way" (CT); "There's a trust when [an adult] comes into your room – you don't feel you'll be judged" (CT). SLT emphasised that neurodiversity within the staff team, as well as the pupils, is celebrated. They take a strengths-based approach to leadership and model a process that supports staff to be the best of themselves.

Accessible Learning for All

The existence of the co-located provision is testament to "bell-curve thinking" (Fendler & Muzaffar, 2008) and "education's normative centre" (Youdell, 2006, p. 22). It is the local authority's physical identification of children who require something additional or different to the majority. Yet the school's *Inclusive Differentiation* policy quotes Carolyn Tomlinson (2017) – "Inclusive differentiation is

not, however, giving a 'normal' assignment to most students and 'different' assignments to students who are struggling or advanced. Instead, 'offering multiple and varied avenues to learning is the hallmark of the kind of professional quality that denotes expertise' in meeting learners' needs". SLT spoke of wrangling with the "dilemma of difference" around curriculum and placement – in other words, the negative implications that come from both recognising, and not recognising, differences when it comes to curriculum opportunities and school access.

This is reconciled within the school by conceptualising inclusion as believing that all children can learn and progress when the adults around them find the best approaches and conditions for this to happen – inclusion "is not something extra…it's just our job and actually, what's good for that child [with additional support needs] is likely going to be good for everybody" (CT). Thus, the co-located provision was emphasised as a flexible, permeable space to support children. Indeed, there was an emphasis on reclaiming *all* spaces in the school as learning spaces - "[The school] does not expect all children to learn in all environments" (DHT). Taken to the extreme, the four walls of the classroom become an artificial boundary.

Parents/carers verbalised ideological conflict around accessing the curriculum for all, with the view that difference needs to be recognised, even if this means recognising that a mainstream educational experience cannot meet a child's needs. The importance of participation was key – "having all children in the same room is not inclusion" (Parent).

We found the Framework helpful in teasing out these core beliefs around the nature of difference and participation. We were able to understand how the school recognised that diversity is normal and valuable – championing every student within the learning environment and striving for equity of access despite structural demarcations.

All Children Can Learn

School staff verbalised a core belief that a child's capacity to learn is not fixed nor deterministic, rather the Vygotskian importance of social aspects of cognitive development was emphasised in the notion of the school as community – "we're a community in the classroom and all supporting each other…we all bring our own bits" (CT); "Achievement is how the whole family is made to feel in a school. It's wider than education – it's feeling stronger" (Parent).

Both SLT and parents/carers spoke of their concerns with the notion of pupils, and indeed, by extension, teaching, being "on- or off-track". SLT talked about ipsative tracking – viewing all their children as where they should be "within their own track", for some children, this just meant taking smaller steps than others. This was expanded upon by CTs who articulated "all our children are 'on-track'" when comparing against their previous performance rather than each other. They felt this linked with the four capacities of CfE and were clear that "differentiation goes beyond the level of academic ability" (CT) because they "see genius in everybody" (CT). Parents appreciated this approach – "You can't standardise achievement, it looks totally different to everyone" (Parent).

Valuing Everyone's Unique Contribution

Another key belief that came through was the benefit to the whole learning community of valuing the participation of each individual (Spratt & Florian, 2015). Teachers verbalised that one of the key tenets of their teaching is to "promote children to have a voice and feel confident in not just accepting things have to remain as they are" (CT). Parents also felt that the school equipped their children with life skills to "navigate the world as a person of colour". Diversity is celebrated and valued in a way that makes everyone richer for it. "The culture and ethos of the school allows children to learn differently and not be judged" (CT); "I like working in this school as it gives

importance to children with additional support needs" (SfLW). Pupils identified that their learning was important and was supported both by staff – "I like the way they [adults] let us [pupils] learn" (Pupil), as well as by other pupils "everyone that finds some things hard…sometimes I can help [pupil from Class Two] to find things easier'' (Pupil). One of the DHTs used the phrase "warm demanding" in terms of the high expectations placed on all learners within the relational ethos of the school.

Knowledge

Formative Assessment

We were also able to unpick teachers' knowledge – their classroom strategies, organisational supports, modifying of instructional approaches, assessment of the needs of their pupils and how to support them with proactive planning. In line with principles of formative assessment, we observed assessment being utilised throughout lessons as a tool to inform needs and extend learning – thus attending to individual differences during whole-class teaching in ways that avoided stigmatisation (Florian, 2014). Both in upper and lower school lessons, clear learning intentions were displayed; children used *show me* whiteboards to monitor learning; tasks were chunked; open-ended activities ensured child-led learning; skilful mediating questions were asked (particularly the importance of transference from previous lessons); self-assessment was encouraged and feedback was provided. Various different output modalities were used (written/iPad/whiteboard) so each child could work within their zone of proximal development.

Staff Learning From Each Other

The school strongly evidences itself as a learning organisation (see Kools et al., 2020) with knowledge dissemination and training provided in collaboration with, and based on the specific needs of, the staff themselves (Spear & Da Costa, 2018). There was much evidence gathered of a collaborative learning approach taken by the adults working in the school toward meeting young people's needs. SfLWs feel that they have "good communication with the SLT" and that they "are valued as an equal team member. Teachers will ask for our opinion". CTs spoke of there being "no hierarchy [with colleagues] when we're learning together". The HT spoke of appreciating the team's strengths and interests, exploring how "teachers' skills can fit into the school".

We heard about professional discussions where teachers within the mainstream classes and those within the co-located provision worked in partnership to support learners – co-constructing knowledge and working together to seek new approaches. Difficulties in learning were teaching problems to be solved (Florian, 2014). CTs viewed the opportunity to support children with more complex additional support needs within the school building as a privilege in terms of supporting their own practice. There is an emphasis on all staff, mainstream and those in the provision, working together and supporting each other. This includes sharing ideas, resources, learning intentions, targets and strategies across the school. Indeed, the teaching staff spoke of the pupils are being "shared" – "it's about having conversations and actually just thinking about the needs of the children…how can we work together to support this…" (CT). Indeed, new members of staff are encouraged to spend time in Classes One, Two and Three to strengthen their mindset that these classes are part of the whole school approach.

This sharing of ideas between school staff so that teachers are aware of colleagues' capabilities, alongside high, positive expectations of practice, can support *collective efficacy* – teachers with positive perceptions about the level of competency of the school as a whole have higher beliefs in their own ability (Wilson et al., 2020).

Listening to Community and Cultural Competence

The school is keenly aware of itself as a denominational school at the heart of its community, which comprises predominantly BPOC[2] families – this is something which the HT acknowledges has been a relationship 10 years in the making. It is recognised by parents/carers who spoke of "finding a home" in the school, with the HT "…listening and hearing what's going on in the community" (Parent); "The Muslim voice is celebrated in XPS" (Parent).

The teaching staff are predominantly white and are acutely aware of the sensitivity inherent within this - there is cognisance given of how "it is very important for the children to see staff who are Muslim" (CT). Staff communicate an attitude of respect and learning with regard to the cultures of their pupils – they facilitate opportunities for these, at times difficult, conversations. "We, as a staff, learn so much from the children about culture" (CT). "It's about being humble enough to say 'I'm sorry, I got that wrong', and learn from the children…let them teach you" (CT).

The school recently undertook a project with local authors to explore the cultural diversity of characters used in children's creative writing - "It's been a long journey…tricky too…just finding publishers that provide a list of diverse books that include children in the provision; children with different family backgrounds…but I think now we're starting to see the outcome of it, and it's exciting…you can see children empowered to hold their heritage up…write about it and be proud of it." (CT). Ongoing training, self-reflection and challenge ensures staff navigate the delicate balance between performative (motivated by personal needs rather than by a genuine concern for the disadvantaged group), and effective allyship (Kutlaca & Radke, 2022). Although XPS's practice of accepting and celebrating their children's diversity was valued by parents, there was acknowledgment of the wider systems within which the school operates – "Inclusion within schools should extend to the Authority – but there, people don't look like me" (Parent).

The Framework supported this nuanced understanding of community and "the complex experiences and interactions which are the reality of children's lives" (Alexander, 2010, p. 115).

Action

Universal Design for Learning

The school identifies its pedagogical design to be aligned with the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (Tomlinson, 2017) – recognising the different needs in a classroom, and planning actions that respond to these. The affective; recognition and strategic pillars of the UDL framework were evidenced in classroom observations and echoed the class-based examples overviewed in Sewell et al. (2022). SLT gave examples of *teaching up* - basing their teaching focus on what the most advanced learners are doing (who, they argue, traditionally have the richest experience) and then taking time to explore what needs to be adapted to enable everyone to participate and succeed. We observed flexibility within classroom teaching and accessible lessons which responded to all students' requirements (Sherrington, 2019), with tasks and objectives aligned to learning goals (Hall et al., 2003). Flexibility ensured a pupil-centred environment that did not place emphasis on ability-based learning (Losberg & Zwozdiak-Myers, 2024) and made use of a variety of environments and contexts for learning experiences. It was observed that children can get choices in their learning and their learning environment – "For some learners…for example, putting a jotter down in front of them is not the best way to be able to see what they can do" (CT). A flexible strength-based approach was

---

[2] black and people of colour

observed with some pupils who required some environmental adaptations – for example, they had a degree of control over when to take a brain break; where to sit; the choice of learning task; the choice of learning materials; involvement in choosing future topics. "Orderly flexibility" is a key principle through which SLT encourage CTs to create differentiated classrooms. "That sense of agency that the kids have is really important because it makes them feel like part of their own learning" (CT).

Staff showed awareness of the sensitivity needed to ensure that differentiated options do not limit learning opportunity. "Differentiation goes beyond just the level of academic ability that is required to do something. You can differentiate by process…by choice and interest. I think that when you widen that approach to differentiation it just automatically becomes more inclusive and makes learning more meaningful" (CT).

Creating Communities of Learners

We observed lessons which involved all children (as opposed to a *most and some* approach) working together in social (rather than ability) groupings on a collaborative task. Observations in classrooms showed CTs changing groups when the dynamic wasn't working – the children appeared comfortable and familiar with this. "We don't have set groups in the traditional sense…our groups are flexible and change around a lot…we often use mixed ability groups to help scaffold for other learners" (CT). The pupils themselves were able to identify some of these actions – for example, flexible groupings, cooperative learning activities, visual supports, meaningful learning tasks – highlighting how embedded they are in practice. Pupils displayed pride when pointing out library books with characters who "look like us", or books written by BPOC authors. In observations, it was noted that adult voice did not dominate learning experiences – there was reciprocity and a turn-taking element between adult and child voice. Lessons were observed where the views of individuals were valued and became learning opportunities for everyone – teachers can use what they learn from listening to pupils' self-assessments of learning in ways that meet the standard of inclusive pedagogy (Florian & Beaton, 2018). At the beginning of the school year, staff use the CIRCLE resources to look at their classroom environment and the various learning needs of the children coming into their class, to explore where adaptations may need to be made.

However, within the school, we also observed and spoke to teachers about practice where specific strategies were in place, particularly in the co-located provision, that were agreed as supportive to an individual child's needs but, in the context of inclusive pedagogy, could be considered exclusionary. This reflects Lindsay et al.'s (2014) findings in terms of applying an inclusive pedagogy framework to learners with complex needs, and Brennan et al.'s (2021) acknowledgement that there are cases where individualised strategies are necessary. It links back to the "dilemma of difference" that the school's SLT spoke at length around (Norwich & Koutsouris, 2020).

Meaningful Data

The local authority require disaggregated attainment data for the pupils in the mainstream school and those who attend the co-located provision. However, the HT spoke of an ideological struggle with this and a desire not to separate the data as, although it would lower their attainment statistics, it would be a statement of the SLT's belief that *all* their children are making progress, and this progress cannot be measured off arbitrary benchmarks. Of far greater meaning is the data story (which the school do not disaggregate) behind the stark figures.

The parents/carers questioned shared a similar stance with regard to pitching their children against standardised measures, but took a different perspective of it – feeling that if their child was in the

provision they should not be measured from mainstream benchmarks, as it served only to make them "feel worse as parents".

These actions are testament to how the school reacts against "bell-curve thinking" (Fendler & Muzaffar, 2008), celebrates difference and accommodates for variations so that all individuals can achieve. However, the tensions within this in terms of reporting data required by the Authority, as well as practices expected by school inspectorate teams, are indicative of discussions taking place across education. They evidence a need for schools to be given permission to do things differently in order to fully put into practice those policy aspirations which aim to put the child at the centre, adopt an asset-based approach and measure achievement in the broadest sense.

Respectful Relationships

Fundamental to the school, is the emotional and affective component of the way in which teaching was carried out (Morina, 2020). The HT spoke about staff with considerable admiration for the hard-work, energy, care and knowledge they demonstrated, which was reciprocal. All staff groups questioned – whether SLT, teaching or support staff, said that they felt valued and appreciated by their colleagues. The ethos of "love and care" demonstrated to pupils extends to colleagues. "It's, I think, inclusive in terms of staff and, of course, we want kids to be respectful but we need to be respectful as well to them, and to each other. Relationships are everything" (CT).

References were made about the importance of "seeing the 'human' behind the job" and connecting with staff on an emotional level – with numerous examples given. Support staff felt valued and noted that SLT took an active interest in their life outside of school, for example by asking about their families. SLT specifically noted the importance of SfLWs as having a key role in pupils' development.

The Framework allowed us to unpick how positive interactions between the adults in the school and the young people was the fulcrum upon which the school operated.

Conclusion

The Framework for Participation (Florian et al., 2017) allowed a socio-cultural exploration of inclusion and achievement in a Glasgow school – the beliefs, knowledge and actions that underpin these concepts for the whole school community (staff; parent/carers; pupils; third sector partners). This inevitably raised tensions and contradictions, some of which we have highlighted. We also discussed situations where the school community felt individualised strategies were necessary, misaligning from inclusive pedagogy. In this regard, we agree with Florian et al.'s (2017, p. 52) assertion that "the intention of the Framework is not to smooth away the everyday complexities of schools but to provide a means by which they can be more clearly understood".

We believe the Framework offers a method of exploring inclusive pedagogy within a school community, in a way that can complement some existing school reference materials, such as the quality indicators of How Good Is Our School? (Education Scotland, 2015), and the Professional Standards and the National Framework for Inclusion (GTCS, 2022) by capturing the spaces, the relationships, the moments where inclusion and achievement were celebrated. These everyday, at times quite prosaic, glimmers that are often overlooked in the hectic demands of the school day. Our research emphasised that inclusive pedagogy does not offer a whole new set of practices – we observed teachers engaging in widely recognised evidence-based practices. However, the Framework allowed us to explore why, how and when these practices were chosen and provided an investigation of attitudes/beliefs. Moving forward, the school we worked alongside is going to use the Framework as a self-evaluation tool. Participants also valued the creation of a reflection space for the school community. Engaging with teacher belief systems in this way may cultivate a school

climate that promotes inclusion (Wilson et al., 2020), which has implications for school partners such as Psychological Services.

We also sought to explore inclusion and participation from the perspective of pupils themselves – ensuring their voices and viewpoints were key to the data gathered. This is an identified gap in the existing body of research on inclusive pedagogy (Morina, 2020).

Finally, by exploring the beliefs, knowledge and actions embedded in the culture of this school, set within the broader national context, it is hoped this research will provide a methodology to support practitioners to consider how achievement and inclusion is understood and constructed in their own schools and classrooms – with the aspiration that the "lovely diversity" (Griffiths, 2001, p. 12) of children is expected and valued within learning communities.

References

Alexander, R. (2004). Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 34*(1), 7–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764042000183106

Alexander, R. (2010). *Children, their world, their education: Final report and recommendation of the Cambridge Primary Review*. Routledge.

Black-Hawkins, K. (2010). The framework for participation: A research tool for exploring the relationship between achievement and inclusion in schools. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education, 33*(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/17437271003597907

Black-Hawkins, K. (2014). Researching inclusive classroom practices: The framework for participation. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of special education* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brennan, A., King, F., & Travers, J. (2021). Supporting the enactment of inclusive pedagogy in a primary school. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25*(13), 1540–1557. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1625452

CIRCLE Collaboration. (2021). *Inclusive learning and collaborative working: Ideas in practice. Primary school resource*. https://www.open.edu/openlearncreate/mod/oucontent/view.php?id=165176&section=1.7 https://education.gov.scot/resources/circle-resource-to-support-inclusive-learning-and-collaborative-working-primary-and-secondary/

Education Scotland. (2015). *How good is our school?* (4th ed.). https://education.gov.scot/media/2swjmnbs/frwk2_hgios4.pdf

Fendler, L., & Muzaffar, I. (2008). The history of the bell curve: Sorting and the idea of normal. *Educational Theory, 58*(1), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2007.0276.x

Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29*(3), 286–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551

Florian, L. (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities? *Scottish Educational Review, 47*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1163/27730840-04701003

Florian, L., & Beaton, M. (2018). Inclusive pedagogy in action: Getting it right for every child. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22*(8), 870–884. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1412513

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813–838. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Florian, L., Black-Hawkins, K., & Rouse, M. (2017). *Achievement and inclusion in schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Achievement-and-Inclusion-in-Schools/Florian-Black-Hawkins-Rouse/p/book/9781138809017

General Teaching Council for Scotland. (2021). *Meeting the needs of autistic learners: A professional guide for teachers.* https://www.gtcs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/professional-guide-meetingneeds-autistic-learners.pdf

General Teaching Council for Scotland. (2022). *Professional standards and the National Framework for Inclusion*. https://www.gtcs.org.uk/documents/national-framework-3rd-edition-2022

Glasgow City Council. (2023). *All learners, all achieving*. https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/media/4924/All-Learners-All-Achieving-Document/pdf/Educ_OurCity_OurLearner_OurFuture.pdf?m=1684146636187

Griffiths, M. (2001). *Action for social justice in education: Fairly different.* Open University Press.

Hall, T., Vue, G., Strangman, N., & Meyer, A. (2003). *Differentiated instruction and implications for UDL implementation*. National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum (links updated 5 December 2024). https://www.cast.org/resources/tips-articles/differentiated-instruction-and-implications-for-udl-implementation/

Hitchcock, C. G., Meyer, A., Rose, D., & Jackson, R. (2002). Access, participation, and progress in the general curriculum: A universal design for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *35*(2), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990203500201

Kools, M., Stoll, L., George, B., Steijn, B., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Gouëdard, P. (2020). The school as a learning organisation: The concept and its measurement. *European Journal of Education, 55*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12383

Koutsouris, G., Bremner, N., & Stentiford, L. (2023). Do we have to rethink inclusive pedagogies for secondary schools? A critical systematic review of the international literature. *British Educational Research Journal, 50*(1), 260–286. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3926

Kutlaca, M., & Radke, H. (2022). Towards an understanding of performative allyship: Definition, antecedents and consequences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, e12727. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12724

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel, multisource examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1006–19. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1006

Lindsay, S., Proulx, M., Scott, H., & Thomson, N. (2014). Exploring teachers' strategies for including children with autism spectrum disorder in mainstream classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 18*(2), 101–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2012.758320

Losberg, J., & Zwozdiak-Myers, P. (2024). Inclusive pedagogy through the lens of primary teachers and teaching assistants in England. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 28*(4), 402–422. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1946722

McKenna, M. (2020). Improving educational outcomes through Getting It Right for Every Child in Glasgow. *European Review, 28*(S1), S86–S92. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798720000927

Morina, A. (2020). Approaches to inclusive pedagogy: A systematic literature review. *Pedagogy, 140*(4), 134–154. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2020.140.8

Norwich, B., & Koutsouris, G. (2020). An inclusive model of targeted literacy teaching for 7-8-year-old children who are struggling to learn to read: The integrated group reading (IGR) approach. In C. Boyle, S. Mavropoulou, J. Anderson, & A. Paige (Eds.), *Inclusive education: Global issues and controversies* (216–233).

Rouse, M. (2008). Developing inclusive practice: A role for teachers and teacher education? *Education in the North, 16*(1), 6–13. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Developing-Inclusive-Practice%3A-A-role-for-teachers-Rouse/4d892db1985539f5369ecd4087e9258262697fb8

Scottish Government. (2019). *Guidance on the presumption to provide education in a mainstream setting*. https://www.gov.scot/publications/guidance-presumption-provide-education-mainstream-setting/documents/

Scottish Government. (2020). *Scottish index of multiple deprivation (SIMD).* https://www.gov.scot/collections/scottish-index-of-multiple-deprivation-2020/

Scottish Government. (2020). *Support for learning: All our children and all their potential.* https://www.gov.scot/publications/review-additional-support-learning-implementation/documents/

Scottish Government. (2023). *Education: National Improvement Framework and improvement plan 2024*. https://www.gov.scot/publications/education-national-improvement-framework-improvement-plan-2024/pages/1/

Sewell, A., Kennett, A., & Pugh, V. (2022). Universal design for learning as a theory of inclusive practice for use by educational psychologists. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 38*(4), 364–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2022.2111677

Sherrington, T. (2019). *Rosenshine's principles in action*. John Catt. https://www.johncattbookshop.com/products/rosenshines-principles-in-action

Spear, A. M., & da Costa, R. B. (2018). Potential for transformation? Two teacher training programs examined through a critical pedagogy framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 69*(1), 202–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.013

Spratt, J., & Florian, L. (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: from learning to action. Supporting each individual in the context of 'everybody'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.006

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD. https://ascd.org/books/how-to-differentiate-instruction-in-academically-diverse-classrooms-3rd-edition?variant=117032

Understanding Glasgow, (2011). *The Glasgow Indicators Project.* https://www.understandingglasgow.com/glasgow-indicators/population/ethnicity/scottish-cities#:~:text=Glasgow%20has%20the%20largest%20percentage,Scottish%20cities%20(around%201%25)

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Incorporation) (Scotland) Act 2024. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2024/1/contents/enacted

Wilson, C., Woolfson, L. M., & Durkin, K. (2020). School environment and mastery experience as predictors of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards inclusive teaching. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24*(2), 218–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1455901

Youdell, D. (2006). *Impossible bodies, impossible selves: Exclusion and student subjectivities*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4549-2

Author Biographies

Lindsay Lobo
lindsay.lobo@glasgow.gov.uk

Lindsay Lobo is an Educational Psychologist within the Glasgow Educational Psychology Service in Glasgow City Council. Lindsay leads the Learning and Teaching development group within the Psychological Service, which involves implementation, planning and evaluation of evidence-based strategic interventions, alongside partnership working with Glasgow Education Services. An Educational Psychologist for 18 years, she has led on the development and implementation of service delivery frameworks within Glasgow and is currently supporting a national pilot on Self-Evaluation. Lindsay has additional interests in speech, language and communication needs, and has been a lead practitioner in the implementation of SCERTS in Glasgow, as well as Glasgow's Language and Communication Friendly Establishments (LCFE).

Katie Fisher
Katie.Fisher@glasgow.gov.uk

Katie Fisher is an Educational Psychologist within Glasgow Educational Psychology Service, Glasgow City Council. She has previously worked as a Youth Worker for Inverclyde Council. Katie has been working as an Educational Psychologist for 4 years and in that time has developed an interest in supporting children and young people who have speech, language and communication needs. Katie is also a key part of the Learning and Teaching development group within Glasgow Psychological Services linking closely with authority partners.

Paula Dudgeon
paula.dudgeon@glasgow.gov.uk

Paula Dudgeon is a Senior Educational Psychologist within Glasgow Educational Psychology Service, Glasgow City Council. She has previously worked as an Educational Psychologist in Inverclyde and North Lanarkshire Councils. Paula first started working as an educational psychologist 32 years ago and in that time has maintained a particular interest in children and young people who are care experienced. Another special interest is the application of solution oriented approaches, where Paula wrote and delivered national training for Education Scotland along with her colleague, Margaret Nash. Paula was co-creator of the Nurturing Me tool alongside her colleague Maura Kearney. She has also been involved in the writing and implementation of the city approach to supporting children and young people with emotionally based school non-attendance. Paula was previously a member of the Association of Scottish Principal Educational Psychologists and in this role was a member of the Scottish Advisory Group on Relationships and Behaviour in Schools.