

Resistance to school inclusion in Chile

¹Dr. Juan Cornejo Espejo

¹Professor of History and Bachelor of Social Sciences. Doctor of American Studies and Doctor of Political Science. Academic at Department of Education – Faculty of Education and Humanities of the Universidad del Bío – Bío (Chile). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3579530>. Email: jcornejo@ubiobio.cl

Abstract

Through a critical reflection, the article addresses the main obstacles and resistance faced by educational inclusion in Chile in the context of the implementation of Law 20,845/2015 on school inclusion. For a better understanding, the text is organized into five sections based on an introduction that contextualizes the study problem within the framework of national and international discussions on the subject. A first section focused on the current legal regulations that regulate school integration programs (SIP), trying to reveal some limitations and restrictions of that same regulation. A second section deals with the most frequent structural obstacles (insufficient or inadequate infrastructure, lack of equipment and lack of preparation of teachers to work with diversity). The third section addresses the ideological obstacles that compromise the future of educational inclusion in the country, derived from the medical model or certain cultural and religious biases. Finally, in the final reflections, some of the main findings of the study are outlined, among which the following stand out: the limitations implied by the predominance of the medical model, the different degrees of progress in the processes of school integration and the lack of a law actually inclusive.

Keywords: Inclusion, Integration, Schools, Obstacles, Challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Considering that educational inclusion in Chile has become a challenge and a pending task, it is worth asking what are the obstacles that limit a more effective and widespread application, at all levels and areas of the national educational system, of an education that is effectively inclusive? For now, we must point out that there has been undeniable progress when compared to what happened during the first half of the 20th century, when there was neither the conviction, nor even less the political will to invest in the education of children, adolescents and young people. that it was believed that they could contribute little to national development and that they constituted rather a burden or a source of shame. Currently, despite greater awareness, the challenges seem

to have multiplied, given that it is no longer just a matter of moving from integration to inclusion in the school setting, but rather the spectrum of people and groups likely to be included in the different formal educational systems has increased, with the consequent increase in requirements and demands, both human and economic.

In this process, which is in itself more complex, due to the high social expectations that it arouses in societies that aspire to greater degrees of participation or to the end (or at least reduction) of the different forms of exclusion, the positive effects cannot be ignored product of the sociocultural changes operated at the international level in favor of the inclusion, recognition and defense of the human rights of traditionally discriminated and excluded

groups. Changes that have directly or indirectly affected the transformations experienced at the national level in recent decades, which have been embodied in a series of laws and regulations that seek to guarantee recognition, access and discourage the different forms of exclusion (some very subtle) present in Chilean society and consequently in school.

In this sense, the international agreements and treaties that have been signed by the national authorities are of great value to sometimes promote and, in others, practically force the necessary transformations. With this, the premise that assigns a pedagogical value to the law is fulfilled, since at the same time that it helps to shape mentalities, it converts the committed reforms into unavoidable actions by virtue of the agreements and commitments acquired. Of course, many of these actions have not been without controversy or their ratification in the National Congress has been strongly resisted.

Beyond these resistances, in this article we intend to focus on those that are identified in the school itself that point to logistical difficulties, infrastructure, training of the different educational agents, etc. that we could describe as logistical or structural, such as those that come from the lack of conviction of some school communities about the need to move towards more inclusive schools, which we could describe as ideological or theoretical, because they continue to be attached to conventional paradigms that represent the school as the space where only those who have certain abilities in cognitive or physical terms should come together, or seek to limit access following restrictive criteria of origin, social extraction, behavior or orientation, typical of classist societies, xenophobic, racist, patriarchal, sexist, heteronormative or binary.

In this same group could be placed both those who continue to opt for segregated schools and those communities that appear open and inclusive in discourse (a discourse that we could describe as "politically correct"), but that in practice are far from being authentically inclusive communities and whose efforts could be described as "perverse inclusion" (Sawaia,

2002), resorting to psychoanalytic terminology, or "negative tolerance" (Ríos, 2001) or simply "tolerance" of the exceptional, the strange or the aberrant (Ledesma, 2017), but that in no case can they claim equal treatment or conditions similar to that of the rest of the student body.

However, the resistance to an effectively inclusive education does not come only from these two sources: structural and ideological, but also from the deficiencies or limitations of the sanctioned law. In the Chilean case, as we will see later, the resistance does not come exclusively from the first two sources, but also from laws and regulations that still preserve medicalizing and pathologizing biases, typical of past stages or supposedly already overcome special education, or of legal loopholes or very limited scope of the standard itself.

This being the epistemic framework of the article, we must emphasize that its purpose is to critically reflect on the real possibilities of inclusive education in Chile, taking into account the current legal framework, the limitation of resources, the emergence of new groups that demand to be included. in formal school systems, which go beyond that classic notion that tended to identify integration and inclusion with attention to special educational needs (SEN) and, by the way, the resistance that comes from ethical-cultural patterns of which teachers do not it is alien.

From the point of view of the structure of the article, it is organized into 3 sections. The first focuses on the current legal regulations that regulate school integration programs (SIP), trying to reveal some limitations and restrictions of that same norm that condition the transition from integration to inclusion. The second section deals with some of the most frequent logistical or structural obstacles such as, for example, insufficient or inadequate infrastructure, lack of equipment or teacher training to work with diversity. The third section problematizes the ideological obstacles that compromise or mortgage the future of educational inclusion in the country. Finally, in the final reflections, some possible solutions

are outlined in the face of the denounced resistance.

Legal framework for educational inclusion in Chile: Critical knots, limitations and possibilities

In the national context, the greatest advances in terms of educational inclusion are verified in the field of special education. Advances that have been expressed in a multiplicity of laws, decrees and regulations that try to regulate its operation, but also the prerogatives that it enjoys in the formal educational system. Not to mention that, given the scarcity or rightly absence of specific regulations towards other groups subject to inclusion in the school environment, they operate as a frame of reference.

The following list shows the most important regulations promulgated in the last three decades that, in some way, have outlined the educational task in terms of inclusion:

- Decree 490/1990. It establishes norms to integrate handicapped students in common establishments.
- Law 19.284/1994. It establishes norms for the full social integration of people with disabilities.
- Exempt Decree No. 1,300/2002. Approves study plans and programs for students with specific language disorders.
- Law 20,201/2007. Modifies DFL No. 2, of 1998, on education, on subsidies to educational establishments.
- Decree 170/2009. It establishes norms to determine the students with special educational needs that will be beneficiaries of the grants for special education .
- Decree 201/2008. Promulgates the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol.
- Art. 34 of DFL No. 2/2009. Mandates the Ministry of Education to establish criteria and guidelines to diagnose students with special educational needs, as well as criteria

and guidelines for curricular adaptation that allow educational establishments to plan pertinent and quality educational proposals for these students, whether they study in special schools or in regular education establishments under the modality of special education in integration programs.

- Law 20.422/2010, Establishes rules on equal opportunities and social inclusion of people with disabilities. Art. No. 3. Establishes Universal Learning Design (ULD).
- Decree No. 178/2014. Regulates payment of the special differential subsidy and special educational needs of a transitory nature to students integrated in secondary education courses.
- Decree No. 83/2015. Approves criteria and guidelines for curricular adaptation for students with special educational needs in Early Childhood Education and Basic Education.
- Law 20,845/2015. Of school inclusion that regulates the admission of students, eliminates shared financing and prohibits profit in educational establishments that receive contributions from the State.

When examining the Chilean educational system and the legislation on the subject itself, it can be seen that both are deeply influenced by the medical model of disability, in which students with SEN are placed. A model that, furthermore, is at the base of numerous discriminatory practices, policies and theoretical conceptions, since, as Infante and Matus (2009) maintain, such medical discursive construction of difference is strongly rooted in the community and leads to practices of exclusion.

At the legal level, an example of the medicalizing bias is Decree 170/2009, which establishes clearly defined criteria to determine a student's SEN and, consequently, the financial subsidies required. That is, through a diagnostic evaluation carried out by "competent professionals" a series of disabilities are verified, which are validated through a medical certificate that identifies not only the disability, but also enables the student to receive a special

subsidy and as a corollary of this, specific educational support (Tenorio, 2005; Infante and Matus, 2009). In other words, to become effective, support requires updating a series of medical records that, in general, end up delaying the delivery of those same benefits. Something analogous occurs with the process of admission and continuity of students in the SIP, who require the same medical certifications.

That is to say, the medicalizing bias and the financing model underlying the current regulations end up becoming obstacles, sometimes insurmountable, not only because of the excessive bureaucratic demands that the implementation of any integration program demands, but mainly because of the prevalence of the model bio-medical over other models, and the pre-eminence and centrality of economic-financial criteria over the principles and requirements of educational inclusion.

Hence, it is not surprising that in the discussions around inclusion these considerations have prevailed over the scope, meanings or understandings of it. This characteristic, the truth, has been repeating itself for the last 4 decades, from the moment in which the military dictatorship privatized the educational system, not being exclusive to special education, but rather it has been a distinctive feature of the entire national educational system, at all its levels and modalities, where the discussions around accessibility, coverage, duration and even quality have been subordinated to the economic-financial discussion; because, although in Chile education is recognized as a right of every person, especially of those who are of school age, that right is mediated by economics.

A clear example of the above is Law 20,845/2015 on School Inclusion, which despite its name focuses its attention not on the demands, problems or challenges posed by an inclusive education that reaches all levels of education and considers the multiplicity of groups that, historically, have been excluded from formal school systems and not only students with SEN (indigenous, ethnic

minorities, migrants, sexual and gender dissidents, among others), in order to promote the transit of focused experiences of integration to an extended inclusive education that reaches everyone, beyond their individual or collective particularities (Cornejo, 2019).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, it cannot be ignored that the aforementioned law represented progress, not so much in terms of policies, cultures or inclusive practices (Booth, Ainscow, Black-Hawkins, Vaughan & Shaw, 2000; Dos Santos; Paulino, 2014). , but rather in the attempt to reverse the inequity and consequent segregation that comes from the financing model of Chilean education, which makes it one of the most unequal systems in the world, and which forces municipal and private subsidized schools to compete for the resources provided by the State, which are distributed based on the number of students enrolled and their attendance at classes (García, Romero, Ramos, 2015). This leads to a competitive dynamic, in which institutions compete for resources and families for quotas depending on their ability to pay.

The situation described above becomes more complex in the case of students with SEN, since, if they attend private schools, they must pay for educational support. Meanwhile, in municipal or subsidized schools, said supports depend on the resources available in the establishment. Thus, in private schools, the offer for children with SEN is limited by family resources (Vásquez, 2015), and in municipal and subsidized schools by the management capacity of their directors.

Hence, in this type of school, in an attempt to increase resources, it is customary to resort to over-diagnosis of students with SEN in order to receive more resources (García; Romero and Ramos, 2015). Situation that affects the inclusion of these students is done in an "isolated and mainly with a compensatory purpose" (Vásquez, 2015, p. 56) seeking to balance equal opportunities and rights. Furthermore, students with permanent educational needs are included in a special education system, but outside the regular education system (Vásquez, 2015).

In other words, inequity becomes more noticeable in the case of students with SEN, who have more limited options to find a school to study and receive support, and are at risk of being victims of flawed procedures such as the manipulation of diagnoses (Iturra, 2019).

Another fairly common practice in many subsidized establishments was to restrict the admission of students with SEN through the application of standardized tests, the purpose of which was to select the best students. Thus, they continued to receive contributions from the State, but discarding the so-called "problem" students, who were more onerous; which tended to be concentrated in non-selective municipalized schools and high schools. This practice seems to be repeated not only with students with SEN, but also with students with disciplinary problems and those who are uncomfortable for the formal systems by virtue of their origin, ethnic origin or sexual orientation and gender identity.

In some way, the promulgation of Law 20,845/2015 on School Inclusion came to correct some of the distortions described above, since it sought to: 1) Gradually transform subsidized education into free, so that all families have the possibility of choosing schools freely, without depending on their economic capacity; 2) Eliminate profit in establishments that receive contributions from the State, which means that all resources must be invested in improving education; and 3) End arbitrary selection, which will allow parents to choose the school and the educational project that they like the most for their children (MINEDUC, 2017a).

However, it cannot be ignored that practically the entire text of the law deals with the prohibitions that schools that receive contributions from the State have to select students or the strenuous efforts to limit the profits of those who administer subsidized schools. Moreover, it is striking that these restrictions are limited to schools that receive economic contributions from the State but do not affect private schools, which can continue to apply selection tests or limit access to those students who do not fit their educational

models derived from ideological or religious visions that not only perpetuate the segregation of the Chilean educational system, but also seem authorized to exclude and, consequently, discriminate against certain students by virtue of those same ideological visions.

A good example of this were the attempts to expel transsexual students by some private establishments in Santiago or the prohibitions of homosexuality contained in some school coexistence regulations. In the first case, the Superintendency of Education had to intervene through Circular 0768/2017, which reiterated the right to education of trans students and the obligation of all establishments to respect the social name, the uniform and bathroom use according to self-perceived gender identity. In the case of school coexistence regulations, the Ministry of Education had to instruct establishments to eliminate any homophobic and discriminatory bias from their regulations (MINEDUC, 2017b).

In this fight for recognition, dignity and respect for the fundamental rights of every person, a key role has been fulfilled by Law 20,609/2012 Anti-Discrimination, which, although limited in scope and lacking effective sanctions (Constesse and Lovera, 2012; Vial, 2018) has had a dissuasive effect on the establishments that insist on their moralizing crusades, added to the fear aroused by the media impact that some arbitrary and clearly discriminatory measures may have on public opinion.

And even when these types of situations seem to be on the decline under current legal provisions, discrimination has not completely disappeared, going from overt or open forms to veiled forms of discrimination, expressed in symbolic violence, indifference, invisibility or silencing, as is often the case, for example, with sexual and gender dissidents who, normally, tend to be ignored in public establishments or silenced in private establishments, (especially confessional). Confirming with this that it is simply about tolerance of the abject (Ledesma, 2017), negative tolerance (Rios, 2001) or "perverse inclusion" (Sawaia, 2002), but in no case inclusion.

In short, it can be said then that Law 20,845/2015 on School Inclusion, although it represented progress in attempting to clarify the segregation derived from the unequal access and distribution of economic-financial resources and, consequently, from the aid derived from these resources, but it contributed little to reflection on the challenges that inclusion imposes and even less to putting it into practice.

Structural obstacles that hinder educational inclusion in Chile

In addition to the legal limitations that hinder the integration processes in Chile, there are others of a logistical or structural nature, such as, for example, the lack of resources or equipment in schools to provide quality support, in addition to the lack of training of teachers. to cater to the diversity of the student body. And although the lack of resources and the consequent lack of equipment and provision of specialized professionals has been remedied in part by injecting more resources through Law 20,201/2007, which establishes subsidies for schools, and Decree 170/2009, which establishes criteria to determine the SEN of the students who will be beneficiaries of the contributions for special education, plus Law 20,845/2015 of School Inclusion that tried to regulate the distribution of State resources and guarantee access to all students of school age, some problems that end up making integration programs less effective cannot be avoided.

For now, the lack of clarity in the objectives of these programs or the definition of strategies and phases to be fulfilled are some of the most pressing problems. This is largely motivated by the distortion caused by the over-diagnosis that we referred to in the previous section, whose purpose is basically to obtain more resources for schools, but not always with clear plans or goals to be achieved.

No less problematic, as the teachers of the different schools with SIP denounce, is the lack of coordination between the professionals hired to care for and assist students with SEN and accompany the implementation of said programs. In other words, although the

contribution is recognized and the hiring of professionals who support the educational work (psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, occupational therapists, etc.) is valued, their contribution is limited by the lack of common articulated projects derived from the lack of coordination Situation that derives, for example, in reports on the same student that are more like a “patchwork quilt” than harmonious and well-arranged documents. This is largely explained by the lack of shared spaces and times, a consequence of partial or deferred shifts of these professionals, which ends up conditioning the possibilities of exchanging ideas or even debating.

In this same sphere, we cannot fail to mention the restrictions that spaces that are not adapted represent, for example, to serve students with different physical abilities. In this sense, it is common to find buildings that do not have appropriate accesses and services, or if there are, it is common that they were not intended for users, resulting in inadequate or uncomfortable, because they were basically made to meet legal requirements. However, this shortcoming is not exclusive to schools, but even affects higher education institutions that, for the most part, do not have sufficiently adapted services or lack specialized materials (study texts, computer programs, etc.) to the attention of blind, deaf students, etc.

In this context, it is not surprising then that many of the protocols and institutional regulations for the attention of these students are only nominal, not going beyond declarations of good intentions. Not to mention that many of these documents are not the result of discernment processes and collective constructions of the respective educational communities, but only copies or reissues of documents from other institutions. Notwithstanding the foregoing, one of the aspects that most limits the development of SIP in regular schools, and which is reiterative in the reports of teachers, as stated in numerous studies (Iturra, 2019, Ojeda, 2019), is their lack of preparation to work with diversity. In this sense, it is common to hear professors who state that “they were not prepared” by their universities to serve students with SEN.

However, this argument is repeated in the case of migrants (Ojeda, 2019), indigenous people or sexual and gender dissidents (Cornejo, 2019).

Without intending to relieve the training houses of responsibility for these gaps, we cannot ignore that these words denote certain degrees of comfort and lack of commitment to a truly inclusive education, since there is no higher education institution in the world that manages to satisfy all training requirements demanded by the contemporary school that in the Chilean case today translate, in addition to inclusion, into: citizen training, human rights, gender, first aid, sex education, care and preservation of the environment among several other topics. In other words, inclusion, like many other topics, should be addressed as cross-cutting objectives by all education professionals, beyond the specific responsibilities that fall to certain professionals specialized in the area, in order to encourage commitment to the necessary transformations and the will to change because, to advance, as Vázquez (2015) maintains, a paradigmatic transformation must occur, in which inclusion is adopted as a social value and diversity is established as the starting point of each educational policy in order to achieve quality and equity.

In other words, the triad: policies, cultures and practices do not operate separately or are insufficient if considered in isolation. In order for there to be inclusion, the concurrence of all three is required, which, although in different spheres and fields, complement and strengthen each other.

From the training point of view, it is necessary to develop an inclusive perspective from initial training to professional teaching, in order to encourage a deep understanding of the meaning of inclusion among teachers, as well as giving them strategies to be flexible, creative and willing to work with any child or young person, favoring diagnostic evaluation of an educational nature, over medical diagnosis (Infante and Matus, 2009). The foregoing is based on what studies show that indicate that in order to meet the needs of all students and

teachers, quality training opportunities must be available (Male, 2011).

The truth seems to be, as the available evidence shows, that the road to an effectively inclusive education is not without problems, dilemmas and aporias. Therefore, educational inclusion must be understood as a process of restructuring educational systems, whose foundations are respect for human rights and the principles of diversity, where learning environments and teachers themselves are prepared to equitably satisfy the educational needs of all children and young people (Iturra, 2019). It should also not be forgotten that educational inclusion can never be considered as a finished process, but as a process that can always be improved or perfected.

Ideological obstacles that hinder educational inclusion in Chile

Among the limitations of an ideological order appear, in the first place, the conceptual confusions. If we are guided by the testimonies of teachers and the ideas that frequently circulate in the social media, it is verified that one of the most important obstacles for educational inclusion in Chile is the association between inclusion and SEN. And although this idea is not exclusive to the Chilean educational system, it is the one that is repeated the most. There are numerous national studies that show the difficulty teachers have in thinking about inclusion beyond SEN (Ojeda, 2019). This is probably due to the fact that historically allusive research on the subject has focused mainly on students with SEN (Artiles & Kozleski, 2014), neglecting not only other groups but also the intersections that come from the different identities of those same students (social class, language, gender, ethnic origin, nationality, etc.). Situation that has even affected the attention of talented students, which is another form of SEN.

One characteristic that does not seem to help broaden or diversify the understanding of educational inclusion is that most of the research, especially those focused on schools, have tended not to document their findings or the scope of the proposed measures (Artiles and

Kozleski, 2014). Hence, the studies around the different excluded populations present in the school or the experiences of inclusion of these same populations are relatively recent in the country, because, although there are innumerable stories of inclusion efforts that take place in the school daily life, most of them are not systematized and even less transformed into learning experiences for a growing number of teachers who demand training.

A second aspect closely linked to or derived from this conceptual confusion is the influence of the bio-medical model which, as we saw in the section on legislation, not only permeates the spirit of the law, but in school practice conditions the processes of admission and continuity of students in the SIP, as well as the support strategies developed in schools, thereby evidencing the prevalence of the model in policies and practices (Tenorio, 2005; Infante and Matus, 2009), but also in the ideas and perceptions that not only have the different educational agents, but also the population in general. An example of this is the recognition made by professors who point out that the medicalizing bias permanently emerges in their speeches, which in the long run ends up, as they themselves affirm, becoming a barrier, but which they justify because the SIP's regulatory policies are full of that language, which is why they feel compelled to communicate in those terms (Muñoz, López and Assael, 2015).

On the other hand, the use of medical terminology makes teachers perceive their own knowledge as insufficient to respond to their students with SEN (Tenorio, 2005); question that once again raises the issue of teacher preparation, since, from a bio-medical paradigm, they will always appear as lacking or insufficiently prepared. Perception that is reinforced by the fears that inclusion arouses, given the material conditions in which teachers must perform, derived largely from the lack of resources of time, space and materials to design and evaluate their own practices. No less worrying is the high number of students they must attend per course (45 on average), which is seen as a limitation to satisfy student requirements (Muñoz, López and Assael, 2015).

In other words, one of the great ideological obstacles that hinders inclusion in Chile is that practically everything related to it: policies, practices and cultures revolves around or derives from the bio-medical paradigm, a situation that ends up distancing teachers that, in general, they feel it as a strange reality, alien to their professional practice, or something of a "specialist" in the medical area. Hence, the difficulties they show when thinking about inclusion beyond medical prescriptions are not surprising, as usually happens, for example, with the intercultural challenges that the inclusion of indigenous people, migrants or ethnic minorities supposes for the school, or even more so the demands for recognition of sexual and gender dissidents who have historically been made invisible and silenced. Thus, the bio-medical paradigm not only ends up reducing the conceptual understanding of inclusion, by circumscribing it to a description of a pathological order, but also hinders its opening up to other realities and groups.

Despite the foregoing, it is possible to advance towards a social understanding of inclusive education, in accordance with the visions underlying international agreements, which in practice would mean, among other things, repealing Decree 170, which establishes disabilities and the need for medical diagnosis to receive educational support through the grant system; Therefore, by adopting a broader concept of SEN, it would not necessarily be related to disability or a transitory condition of development or learning, but also to general, mental, emotional, behavioral health conditions, among others (Iturra, 2019). . That is to say, from a social perspective of education, schools would not be forced to depend on the number of diagnosed students, but on the general enrollment, thus avoiding over-diagnosis, with which all students who had an SEN at one time of their lives will receive the necessary educational support, without the need to be labeled.

However, the most important barriers to inclusion at the ideological level are certain social representations of certain groups, which are resisted not because of material conditions or the feeling of not having the tools to deal

with them as it happens, as we saw, with students with SEN or with different physical abilities, but for behaviors, desires and affections that are "shocking" and, consequently, abject due to certain cultural patterns or religious beliefs. In these cases, inclusion becomes even more complex, because unlike other groups that at least enjoy the theoretical conviction that they should be included (even when practices contradict that), they do not even enjoy that privilege. In the Chilean case, a good example of this are the sexual and gender dissidents who, although "tolerated" in schools (Ledesma, 2017), given the legal restrictions that prevent their expulsion, are strongly resisted. In this regard, it should be remembered that the enactment of Law 20,609 / 2012 Anti-Discrimination took many years to be approved, basically because certain groups were opposed to including sexual and gender dissidents among those who could be discriminated against. This resistance has been transferred in the present decade to the school, proof of this are the incipient advances in terms of integration if compared to other groups. And this because although the aforementioned Anti-Discrimination Law, plus Law 20,845/2015 on school inclusion, protect and guarantee the access of these students to the school system, situations of discrimination or marginalization in the school space are not sanctioned by virtue of the limitations of Law 20,609 / 2012 itself, which does not contemplate effective penalties (Vial, 2018).

Final considerations

By way of closing, the first thing we have to point out in this tight attempt to summarize the obstacles to inclusion in the school environment in Chile is that it is related to the problems posed by diversity and not to that of disability (Molina, 2016) or pathology as it seems to be implicit in the predominant bio-medical model, which ends up not only reducing and impoverishing the conceptual understanding of it and distancing teachers who feel it as a foreign reality to their professional practice, but also it does not allow us to talk about it as a need that comes from the human

condition itself by preventing us from thinking about it from different perspectives, realities and communities.

That said, it should also be noted that the necessary transition from integration to inclusion in the country in the different groups does not show the same degree of progress. Clearly there are experiences of integration, beyond the objections and questions that can be made to these processes, already consolidated, especially those related to SEN. Others seem to be just taking their first steps, as is the case, for example, with students with different physical abilities, indigenous people or migrants. For others, on the other hand, that path has not even begun, since their presence at school responds more to coercive measures than to the desire to integrate them. However, none of these processes and groups can properly speak of inclusion. All the experiences developed up to now are inscribed in the different stages of integration.

Of course, not having a law (or a legal body) that effectively deals with inclusion does not help to accelerate this transit either, since what we have is, basically, a school subsidy law, but not a law that talks about it, indicates strategies or goals to be achieved (Constesse and Lovera, 2012; Basso, 2016). However, a law would be insufficient, even if it met these conditions, if it did not aspire to change the models that limit, restrict or hinder thinking about it beyond bio-medical categories, but, above all, if it did not aspire to break with the normative and normalizing paradigms that are at the base of discrimination and exclusion (Cornejo, 2019).

Reference

- [1] Ainscow, M. & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(4), 401- 416.
- [2] Basso, G. (2016). ¿Inclusión en Chile? ¡Basta de falsos discursos! Ciper Chile, Santiago.
<https://ciperchile.cl/2016/03/02/inclusion-en-chile-basta-de-falsos-discursos/>

- [3] Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M. & Shaw, L. (2000). *Índice de Inclusión. Desarrollando el aprendizaje y la participación en las escuelas*. Bristol: CSIE.
- [4] Artiles, A. y Kozleski, E. (2014). Educación inclusiva en el siglo XXI: notas para un programa de investigación histórico – cultural. En M. C. Cardona y E. Chiner (Ed.). *Investigación educativa en escenarios diversos, plurales y globales* (pp. 51-65). Alicante: AIDIPE – Universidad de Alicante.
- [5] Casanova, M. A. (2011). *Educación inclusiva: un modelo de futuro*. España: Wolters Kluwer.
- [6] Cornejo, J. (2019). Nuevos excluidos en el sistema educacional chileno: problemas y desafíos. *Revista Páginas de Educación*, 12(1), 28-48.
- [7] Constesse, J. y Lovera, D. (2012). Dudas sobre la efectividad de la nueva ley antidiscriminación. *Ciper Chile*, Santiago. <https://ciperchile.cl/2012/07/13/dudas-sobre-la-efectividad-de-la-nueva-ley-antidiscriminacion/>
- [8] Devalle De Rendo, A. y Vega, V. (2009). *Una escuela en y para la diversidad*. Buenos Aires: AIQUE Educación.
- [9] Dos Santos, M, P. y Paulino, M. M. (2014). *Inclusão em educação: culturas, políticas e práticas*. 2da. Ed. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- [10] García, I., Romero, S. y Ramos, L. (2015). Where do Mexico and Chile stand on inclusive education? *International Journal of Special Education*, 30(2), 145-156.
- [11] Infante, M. y Matus, C. (2009). Policies and practices of diversity: reimagining possibilities for new discourses. *Disability & Society*, 24(4), 437- 445.
- [12] Iturra, P. (2019). Dilemas de la inclusión educativa en el Chile actual. *Revista Educación Las Américas*, 8, 95-111.
- [13] Ledesma, I. (2017). La educación como espacio de resistencia. Una propuesta desde las Artes y la Educación Social asentada en la pedagogía queer (pedagoqueer). *A journal of queer studies*. 12, 40-52.
- [14] Male, D. (2011). The impact of a professional development programme on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. *Support for Learning*, 26(4), 182-186.
- [15] MINEDUC (2017a). *El primer gran debate de la reforma educacional: La Ley de Inclusión escolar*. Santiago: MINEDUC. <https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/handle/20.500.12365/441>
- [16] MINEDUC (2017b). *Orientación para la inclusión de las personas lesbianas, gays, bisexuales, trans e intersex en el sistema educativo chileno*. Santiago: MINEDUC / OREALC / UNESCO. <https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/handle/20.500.12365/439>
- [17] Molina, V. (2016). La inclusión tiene que ver con la problemática de la diversidad y no con la de la discapacidad. *DEC, Talca*. <https://enlinea.santotomas.cl/actualidad-ucionl/mundo-academico/la-inclusion-ver-la-problematika-la-diversidad-no-la-la-discapacidad/15240/>
- [18] Muñoz, M. L., López, M., Assaél, J. (2015). Concepciones docentes para responder a la diversidad: ¿Barreras o recursos para la inclusión educativa? *Psicoperspectivas*, 14(3), 68-79.
- [19] Ojeda, G. (2019). Problemas y desafíos para la inclusión de género de niñas y niños migrantes que asisten a escuelas básicas de distinta dependencia de la región del Maule. Tesis de doctorado educación. Universidad Católica del Maule, Talca – Chile.
- [20] Rios, R. R. (2001). *A homossexualidade no direito*. Porto Alegre: Livraria do Advogado.
- [21] Sawaia, B. (2002). *As artimanhas da exclusão – análise psicosocial e ética da desigualdade social*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- [22] Vásquez, D. (2015). Políticas de Inclusión educativa: Una comparación entre Chile y Colombia. *Educación y Educadores*, 18(1), 45 – 65.
- [23] Vial, T. (2018). *La Ley Antidiscriminación: ¿Llegó el tiempo de revisarla?* El Mostrador, Santiago. <https://www.elmostrador.cl/noticias/opinion/2018/07/23/la-ley-antidiscriminacion-llego-el-tiempo-de-revisarla/>