

# Education, Equality and Social Exclusion: A View

**A. Abdulraheem\***

---

---

Education is a vital investment for human and economic development and is influenced by the environment within which it exists. Changes in technology, labour market patterns and general global environment, all require policy responses. Traditions, culture and faith all reflect upon the education system and at the same time are also affected by them. The element of continuity and change remains perpetual and it is up to the society to determine its pace and direction. The societal, political and governmental structures also impinge on the effectiveness of the education system. An education policy cannot be prepared in isolation of these realities. The current educational policy, therefore, identifies some of the overarching challenges, and proposes policy options within the context of the education system.

Exclusion in education is a facet of social exclusion and manifests itself in a spectrum of social and psychological inequities. Extreme educational exclusion arises when individuals and groups find themselves systematically excluded from rights and entitlements, that includes denial of resources and facilities. At the other end of the spectrum, exclusion could take the form of subtle forms of manipulation of the delivery of educational goods and services to favour some individuals and groups at the expense of others, or the reinforcement of negative or discriminatory social attitudes towards particular groups. In these cases, while the effects are often as damaging as when extreme forms of exclusion occur, proof is hard to adduce.

Education policies have been particularly oriented to expanding supply to ensure universal enrolment of children. Poor supply of quality

---

\* Assistant Professor, Dept of Economics, The New College (Autonomous), Chennai-14, E.Mail: [abdulraheem1967@gmail.com](mailto:abdulraheem1967@gmail.com)

schooling continues to be a factor constraining the access of different groups of children to school. However, even with qualitative improvements and greater supply, it is apparent that there are consistent gaps in the participation and achievement of different social groups in education. Inequalities thus need to be seen not just in relation to the physical access of children to school but also in relation to the quality of the experience of education and its ability to maximise the potential of every individual child, build self-esteem and develop capacities to function fully as citizens.

Inclusive education is not an end in itself, but a means to an end – the creation and maintenance of an inclusive society. As such, the interest is with all citizens, their well-being and security. This is a radical conception. It is ultimately about the transformation of a society and its formal institutional arrangements, such as education. This means change in the existing values, priorities and policies that support and perpetuate practices of exclusion and discrimination.

#### **Developing a policy response**

The policy response, particularly in the industrialised or developed world, has been to actively tackle social exclusion of individuals and groups of citizens to ensure that they become part of that maintenance. In policy terms, addressing social exclusion can be understood as comprising a number of processes as follows:

- ◆ It requires the identification of groups who are excluded.
- ◆ There is a need to understand why individuals and groups might be excluded.
- ◆ In response to this, there is a need to institute processes which either (i) eliminate the barriers which lead to discrimination experienced by these individuals and groups and which preclude their involvement or participation in the democratic processes and activities of the society, or (ii) secure, through mechanisms such as targeting and affirmative action, their receipt of essential goods and services where access is limited.
- ◆ Social exclusion requires coordinated policy mechanisms across different social sectors and services. In paying attention to the scale of the problem of exclusion it is important to understand why it arises.

Most commentators on the subject would agree that exclusion is rarely mono-causal in its origin and that exclusion in education is a process in which different societal factors (social, political, and economic) coalesce to prevent children from enrolling in and completing school.

### **Education, equality and social exclusion**

Education is one of the most important factors affecting the development of children. It has great intrinsic significance as access to education is an important right and *being* educated is an important and very valuable capability. (see Constitutional provisions: Article 28). At the same time, establishing the empirical linkages may be very important to generate societal consensus around policies combating social exclusion, particularly if it can be shown that social exclusion hurts everyone and not just those suffering from it. The complete reliance on this approach is quite tricky as it may get bogged down in empirical issues rather than focus on important policy-questions.

### **Education**

With the increasing importance of lifelong learning there is an increasing emphasis on 'learning'. This not only holds for 'learning situations' outside the formal education system (like: learning on-the-job or learning by doing), but also for education and training within the educational system. In that sense, there is a paradigm shift away from teaching or knowledge transfer towards learning or shared and mutual knowledge development and knowledge creation. At the same time, it is more and more acknowledged that learning is not restricted to formalised and intentional settings, but takes place in various contexts. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD ), (2001c, p:15), states with regard to lifelong learning that "...covers all purposeful learning activity, from the cradle to the grave that aims to improve knowledge and competencies for all individuals who wish to participate in learning activities (...). The lifelong learning framework emphasis that learning occurs during the whole course of a person's life, formal education contributes to learning as does the non-formal and informal settings of home, the workplace, the community and the society at large".

A similar broad definition is provided by the European Commission (1999), in which it is emphasised that lifelong learning does not only

concern learning activities undertaken in order to develop and improve knowledge, skills and competencies from an employment perspective, but also from a personal, citizen and societal perspective. This report therefore does not focus on education in a restricted and traditional sense, but on learning in a broad sense. It not only encompasses publicly provided education ranging from pre-school education to tertiary (university and non-university) education, but also publicly or privately provided continuing education and training and learning opportunities in the context of labour market schemes, within enterprises or supported by enterprises or undertaken by individuals on their own account. Training and learning opportunities in the context of enterprises also encompasses human resource development activities, which stretch beyond the traditional courses, workshops and conferences. In essence, it concerns the creation of conditions and facilities that stimulate informal learning, such as multimedia facilities for learning on-the-job, job rotation, coaching by a more experienced colleague and job enrichment.

### **Equality**

In the context of education, the concepts of ‘equality’ and ‘equity’ are often used together. There is, however, an important distinction between the two concepts. Equity refers to ‘justice’ and forms essentially a basis or justification for government interventions in education, which, theoretically spoken, is a private good. Together with efficiency (e.g.: sub-optimal investment due to external effects and/or uncertainty with regard to the returns on investment), equity (the market does not provide individuals with equal access to essential goods and/or does not provide in the amount, which is considered strictly necessary for all individuals) forms the rationale for the government interventions that make education a quasi-collective good. If one aspect of equity concerns the extent to which the market provides individuals with ‘equal access’ to (essential) goods, ‘equality’ can be defined in terms of having equal opportunities with regard to (the chances on participation in) valorised goods like education and gainful employment.

Concerning such equal opportunities Van Werf, Brandsma, Cremers-Van Wees and Lubbers (1999) state: It is known, however, from research into educational opportunities that student achievement and school careers are largely influenced by the capacities or the motivation of students themselves. Therefore, equal opportunity should be conceived

as 'as many pupils as possible should learn and profit from education as much and as efficiently as their capabilities allow for.' This means that pupil achievement and school careers should only be related to their capacity and willingness to learn and not to Social Exclusion Society (SES), gender or ethnicity.

The latter, however, is more a wishful thinking than a factual statement. Whereas in the early 20th century (up to the 1950s) social stratification as well as educational achievement was based primarily on class principles, the disentanglement of class and social stratification gave rise to the ideal of meritocracy. The meritocratic society assumes that societal positions are not distributed on the basis of class or other background characteristics that are given for individuals, but that these societal positions are distributed only on the basis of individual achievements.

Meijnen (1999) in this context indicates that in a classless society a prime political question is whether societal positions are distributed on the basis of personal achievement instead of ascribed characteristics and whether all groups retain equal opportunities in acquiring such positions in and through education. Therefore, the concept of equal opportunities, in his opinion, does not relate to differences in talents or capacities of individuals, but to the equal circumstances in which children grow up. This indicates that the meritocratic perspective is only one perspective on equality or equal opportunities. In principle, three perspectives can be distinguished:

- ◆ the meritocratic perspective, which basically means equal educational rights in the case of equal capacities;
- ◆ the 'equal opportunities' perspective, which means an equal educational investment in each pupil;
- ◆ the egalitarian perspective, which means more investment in less talented pupils in order to reach equal achievements.

In general, it can be assumed that governments will strive for equal or at least equivalent education for all. In order to reach that goal, educational policies will often be characterised by adopting the three perspectives or measures inspired by these perspectives alongside.

**Social Exclusion**

The concept of *social exclusion* appears to be a complex and multidimensional one. The complexity of defining social exclusion partly stems from the differences in theoretical perspectives and disciplinary backgrounds applied while studying the concept, the different and multiple criteria that can be applied for defining the concept, and the different manifestations of social exclusion.

In their report on preventing social exclusion, the UK's Social Exclusion Unit (SEU, 2001) states that social exclusion 'includes poverty and low income, but is broader and addresses some of the wider causes and consequences of poverty'. Social exclusion in their definition is: A shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown... The most important characteristic of social exclusion is that these problems are linked and mutually reinforcing, and can combine to create a complex and fast-moving vicious cycle.

Pilgram et al. (2001) define social exclusion as: continuous and gradual deficits of full participation in the social (including material as well as symbolic) resources produced, supplied and exploited in a society for making a living, organising a life and taking part in the development of a (hopefully better) future. In their opinion, the concept of social exclusion has advantages over related concepts as poverty and marginalisation, since:

- ◆ social exclusion is a multi-dimensional concept;
- ◆ social exclusion has a relational character (instead of the distributional character of the concept of poverty);
- ◆ social exclusion is a dynamic concept (instead of the static nature of the more traditional concepts of poverty and marginalisation);
- ◆ social exclusion is actor-oriented;
- ◆ Social exclusion (as well as social inclusion) is closely related to the concept of 'participation'.

**Process of social exclusion/inclusion**

Cullen et al. (1998) indicate that social exclusion is a highly disruptive process produced by advanced societies which consist in the erosion of

collective values, social cohesion and bonding. Walraven (2000) indicates that the concept of social exclusion can be used to describe many different things. On the one hand, it refers to problems like long-term unemployment and 'modern poverty'. Problems which are encountered in modern welfare states and which may result in exclusion of people from participation in all kinds of institutional, social, cultural and political activities and associations. They lack the resources for participation in society, which sometimes is also coined as 'deficient citizenship'.

The resources for participation are not only financial ones (like income) but also non-financial ones (like health, welfare, social participation, housing, education, paid employment). On the other hand, it refers to social inequality, which as a term is not new in itself. The attention for social inequality has, however, grown over the last two decades due to the fact that it increased during that period, which is, *Education, equality and social exclusion: final synthesis report* among others, reflected in the growing income disparity between low-paid, low-skilled and high-paid, high skilled jobs.

In the final report of the Child Immigration project, (CHIPS, 2000) social exclusion is linked to 'precariousness' and 'well-being'. Precariousness and well-being are applied here as 'alternatives' for respectively social exclusion and social inclusion, with precariousness being determined by a past migratory event. The extent to which the situation of individuals in – this case, children of immigrant origin – is characterised by precariousness depends on the extent to which they suffer from inadequate (access to) economic, health, educational, cultural and societal resources, including social participation.

Common elements in these definitions are the extent of having access to various relevant resources and the participation in various relevant processes and activities. In this context, Pilgram et al. (2001) point out that social exclusion can be described also as the deprivation of aspects of full social participation in different fields and with different consequences for other fields.

Access and participation can be perceived as key elements in the process of social exclusion/inclusion. The extent to which different societal groups have access to the relevant economic, socio-cultural and educational resources and structures as well as decision-making processes will influence their (possibilities for) participation and with

that their inclusion/exclusion. However, full (social) participation also requires mutual trust. Where such trust is lacking, social bonding is being disrupted. It can be assumed that it is the lack of equitable access to economic, socio-cultural and educational resources that undermines this bonding and trust.

The question is whether there is a difference between social inclusion and social integration. Most authors agree that inclusion and exclusion are opposite sides of the same coin. However, with regard to social integration, positions appear to differ. Whereas Pilgram et al. (2001) argue that social exclusion and social inclusion are related to each other through social integration. Mosley et al. (1999) appear to take the position that inclusion/integration can be treated as the same, indicating that social exclusion and social integration are each other's counterparts.

In addition to this there are of course the concepts of social participation and social cohesion. Even though, these various concepts cannot be used as synonyms, the question is whether a focus on the demarcation between the different concepts will not result in a rather unfruitful nomological discussion. Social exclusion as a state and a process is problematic both at societal and individual levels. At the societal level, social cohesion and integration (of those already excluded or threatened with exclusion) are important given the societal costs of exclusion, such as the probability of higher crime rates, lack of skilled workers, reduced productivity, higher expenses for income compensation/ support, etc.

In addition, social exclusion can also result in exclusion from full participation in social and political life, which in turn may undermine the trust in the basic institutions of our democratic societies. Likewise, social exclusion takes its toll at the individual level, where excluded individuals may suffer from loss of work, loss of income (or less income), under-utilisation of educational potential and most important, a lack or loss of hope. It is important to note that the societal and the individual perspectives on exclusion/inclusion do not necessarily coincide. In that sense, the concepts of exclusion and inclusion do have a certain normative connotation. From a societal perspective, a certain situation or process can be considered as problematic since it might result in social exclusion or exclusionary processes. From an individual's perspective the same situation or process might be evaluated differently.

In their report on the project 'Social exclusion as a Multi-dimensional



Process; Pilgram et al. (2001) also point at the necessary distinction between the societal and the individual level, albeit from a different perspective. Based on their extensive interviews in disadvantaged urban areas, which focused on episodes of social exclusion that the respondents experienced throughout their life, they make a distinction between 'normalised social exclusion' and 'indignation' as two individual reactions towards such episodes of social exclusion. Where 'normalisation' (or rather widespread neutralisation) is the reaction, people appear to take the exclusion that is experienced for granted, perceiving it as more or less normal or at least less burdening than other problems they are confronted with.

In contrast, indignation indicates that people experiencing episodes of social exclusion do have a feeling of injustice or unfairness. They feel that they are entitled to something in terms of access to resources and participation, which however, is not acknowledged at the societal level. At the same time, it can be the societal level that causes social exclusion or at least produce difficulties for coping with forms of social exclusion. Concerning the former, this can range from social norms that define particular status groups as being inferior or legal norms that define that status of particular groups as being excluded (e.g. foreigners, illegal immigrants, criminals) to the actual functioning of the welfare system (e.g. hindering access to multiple coping resources and strategies; labour-based insurance systems) or outright discrimination by state regulations.

### **Processes of becoming socially excluded**

Social Exclusion Unit in the UK (SEU, 2001) argues that social exclusion is something that, in principle can happen to anyone, though particular groups are significantly more at risk than others. As key risk factors they mention low income, family conflict, being in care, school problems, being an ex-prisoner, being from an ethnic minority, living in a deprived neighbourhood in urban and rural areas, mental health problems, age and disability.

Walraven (2000) indicates that there are both 'old' and 'new' risks for becoming excluded. Among the 'old(er)' risks are mobility, cultural and lifestyle diversification and the weakening of institutions and in-group solidarity (Green, Wolf & Leney, 1999). The 'new' risks entail, according to Green et al. (1999), the increasing emphasis on a materialistic culture

and priority of individual, private consumption before collective goods and responsibilities. Walraven (2000) adds to this that the initial education and the metacognitive skills needed for a self-steered process of life-long learning that meet the rapidly changing society and the ever-increasing demands from the knowledge society, are crucial for the extent to which people remain included or become excluded. With this, initial education and metacognitive skills have become a key risk factor in what is called the ‘modern risk society’ (Beck, 1992, 1999).

### **Exclusion/inclusion during lifetime**

An issue that various authors address in the context of becoming excluded (Cullen et al, 1999; De Haan, 1997; Pilgram et al., 2001) concerns the question whether social exclusion should be defined as a process or as a state. From the perspective of analysing the causes of social exclusion and its policy implications, a more dynamic conceptualisation of social exclusion in terms of processes seems to be favourable. However, such processes result in a certain ‘state’ at a certain point in time that will be characterised by more or less non-participation, deprivation, marginalisation and poverty as the (temporarily) static outcomes of social exclusion processes. In that sense becoming socially excluded is a process with various transition points. There are different typologies for distinguishing between stages and transition points in the processes of social exclusion:

- ◆ fragility, where the connection with working life is becoming insecure or broken off;
- ◆ worsening material situation, where individuals become dependent on economic support;
- ◆ complete break-down of social ties.

The dimension underpinning this typology is the ‘extent of precariousness’ people are faced with. In other words, the more precarious the situation becomes in terms of access to and participation in different social processes and social structures, the more their inclusion is threatened. Another approach to distinguish between stages and transition points in processes of social exclusion is one in which the emphasis is on the identification of situations or ‘critical’ transitions during an individual’s life course, which might establish a discontinuity or at least a potential for discontinuity in that life course. Mosley et al. (1999) distinguish five

such (critical) transitions in relation to (transitional) labour markets:

- ◆ transition from school to work;
- ◆ transition from part-time to full-time work;
- ◆ transition between family work and the labour market;
- ◆ transition between employment and unemployment;
- ◆ transition to retirement.

As mentioned, these transition points have been defined in particular in relation to the labour market. It can be argued easily that there are more transitions during an individual's life course, e.g. within the initial or continuing education career that are equally important. With regard to the initial education career, for instance, transitions from primary education to lower secondary education or from compulsory education to upper secondary education can be considered equally as 'critical' transition points. Not in the least since these transitions often form the points where young people decide to leave the education system. Once (young) people have entered the labour market, varying transition patterns can occur. With a certain decrease in lifetime employment with one employer and the increasing importance of retaining one's employability, the simple transitions between employment and unemployment and between employment and retirement have become more and more complex, as depicted below:

- school - job search - stable employment
- school - job search - part-time, temporary job - unemployed - employment training - stable employment
- school - job search - temporary job - unemployed - employment training - job search - withdrawal from the labour market
- work - work (either after loss of job or voluntarily)
- work - unemployed - employment training - work (either temporary work or stable employment)...etc.

These are only some examples that can be extended with all possible patterns, like returning to full-time education either directly from work or after a situation of unemployment in order to obtain a higher qualification (Ledema et al.1997; Hannan and Werquin, 1999). The

extent to which these transitions will become critical and in turn establish discontinuities in an individual's career, will depend on the nature – if not the quality – of these transitions. The transition from school to work, for example, can be a smooth transition if stable employment is relatively easily obtained after graduation. However, depending on the labour market conditions, this transition can become a discontinuity if gainful employment is not easily obtained and a job is found, only after a long period of job search and unemployment.

Pilgram et al. (2001), in their report on the project 'Social exclusion as a multi-dimensional process', also underline the fact that social exclusion can occur at different moments in life, caused by different and multiple factors. Individuals and their predicaments do not stay stable over a long time and most particularly in precarious positions. In their opinion, (socio-economic) policies have focused too long on social exclusion from a rather static point of view, splitting society into the two-thirds that are 'in' and the one-third that is outside and perceiving this constellation as a stable one (from a qualitative perspective). The consequence of this perspective is that the one-third that is outside is stigmatised as being the permanent losers of society.

According to Pilgram et al. (2001), this perspective does not hold for two different reasons. On the one hand, the results of their study show that there is little or no evidence for the so-called 'poverty trap' and that even if downward cycles of poverty and long-term situations of poverty can be found (in particular if housing problems are involved as well), the label of permanent losers being permanently excluded does not do justice to reality. Such a vicious downward cycle appears to be the extreme, but not the average. Moreover, perceiving social exclusion as a dynamic process shifts the focus from the inevitable to episodes of social exclusion as temporary, in which people can operate actively trying to get access to those resources that can help them overcome the experienced exclusion. On the other hand, this static perspective is based on an assumption with regard to what it means to be included that is no longer valid. Present welfare states still seem to be based on the logic of security and insurance, with insurance made conditional on participation in the labour market in standard wage labour. Given that standard wage labour is partly replaced by non-standardised types of jobs, this logic is no longer useful and actually represents the growing discrepancy between the *education, equality and social exclusion*:

*final synthesis report* traditional welfare state and the reality of today's labour market.

The increasing diversity in participation in the labour market and participation in society in general, indicates that a dynamic reconceptualisation of the welfare state is needed taking into account that a) there are qualitatively different perceptions with regard to satisfactory participation in the labour market and in society and b) such participation differs with stages in life and work capacities of individuals. In the perception of Pilgram et al. (2001) this calls for a state that no longer provides security and insurance, but for a state that provides the resources that address the diversity in the demands of those experiencing episodes of exclusion at different stages in life. This has to be borne in mind in exploring the processes of social exclusion and the factors contributing to or preventing social exclusion.

### **Conclusion**

It could be concluded from the above discussion that the concepts 'education', 'equality' and 'social exclusion' are interdependent. Education is defined in a broad sense, encompassing all publicly and privately provided education and training, ranging from pre-school learning to continuing training in the context of the labour market, with the latter also encompassing human resource development activities (e.g. informal learning).

Equality is defined in terms of having equal opportunities with regard to the chances on participation in education. Such chances can be judged from the meritocratic perspective (equal educational rights in case of equal capacities), the 'equal opportunities' perspective (equal educational investment in each pupil) and the egalitarian perspective (more investment in less talented students in order to reach equal achievement). Concerning social exclusion, this will be interpreted both in terms of a (dynamic) process and a 'state', with the latter referring to a state of denial of participation in important societal, cultural and economic spheres, due to a lack of resources to enable such participation.

In the context of the theme 'education, equality and social exclusion' this means a denial to participate in any kind of learning activities, which may be caused by a lack of financial means or by institutional, situational, psycho-social or personal (e.g. health) factors or by a lack

of means and resources to obtain the information needed. Social exclusion is also interpreted as a (dynamic) process, since exclusion can occur at different stages in life in relation to various types of critical transitions and since being excluded is not necessarily a final position, but one which can be altered, depending on the depth of deprivation and on the resources provided to individuals.

Social exclusion is problematic both at societal and individual levels; at the individual level, since it denies individuals to participate in societal spheres in the way they would prefer. At societal level, it bears costs (social/unemployment benefits, waste of human resources, health problems, crime rates, etc.) the society has to pay for. Nevertheless, there can be a discrepancy between what is perceived and/or experienced as social exclusion at an individual and societal level. Various factors can contribute to becoming excluded – economic – technological factors, socio-demographic factors, institutional factors, political factors and cultural factors.

Education as such can contribute to processes of social exclusion (or social inclusion). The explanations for this phenomenon differ depending on the particular disciplinary perspective used for analysing this relationship (e.g.: institutional economics, educational sociology, linguistics) as well as (implicit) political views. The investigation of the relation between education on the one hand, and equality/equity and social exclusion on the other hand has been restricted for a long time to initial (compulsory) education. However, given the increasing importance of life-long learning, the growing awareness that learning takes place throughout life and the understanding that social exclusion can occur at different points during the life cycle, an analysis of the theme ‘education, equality and social exclusion’ needs to go beyond compulsory schooling.

#### REFERENCES

- Beck, U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- . 1999. *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- CHIPS (2000) *Child Immigration Project: Final report*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Cullen, J. et al. 1998. *Looking at Innovation in Education and Training. Framework, Results and policy implications of the*

*DELILAh Project*. Brussels: European Commission, TSER.

- de Haan, Arjun. 2005. "Social Policy: Towards Inclusive Institutions", University of Guelph and Department for International Development, UK. Paper at the World Bank Conference 'New Frontiers of Social Policy: Development in a Globalizing World': December 12-15, 2005.
- EC 1999. *Continuing Training in Enterprises: Facts and Figures*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Green, A., Wolf, A. and Leney, T. 1999. *Convergence and Divergence in European Education and Training Systems*. University of London: Bedford Way Papers.
- Hannan, D.F. and Werquin, P. 1999. 'Education and Labour Market Change: The Dynamics of Education to Work Transitions in Europe'. Report for the European Commission on behalf of the European Socio-Economic Research Conference, 28-30 April 1999, Brussels.
- Meijnen, G.W. 1999. 'De meritocratische samenleving: nakende werkelijkheid? In: P. van der Kley & P. Slegers (red.) *Onderwijs en de verdeling van maatschappelijke kansen. Een multidisciplinaire, kritische beschouwing*. Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant, pp. 81-97.
- Mosley, H., O' Reilly, J., Schmid, G. and Schömann, K. 1999. 'Social Integration through transitional Labour Markets'. In Schmid, G. (ed.), *Social Integration Through Transitional Labour Markets: New pathways for labour market policy. Final report of the TRANSLAM project*. Brussels: European Commission, Targeted Socio-Economic Research.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2001c. *Education Policy Analysis*. Paris: OECD.
- Pilgram, A., et al. 2001. *Social Exclusion as a Multi-dimensional Process: Sub-cultural and Formally Assisted Strategies of Coping with and Avoiding Social Exclusion*. Brussels: European Commission.
- SEU 2001. *Preventing Social Exclusion. Report by the Social Exclusion Unit*. London: Cabinet Office.

- Walraven, G., G.Parsons, D.Veen and Ch. Van and Day (eds.) 2002. *Combating social exclusion through education. Laissez-faire, Authoritarianism or Third Way*, Leuven: Apeldoorn: Garant, pp.29-50.
- Werf, G.P.C van, H.P. Brandsma, L.M.C.M. Cremers Van Wees and M.J. Lubbers, M.J. 1999. *Quality and Opportunities in Secondary Education: Implementation and Effects of the Core Curriculum*, Dordrecht/ Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 113-135.