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Executive Summary

What do we want to know?

The overarching goal of the research within which this review is embedded is to develop an innovative framework for analysis of the processes that lead to social exclusion within learning systems, thus leading to inequality and hindering quality of education. The review aims to map and analyse existing documents that relate to the deciphering and assessment of social exclusion within education. By doing so it provides crucial evidence for structuring the conceptual framework for analysis of social exclusion as well as identifying methods for analysis of the phenomenon to be further tested in successive phases. The findings and conclusions of the review process shed light on theoretical foundations as well as methods/tools that decipher social processes that perpetuate marginalisation and discrimination.

Who wants to know and why?

The present review will strongly contribute to on-going debates on quality of education in academia but also make a strong contribution to the process of reviewing international and national policies in line with Sustainable Development Goal 4. Liaising with partners from various backgrounds is strategic to our aim of strongly building user-involvement from the onset of the research. The PI and Co-I are currently leveraging extensive past experience in order to ensure that all stages of the research are defined successively in a participatory manner. The users of this research include UNESCO, UNICEF, Leonard Cheshire Disability and Handicap International and the findings will be disseminated through the mentioned partners.

What did we find?

In the documents analysed for the review, inclusion and inclusive education were used interchangeably with the concept of social exclusion. Moreover, inclusion was most often limited to considerations of access and of getting children into learning systems, as a phenomenon limited to a given time in the process of learning.

At the theoretical level the definition of social exclusion as it is framed within the capabilities approach presents a grid within which to understand the process within learning systems through 3 main ideas: (i) to view social exclusion (and inclusion) as capability deprivation and focus more deliberately on the role of relational features of the education process; (ii) stress the distinction between the intrinsic value of education as well as its instrumental value; (iii) pertaining to education and questions of access, it seems crucial to make the distinction between SE and unfavourable inclusion.

At the implementation level, the majority of the 58 documents referring to programmes and interventions used qualitative or mixed methods. It was challenging to identify mechanisms that explained the links between the context and the outcomes as the arguments to make the causal connections were often not stated clearly in the
papers but often inferred. Moreover, the outcomes stated often did not reflect the complexity and the multidimensionality of the links with the mechanisms.

**At the policy level**, we carried out analyses using systems dynamics in order to understand the complex linkages between the various components of social exclusion in education. The preliminary model shows various feedback loops that influence the learning process pertaining to teachers, parents and communities as well as the wider context (labour markets). The next phases of the review will delve deeper into some of these loops. This innovative methodology allowed us to present a more complex analysis of existing evidence.

**What are the implications?**

Academics, policy-makers as well as field implementers and educators agree that education needs to be “rethought” to meet the challenges of a fast changing world. However, there is also often a recognition that the current ways and means of viewing what constitutes education success, mainly viewed through standardised tools that assess basic learning skills such as literacy, do not capture the wider view of education as a human right and as a common good. This review, as well as the broader research, focusses on dynamic processes and questions of vulnerability to provide critical and innovative avenues for moving closer to the paradigm shift called for in SDG 4.

**How did we get these results?**

In the first step we carried out a thorough review of definitions of social exclusion in order to build the tools for analysis. We then defined a keyword search for 6 search engines of academic and grey literatures. Our first search yielded a body of evidence of 1941 documents (of these 184 were duplicates). We applied inclusion/exclusion criteria to the 1641 remaining documents and identified 115 for further analysis. 45 documents were not accessible. We then differentiated between the documents that had a primary focus on programmes (58) or on policy (24). In the second step of analysis, for the 58 programme focussed documents we carried out an in depth context analysis with a specific aim to identify links between CMO. In the third step of the review we used SD methodologies to build a model of the linkages between various factors that influence inclusion/social exclusion in education. In the next phases of the review (to be carried out in 2016-17) we will focus on tools that are used for assessment of social exclusion as well as analyse the documents that present specific analysis of the role of teachers.

**Where to find further information**

[To be completed by EPPI-Centre]
1. Introduction and Background

As the MDGs come to a close, critique of their scope as well as achievement has been prominent in terms of narrowing views of education by focussing on questions of access to primary schools. There is broad agreement that there is a need for a profound paradigm shift to define and evaluate what constitutes a ‘good quality’ education. The discussion preceding the defining of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) - in particular SDG 4 relating to “quality education” and the related targets that set benchmarks for assessing success in education strongly advocated for a more prominent recognition of the links between questions of equity and inclusion as inherent constituents of any education of quality (Unterhalter and Dorward 2013). SDG Goal 4 embodies the paradigm shift that countries will need to navigate: “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong opportunities for all.” Although the SDG targets that are proposed to monitor progress towards achievement of educational goals do focus on questions of equality and focus of specific vulnerable groups, these remain limited to disaggregated data and simplistic indicators and do not propose innovative ways to navigate the complex questions of dynamic and systemic phenomenon that occur within learning environments that will need to be addressed in terms of assessment. If education aims to be inclusive towards all vulnerable groups in a given society, it will have to cross hurdles that have impeded progress in the past by: (i) moving from processes of labelling and classifying various learner profiles through a multidimensional lens; (ii) shifting analyses from capturing static snapshots towards deciphering the complexity and variation of psychosocial phenomena within learning systems; (iii) moving beyond the “one size fits all” and set up policies and programmes that are adapted to context. There is a need for concrete directions for triggering the paradigm shift in education and learning by not only re-affirming or redefining theoretical groundings, but also by challenging policies and programmes that continue to reflect age-old beliefs as well as critically appraising the implications of the new mantra of standardised tests as the primary indicator to defining what constitutes educational success. There is a strong push in the global arena for reorienting education systems by urging national governments and organisations to move from current discourses of inclusion (and inclusive education) and focus on the process of social exclusion by no longer viewing silos of vulnerability but by recognising and addressing the continuity between exclusion mechanisms in education and those inherent to the social fabric of a community (UNESCO 2012). Going beyond analyses of the inherent links between inclusion and equity, the present review scopes the evidence pertaining to understanding and assessing Social Exclusion (SE) within the field of education and provide elements to construct a framework that deciphers how education contributes to structural inequalities by maintaining status quo of power dynamics or how, on the other hand, it contributed to combating inherent systems of beliefs and functioning that lead to exclusion.

As a consequence we designed and set-up a “living” review to collect, map and summarise evidence on learning processes viewed through a novel analysis lens for
scrutinizing the various parameters as well as their dynamic interactions within specific contexts.

- Identify the studies that evaluate the process of social exclusion within education;
- Comprehend how social exclusion processes are being viewed within education in Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs);
- Systematically identifying knowledge gaps that exist in evaluation of social exclusion in education in LMICs;

2. Objectives of the Review

Initial Review Question:

**How is social exclusion assessed within education systems in Low and Middle Income Countries?**

Revised Questions:

**How is social exclusion addressed within education systems in Low and Middle Income Countries?**

Supporting concerns that will frame the systematic review:

- What views of social exclusion are prominent in the field of education policy and implementation?
- In practice and policy is social exclusion most often synonymous of inclusion and access?
- What methodologies are being used for the analysis of social exclusion in education as a dynamic process?

2.1. Aims and use of a review

The overarching goal of the research within which this review is embedded, is to develop an innovative framework for analysis of the processes that lead to social exclusion, inequality and thus hinder quality of education. The research will utilise scoping methodology and result in developing user involvement with the intent of laying the foundation for the theoretical and methodological analysis of the phenomena of social exclusion moving forward. **The review was carried out within the scope of Specific aim 1:** To review methods, tools and analyses, which have been used to assess social exclusion within teaching and learning processes at the global level. **Specific aim 2** provides evidence from data collected in LMICs that supports the need for viewing learning outcomes beyond indicators currently being defined to determine quality learning. **The findings of the review have provided information for Specific aim 3** to build an innovative framework for analysis that combines relevant theoretical foundations as well as methods/tools that decipher social processes that sustain social exclusion.
2.2. Context of International Education Policy: Contribution of the Review

Throughout international policies and conventions over the past three decades, the role of education as a process for fighting discrimination, promoting social justice and overcoming poverty has been undisputable (Caillods and Hallak 2004, Raffo, Dyson et al. 2009). More recently, the 2008 UNESCO Global Monitoring Report focused on marginalization and ‘educational poverty’ and its links to well-being and human development (Unterhalter 2009). In many countries, education constitutes a fundamental tool to fight poverty (from a human rights perspective) or to promote economic growth (from a utilitarian perspective), and constituted Goal 2 in the World Bank’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). UNESCO’s Education for All initiatives (EFA) and number of national policies have repeatedly reiterated the claim of education as a fundamental human right. As the MDGs closed in 2015, Goal 2 pertaining to Universal Primary Education and Goal 3 (to promote gender equality) as well as the EFA goals set over two decades ago were not on track to be met; 69 million children of school-going age that are not in school and over 750 million adults have no literacy skills (UNESCO 2005). The policies and programmes that had been set-up to ensure EFA failed the most vulnerable groups such as girls living in challenging contexts by falling short on promises of equity and social justice (UNESCO 2012b). With current trends in literacy, inequality and poverty rates, it is becoming clear that fundamental challenges are similar across countries and contexts. While it is undisputable that exclusion from education maintains persons in poverty, there is a need to understand fully the role that education plays in contributing to - or fighting - mechanisms of social exclusion beyond the learning years (Sparkes 1999; Sparkes & Glennerster 2002). Social exclusion as shaped by educational experiences is a crucial hurdle that needs to be addressed in various contexts (Kabeer 2005; Mitchell 2005). It is clear that low levels of performance in schools lead to a lack of participation in society. Thus, education is perceived as indicative of exclusion from different domains of the adult life (employment, political, community).

2.3. Capturing the dynamic phenomenon of social exclusion

In order to contribute to the wider discussion on the paradigm shift that needs to be negotiated within education policies and programmes, the present review critically examines the concept of social exclusion as it is addressed in the field of education. We argue that in order to better unpack the complexity of the links between equity and inclusion, the concept of social exclusion constitutes an innovative lens to decipher dynamic phenomena and capture factors related to contexts and mechanisms. As a concept, social exclusion originated in European countries, specifically pertaining to questions of employment from a welfare perspective (Atkinson 1998, Levitas 2005). In the field of development the concept constituted an integrated lens for comprehending social discrimination and marginalisation (Kabeer 2006, Stewart, Saith et al. 2007, Betts, Watson et al. 2010), whereas health inequalities are increasingly viewed as resulting from complex social determinants (Mathieson, Popay et al. 2008). In the field of education, the concept of inclusion is used more widely and (social) exclusion has been
approached in terms of denial of access to learning systems for identified vulnerable groups (Harttgen and Klasen 2011). This narrow perspective has led to an overwhelming focus on exclusion from learning systems and analyses have followed a process of identifying (by labelling) vulnerable groups and finding strategies to get children into formal/informal learning systems. However, in recent years, social exclusion as shaped by educational experiences has been identified as a crucial hurdle that needs to be addressed ([Mitchell 2005; Caber 2011]). While it is undisputable that exclusion from education maintains persons in poverty, there is a need to fully understand the role that education plays in contributing to fighting mechanisms of social exclusion not just in school but also beyond the learning years (Sparkes 1999; Sparkes & Glennerster 2002). There is a need to capture the dynamic and systemic nature of the marginalisation process within learning structures with the aim of re-thinking policy priorities and implementation mechanisms (Curcic 2009; Erten & Savage 2012; Ballard 2013). The Guide to Assessing Education Systems towards more Inclusive and Just Societies (UNESCO 2012) urged all actors of education to shift the focus from conditions for inclusion towards deciphering the mechanisms of exclusion. Policy makers are increasingly recognising the need to better grasp these processes in order to understand the “WHY” of failure of education initiatives. It is clear that existing measures of achievement need to go beyond acquisition of mere skills such as basic literacy and numeracy. The concept of social exclusion is crucial not just to gauge the commitment to equality of policies but also to assess what constitutes quality of curriculum, relevance of teacher training and acquisition of evasive “soft skills” (beliefs, attitudes, etc.) within a given context.

In terms of education and inclusion of vulnerable groups there seems to be a disconnect between policy documents and delivery where it matters most (Sayed and Ahmed 2015). To address this issue, researchers, experts, and policymakers must explore new approaches to “quality” and “inclusive” education—going beyond the usual aggregated analyses of quantitative indicators and attempting to unpack the process (Unterhalter 2012). Although the tools that evaluate literacy, numeracy, and other outputs\(^1\) have proliferated over the past decade and provided information about basic achievement, because of an over-focus on basic access and numbers of “bums on chairs” (enrolment), especially in LMICs, the “quality process” of learning has been somewhat neglected. As a result, children are not achieving even basic skills, let alone the more complex critical analyses or problem-solving skills that are required in order to adapt to a fast-changing and increasingly technological world (Andrabi, Das et al. 2014). It is also evident that there is a need for tools and processes not just to assess outcomes, but also to ensure that educational policies and programs are achieving impact in terms of equity and social change. This requires setting up accountability processes and establishing reliable baseline information against which progress can be measured, as well as defining frameworks that decipher mechanisms by establishing links between process indicators.

\(^1\) TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematic and Science Study), PISA (Program for International Studies Assessment), IALS (International Adult Literacy Survey), PIRLS (Progress in International Reading Literacy Study), LAMP (Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Program).
cultural analyses and qualitative data. In the field of international development, impact is often evaluated through one-dimensional educational outcomes that lack systemic analysis of the gaps and negative outcomes of educational programs on the students and the community as a whole.

2.4. Theory of change, realist views and systems dynamics

The aim of the present review is to provide information for analysis of social exclusion within education in LMICs. The evidence base scrutinized for the review was extremely large and diverse, ranging from peer-reviewed papers to documents obtained from NGO networks. In order to identify relevant information to build the analytical framework we applied principles for various theories and methodologies.

Although the theory of change discourse originating in the evaluation field is widespread in international development, there is no generally accepted definition in practice (Vogel 2012). However, the guiding principle of theory of change is the imperative to tackle complexity through social analyses and decipher dynamic processes in order to understand how and why a given combination of initiatives can lead to desired change within a given context, which “is vital in relation to attributing cause” (Blamey and Mackenzie 2007 p441). In order to effectively do this, it is essential to have agreement over what change is desired, especially by local actors, to gauge if this desired change is reflected in the broader policy frameworks as well as engaged in discussion at the local level to design initiatives and identify the entry points that can trigger the mechanisms of change. The challenge is to take a procedural approach that allows for fine-tuning which in turn allows a scrutiny of the education context as well as ensures local ownership and accountability. Such an approach is crucial to better understand how SE occurs within learning systems, beyond simple questions of equity in access and basic skills.

Based on principles and theory of change and taking a realist perspective that aims to decipher the mechanisms of how initiatives impact behavioural change, we focused our analyses on: (1) questions of external validity of information provided by the evidence; (2) identifying the situational triggers by deciphering the Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) processes in the evidence base. In doing this we will attempt to seek out the “patterns between interventions and their outcomes, on the generative mechanisms by which the relationship is established” (Blamey and Mackenzie 2007 p450).

Finally, we used system dynamics (SD) as a methodology for studying and managing complex systems that change over time. It offers tools and perspectives that provide new approaches to planning and testing management and social policies. Complex systems are characterized by evolution, adaptation, and emergent behaviours, which result from the feedback loops, nonlinearities, and time delays among system components (Forrester 1961; Sterman 2000). A SD perspective argues that the failure to account for these dynamic complexities often leads to poor policy decisions. SD models offer a way of understanding these properties by simulating causal relationships of
multiple variables over time, under different assumptions (e.g., different policy environments), and identifying high leverage policy interventions (Meadows 1999).

2.5. Previous systematic reviews

Various reviews have been carried out with the EPPI-Centre, Campbell and 3ie on education of vulnerable groups. As a complement to traditional systematic reviews, the present review includes various types of documents and maps qualitative and quantitative analyses in order to identify information relevant for policy makers and field implementers (Pawson and Tilley 1997). It further draws upon novel approaches such as SD (Hovmand 2013) to gauge evidence and identify analysis that decipher links between contextual elements, implementation/assessment mechanisms and identified outcomes.

The present review differs from these and adds to some of the recommendations made by previous studies.

1. The scope and objectives of our review call for a realistic perspective and on-going discussion with future users of the review. As a result, the “intervention” (programme or policy) is not the only unit for analysis.

2. We have defined the quality appraisal tool for scrutinizing the evidence base with the aim of identifying patterns that lead to exclusion within learning.

3. The past reviews have focussed closely on certain aspects of inclusive education mostly in relation to children with disabilities and special needs:
   • Reviews that have a strong focus on children with disabilities (Nind, Wearmouth et al. 2004);
   • Reviews that have a strong focus on a certain type of intervention (Rix, Hall et al. 2006);
   • Reviews that have a strong focus on impact evaluation or cost-effectiveness (Bakhshi, Kett et al. 2013).

4. The present review complements the findings from a review carried out in 2002 that looks specifically at the “effectiveness of school-level actions for promoting participation by all students” (Dyson, Howes et al. 2002), however the review on promoting participation:
   • Was published in 2002. As a result our review will scope evidence that was published after the review;
   • Identified a majority of studies and interventions that were from High Income Countries;
   • Focussed on the various actions without strongly looking at process analyses or lack of these, within the studies identified;
   • Did not focus on questions of definition of inclusion and theoretical frameworks on which interventions are carried out.

Our review is in line with one of the recommendations made by the 2002 review: “The systematic review process has proved powerful in enabling us to identify trustworthy empirical evidence in a field where such evidence tends to be embedded in conceptual
development, advocacy and illustration. It should therefore become more firmly established amongst the research methodologies in education. However, it should not, in its current form, be seen as the only way to engage legitimately with research literature. **In particular, narrative reviews and non-empirical forms of inquiry (such as theoretical development and conceptual analysis) which are not readily accessed through the sorts of systematic review processes in which we engaged are important in a developing field such as inclusive education.** Moreover, the development of policy and practice cannot always wait for evidence from systematic reviews” (p5).

5. In order to define the key wording tool we will refer to concepts and tools defined by a systematic review on girls’ education (Unterhalter 2015). In line with this review, we will place importance on identifying the role of the context within which exclusion occurs, focus on questions of policy and changes in norms and behaviours and focus on the triggers of social change. We will also borrow elements of the coding frame used in this study for the mapping of evidence (p83).

6. In December 2015 a Campbell review on “Education Interventions for Improving the Access to, and Quality of, Education in Low and Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review” was published and aimed to “identify, assess and synthesise evidence on the effects of education interventions on children’s access to education and learning in low and middle income countries” (p5). This review focuses on interventions and their impact by looking at experimental and quasi-experimental designs and the impact of specific interventions such as cash transfers and school feeding programmes on learning outcomes in terms of literacy, numeracy and language arts.

### 2.6. Specifying the scope of the primary question

The perspective of viewing education through a social exclusion perspective taken in the present review is based on the policy document: **Define social exclusion in education with reference to the UNESCO guideline 2012** (UNESCO 2012). In order to determine the scope of the search we referred to the document on exclusion within education, which goes beyond exclusion from learning systems to examine how processes of prejudice and discrimination operate within learning. Most analyses carried out on questions of inclusion have focussed on the first two aspects of exclusion as specified in the document, namely:

- Exclusion from having life prospects needed for learning
- Exclusion from entry to schools or education programmes

In order to identify information pertaining specifically to the process of social exclusion as defined in the previous sections our review focused more specifically on the following four aspects:

- Exclusion from regular and continuing participation within a school programme;
- Exclusion from meaningful learning experiences;
- Exclusion from recognition of learning;
• Exclusion from contributing the learning acquired to the development of community and society.

The review includes various types of analyses and interventions at various levels. These may range from international frameworks, national or regional policies, large-scale programmes or specific projects, large or small. In order to map the evidence with the aim of understanding the process of social exclusion we will determine the key wording tool as well as the quality criteria with reference to dynamic process of SE. Education systems will include formal and non-formal, primary and secondary.
3. Methods used in the review

3.1. Search Strategy

The review of existing evidence on social exclusion in education is tasked with identifying, screening and critically appraising a considerable and diverse body of evidence to answer the crucial question of how the process of social exclusion is being understood and assessed within learning systems at various levels: theoretical, policy as well as implementation and assessment. This task was broken down into successive stages in order to tackle the complex intertwined questions that the review seeks to answer. Through on-going discussion with future users of the review, we determined the framework for a “living” review that primarily aims to tackle questions of complexity by integrating trends and conclusions based on very diverse types of evidence. As a consequence, we were aware that the review would not be completely exhaustive in the identification of all evidence pertaining to the process of social exclusion within education. However, the review does propose a “thick” analysis of social phenomena that can contribute to viewing the learning processes in a dynamic and multidimensional manner. In the first stage of the review process we had a two-pronged approach:

• The first step mapped the existing literature based on definitions of social exclusion in general and pertaining to education in LMICs in particular through a broad literature search;
• The second step defined key search terms that would allow for a scoping of the various facets of social exclusion in education that are prominent in LMICs using a “systematic” approach.
3.2. **Step 1: Building a theoretical framework**

The main objective of the first step of the review was to identify key definitions of social exclusion that are prevalent in the field of education and to better comprehend the key concepts to unpack the complex dynamics of the learning process. We proceeded by carrying out a general search key terms and theories of social exclusion using ERIC thesaurus as well as Google Scholar.

We argue here that the capability approach (CA), as defined in previous sections, offers a useful framework to analyse these mechanisms. This approach is of crucial importance for designing programmes and even more so for assessing impact as it focuses not solely on what a person actually does (functioning) but the range of possibilities that he/she chooses that specific functioning from – the capabilities set (Sen 1999). The implications of the CA in the field of defining and assessing education are essential. Firstly, rather than trying to ‘label’ a person with a given vulnerability (disability, gender, minority ethnicity or religion, etc.), it focuses on whether vulnerability leads to deprivation of capabilities resulting in lower wellbeing; secondly, the CA has the potential to look at the impact of vulnerability beyond the individual by including the effect on the family and the community (in terms of coping strategies, loss of resources and shared burden) which is crucial in developing countries; thirdly, it focuses on the agency of the person to make decisions that they value.
3.3. Step 2: Key Word Search and Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

The second stage of the search was carried out in successive stages to answer the review questions in a coherent and systematic manner, and in line with the concepts stated in previous sections. See Appendix 4 for a more detailed overview of the database search process.

We searched the following academic databases:

- Psych INFO
- Web Of Science
- ERIC Proquest
- SocINDEX

A broad search of non-traditional publications was conducted to attain grey literature and publications developed from research organizations fundamentally based on in the field experience and approaches. A total of 133 documents were procured from the following sources: UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank, INEE, USAID, DFID, Education International, EENET, ELDIS, BLDS, Social Science Research, Asian Development Bank, African Development Bank, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and Global Partnership Education. Of the 133 documents procured 73 were excluded based upon the primary exclusion criteria or due to duplication. In total 60 were included into analysis after a title and abstract screening process.

The main challenge in defining the key word search was to ensure identification of relevant literature in order to grasp how social exclusion processes were addressed within learning systems. The specific key word search and exclusion criteria are detailed in Appendices 5 and 6.
1. **Exclude on country:** all high income countries were excluded; however if there was a comparison with a middle or low income country, the document was included;

2. **Exclude on date:** papers published before 2000 were excluded; If the study was based on data that was collected before 2000 it was also excluded;

3. **Exclude on education type:** this category consists of various types of research that do not address education but not centred on learning processes of children:
   - Non school based education (exclude home school, vocational and out of school children);
   - Population of focus (exclude studies based on teachers, teaching staff, parents and community indicators only);
   - Specific subject related studies (exclude if focus on ICT, bullying, sexual harassment, corporal punishment, specific subjects including maths, etc.);
   - Health-related programmes within schools;
   - Exclude studies that refer solely to questions of access in learning systems such as accessibility of the learning environment (physical accessibility, water, toilets, teaching materials, etc.).

4. **Exclude on subject:**
   - Exclude if focus is not on education but on health, hygiene, HIV/AIDS, drug use, etc.;
   - Exclude prevalence studies with no education based analysis;
   - Exclude on other issues such as environment;

5. **Exclude on document type:** exclude books, chapters of books and reviews of books.

### 3.4. Looking at complex analyses

In line with the aims of the overarching research question, we identified a large body of research in our initial search through academic engines. The flowchart in Section 3.1 delineates the inclusion/exclusion process that was conducted. After elimination of duplicates we included 1757 studies in our first search. After applying inclusion criteria, 168 documents were retained for analysis on full text, of these 52 were not available or excluded due to language. A total of 115 (see Appendix 3) documents were then analysed using key wording. Within the key wording tool all documents were categorized according to primary focus. Those that fell into the primary focus of intervention or practice and were considered a peer-reviewed academic article, a total of 58 documents, were selected for in-depth content analysis following the categories below. The content analysis tool, in Appendix 7, was developed and designed to understand the complex and multidimensional processes of social exclusion within the classroom and decipher the mechanisms that lead to marginalisation of vulnerable groups. In order to conduct a content analysis a qualitative analysis approach guided by a theoretical framework was used. Qualitative in nature, the content analysis was less restrictive a priori classifications on the collection of date and thus less driven by a specific hypothesis and more concerned with emerging themes. The content analysis grid (see Appendix 7) prompted interpretation of text and placing text into categories, which were carefully
founded and revised within the process of analysis. The analysis grid for content analysis included categories on context, mechanisms of exclusion or inclusion, outcomes, and framework. The specific categories are detailed in appendices.

3.5. Challenges and limitations

Orienting the review and appraising relevant evidence at successive stages

As stated, the aim of the present review is to seek out evidence that would provide insights and concepts for contributing to the much discussed paradigm shift in the field of education quality and equity. The complexity of the aim required a re-assessment and orientation of the review at each stage with regards to tools and methods. The choices were made through discussion among members of the review team as well as in light of the on-going discussions with future users of the review. As a result, the review was conceived as a “living” entity that would be continued beyond the scope of this report. The present report presents the analysis from the first 3 stages of the review and sets the groundwork for the next steps that will be carried out later this year.

Screening the evidence for an “living” review

The initial body of evidence will be scrutinised to not just identify methodologies that assess social exclusion in education but also to constitute a theoretical framework of social exclusion within education that can be analysed and assessed. This dual objective (methodological and theoretical) is ambitious and will require fine-tuning of the review steps as the review advances. We will draw on expertise from the advisory group in order to help redirect the review as and when required.

Scrutinising the grey literature

The main challenge of this review will be to define a search strategy that allows the screening of a wide and versatile body of work in the grey literature. This includes a number of working documents, policy documents, white papers, technical documents, project and programme reports as well as website information of various organisations, which we hope to identify through searching relevant websites, and contacting authors and on-going projects. As these documents do not go through a peer-review process they also differ greatly in terms of quality. Moreover, within this literature, the terms ‘impact’ and ‘cost-effectiveness’ are often over-used without referring to a precise study or assessment. Limitations in the methodology to collect the grey literature include the following. Several sites produced over 100 results. In these cases only the first 100 documents were reviewed for possible inclusion in the grey literature review. In addition several sites did not produce appropriate documents after the primary screening and therefore no documents were used in the review. Examples of sources without relevant documents include Global Partnership for Education and African Development Bank Group. This may limit the geographic focus of the grey documents reviewed.
3.6. Determining a “quality assurance” process

**Identifying and describing studies**

In view of the size of the body of evidence selected for analysis, the review team scrutinized the literature in order to present a precise mapping of the existing studies. The review team consisted of the PI and three students who assisted in the analysis of the documents. The inclusion criteria were applied through double coding. In addition, two members of the review team coded each study by applying the key wording tool independently. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved, with a third reviewer if necessary. The key wording tool, which comprises of closed questions that pertain to the characteristics of the study, is sufficiently precise to carry out the mapping exercise. The studies were divided between the members of the review team; whenever reviewers were ‘unsure’ of the appropriate coding, studies were discussed and coding settled before analysis.

The documents screened through the successive phases of the search strategy were recorded using the EPPI-Centre Key Wording Strategy for classifying education research version 0.9.7. All documents were uploaded into EPPI-Reviewer 4 for application of inclusion/exclusion criteria. The key wording tool for profiling the evidence was designed within EPPI Reviewer 4. The documents that were included in the review where then divided into 2 sections for quality analysis: (i) education interventions and programmes and (ii) policy documents (national and international).

**Analysing studies in 2 stages**

The defined aims of the review also call for determining what constitutes QUALITY criteria in our screening and analysis. The scales that are currently uses in systematic reviews place high emphasis on internal validity and scientific robustness. Our screening process will take a realistic approach of “Digging for Nuggets” (Pawson 2006). We agree with the author that the “study is not the appropriate unit of analysis for quality appraisal and (...) indicators are not decision points but invite the appraiser to examine rather more complex propositions as “possible features for consideration” (p131). Our quality appraisal will need to bring into light the “assumptions that underlie programme interventions” (p134).

We designed a quality grid using the UNESCO 2012 document that details the various types of evidence that are needed to understand social exclusion related to education within a given context. We added a process analysis that focuses on uncovering the patterns of exclusion through a CMO approach. Through this perspective a study will be considered of “good” quality if the links between context-mechanisms and outcomes have been articulated, or suggested. We will define a scoring methodology to be able to assess the weight of various documents according to the various elements. Questions from this analysis will be discussed with the advisory group or put out to the networks associated with this study (see Appendix 7 for Analysis Grid).
4. Analysing the evidence

A review that sets out to structure and comprehend relevant evidence for policy making in the field of education and social exclusion requires a clear framework to piece the evidence together in order to map the research/studies/policies that are currently being referred to. Most systematic reviews that are carried out, dominantly in peer-reviewed literature and especially in the field of health have a strong focus on the internal validity of the findings, the scientific robustness of the evidence. However, it is clear that for education policy, the external validity of the evidence or what it demonstrates with reference to replication in different contexts or “generalisability” of knowledge is the prime objective. Focusing solely on outcomes does not suffice to answer questions of process that call for the identification of the causal links as well as of the mechanisms that shed light on what works, but also how, why or why not. “In order to identify causal connections, we need to understand outcome patterns, rather than seek outcome regularities” (Pawson 2006 p22). In order to grasp the “process” or the dynamic chain that leads to social impact and positive change we need to scrutinize the evidence to identify general models of explanation. This in turn requires a clear definition of the theoretical analysis lens through which the body of evidence can be organised and understood. The present review is thus designed at the crossroads of different theories as well as conceptual frameworks and aims to look at evidence that is complex. As a result the review represents an on-going process conceived in three successive steps:

- **Step 1**: Overall review on theories of social exclusion in education (red circles) and construction of an analysis grid to be used in Step 2;
- **Step 2**: Analysis of documents related to implementation and assessment using the Context-Mechanism-Outcome approach for content analysis;
- **Step 3**: Analysis of documents related to the national and international policy, using a systems dynamics approach in order to identify the causal links between the various concepts that shape the social exclusion within education, as it is currently understood.

The analysis was carried out by the PI and the Research Assistant for the review, as well as a team of 6 Masters students from Washington University in St Louis.

- The PI and the RA carried out Step 1 to identify and analyse the current theories and frameworks related to SE as a concept and SE within education. The framework for analysis was conceived in discussion with the Co-I for this research to clarify the hypotheses. We also designed a specific analysis grid based on Step 1 to allow for in depth scrutiny of the evidence
- A first team of three students carried out the various stages of the review process in order to (i) identify and organise the evidence recovered using inclusion/exclusion criteria; (ii) carry out key wording on all 115 documents included in the review; (iii) analyse the 58 documents related to educational interventions (implementation/assessments) using the CMO analysis grid. The documents were
divided between the three reviewers who met with the PI weekly over a period of three months in order to discuss the discrepancies as well as ensure that all reviewers were proceeding along the same guidelines. These discussions were key in gaining insights onto the process of identifying diverse definitions of “context” as well as “mechanisms”.

- A second team of three students from the Social Systems Laboratory at Washington University in St Louis proceeded with the analysis of the policy related documents. We excluded the dissertations and toolkits/reports at this stage in order to define the initial dynamic model from the evidence.

4.1. Step 1: Understanding the theories of social exclusion as a framework to decipher inequalities in education

In order to identify the theoretical space within which this review and the subsequent research will be embedded, the first step was to gain an understanding of the discussions around social exclusion in general, and social exclusion within education in particular. We proceeded with a rigorous review of the literature to identify the documents that discussed issues pertaining to SE as a concept as well as scrutinize how this concept was being used and understood within the field of education (see Appendix 2).

The arguments presented in this section are based on the corpus of theoretical and policy evidence pertaining to:
- Review theories and definitions of social exclusion;
- Understand how social exclusion is currently being defined within the field of education;
- Review policy documents that have stressed the relevance of the concept of social exclusion.

4.3.1 The review of theories and definitions of social exclusion

Discourses of social exclusion (SE) gained prominence in France with the notion of “les exclus” or the “persons who had slipped through the net of the social insurance system and were thus administratively excluded by the State” (Levitas 2005): the idea that there are sections of society that are not being taken into account in the policies is central to this perspective. The concept of SE in the second half of the twentieth century was used mainly by sociologists and political scientists in the European context to define exclusion from employment and housing and denial of civic rights. A general and widespread understanding of the concept of SE thus focused on non-participation in society.

The Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) of the London Schools of Economics carried out research focusing on policies in the UK. The findings have highlighted the dynamic nature of the process of SE that is always multifaceted and complex. “It is conceptually differentiated from poverty and deprivation, primarily by having a focus on the process of disengagement. Indeed, tracing this process from source to outcome emerges as a key issue (Room, 1995), and as a result social exclusion perspectives recognize the dynamism of individuals’ trajectories over time. In addition the term moves the unit of analysis from the individual, to socially structured disadvantage” (Sparkes 1999).

In the field of education, the analyses and discourses with regards to exclusion have been most often synonymous of inclusion understood as access/non-access to various forms of schooling. Policies and programmes have mainly been framed around the concept of ‘inclusion’ and ‘participation’ that are most often defined at a policy level. However, there is an urgent need to look at the inherent links between the various concepts that are intertwined and constitute re-enforcing feedback loops within specific contexts: equality, equity, quality and poverty. As a result there is a need to focus not just on exclusion from education, but also to analyse how education can maintain or combat inherent systems of beliefs and functioning that lead to social exclusion and discrimination within the classroom. “Inclusion” unfortunately often becomes synonymous of presence of vulnerable groups in classrooms, “bums on chairs”. However, it is clear that this dual dimension of exclusion –from school, but also from learning within schools – needs urgent attention. “Addressing Exclusion in Education” (UNESCO 2012) lays out the guidelines to “reorienting today’s education systems” by urging policy makers to become more aware of the dynamics of exclusion by recognizing that “exclusion in education can feed into social exclusion”. In order to do this, it is imperative to understand the various facets that social exclusion can take.
4.3.2 Inclusion – Exclusion and Social Exclusion in Education: The Policy Context

In the field of development, the concept of ‘inclusion’ has become a central tenant of social policies and international frameworks. In education, inclusion, and its corollary inclusive education, have become ubiquitous in terms of design of policies and programmes. However, the term “inclusion”, which has been, from the very onset, grounded in a human right perspective, remained vaguely defined in the World Declaration for Education for All in Jomtien in 1993. However, the UN Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities linked the concept of inclusion strongly to this specific population. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education further consolidated this connection between inclusion and disability. Since 2000 however, with the EFA, Dakar Framework for Action and the EFA flagship on the Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities, there has been a trend to define inclusion more broadly as a concept for addressing vulnerability resulting from various phenomenon (gender, ethnos groups, etc.). But, simultaneously, inclusion and especially inclusive education was the central tenant of the UN Convention for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). At the global level, the MDG education focussed goal 2 was measured through the limited lens of Universal Primary Education (UPE). As a result, inclusion, in many contexts, has become synonymous with access measured by enrolment rates and remains narrowly assessed by basic indicators such as access and completion of learning cycles, looking at equity in reduced terms and failing to provide insights about persistent structural inequalities within schools in particular and within societies as wider entities. Since 2015 there has been a strong impetus to push the education agenda to address more complex questions of learning. The SDG goal 4, by stating that countries should “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning,” has created a space for re-thinking central concepts and critically examining the links between “inclusion,” “quality,” and “equity.”

The documents related to theory have strongly suggested that one of main drawbacks of the concepts of “inclusion/exclusion” is that, unlike SE, they are not consistently linked to a strong theoretical framework or definition. Some authors have strongly argued that despite being a central tenant of international and national policy documents, there is a danger that “the analytically coherent paradigms of SE are predicated on the moral paradigms of social inclusion. It does indeed seem to be common that “inclusion” is left under-theorized and under-discussed; it is simply assumed to be an ethical good” (O’Reilly 2005 p80). This under-theorization of the concept has led to a lack of scrutiny of the term to address the evaluation of progress as well as inclusion continuing to be viewed as synonymous to access. As a direct consequence, in policy documents, inclusion and exclusion are used as related concepts that define access or denial of access to learning systems. In order to define pathways for negotiating the paradigm shift that SDG goal 4 calls for, it will be imperative to re-examine and re-define the links between inclusion and social exclusion in terms of content-mechanisms and outcomes and clearly distinguishing these from questions of access.
4.3.3 Social exclusion in education through a capabilities perspective: stressing relational features

Three aspects of Sen’s CA could serve as a basis to more strongly conceptualise questions of social exclusion within education.

To better unpack the social exclusion processes, Sen argues that it must be viewed as a capability deprivation (2000): “the real importance of the idea of SE lies in emphasizing the role of relational features in the deprivation of capability and thus in the experience of poverty” (p6). It is this “relational feature” that remains elusive in inclusive education programmes’ implementation and more specifically in assessment measures. Within this perspective, one can argue that in practice, the very nature of the concept of “inclusion” within education is starkly distinct from that of SE in that the former has become inherently bogged down by specific labels of one-dimensional identities (disability for instance), and by simplistic assessments of access/attendance that provide head counts. SE as capability deprivation should be more central to programme implementation and assessment by “focusing attention on the role of relational features in deprivation” (p8). Such a view also stresses the synergies between SE and poverty: “SE cannot be used to describe every kind of deprivation – whether or not relational features are important in its genesis” (Sen 2000 p9).

Following Sen’s approach, Unterhalter and Walker stress the distinction between the intrinsic value of education as well as its instrumental value. Behind all research, policy and programmes, there is an often implicit belief pertaining to what education strives to achieve. Views of education as a means to employment or income generating activity would focus on the instrumental value, whereas the intrinsic view would recognise the inherent value of being educated as a central capability. Focussing on this distinction would allow for a lens for scrutiny of learning processes within education in order to grasp the very nature of the process. If education is an instrumental good, standardized tests and questions of completion would suffice as a yardstick for success. However, if inclusion, as often viewed within policy documents, is defined as a means of strengthening social cohesion equity and fighting poverty, it needs to be more strongly defined as a dynamic process related to context and fighting inequality as a central aim.

Pertaining to education and questions of access, it also seems crucial to make the distinction between SE and “unfavourable inclusion” (p28), which pertains to unequal terms of social participation (Kelles-Viitanen 1998). Sen suggests that there are situations where people are in fact included but on unfavourable terms (2000). He further states that the nature of the problem of exclusion and unfavourable inclusion are different and should thus be analysed as distinct phenomenon. In the field of education, this distinction seems paramount and often overlooked, since consensus for the past decades has been towards getting children into learning systems, which is where the crux of the issue lay. However, overwhelming evidence is now showing that in a number of countries, children, especially vulnerable children, are not learning even the basics within schools. The global discourse labels the lack of learning as an issue of quality. We strongly argue that the “quality” needs to be unpacked and inclusion needs
to be recognised as a crucial component of quality at all levels. Shifting the lens to analyse learning processes beyond attendance seems long overdue.

4.3.4 Distinguishing various levels of analyses

Evidence shows that although inclusion is a ubiquitous policy term and has strong grounding in human rights perspectives, it is based on unclear theoretical frameworks in social sciences. As a result, it does not allow us to capture the processes that are in action within diverse learning systems. The concept of Social Exclusion, that has been more prominent in the field of unemployment and social welfare policies of Europe, provides a relevant lens for analyses of dynamic processes that occur within education. Some authors suggest that in order to refocus the analysis it could be useful to distinguish between the 3 levels of analysis of the phenomenon (Cohen 2015):

- The individually-based micro level which focuses on the psychological study of prejudice;
- The socially-based meso level where the boundaries between the “us” and “them” are drawn and where identities are labelled (disability, ethnicity, gender) in order to categorise groups;
- The structurally-based macro level that addressed questions of policy.

The process of SE plays out at these various levels ranging from the individual/personal to the national or international. In order to grasp the complexity of the phenomena, evidence that links the various levels will be paramount.

Conclusions from Step 1

The following figure summarises the trends that we identified as cross-cutting issues in the theoretical documents that we scrutinised for the first step of analysis. While it is clear that there is a need for stressing the theoretical differences between inclusion/exclusion and social exclusion based on the discussion above, certain questions can be defined in order to gauge if policies, programmes and assessments are in fact addressing SE.

Content Analysis Tool for Step 2 (Appendix 7):

The content analysis tool was devised using a CMO framework and in view of finding the:

1. Context
   - Target Population: Identification of specific vulnerable group
   - Definition of Concept: Language or keywords used to identify and communicate about social exclusion or inclusion
   - Context: Specific culture or environment in which exclusion/inclusion occurs

2. Mechanisms of Exclusion
   - Micro Mechanisms: Processes by which inclusion/exclusion occur in psychosocial setting
• Mezzo Mechanisms: Processes by which inclusion/exclusion occur in sociological level
• Macro Mechanisms: Processes by which inclusion/exclusion occur in large-scale systems and political realms.

3. Outcomes
• Intervention Outcomes: Circumstances that occur as a result of intervention or practice implements

4. Theoretical Framework
• Intrinsic Framework: inherent value to education as a human right
• Instrumental Framework: Education linked to economic or utilitarian goal.

Figure 2: Social Exclusion in Education- Framework for Analysis of Evidence
4.2. Step 2: Profiling of the Evidence (115 documents)

For Steps 2 and 3 of the review we identified 115 documents pertaining to social exclusion in LMICs. The year of publication shows that interest in SE has been more pronounced since 2006, the year of the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Persons with disabilities (UNCRPD) as well as the UNESCO-Global Monitoring Report on Quality Education.

After the application of our exclusion criteria on the titles and abstracts of the documents, we found that a number of papers focussed on Sub-Saharan Africa with a number of these analysing questions of Apartheid and social discrimination. We believe that in subsequent phases of the review (Steps 4 and 5) we will include papers from other continents.

The majority of documents are academic research or discussion papers, with 11 dissertations and 16 reports.
4.3. Step 2: Interventions and programmes to improve education equity and inclusion (Context-Mechanism-Outcomes) (58 documents)

We organised the documents according to their main focus and 58 papers discussed programmes and interventions. We carried out content analyses on these papers in order to identify links between context-mechanisms-outcomes (CMO).
4.3.1 **Context**

The articles referring to interventions and programmes consisted of various views and perspectives of “contexts” ranging from focussing on physical and psychological spaces within which the educational systems are operating to wider considerations of political and cultural contexts.

a) **Contexts as space**: A number of papers refer to contexts viewed as spaces that influence education: schools, neighbourhoods/communities, and school systems. Contexts included references to schools, communities, and the dynamics between life in the children’s home as well as expectations of the educational systems.

b) **Context as people**: Interventions in the community targeting parents and teachers were more commonly viewed as the most important context to address. Family based intervention or those that provided additional social and academic support for the families and parents proved most successful. Teachers are identified as THE main factor that determines the learning process. In view of the amount of evidence pertaining to teachers we identified the documents referring to teachers and will address this in Step 5 of the review during the coming year.

c) **Context as focus on broader issues**: In addition, several interventions were designed to address global issues such as immigration of specific populations and post apartheid culture. The articles demonstrated large-scale contexts of which the educational systems are occurring. For example, all articles demonstrated school systems or educational systems that interplay with large scale issues such as HIV or Apartheid. Overall, researchers focused on students who are impoverished, orphaned, or those prone to drop out.

b) **Context as policy**: Several articles focused on interventions that are put into place given the context of a new policy, budget, or political force.

e) **Context of disability and mental health**: Often, researchers focused on students with physical disabilities and the challenges they face regardless of policy level definitions of inclusive education. In addition, research focused on racial differences in education quality as well as the emotional and mental health difficulties of students who were survivors of traumatic events, those in extreme poverty, those that consistently misbehaved at school, and children that do not meet expected academic outcomes.

f) **Inclusion as context**: Overall it appears the concepts of inclusion and exclusion were not limited to disabilities but integrated with concepts of discrimination, freedom, economic opportunities etc. It was evident that when inclusion is not seen as a mere question of access to school or as synonymous of special education, then the concept lends itself to a broader framing by being viewed as a context within which educational equity can be achieved and where the intrinsic value of learning is wholly recognised. In this perspective, the term “inclusion” refers more to “social inclusion” and can be viewed in contrast to SE.
4.3.2 Mechanisms

a) **Pedagogical strategies**: Overall, almost all of the articles focused on the interaction between students and teacher via pedagogical strategies. Almost none of the interventions were based on conceiving these interactions to address exclusion from the very onset, but rather as response to undesirable outcomes or circumstances. For example a common mechanism identified was the lack of support and training for teachers to address the variety and diversity of needs of children. Teachers’ views of students and students’ perceptions of teachers were clear factors in both what teachers expected of students and their understanding of their capability to succeed in the educational system regardless of factors in the community or at home.

b) **Psychosocial and social mechanisms** were the primary focus of a number of articles. A majority of the research spoke to processes of exclusion within the schooling system, pedagogical methods, or curriculum that impact the quality of education received. Often the process of exclusion or inclusion occurred in very micro psychosocial mechanisms such as student engagement, how it occurs, if it is effective, and what improves it.

- Some examples include language, teachers’ responses or incorporation of **self-concept or identity** and how this plays out in the classroom, etc.
- Social, meso level mechanisms generally focused on **school environment** and teachers relationship with the students. Macro mechanisms were often mentioned in the discussion as proposed steps forward, assessed through passing examinations rather than learning how to ask questions and encourage creativity.
- Some **political mechanisms** were derived from social trends changing in the country such as gender reform in Turkey. Psychosocial and sociological mechanisms were the primary focus of the articles, particularly in the qualitative data. Political mechanisms were delineated through policies including Education for All, White Paper 6 in South Africa and international requirements for education and access.

c) **Processes of exclusion or inclusion** appear to occur most prominently on the psychosocial and sociological level. Common psychosocial mechanisms of exclusion or inclusion consist of social identity (associated with gender, socio economic status, etc.), personal motivation of students and stigma and the relationship to performance in the classroom. In addition sociological mechanisms of exclusion or inclusion surrounded barriers experienced in relation to discrimination or inability to participate due to gender status or socio economic status. Macro mechanisms analyses were minimal. Definition of the concept included ability to adhere to mainstream learning assessment levels and social identity in the classroom. Overall, almost all of the articles focused on the interaction between students and teacher via pedagogical strategies.
4.3.3 Outcomes

- The main consideration was achievement of education that is most often viewed in terms of access and presence within schools, as well as basic learning. Drop out rates were a prominent assessment of inclusion. As a result, a number of interventions remains focused on retention for those likely to drop out.
- Research indicates that implementing teacher-based and community-based changes showed the most positive changes in the way that students approached school.
- Research also showed several psychosocial factors and teacher student interactions greatly influence the quality of education received by target populations. Students’ views of themselves and teachers views of the students impact attainment and quality of education in the classroom. More specifically, teacher student interaction is a key intervention point for students.
- Research also showed that family views about education impacted not only student engagement but also teachers’ beliefs about how well students would perform in school. Inclusive education did not only impact the students who required those educational services, it also influenced students who were learning in an inclusive environment with students with disabilities.
- Family based intervention or those that provided additional social and academic support for the families and parents proved most successful. Majority of outcomes suggest focusing on family support to assist with success rates.

CMO connections

In terms of the research and methodology almost all was qualitative or mixed methods. Most of which used purposive sampling. It was challenging to identify mechanisms that explained the links between the context and the outcomes as the arguments to make the causal connections were often not stated clearly in the papers but often inferred. Moreover, the outcomes stated often did not reflect the complexity and the multidimensionality of the links with the mechanisms.

4.4. Deciphering policy documents using systems dynamics methodologies

The research team reviewed 24 articles on national education policy with respect to inclusive education and social exclusion in education. The articles for study were selected following the key-wording process and given to a team of three students for analysis from a systems thinking perspective. The team executed the following steps to create a system model of inclusive education.

First the team reviewed the system modelling process used by Faustine Williams to analyse Global Cancer Disparities\(^2\). This model was a causal loop diagram that highlighted important stocks, and was accompanied by a variable analysis that identified important sub-systems from the larger model. The three-member research team divided articles so that each article would be read by two researchers prior to discussion and

\(^2\) Understanding Global Cancer Disparities: The Role of Social Determinates from System Dynamics Perspective (Faustine Williams, Nancy Zoellner, MPH2, Peter S. Hovmand) To be Published
analysis. Researchers first reviewed the article abstracts for key themes and potential variables. Researchers then performed a thorough reading of articles, making notes of relationships between variables and concepts and identifying potential stocks for the model. The research team then collectively created a first draft of the model.

1. To start, the team elicited variables and clustered them into groups based on stakeholders (teachers, schools, students, community, parents).
2. The team identified two key parallel stock flows:
   - Quality of Education – students in school not receiving quality education ↔ students receiving quality education.
3. The team decided to focus the model only on the second flow, which focuses on quality of education that students receive in schools.
4. Based on this flow, the team built a draft model, starting with teaching as the focus area and building out to other stakeholders, including the role of students and the community context that affects schooling.
5. The team then built the Causal Loop Diagram using Systems Dynamics Analysis for policy related documents.
6. The model was then translated into a digital format using StellaPro.
The team then reviewed the model to identify remaining questions and points for further clarification, and then sent the draft to the lead researcher for feedback.

**Conclusions based on the Causal Loop Diagram using Systems Dynamics**

- **International policy** couches education development in terms of promoting sustainable development (instrumental value of education). Cultural bias in international policy tends to create education policy that is heavily influenced by western frameworks; national and local contexts are not sufficiently taken into account. National policy language echoes international language with use of general concepts that are not systematically defined in relating to the local context.

- **High-level international policy goals** are siloed by sector, rather than addressing intersectionality (i.e.: Health and Education are treated independently). Separation of sectorial policy seems to constitute a missed opportunity for understanding and planning for the intersectionality and interactivity between multiple sectors.

- **Language** that is used at the high policy level remains broad and theoretical and the documents analysed do not offer pathways for translating the policy recommendations into practice.

- **Funding** and decentralised approaches to funding are the main point on which more detail is provided and practices explained.
• One of the most evident divergences between the international education policy lexicon and the national level documents is that the former is increasingly based on concerns of sustainable development, while the latter seems more strongly grounded in human rights frameworks with concerns of equality in education, reflecting a recognition of the intrinsic value of education. As the various national agendas progress to strive towards the new SDGs, there may be a shift in the broad reference frameworks.

**Analysis of Feedback loops**

The dynamic analyses yielded a preliminary model that can be further refined in future research pertaining to the next steps of this review. After discussions with the modelling team we determined the following questions that will need to be further explored.

• Differentiate between process indicators and outcome indicators;
• Mechanisms that need to be further unpacked (and are not at the policy level);
• The various feedback loops pertaining to the teaching process;
• Factors that can encourage and strengthen student engagement and participation;
• The various factors that are exogenous to the model but that have a strong influence of the learning process (i.e. parents’ level of education, community norms and belief, requirements of the labour market).
5. Conclusions and future use of review

5.1. Mains conclusions on social exclusion within education

5.1.1. Theoretical Framework: Clarification over the concepts of inclusion/exclusion and social exclusion

• Inclusive education versus social exclusion

In the documents analysed for the review, inclusion and inclusive education were used interchangeably with the concept of exclusion. SE was not referred to in the majority of documents. Moreover, inclusion was most often limited to considerations of access and of getting children into learning systems, as a phenomenon limited to a given time in the process of learning. This confusion between concepts that are not clearly defined and distinguished in terms of what they refer to contributes to the inability to move towards considerations of process and allow for more dynamic attention to the influence of “context”.

• Using the capabilities approach to re-frame SE within education

The definition of SE as it is framed within the capabilities approach presents a grid within which to understand the process within learning systems through 3 main ideas:

1. To view social exclusion (and inclusion) as capability deprivation and focus more deliberately on the role of relational features of the education process;

2. Stress the distinction between the intrinsic value of education as well as its instrumental value. Focusing on this distinction would allow for a lens for scrutiny of learning processes within education in order to grasp the very nature of the process.

3. Pertaining to education and questions of access, it seems crucial to make the distinction between SE and unfavourable inclusion. Sen suggests that there are situations where people are in fact included but on unfavourable terms. He further states that the nature of the problem of exclusion and unfavourable inclusion are different and should thus be analysed as distinct phenomenon.

5.1.2. Policy considerations: Moving focus of Inclusion beyond disability

• Importance of the SDG 4 for reconceptualising Inclusion

Some of the findings from the review were discussed with experts in inclusive education during a meeting in Paris (May 23rd, 2016) on the international policy guideline for the implementation of SDG 4. During this meeting more clarity was given to the need to define inclusion in education as well as distinguish questions of “access,” issues of quality learning as well as the paramount challenge of assessment of inclusion. The next steps of the review will attempt to map out the methods and tools that are currently being used, most often as proxies, for monitoring inclusion. Although it was clear that disaggregated data is crucial to assessing equity in basic learning, there was also recognition of the need to develop “indicators” for the
process of inclusion. The dynamic analyses that were applied in the present review could serve as a first step towards conceptualising the issues of inclusion in an innovative manner.

- **Moving from inclusion as access to inclusion as context**

In a number of papers, research or policy, “inclusion” continues to be viewed as “access.”

### 5.1.3. Assessment: need for new “indicators”

- **Targets for SDG 4: limited and global discussions**

Ten targets have been identified for monitoring and assessing SDG 4. The present review will make strong contributions to the targets 4.5 pertaining to vulnerable groups as well as 4.7 pertaining to sustainable development and global citizenship. The need to focus on relational indicators as well as the use of SD modelling will be crucial in order to navigate the paradigm shift from the narrowly defined vision of the MDGs towards the expanded rights-based view embedded in the SDGs.

- **By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and Goal-4 effective learning outcomes;**

- **By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and preprimary education so that they are ready for primary education;**

- **By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university;**

- **By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship;**

- **By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations;**

- **By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development;**

- **Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, nonviolent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all;**

- **By 2020, substantially expand globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communications technology, technical, engineering and scientific programmes, in developed countries and other developing countries;**
4.10. By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small-island developing states.

5.2. Building a system for mapping and profiling the evidence: next steps of the “living” review


- **Methodology for identifying and mapping assessments**
  The next step of the review will entail analysing the documents that were identified as focusing on assessments of inclusion/social education. During the screening of documents on title and abstract, we identified 1339 documents that mainly presented methods and tools for assessment. We will scrutinise this body of evidence to specifically identify assessments of relational phenomenon as defined through the CA in order to decipher social exclusion within learning systems. We will also list tools that have been developed in LMICs to gauge relational features of learning.

- **Discussing the challenges for SDG 4 and target 4.5**
  The sole indicator that is currently defined for target 4.5. is to look at parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile) for all indicators that can be disaggregated. As a result, monitoring of inclusion is currently limited to questions of “access” to various levels of learning. Experts further agree that even within this limited assessment, disaggregated data for children with disabilities and indigenous groups remain a crucial challenge. The use of SD analyses to better capture the nature of inclusion (and exclusion) within learning systems will offer a novel perspective to work towards dynamic indicators. During Step 4 of the review we will continue to refine the dynamic model that was designed in Step 3 of the review in close collaboration with the Social Systems Laboratory at Washington University in St. Louis.

5.2.2. Step 5 of Review: Focus on teachers (December 2016-April 2017)

775 documents were excluded during the screening on title and abstract on “type of education.” A number of these focus on teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and pedagogies. Using our content analysis grid developed in Steps 1 and 2 of the present review we will scrutinise this body of evidence to refine the CMO links that we identified to date. Specific focus will be given to identifying “unfavourable inclusions” as well as relational aspects of learning.

5.3. Embedding review in on-going research and policy discussions

During 2016, the PI and Co-I have been discussing the implications of the review as well as the findings from the broader research with key stakeholders of international and national educational policies.
UNESCO education sector: The PI is part of a 15-member expert team that has been reflecting on the challenges of education for the 2015-2030 period. The team met in May 2016 in order to finalise the “Policy Guidelines on Inclusion and Equity in Education” that are designed to help governments review national educational policies to be aligned with the SDGs. The policy brief of this review will be widely shared with the expert team and will lead to further discussions on questions of assessment in the fall of 2016. In September 2016, the findings of the review as well as of the larger research will be presented at UNESCO-Paris.

UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS): The discussions with UIS have made clear that target 4.5 as it stands with the related indicator does not allow for the much needed shift in monitoring of educational success. Moreover, the data pertaining to some vulnerable groups as children with disabilities remains extremely scarce. The research team is working towards ensuring that the data gathered through large-scale surveys as well as the findings of the present review feed into the assessment of education of the most vulnerable groups.

Handicap International and UNICEF North Africa: The PI is conducting a research project in the Southern region of Morocco (Souss-Massa) on inclusive education within primary and secondary schools. The findings of the present review will be used to analyse the findings from the mixed methods study currently being carried out in 902 primary and secondary schools in order to gather data with regards to vulnerable children, specifically children with disabilities. The PI will be discussing the findings with policy makers in Agadir in October 2016.
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Appendix 4: Search Strategy- List of Databases

Electronic searches of academic databases

Academic databases in the fields of medicine, education, psychology, anthropology, and the social sciences will be searched. Subject librarians of education and anthropology were consulted in order to determine the most appropriate databases to search for those disciplines.

A preliminary search of fifteen databases was conducted with a wide range of keyword (free text) and subject (thesaurus) terms. The first 40 results of each search were reviewed and based on the number of relevant results and database features which refined the search and limited results (e.g. ability to search by title/abstract rather than full-text, ability to use truncation symbol), 9 databases will be selected for use in this review. Databases searched include:

- ERIC
- Eldis
- British Library of Developing Studies (BLDS)
- PsychINFO
- Social Science Research Network
- Web of Science
- PsychLit
Appendix 5: Key Search Terms

Example of search terms defined in ERIC using the Thesaurus (this strategy will be followed and adapted to the other academic search engines)

a. Education
Primary Education OR "Elementary School*" OR "Kindergarten*" OR "Elementary Secondary Education" OR "Elementary Education" OR "Primary Education" OR "Secondary Education" OR "Compulsory Education" OR "Elementary Secondary Education" OR "Secondary Education" OR "Grade School*" OR "elementary student*" OR "Primary grade*" OR "High School*" OR "Middle School*"

b. Exclusion
"Exclusion*" OR "Exclusion" OR "Social Exclusion*" OR "Social isolation" OR "Isolation*" OR "climate of exclud*" OR "climate of inclus*" OR "exclusion and integration*" OR "exclusion approach*" OR "exclusion attitude*" OR "exclusion classes" OR "exclusion classroom*" OR "exclusion curriculum*" OR "exclusion educat*" OR "exclusion in education*" OR "exclusion environment*" OR "exclusion in school*" OR "exclusion instruction*" OR "exclusion learning*" OR "exclusion pedagogy*" OR "exclusion placement*" OR "exclusion policy*" OR "exclusion practice*" OR "exclusion program*" OR "exclusion reform*" OR "exclusion school*" OR "exclusion setting*" OR "exclusion strategy*" OR "exclusion student*" OR "exclusion style of teaching" OR "exclusion teach*" OR "exclusion elementary" OR "exclusion general" OR "exclusion high school*" OR "exclusion kindergarten*" OR "process* of exclusion*" OR "school* exclusion" OR "social cohesion"

c. Inclusion/Exclusion
"climate of inclusi*" OR "inclusi* and integrat*" OR "inclusi* approach*" OR "inclusi* attitude*" OR "inclusi* classes" OR "inclusi* classroom*" OR "inclusi* curricul*" OR "inclusi* educat*" OR "inclusi* in education*" OR "inclusi* environment*" OR "inclusi* in school*" OR "inclusi* instruction*" OR "inclusi* learning*" OR "inclusi* pedagog*" OR "inclusi* placement*" OR "inclusi* polic*" OR "inclusi* practice*" OR "inclusi* program*" OR "inclusi* reform*" OR "inclusi* school*" OR "inclusi* setting*" OR "inclusi* strateg*" OR "inclusi* student*" OR "inclusi* style of teaching" OR "inclusi* teach*" OR "inclusive elementary" OR "inclusive general" OR "inclusive high school*" OR "inclusive kindergarten*" OR "mainstream* inclusion" OR "practice* of inclusi*" OR "process* of inclusion" OR "provid* inclusi*" OR "school* inclusion" OR "social* inclu*" OR "inclus* teen*"

d.  **Low-middle income countries:** World Bank list of Economies (2015 listing):
“economic condition” OR “poor countries” OR “low income countries” OR “LMIC” OR “Middle income countries” OR “underserved countries” OR “poor nation” OR “underdeveloped economy” OR “developing economy” OR “Low income Countr*” OR “Middle income Countr*” OR “lower middle income” OR “Afghanistan” OR “Albania” OR “Algeria” OR “American Samoa” OR “Angola” OR “Armenia” OR “Azerbaijan” OR “Bangladesh” OR “Belarus” OR “Belize” OR “Benin” OR “Bhutan” OR “Bolivia” OR “Bosnia” OR “Botswana” OR “Brazil” OR “Bulgaria” OR “Burkina Faso” OR “Burundi” OR “Cabo Verde” OR “Cambodia” OR “Cameroon” OR “Central African Republic” OR “Chad” OR “China” OR “Columbia” OR “Comoros” OR “Congo” OR “Dominican Republic” OR “Congo Republic” OR “Costa Rica” OR “Cuba” OR “Djibouti” OR “Dominica” OR “Cuba” OR “Ecuador” OR “Egypt” OR “Arab Republic” OR “El Salvador” OR “Eritrea” OR “Ethiopia” OR “Fiji” OR “Gabon” OR “Gambia” OR “Georgia” OR “Ghana” OR “Grenada” OR “Guatemala” OR “Guinea*” OR “Guyana” OR “Haiti” OR “Honduras” OR “India” OR “Indonesia” OR “Iran” OR “Islamic Republic” OR “Iraq” OR “Jamaica” OR “Jordan” OR “Kazakhstan” OR “Kenya” OR “Kiribati” OR “Korea” OR “Kosovo” OR “Kyrgyz Republic” OR “Lebanon” OR “Lesotho” OR “Liberia” OR “Libya” OR “Macedonia” OR “Madagascar” OR “Malawi” OR “Malaysia” OR “Maldives” OR “Mali” OR “Marshal Islands” OR “Mauritania” OR “Mauritius” OR “Mexico” OR “Micronesia” OR “Moldova” OR “Mongolia” OR “Sub-Saharan Africa” OR “Sub Saharan Africa” OR “Subsaharan Africa” OR “South Asia” OR “Southern Asia” OR “East Asia” OR “Eastern Asia” OR “Middle East” OR “North Africa” OR “Central Asia”
## Appendix 6: Key-wording tool for research documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Source</th>
<th>Electronic Database Grey Literature Requested from partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2. Year of Publication</td>
<td>2000- 2016 (one code for each year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4. Region of focus (specify country in box)</td>
<td>South Asia South-East Asia North Africa Sub-Saharan Africa South America Middle-East No specific country Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Focus</td>
<td>B.1. Primary Focus (only one category selected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy: This is a statement of policy from a central or local government body Research/Data Including statistical reports Review/synthesis (e.g. of research literature; MI data etc.) Theory (i.e. scholarly articles from peer-reviewed journals) Education Intervention and impact (specific programme) Practice: description A descriptive account (not research) Practice guide (Practice-related guides, handbooks and toolkits (i.e. main purpose is practical guidance rather than detailing research findings) Opinion/discussion piece This presents an opinion or makes an argument (from media source or professional journal) Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Analysis Grid for appraising the papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Grid for Content Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>