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This research is about the policy and practice of inclusion in Southampton. Although inclusion is a process of increasing the participation of all children in learning, the focus is on those who are experiencing difficulties in, and are at risk of being excluded from, learning. A mixture of quantitative and qualitative methodology is used to provide a rich picture of the LEA's context. The quantitative data illustrate the nature of the task if Southampton is to promote inclusion. The qualitative data provide the perspectives of key stakeholders who are either providers or recipients of education. Grounded theory methodology is used to identify themes and findings are tested against a theory based on Dyson's (1999) model of discourses on inclusion.

Southampton has taken steps to promote inclusion though there are variations in school practice. Nearly 99% of children are attending mainstream schools and there is evidence that they are consistently making progress in learning. However, increasing accountabilities and expectations based on pre-determined academic measures, risk making some of them more welcome and worthy than others. Some are at risk of being overlooked whilst others are excluded from the learning process. Whilst acknowledging successful practices in Southampton, the research identifies a number of key issues. These range from addressing inequalities and removing barriers and prejudices to providing the infrastructures, resources and training in schools so that all children are able to maximise their participation in learning. Key themes emerging from the research illustrate the growing influence of competition and market forces, the pressures in schools, the issue of human rights and the politics of practice. It is argued that LEAs have a role in changing attitudes and cultures in order to promote an acceptance of diversity and difference and the removal of perceived oppression and injustice. Inclusion will require such changes supported with insightful management.

Southampton LEA offers a mixed picture in relation to the rhetoric and reality of inclusion. There seems to be commitment to its rationale though its realisation or implementation is considered to be problematic.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is about the policy and practice of inclusion or inclusive education in Southampton Local Education Authority (LEA). It analyses, compares and appraises the LEA's policy and practice from a range of perspectives.

Chapter 1 introduces the aims, objectives and rationale of the research. It sets the context, describes the scope and details the key questions to be addressed. It briefly introduces the key terminology, including a working definition of inclusion in order to set the parameters. The focus is on the practice of inclusion with specific reference to children of school age who are perceived to be experiencing difficulties in, and at risk of being excluded from, learning. Inclusion is about all children. However, this research restricts itself to this group, particularly those who in the past would have been segregated in special schools.

CONTEXT

Southampton LEA is a relatively new unitary authority. Prior to local government re-organisation (LGR) in April 1997, it was part of Hampshire, having lost its functions as an LEA in 1978. The City has a population of 210,000 with a school aged population of 30,800 in September 2000. There are 91 schools; 71 primary, 14 secondary and 6 special schools.

Southampton City Council (SCC) uses the term Special Educational Needs (SEN) to refer to children experiencing difficulties in learning, keeping in line with current legislation and practice (Education Act, 1996; DES, 1978; DfEE, 1997). Its SEN policy rejects the notion that children “have SEN”,
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taking the view that children “experience difficulties in learning” which are usually context based (SCC, 2000a, p. 1). This policy addresses inclusion at length, stressing equality of opportunity and partnerships with parents, schools and other agencies. Southampton aspires to be an ‘inclusive City’ and a ‘City of learning’ (SCC, 1999).

Southampton has been benchmarked with a group of other LEAs, i.e it is considered to have similar circumstances and to be comparable with them. These are Bristol, Coventry, Derby, Portsmouth, Leicester, Gateshead, Newcastle upon Tyne, North Tyneside, Sandwell, Salford, Trafford and Wolverhampton. Benchmarking is based on demographic and socio-economic indicators which the Audit Commission considers to be appropriate markers for comparison. Although Southampton is unique in some ways, it shares many of the features of other LEAs deriving from its legal duties to provide education. Where appropriate, this study therefore includes data on inclusion to indicate Southampton’s position in relation to these so-called ‘statistical neighbours’. This enables an assessment of the applicability of its context elsewhere. The extent to which generalisations can be made from this study is argued in chapter 8, page 218. Although there are issues of reliability and validity in comparing LEAs performance data, these are the ones with national currency which have to be reported annually. The Government's argument is that education should not be a lottery, i.e. it should not depend on where children and families live, especially when circumstances are very similar.

RATIONALE

Inclusion is an important, contemporary and controversial topic. It figures as one of the key policies being pursued by central Government (DfEE, 1997) and has far reaching implications for all LEAs. Southampton, like other LEAs, needs to be prepared to address this issue positively. It is therefore opportune for me as an LEA officer to research both policy and practice as it exists so far, with a view to identifying and remedying shortfalls, looking for potential, and opportunities for improvement.
I am employed as an Education Officer with responsibility for Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the city. My professional training and experience has been in primary and special education, including practice as a child and educational psychologist. I am therefore in a good position to assess the changes which have taken place in relation to inclusion. I recognise that my role influences how I am perceived and the effects this has on this study. These issues are addressed through my methodology and in the reporting of my findings. I also include and make clear my own views so that my perspectives and influences are readily identified. This research is relevant in informing both day to day practice and strategic planning.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

With regard to the education of children who are experiencing difficulties in learning:

1. **To what extent is Southampton implementing its policy of inclusion?**
   - What do children's school placements reveal about practice?
   - How does Southampton compare with its statistical neighbours on inclusion?
   - To what extent is it making effective use of its resources to promote inclusion?
   - Given a policy of inclusion, are schools raising standards?

2. **To what extent is there a mismatch between the rhetoric of inclusion, as promoted by education providers, and its reality, as experienced by recipients?**
   - What are the views and discourses of teachers, officers and other education providers? What are the experiences of children and parents?
   - To what extent is there a mismatch in the perspectives of providers and recipients?
3. **Is there any evidence of inclusive practice in Southampton?**
   
   - Are there lessons for the LEA in terms of factors which influence inclusion?

4. **How can Southampton LEA progress its stated aim of promoting inclusion? I.e., how can it move from rhetoric to reality?**
   
   - What are the key themes that emerge from this study?
   - How can the LEA take appropriate action to build on strengths and remedy weaknesses?

These research questions are not in any hierarchical order of importance and are the outcome of the process I undertake in chapters 2 and 3. In chapter 2, the literature is reviewed in two parts in order to illustrate the rhetoric and the reality of inclusion separately. This locates the research within an international dimension and provides the context within which to look at theory. Chapter 3 focuses on theoretical considerations. These refine the rationale and focus for the research questions; they also provide some of the tools for analysis of the findings. These questions are intended to be exploratory and investigative in nature being aimed at providing a clear understanding of Southampton's context. As a methodology based on grounded theory was adopted, I did not set out to test theory, though once I have gathered the data I explore the links with my theoretical framework.

Chapter 4 details my methodology. Chapters 5 to 8 deal with each question in turn. Chapter 8 concludes with a summary of my findings, discusses the key themes and concludes with recommendations. My aims have been to carry out a study, which includes both qualitative and quantitative elements, so that the LEA's circumstances can be clearly described. The perspectives of education providers and recipients are explored and case studies are examined with a view to identifying practices which influence inclusion. Whilst the LEA is named for the reasons given on page 87, confidentiality of participants is maintained. Where there may be risks of them being identified, they have been consulted and given the opportunity of being further anonymised or of their data being withdrawn (see page 87).
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Inclusion is a relatively new term, having emerged in the 1990s. There is still much confusion surrounding its use, partly caused by the existence of other terminology referring to similar processes and partly because of the perspectives of researchers and practitioners in the field. Integration, inclusion and inclusive education have been used as if they were interchangeable. They refer to a variety of processes and contexts, e.g. integration in the UK; mainstreaming in the U.S (Jenkinson, 1997; Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1995). They will be the key terms used in this study.

This is necessary to incorporate the literature findings which pre-date use of the word inclusion, i.e. studies before the late 1980s. Whilst there are differences, they refer in the main to the process of supporting all children in their local school though there is still a tendency to view this primarily as being linked with the process of de-segregation from special schools. It would be cumbersome to separate the three though there are subtle differences. These are discussed below. Chapter 2 provides further details from the literature.

Working Definition of Inclusion

The working definition adopted in this study is that inclusion is a process aimed at enabling all children to attend, to learn and to participate on equal terms in the lives of their schools, preferably their local, mainstream schools. Schools are expected to educate all children equitably and effectively and to have cultures that respect, celebrate and value the diversity of pupils. Their response to such diversity is through their teaching, curricular approach and organisation. The process of inclusion is incremental and evolutionary, rarely revolutionary.
The working definition includes elements which are not easily measurable or quantifiable. Mager (1972, p. 26) calls them "fuzzies"; e.g. respect and value. This is because the focus is on qualitative processes rather than measurement of outcomes. It is however, acknowledged that an emphasis on indicators not easily described in 'performance terms' makes comparisons difficult (Mager, op.cit).

The research looks at the rhetoric and reality of inclusion, i.e. what people say and what they do. Sparkes (1991) defines rhetoric as "the art of public speaking and also (by extension) the art of writing, i.e. the art of getting one's message across" (p. 215). He suggests that "such an art can be abused for the sake of deceiving people or for the sake of making mere empty self-indulgent noise sound like profound and interesting truth" (ibid). He argues that in spite of such risks, rhetoric still has a legitimate use (see also Dixon, 1971). Rhetoric is a process of human interaction aimed at providing accounts of the world within shared systems of intelligibility (Gergen, 1991). These contribute to the development of knowledge. An analysis of rhetoric may show "how people's versions of actions, features of the world and of their own mental life, are designed to counter real or potential alternatives and are part of ongoing arguments, debates and dialogues. People are constructing versions, in the performance of actions, and these actions are related to and often rhetorically undermine alternative constructions" (Potter, 1996, p. 152-153). Recognising this relation between versions of events in the world and versions of mental events has radical consequences.

Reality is perceived (Eisner, 1991). It is socially constructed and interpretations are from individual perspectives (Addelson, 1990). These perspectives are temporally and spatially located. My research pursues the similarities and differences between what is said and what happens in practice in Southampton. My main aim, however, is to examine the LEA's inclusion policy and how this translates into practice.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is in two parts; the first part aims to illustrate the rhetoric of inclusion in terms of its embedded meanings and how this rhetoric is perceived by key stakeholders. This relates to my rhetoric question, i.e. perspectives on meaning. The second part considers the rationale for inclusion and the 'realities' of its practice in national and international contexts. This helps to provide the wider context within which Southampton's policy and practice can be located.

The questions the literature review sets out to clarify are:
1. What is the rhetoric on inclusion? What does it mean? I ask this in order to understand my own and Southampton's rhetoric?
2. What are the views and experiences of key stakeholders? What is their rhetoric?
3. Are there historical factors that might have shaped the rhetoric and the practice?
4. Is there a rationale for inclusion; one that might have shaped the rhetoric or the practice? Is inclusion really achievable and how does it compare with special education, particularly in terms of efficacy and pragmatics?
5. Given that inclusion is a global agenda, what are its practices in this country and elsewhere?

Chapter 2 focuses on the key themes of most relevance to this study. It also provides a useful reference point against which to pursue and make sense of the research questions and findings. Within both the rhetoric and reality dimensions, there are issues of rights, politics, efficacy and pragmatics. These are not altogether surprising. Rhetoric includes aspirations. The reality of translating these into practice is more challenging.
RHETORIC OF INCLUSION: PERCEPTIONS OF MEANING

**Segregation**

This term refers to the practice of placing children in special schools, away from their mainstream peers. Historically, this was conducted for humanistic reasons (Cole, 1989; DES, op.cit), when it was considered ordinary schools did not have the capacity, resources or expertise to include children experiencing difficulties in learning (Jenkinson, 1997). Special schools were considered to offer the care and education some children needed; a sanctuary away from the pressures and demands of ordinary schools (Biklen, 1989).

In educational circles, the term segregation refers to special school placements, being very specific about children attending special schools (Cole, 1989). However, there is now increasing recognition that children can also be easily segregated in mainstream schools, particularly where they are isolated or where they are not actively engaged in learning and other activities around school (Letendre and Shimizu, 1999; Jenkinson, 1997).

**Integration**

Booth (1981) defines integration as "a process of increasing children's participation in the educational and social life of comprehensive primary and secondary schools" (p. 288-289). This definition more or less equates with that of inclusion, but offered at a time when inclusion did not have currency in the language used. The definition includes the different types of integration in practice, e.g. locational, social and functional (DES, op.cit; Hegarty and Pocklington, 1981). Integration is a precursor to inclusion; the term that has succeeded it. Hegarty and Pocklington (op.cit) define integration as a complex process of "making whole, of combining different elements into a unity", p. 11). They see it as a means, not an end as "children do not need integration; they need education" (p. 14). O’ Hanlon (1995) suggests that integration and segregation are not mutually exclusive; inclusion, however, is absolute.
There are variations in the definition of integration in comparison with inclusion. Booth's definition (1981) most closely approximates the two terms in that both are about increasing children's participation in the mainstream. However, it is possible to increase participation from a position of little or no participation; e.g. with part time or limited attendance in the mainstream (Jenkinson, 1997). This is how some "partial integration" programmes operate. Inclusion does not work in this way as it also requires schools to change. Other writers see a wider distinction between the two concepts of integration and inclusion (Thomas 1997).

**Figure 2.1: A model to illustrate the hierarchy of integration**

| Functional Integration: (Full participation in all mainstream activities) |
| (Child is fully integrated; takes full part in all school activities; accesses a fully differentiated curriculum; all aspects of special educational needs are met; children make expected progress in learning). |
| (Mainstream Classroom: Small Group Teaching (Activities differentiated for participation)) |
| (Small group teaching in some subjects, e.g. literacy, numeracy; differentiated programmes to take account of weaknesses in other areas but all activities take place and are supported in the mainstream class) |
| Mainstream Classroom + Withdrawal teaching (for individual teacher-pupil contact time) |

| Social Integration: (limited participation in learning activities) |
| (Primary purpose is to enable child to spend some time working with peers in non-academic activities; e.g. social interaction/experience. Curricular activities relate to games, PE and assembly, perhaps music; there is no evidence that child is gaining from integration other than through the social opportunities presented) |

| Locational Integration (Segregated Class in a Mainstream School) |
| (Child is not taught and has no significant contact with mainstream peers. |

| Segregation: (Special School) |
| (Children attend different types of special school ranging from day to residential special school, e.g. weekly, termly or 52 week boarding. Some attend more specialised settings; e.g. secure or regional hospital units. |

Figure 2.1 shows the hierarchy of integration, which is adopted in this study. This is derived from a review of the literature (see Hegarty and Pocklington, op.cit) and has been adapted from the model described by Soder (1997). It illustrates different forms of integration, from functional to social and locational integration. As the terms imply, functional integration is the ideal and is at the top of the hierarchy. However, there are continual changes and variations around these types of integration in real life, i.e none are pure forms and exclusive of the other. If schools adapt themselves
to maximise children's participation in learning, some parallels can be drawn from this diagram to reflect stages towards inclusion.

**Inclusion**

Inclusion is about participation in learning as a human right. However, it has also been used as an "umbrella term in the United States to describe the restructuring of special education to permit all or most students to be integrated in mainstream classrooms" (Ware 1995, p. 127). As with integration, inclusion is a socio-political process linked with but exceeding de-segregation from special schools. It partly arises from concerns about special schools (Dunn, 1968; see page 21) and is a move to increase the ability of mainstream schools to provide for a greater diversity of children (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1995), where differences are seen as an ordinary part of human experience to be respected and valued (Ballard, 1995). Inclusion is a process of operating a classroom or school as a supportive community within such a context of diversity. It is different from integration and mainstreaming in requiring *fundamental changes to schools* to make them more effective and better able to provide for *all* children, irrespective of their abilities and needs. There is a contradiction in terms if this is compared with Ware's (1995) definition above. This definition specifically refers to "all or most", qualifying the fact that the process may not refer to all children and acknowledging that for some, "integration" may not be achievable. Ware (1995) explicitly links the two terms of inclusion and integration and such loose usage is not uncommon in the literature. Clark, Dyson and Millward's (1995) view of inclusion as being an incremental process holds true of the position of schools. Inclusion has a beginning but no end point; this is never reached.

Given such a lack of clarity and consensus, my view is that the process of inclusion is incremental, depending on the children’s and school’s starting points or indeed levels of development. It is fluid and is ever changing as it is essentially interactive. All children can then benefit from inclusion,
irrespective of their abilities and needs. I would suggest that inclusion is an ideal, a process that all schools should be constantly working towards. It is the antithesis to exclusion which denies children their right to participation in learning and in the lives of their schools. Where inclusive processes value diversity, exclusionary pressures create "disability as sickness, personal tragedy and object of charity" (Ballard, 1995, p. 1).

Disciplinary exclusions can 'demonise' children and view their problems as evil, requiring extreme sanctions in order to safeguard the smooth running of schools and classrooms but often disguised as being for the sake of the other children (Biklen, op.cit; Jenkinson; 1997; Sinclair, 1999; TES, 2000c). Discourses on 'blame and shame' contrast markedly with those focusing on 'helping and healing' (Biklen, op.cit; Sleeter, 1989). In the UK, these may explain the dramatic rise in disciplinary exclusions (TES, 1998, Parsons et al, 1995; p. 25 and 30).

Inclusion is not cheap but not as expensive as segregation (Fulcher, 1988; Crowther et al, 1999; chapter 5). The initial set-up costs are high if schools are to be provided with the resources to make the necessary changes; these should reduce as savings accrue from fewer special school placements. However, there are many barriers to overcome. Such barriers include attitudes; resources; lack of expertise, e.g. with differentiating the curriculum for all children; lack of political, or administrative will and commitment (O'Hanlon, 1993, 1995). There are other pressures; e.g. from stakeholders and pressure groups. Some of these forces are a disincentive and a threat to change. The deaf community is also strongly opposed to inclusion, claiming that this is counter productive to students who lack oral and communication skills and without a peer group in mainstream settings (Bunch, 1994).

In the U.K Newham seems to have been the first LEA to have adopted a radical approach in terms of what it believes to constitute inclusion. It closed down 11 out of 13 of its special schools and by 1999 had 99.8% of children in mainstream schools, reducing their percentage of placements in special schools from 0.6% in 1994 to 0.2% in 1999 (DfEE, 1998). Their
focus has been on "children's rights, whatever their needs, to learn together" in mainstream settings (Jordan 1996). Newham's position in this report is as reported in the published literature, reflecting its initiatives in the 1990s. This information should be treated with caution as the latest developments in this LEA have not been followed up, being outside of the scope of this study. Inclusion may be differentiated as two related and intertwined sets of priorities; the first being about children being actively engaged in learning and the second being about this taking place in a mainstream setting. It is dangerous to think that both hurdles can be reached in one quick move; one does not guarantee the other. Placements in mainstream schools need to be properly planned and supported to ensure active participation.

*Inclusive Schools*

Inclusive schools strive to make provision for all children in their locality. They are "schools for all" (Ainscow, 1995, p. 66), "high reliability organisations", (Reynolds, 1995, p. 124-125) underpinned by a number of key principles and beliefs. Levels of predictability and reliability in delivering stated objectives and the valuing of diversity are central to these. These schools operate technologies for inclusion (Clark et al, 1999). They are described as having the right ethos, staff being appropriately trained and supported and the curriculum being carefully differentiated and individualised where necessary (Clark et al, op.cit, Ainscow et al, 1999).

The idea of inclusive schools was accredited with international authority at UNESCO's World Conference, leading to the Salamanca Agreement in 1994. Most Governments, including Britain, became signatories to integration and inclusion but so far, few, have gone beyond the rhetoric and taken active steps to promote inclusion (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1995). Those most active include Denmark (Tetler, 1995), Spain (Pastor,1995), Madison in Wisconsin (Gruenewald and Schroeder, 1979) and Parma in Italy (Pasternak, 1979).
A Model For Inclusion

Figure 2.2 summarises and illustrates the contrasts between integration and inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit is within children; they need to be 'ready' to access and benefit from mainstream education.</td>
<td>The school curriculum needs to be accessible to all children, irrespective of their ability, needs or aptitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and confirmation of SEN follow diagnostic and assessment procedures.</td>
<td>Focus is on teaching approaches, delivery and curriculum content; children's learning styles and responsiveness to learning are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptions: Professional reporting on SEN and placement. Expertism, i.e. province of specialists.</td>
<td>Collaboration between teachers and systems to promote effective learning. Recognition of teacher expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Education Plans/Programmes to meet SEN as prescribed.</td>
<td>Teacher training; skills and strategies required in order to respond effectively to student diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Curriculum; e.g. precision teaching</td>
<td>Differentiated not exclusive curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special class/unit/part-time placement in a mainstream setting.</td>
<td>Mainstream placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing/modifying the subject; curriculum disapplication</td>
<td>Changing the school ethos, attitude, processes, expectations and practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusion will not be achieved by schools alone. The interaction of home, school, local community and wider society will have an influence. Figure 2.3 shows that inclusion will require more than school reform, e.g. the forces shown, will have an influence.

Figure 2.3: The Multiplicity of Factors influencing Inclusion
RHETORIC OF INCLUSION: STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Teacher Attitudes And Training

Early studies of integration programmes have found a high level of anxiety amongst teachers arising from a lack of familiarity with disability issues. They are uncertain about how to provide appropriate educational programmes and instructional methods to meet special educational needs (SEN), tending to pass responsibility for these to others (Keogh, 1988; Coates, 1989; Semmel et al, 1991). Fulcher (1989) argues that teacher trainers have failed teachers, having only prepared them to teach 80% of children, neglecting the remaining 20% who experience difficulties in learning. Sleeter (op.cit) claims that teachers only make minor differentiation to the curriculum, leaving a large proportion to flounder. They are more confident with students with 'normative' needs, usually sensory or physical. They are less comfortable dealing with those presenting with non-normative needs, e.g. socially constructed categories of learning such as emotional and behavioural difficulties. Udvari-Solner and Thousand (1995) claim that they adopt two sets of practices: a core practice which addresses the needs of the majority and an adaptive practice which has to be differentiated for the rest to take account of difficulties in learning.

Teachers are also concerned about rationalising their resources to meet the needs of all their children; they are fearful that, addressing the needs of the few, could disrupt the education of others. Their anxieties were dispelled as they became more familiar with SEN issues; however, concerns about individualising programmes continue (Jenkinson, 1987).

Bowman (1989), in his study of integration in 14 countries, found that teachers categorise children according to their specific impairment, "mentally disabled" children being at the bottom of their preference list. They were, however, influenced, by the forms of help they received. Wishart and Manning (1996), found considerable reservations amongst trainee teachers about inclusion. 96% felt their training to have been inadequate in this respect; only 13% indicated a willingness to teach in
integrated settings. De Lemos (1994) also found that the majority of mainstream teachers in Australia had not received SEN training. This is interesting, given the increasing number of children experiencing difficulties in learning who are in mainstream education in Australia. Parents, on the other hand, feel that the greatest obstacle to inclusion is not policy or legislation; it is "the teachers who refuse to teach our children" (Florian, 1998).

Giangreco et al (1993) found that direct experience of 'severely disabled' children seemed to be the critical factor in transforming teacher attitudes. Vlachou (1997) suggested that conditions within which teachers work were the most important; legislative, bureaucratic and administrative pressures were significant burdens and a 'waste of valuable teaching time' (p. 115). Sloper and Tyler (1992) considered children to be accepting of integration and that adults were the problem. Teacher attitudes are shaped by the nature of their society, the prevailing conceptions of 'disabilities' and difficulties in learning, including methods of financing schools (Pijl, Meijer and Hegarty, 1997).

If inclusion is to work, teachers will need to be adequately prepared and supported. This will enable them to meet the increasing challenges in respect of curriculum differentiation and the meeting of individual needs as more children are included in the mainstream. They already feel devalued (Coughlan, 2000), having been constantly criticised for the best part of 20 years. Their level of dissatisfaction with governmental attitude is not a secret (BBC, 2000a). Their stress levels also continue to rise, with risks of burnout (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978). Inclusion might be seen to be an additional burden, following league table and other pressures. Currently, teachers' concerns centre around the issue of disruption and 'unruly pupils' (Eason, 2000). This is an area of increasing litigation as teachers are suing their employers for failing to protect them from violence in the classroom (BBC, 2000b and c). These issues are significant to LEAs.
Parents And Inclusion

The literature provides a wealth of evidence about parents' attitudes towards inclusion (e.g. Ballard, 1999). Hegarty and Pocklington (op.cit) found parents to favour integration. They interviewed 43 sets of parents whose children experienced a variety of difficulties in learning and who were in a range of settings. Everyone preferred an integrated setting.

There are also accounts of parents struggling for their children's rights to receive any education at all (Ballard, 1999), let alone this being in the mainstream. Brown (1999) details the plight of many parents, including her own, to secure the admission of their children at their local school. She lists various prejudices such as teachers not wanting her daughter in their classroom; school's refusals to admit children so that they have to be educated at home and parents' distrust of professional alliances and practices.

Similar accounts abound in the literature, e.g. Allan (1999) and Walsh (1993). Grant (1995) tells her experiences of being scapegoated and ridiculed at school for being "thick" and her eventual transfer to a special school. Ware (1999) provides several examples of parents, experiencing prejudice, misunderstanding, oppression and injustices in their struggles for inclusion. Her accounts from detailed interviews make uncomfortable reading of the social, educational and professional injustices and oppression which persist. Ware (1999) feels that:

"[The educational system] all but silences parents [..who ] live the experience of their child's disability [..]; the goals for their children, like those of inclusion, cannot be measured in conventional outcome terminology. The complex outcomes of inclusion must instead be considered on a human scale, with an ever shifting gaze towards the realities of life after school." (p. 64).
Murray and Penman (1996) make an impassioned plea as parents, on behalf of children experiencing difficulties in learning. They plead for them to be allowed to be as they are; for their humanity to be recognised; for their differences, individualities and talents to be welcomed and not to cause fear. They maintain forcefully that they are not interested in labels and that they are tired of children being treated as the property of professionals. They want all children to be included and state that by all they mean all. Their accounts illustrate their experiences, grievances and aspirations. Their circumstances and wishes mirror those of many other parents who have a clear message about children being celebrated for who they are and what they bring and not to be discriminated against and disadvantaged in any way.

There are also many parents who find the education system less oppressive and more empowering. Arrondelle and Arrondelle (1995) describe positive experiences and progress in mainstream education for their daughter Kirsty. Kirsty attended a sixth form course, leading to a City and Guilds certificate in vocational education, excels at swimming and has acquired "medals galore" in Olympic standard swimming. She has Down's Syndrome. There are also millions of parents worldwide whose children are educated in special schools. The Fish Report (1985) confirmed that whilst a minority of parents were dissatisfied with their children's placement in special schools for moderate learning difficulties, the majority were quite content - as were the pupils. Thornton (2000a) and BBC (2000f) reported on parents' lobbying for special schools and against their closures in various parts of the U.K. Other reports confirmed that the balance between parental support for integration and special schooling was about the same (Times Educational Supplement, (TES) 1996; Cole, 1989). Similar situations were arising in Australia as parents became alarmed at the possible closure of special schools following the Collins report in 1994. The high quality of work in some special schools was suggested as one of the major obstacles to inclusion (Jenkinson, 1997).
McDonnell (1987) interviewed 400 parents of children attending schools for moderate and severe learning difficulties and found them to be generally negative in their perceptions of mainstream placements. They predicted significantly more mistreatment, reduced services, greater isolation and a lower quality of education in contrast with reports of parents whose children were in the mainstream. Many of these parents are more concerned about their children's happiness and well being than about academic attainments (Ballard, 1999). Other studies suggest that parents are likely to respond most positively to the situation they are familiar with and the one they chose in the first place (Jenkinson, 1997).

To what extent do parents feel they are struggling in respect of inclusion or otherwise in Southampton? If outcome should be measured on a human scale, what are the costs of perceived oppression? Are children at risk of mistreatment or injustice?

Children And Inclusion

Children's experiences of segregation and oppression raise many questions. Souza (1995) provides a disturbing account of her experiences at school. She talks about the futility of her education in a special school, her re-entry into the mainstream and the treatments she received. She has Downs Syndrome and her presence in a mainstream secondary school was questioned thus by the Headmistress: "What is this Mongol person doing in my school?"

This was challenged successfully at the High Court but she still bears the scars. Hot custard was poured down her back by another pupil. It is not difficult to imagine her suffering and her sense of outrage. This is not the only time this has happened. The literature provides other examples. Armstrong, Clark and Murphy (1995) describe the experiences of young people in care and the prejudices and bullying they are subjected to from adults and other pupils, including a lack of commitment from their schools to provide them with the same opportunities as their peers.
Wade and Moore (1993) provide comprehensive accounts of teaching and learning from children experiencing difficulties in learning. Of particular interest are children's perceptions of 'feeling different', their expectations of fair treatment and fair play, their desire to succeed and their discomfort and embarrassment when they are in trouble for misbehaviour. Allan (op.cit) describes the attempts of students to challenge the kinds of identities assigned to them and their efforts either to transcribe in or transcribe out of these disabled identities. She contrasts teachers' discourses on need with students' perceptions and discourses on disability. She is concerned that in order to have a voice, disabled people "have to speak as disabled people" (p. 78). She argues that we all have to transgress, e.g. speak out, abandon and challenge convention and tradition; if we are to move away from discourses of need and disability to those focusing on rights and realities.

Ballard and McDonald (1999) describe the effects on people's lives of disabling environments. They emphasise the need for advocacy and suggest that:

"Disability is being grateful for support while lacking the power that your school or society will continue to meet your needs. [They suggest] that to be segregated can mean that you are treated as less than human."

This points to the need to be alert to children's circumstances if society is not to run the risk of dehumanising them. Amongst the most vulnerable are those experiencing physical difficulties who are at risk of being patronised (Walsh, op.cit; Ballard, 1995; Bailey and Barton, 1999). Howarth (1987) provides a moving account from Shaughnessy who suffers from muscular dystrophy. Shaughnessy says that he wants to lead a normal, fulfilled life, welcoming the chance to go to an ordinary school and wanting other 'handicapped' children to have the same opportunities. He feels nobody should be treated differently; all can be useful to society. To him, the future matters not the past and he says :"I like being me; it's a challenge." This is sobering and communicates some of his pain; he went to a special school but was bright enough to transfer. His needs were not being met.
Discourses are about talk, conversation, treatise or sermon on a topic. Fulcher (2000) explains that a discourse is an analysis of language. "Discourses deploy various themes, styles and statements and [...] different objectives (Fulcher, 1989, p. 4)." She suggests that discourse is central to integration struggles and that "discourses articulate the world in certain ways: they identify problems, perspectives on those problems and thus solutions [...] they contain a theory which informs practice, [which] means that we act on the basis of our ideas on how something works and what we want to achieve" (ibid, p. 8).

Corbett (1996) argues that discourses are sources of power; words have to be won in the battle to construct or de-construct dominant discourses. Some of these are oppressive and may need to be de-toxified if they are to represent the perspectives of the disabled. She suggests that the language of special education devalues and disadvantages children experiencing difficulties in learning through 'bad mouthing'. Education legislation and its associated guidance encourage such professional discourses about disabilities (Bray, 1987), framed within a psycho-medical paradigm. Whilst a consistent discourse of inclusion is about celebrating diversity in a human rights context, that for exclusion takes many forms, ranging from special and separatist models to those linked with the creation of "badness, sadness, sickness and madness" (Pilgrim, 2000; p. 302-3). "Badness" leads to blaming and shaming discourses; the rest attracts the more caring, helping and healing responses, based on medical models. Pilgrim (op.cit) argues that the discourses relating to functional psychiatric deficits, i.e. without an organic dysfunction, have no theoretical grounding or empirical foundations.
There is a range of rhetoric and discourses on inclusion (Clough and Corbett, 2000). Inclusion implies a respect for diversity leading to conflicting views to provide the totality of responses that might be required. These responses have led to dominant discourses from professionals (professional discourses), discourses from those exercising power (political discourses) and other discourses aimed at re-constructing the language and challenging the practices of special education. Each of these discourses arise from a particular perspective with a common set of assumptions and values serving as filters to incoming information (Stangvik, 1998). Many are loaded with personal, political or professional interests (Stangvik, op.cit). The rationale underpinning discourses on inclusion is dealt with below.

RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION

Empirical And Theoretical Foundations?

The move from special to mainstream education was brought about by two inter-related influences. The first was the principle of normalisation (Wolfensberger and Tullman, 1984). This referred to the measures that would maximise a person's participation in the mainstream of their society and culture. The focus was still about the person fitting in and being normalised as opposed to institutions and society changing; i.e. integration and not inclusion.

The second was the increasing dissatisfaction with both the practice and the outcomes of special schooling. One of the first and most influential critics was Dunn (op.cit) who argued that the main beneficiaries from special education were not the pupils placed there but their teachers and their peers in mainstream classrooms.

He claimed four outcomes for pupils in special schools. The first was academic underachievement, due to lack of competition; a failure to concentrate on the development of basic academic skills; an over-emphasis on personal and social skills teaching and dull, unimaginative and limited
variation in curriculum content. The second derived from lowered expectations from teachers, parents and the pupils themselves, arising from the detrimental effects of labelling children (but see Kaufman and Hallahan (1995) who provide a diametrically opposed view). The third was related to racial segregation and imbalance in special education, which Dunn (op. cit) attributed to unfair methods of identification, particularly related to the use of culturally biased measures of intelligence. These encouraged legalised forms of racial segregation (see Lipsky and Garner, 1992; Watts et al, 1978 describe the position in Australia). The fourth reflected a failure to make use of recent advances in individually paced curricula.

A number of studies followed, many derived from and re-emphasising the themes of Dunn's position. The resulting literature was enormous (see references below), though in terms of focus, they could be summarised in relation to attitudinal, educational and social outcomes. Attitudinal outcomes relate to the extent to which increased community participation was achieved. Educational outcomes showed as evidence of improved learning and performance, including advances in teaching methodologies and more recently, increased access to a common curriculum, e.g. the National Curriculum in the United Kingdom. Social outcomes reflected as improvements in social skills and adjustment, improved self image and autonomy. Of these, academic outcomes have received the most attention, particularly in the light of increased accountabilities and an emphasis on an instrumental curriculum.

The results of research have been inconclusive. There has been as much support for mainstream as there has been for special education. Those studies supporting mainstream education have found that students in special classes achieve no better educationally than their peers in mainstream settings in spite of higher costs. They argue that mainstream classes foster a social climate of competition and achievement whilst special classes favour the development of personal and social skills at the expense of academic achievement. They also stress the richness and variety of the mainstream curriculum. Examples of such studies include Carlberg and Kavale (1980); Strain and Kerr (1981); Wang and Baker (1985-6).
Counter studies finding improved social outcomes from special placements include Danby and Cullen (1988); Bless and Armein (1992); and a review of 40 studies by Gresham (1982).

On balance, it has been virtually impossible to demonstrate that one type of setting is better than another in terms of outcome. The studies themselves are not strictly comparable and they all suffer from various methodological flaws which are discussed below. Comparisons have been about children categorised as experiencing learning difficulties. The emphasis is on groups perceived to be comparable and not about all children, the processes of learning or the school structures which apply to them. Moving away from this deficit model of special needs categorisation makes it difficult to justify segregation, especially if all children are considered equal and to have equal rights. This would fit in with the requirements of a democracy (Lipsky and Gartner, 1992). Well intentioned though allegedly misguided humanitarian and altruistic concerns to meet the needs of children experiencing difficulties in learning, have masked discriminative approaches (Tomlinson, 1999). The plight of a significant proportion in mainstream settings who are not included in learning has not received the attention it deserves. They are those whose needs have not been identified; those at the margins between ordinary, supported and special education, i.e. without any additional help or support. The development of more inclusive approaches in schools might address this anomaly as might increased accountability from teachers.

The Failure Of Outcome Studies: Methodological Issues

Outcome studies have failed to demonstrate the superiority of either special education or inclusion. With hindsight, this could have been predicted. This is because of fundamental design and methodological flaws. These arise from essentially invalid comparisons between groups of children attending different sectors of education. We have seen that comparisons have usually been based on academic attainments, social adjustment or acceptance.
These studies failed to control the multiplicity of factors which operated. There were major methodological weaknesses, e.g. pupils did not fall neatly into homogeneous groups nor could such factors as intelligence, home background and social class be effectively matched between and within groups. In any event, it was unrealistic to expect such complexity to be reduced to a level where reliable and valid measurements could be made. There were also environmental and interaction factors, making the whole exercise rather questionable and unproductive. Such research efforts went on for decades, giving rise to inconsistent and inconclusive findings and fuelling criticisms from cynics. Not surprisingly, claims of 'data out; stories in' became popular in respect of such research (MacMillan and Hendrick, 1993). Despite the introduction of alternative and more sophisticated and refined approaches used in re-analysing hundreds of efficacy studies, confidence has not returned as findings have remained inconclusive. The rigorous requirements of comparative designs could rarely be met. Carlberg and Cavale (op.cit); Wang and Baker (op.cit); and Marston (1988), give useful discussions of meta-analysis and time series designs in their research.

Given this state of knowledge or lack of it, what can be deduced about inclusion? It is known that these studies were about integration and not inclusion as it is now understood. Nevertheless, is inclusion worth the effort, the changes and the investment or should the status quo be maintained? Hegarty (1993) suggests that in the absence of conclusive evidence supporting special schooling, there are strong moral grounds for adopting an inclusive stance. This is echoed in Government proposals in the UK which suggest that there are "strong social, educational and moral grounds for inclusion" (DfEE, 1997). It is also increasingly the view emerging from the literature; that, on balance, there is no justification for segregation (Thomas, 1997; Buckley, 2000). Careful reflection suggests that LEAs have no option but to pursue inclusion. If the links in legislation and LEA policies relating to rights and disabilities are brought together,
then inclusion is an inevitable aim. Equal opportunities policies and the Human Rights Act 1998, bring inclusion and SEN closer, integrating the two principles for the first time (Gerschel, 1998). SEN and Disability Rights legislation strengthen this further. If the economic factor of costs is also added to this equation, then LEAs will find it hard to justify segregation, given a decreasing basis to support it. The rights discourse is certainly favoured by central government, but there are tensions which arise from the practical implications on how to deliver even more in schools, taking account of the burdens on teachers (see Wallace 1999; Parsons et al, op.cit; on permanent exclusions).

**Future Research Directions**

Given the issues already raised about the failure of large scale studies, it seems that qualitative studies hold a greater promise than quantitative research of clarifying factors influencing inclusion. By definition, if inclusion is a process, then it does not make sense to take a 'balance sheet' approach and search to evaluate its effectiveness through isolated snapshots. Pjil, Meijer and Hegarty (op.cit) use the analogy of an arrow in mid-air; movement illustrates the process and the still picture, the state. The process is best explored through qualitative methods which are deep and data rich as opposed to those which, at best, only scrape the surface. Inclusion is best shown as a movie. Sebba and Sachdev (1997) argue that multi-method studies focusing on processes are likely to be more successful in illustrating what works and does not work in inclusion. They suggest that studies with a multiplicity of perspectives are more robust than those with single method research designs. They suggest the adoption of research approaches that evaluate the performance of all children and not only those experiencing difficulties in learning (Sebba and Sajdev, op.cit). This is similar to the kind of approach advocated by Booth and Ainscow (1998) in departing from viewing research through the traditional lens of special education and seeing it as more complicated and messy.
Soder (1997) argues that inclusion is a necessary goal and that research can assist that process by not taking an evaluative or normative stance but by asking questions aimed at improving facilities for all, specially those considered to be experiencing difficulties. These are more important and relevant than those about effect, effectiveness or success. Nearly twenty years ago, Booth (1981) argued that research on efficacy should instead focus on practicality; his words apply now as they did then:

"Despite the fact that much time, effort and money has been expended by researchers in attempting to prove the efficacy of a particular educational placement, a few moments' reflection might lead one to doubt the wisdom of their quest. Could the world really be constructed in such a way that groups of children learnt more because they were housed in a building called a special school?" (Booth, 1981, p. 303).

Such clear guidance in the literature has influenced the research design, particularly with regard to my choice of method and methodology (chapters 3 and 4). There are issues about socio-political thinking, influences and control. These appear to be changing but are they restricted to rhetoric? I aim to find out. Although special schooling is increasingly questioned, mainstream schools still exercise degrees of selection and control. These are reflected in the numbers of children in special schools which remain high (Norwich, 1997; 1999).

The rationale for maintaining a dual system of mainstream and special education may have just been helped by the lack of conclusive evidence supporting either option. The rhetoric of policy makers and those with power can choose this line of argument or they may favour a more drastic option such as Newham's rhetoric in the 1990s of no role for special schools. What has been the rhetoric of other LEAs in this country and abroad? If none has been articulated, how can this be discerned from the reality of their practices. This is addressed next and helps locate Southampton's practices within a wider context for research purposes.
THE REALITY OF INCLUSION

Practice of Inclusion: The International Dimension

Britain lags behind a number of countries within and outside Europe in its practice of integration and inclusion. This reflects international differences between the rhetoric and practices. For instance, Spain has been deeply committed to inclusion since the death of General Franco. There is a collective and political will to pursue this in order to ensure equal opportunities for all citizens. Greece, on the other hand, only seems to be subscribing to the rhetoric, although neither country has the resources of their European neighbours (O'Hanlon, 1995). Table 2.1 below shows England's position in comparison with eight other countries.

Table 2.1: International Comparisons on Mainstream and Special School Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>C %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>E %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Sources: Pijl and Meijer, 1991, p.108, Helgeland, 1992. The "hard to integrate" figures (in percentages) refer to children whose difficulties are such that ordinary schools did not expect to be able to provide for them. They took no part in the educational elements of the curriculum; their participation was restricted to social activities, at best.

KEY: A= Statemented Pupils; B=Ordinary Class; C= Special/Unit Class; D=Special School; E=Hard to Integrate.

These figures are not easily comparable as school populations and assessment procedures are subject to legislative and national differences. However, judged purely against these crude statistics, England seems to have the same number of students segregated as Italy but has more in special schools than in special units or classes. Norway and Sweden place half this percentage in special schools; Italy places only 0.2%. West Germany, Belgium and Holland place by far the highest numbers in segregated provision.
Holland's justification is said to derive from the inflexibility of its curriculum, particularly the curriculum pressures in its primary schools, compounded by the attitudes and expectations of its headteachers (Den Boer, 1995). Likewise, Germany is constrained by its curriculum and organisation of its educational resources (Randol, 1995). These countries illustrate the impact of the curriculum on children's placements, the "Berlin Wall" separating mainstream from special education (Clough and Corbett, op.cit, p. 21).

There appears to be no integration in Germany, all recorded or statemented children seem to be diverted out of ordinary into special schools. Belgium, on the other hand, is making a determined effort, since the passing of the Special and Integrated Education Act, 1986, to integrate more children in the mainstream (Dens and Hoedemakers, 1995). Though its percentage is still high, this represents a significant increase in the number of children integrated in the mainstream as compared with those in special schools. This percentage has risen from 8% in 1983 to 26% of mainstream placements in 1991.

England's integration figures were at best static until the mid 1990s (CSIE, 1994, 1996). However, since 1994, there have been significant strides. These may be no more than statistics, representing the numbers attending mainstream and special schools. Given the wide differences in practice, they should be viewed with caution; the statistics may not be reliable, valid or strictly comparable.

Americans identify a large number of children who are considered to be experiencing difficulties in learning and who are eventually categorised. As table 2.1 shows, the United States (U.S) holds second place in this respect. However, a large number of the children attend mainstream settings. The position is improving in the U.S; Wisconsin is acknowledged to take the lead on inclusion (Gruenewald and Schroeder, op.cit). Victoria in Australia and New Zealand (Wilson, 1995) are also pursuing policies of inclusive education.
Chile, Brazil and other countries are aiming to follow in similar directions. Chile is working towards re-enfranchising its whole population. It is starting from a low base; some schools from the private sector are richly resourced and others much poorer (Baez, 1999). Japan is claimed to have large numbers of children categorised as experiencing significant difficulties in learning in mainstream schools. They also have a small minority in special schools. However, there is a view that there may be significant elements of mainstream segregation and non-participation in learning within their arrangements (LeTendre and Shimizu, op.cit), compounded by curriculum pressures.

Many of these countries are starting from relatively lower bases in comparison with western Europe but appear to be committed to increase children's participation in learning, though they are unlikely to make accessible provision for all children (Daniels and Garner, 1999). UNESCO countries are also on the whole, trying to bring themselves into line with the principles of the Salamanca Agreement, particularly as this affects any consideration of grants from the World Bank. However, there are still many countries where standards of living are so low that education is a luxury and is not available to many, e.g. in parts of India. The world picture therefore is variable, even when this relates to the proportion of children who receive an education at all. Whether or not they are in the mainstream and participating in learning are other questions of considerable magnitude which are not capable of being answered with current levels of reporting and knowledge. Latest reports indicate that 125 million children worldwide receive no education at all; more than two thirds of them are girls (DFID, 2000). There are calls for universal access - but not until the year 2015; the costs are estimated to be enormous and $8 billion have been pledged (Blunt, 2000). Nearer home, in England, 12,000 children, mostly boys, are permanently excluded from school at the beginning of each school year (Wallace, op.cit). World-wide, there is a shift away from humanitarian concern for children experiencing difficulties in learning to an emphasis on the rights of all children and their entitlement to learning (DFID, op.cit). It is nevertheless humanitarian to take steps to secure the rights of children and any disadvantaged group.
Issues In Respect of International Research Data On Inclusion

The national and international literature provides a base against which the practice of Southampton LEA can be usefully compared and contrasted. However, there are issues which need to be taken into account. There is no consistency in the use or understanding of integration which forms the bulk of such research; this is even less so with inclusion. Countries differ in their rates of "recording or statementing" children, i.e. in their ascertainment or assessment process. Differences exist between and within countries and localities so that it is difficult to take full account of cultural, demographic, economic, educational, political and legal issues. The historical circumstances and starting points are different for each country as are current initiatives and pressures. The reliability and validity of data is also problematic, especially if these are based on official returns. This is compounded by the absence of consensus on criteria, definition and meaning. Education, special needs and "disabilities" are nationally, culturally and contextually bound making it difficult to make comparisons between countries. Booth and Ainscow (op.cit) suggest that studies seeking findings of global significance, oversimplify the range of educational processes and practices operating in different countries and fail to take into account problems of translation and local interpretation. There is no such state as a global monoculture as the range of provision is enormous.

The international data, however, establishes the consensus which is that inclusion is generally a philosophy which is subscribed to, in spite of its varied meanings. Such variability makes it difficult to establish whether it is based on rights or humanitarian concerns. Each society is different. The only consistency is that it refers to children attending their mainstream schools. The consensus on the desirability of inclusion suggests that it would be profitable to engage in research in this area, particularly if the aim is to improve provision in a specific location, e.g. in Southampton. So, how is inclusion progressing in the UK? What have been its starting points, the historical heritage it has needed to work from?
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

How has this affected inclusion in the U.K?

Until the early 19th century, education in the United Kingdom was limited to the privileged few, to the exclusion of the masses. This changed to include so-called normal children, who by law had to receive an education. This right was later extended to others who experienced difficulties in learning, starting with deaf, then blind and later on physically disabled children. Facilities for these groups were invariably in special schools and classes. Mainstream schools, with their overcrowding were not generally expected to teach children experiencing complex learning difficulties or those who did not fit in. Indeed children whose learning difficulties were considered severe, were deemed to be ineducable and were denied any education in schools until 1972 (Cole, 1989).

Figure A.9.1 in Appendix 9 illustrates developments in special education during the 18th and 19th centuries, highlighting the major milestones in securing the entitlements of some children, albeit in special education (see Cole, 1989; for a review). Throughout the period, there were calls for children to attend the mainstream. Cole (1989) suggests that integration is embedded in the movement for mass education and is not a new phenomenon. Inclusion may be seen as a modernisation, a more enlightened review of the concept of integration.

Figure 2.4 illustrates the key developments with regard to integration and inclusion. The illustration clearly shows the pace in respect of integration to have been slow. As time has passed, there has been increasing recognition that more children should receive education as a right; in the mainstream as far as possible (Herr, 1993; DfEE, 1997). This was embodied in 1990 in the UN Convention on the rights of children. By 2002, all children will be expected to receive full time education (DfEE, 1999) and this in itself illustrates the position of children over the past century. Although entitled to ‘suitable and efficient education’, as required by legislation, children's right to full time education still awaits implementation.
Figure 2.4: Key Milestones in Integration and Inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Wood Committee: Large majority of children experiencing learning difficulties to be educated in the mainstream; only 17% to be in special schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Wood Committee’s recommendations enshrined in legislation; Section 33(2) of 1944 Education Act (see DES Warnock Report, 1978).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Re-organisation of all age schools; progressive ending of selection. Effects of Circular 10/65: schools broadened their curriculum to take account of individual needs; special classes and units were set up, including remedial classes. Integration was placed high on the education agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Chronically Sick and Disabled Person’s Act required provision to be made in ordinary schools for “deaf-blind, autistic and acutely dyslexic children”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>McCann Committee in Scotland recommended the integration of physically disabled children in the mainstream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976 Education Act; Section 10 required LEAs to arrange the education of all “handicapped” children in ordinary schools. Section 10 was however never implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Warnock Committee recommended the abolition of categories of ‘handicap’ and the integration of all children in the mainstream, subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>UN Convention on the rights of disabled children to receive an education so that they may develop their fullest potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-8</td>
<td>Labour Government revives debate about inclusion; will legislation follow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>SEN and Disability Rights in Education Bill to strengthen children’s rights to be included in the mainstream.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Current Position In England

Integration in England showed a slight downward trend in the 1980s. This changed after a "temporary blip" in the early 1990s (CSIE, 1994, 1997). The figures show that from 1991 to 1992, there was a small increase in special school placements across English LEAs, contrasting with the past decade’s gradual trend towards more integration (CSIE, 1994). In January 1992 the special school population increased from 1.47 to 1.49%.

There were wide variations between LEAs, with Lambeth and Hackney topping the league for special school placements at 2.98% and 2.76% respectively, compared with the national average of 1.49%. Barnsley (0.45%) and Cornwall (0.51%) were the lowest segregating authorities.
Appendix 14 shows the percentage of 5-15 year olds in special schools for the period, 1982 to 1992. This confirms a consistent downward trend, from 1.72% in 1982 to 1.47 in 1991. This increased to 1.49% in 1992. The period from 1993 to 1999 shows a gradual decrease as shown in table 2.2 below.

**Table 2.2: Percentages of special school placements in 1993, 1994, 1996 and 1999.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% in Special Schools</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in special schools</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>98,973</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>97,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures have been quoted from DfEE reports which are incomplete for some years, e.g. 1995; 1997 and 1998. However, it is clear that even the lowest figure is higher than those for the previous decades, i.e. 0.75% in 1950, 0.81% in 1955, 0.96% in 1965 and 1.01% in 1970. This does not compare favourably even with the 1.35% figure in 1972 when LEAs started to make provision for children previously considered ineducable (p. 31). However, the notion of a special school before this was quite different so that previous figures exclude these children. This said, the trend is not in accord with Government initiatives which build on the integration or normalisation principle (see Wolfensberger and Tullman, 1984) for wider groups, e.g. Care in the Community, following the 1993 Community Care Act.

The above statistics are based on LEA returns to the DfEE and are lacking in accuracy (CSIE, 1997; see also Hakim, 1996). Whilst they show percentages in mainstream and in special schools, they do not include essential details; e.g. how many children are in ordinary, in special classes or both; or in mainstream schools; essential information without which no judgement can be made as to the extent and level of integration. There is not enough detail to assess the extent to which the statistics mask LEA practices with regard to integration, e.g. whether they have a policy of providing resources without statements in the mainstream. This would have underestimated the numbers in mainstream and overestimated the proportion segregated. On the other hand, if a statement was always required for additional resources in the mainstream, a higher percentage would be shown as integrated. The same might apply to other LEAs in
broadly similar circumstances. However, LEAs with a range of special provision might feel they need to fill these facilities if they are to make effective use of their resources. Perhaps Newham is the LEA where there can be certainty about a policy having a direct impact on figures in the mainstream (Jordan, 1996).

Thomas and Davies (1999) summarise developments in England and Wales and argues that there have been many LEAs which have adopted the rhetoric of inclusion without providing for its implementation. These LEAs run the risks of failing children through "maindumping" (p. 68) because the enthusiasm for de-segregation has not been matched with similar care for all the children's needs to be provided. Information about other LEA practices has therefore to be interpreted with caution; this is provided to assist with comparisons when uncovering Southampton's position. Although many of the figures are about integration, it has already been suggested that this might be the first of two steps towards full inclusion, i.e. mainstream attendance followed by increasing participation in learning. Others have argued that as integration is a precursor to inclusion, many of the ideals aspired for inclusion in terms of children's participation rank highly with integration too (Cole, 2000). There are many similarities in terms of principles and approaches though the restructuring of schools may not have been as well understood (p. 10).

Reports from the DfEE (1996, 1998) confirm that nationally for the period 1995/96, up to 30% of school aged children were identified as experiencing difficulties in learning and at the early stages of the DfE's Code of Practice for Children with SEN (DFE, 1994); the national average was 10.2%. Special school placements remained at around 98,000, between 1.2 to 1.5% of the total school population. The placements of children issued with statements of SEN were 57% in mainstream; 40% in special (including maintained and non-maintained special schools and pupil referral units); and 3% in independent special schools. The percentage of children re-integrated in mainstream schools during 1995/96 was on average no more than 1% of the special school population.
The DfEE reports show that once segregated, very few children are returned to the mainstream. This may be to do with the complexity of needs special schools deal with. However, the figures run counter to any claim of integration, still less of inclusion, as long as such practices continue. It does not show any move from mainstream schools to be making the necessary changes for children who experience the greatest complexity in learning. How does Southampton compare with other LEAs in respect of children's placements? Are there identifiable trends in respect of inclusion?

Inclusion: Pace And Progress In The U.K.

The process of enabling children to stay in the mainstream seems to have been slower than would have been anticipated. What are the reasons for this? The literature suggests a number of factors as being relevant.

The lack of any conclusive research evidence in favour of either inclusive or special education (p. 20-24) has influenced thinking and practice. The consequences of the 1988 Education Reform Act were another factor. The introduction of the National Curriculum, key stage assessments, and the increasing impact of accountability and other forces, including appraisal, on the teaching profession have exercised negative forces (Daniels and Ware, 1990, Hegarty, 1993, O'Hanlon, 1993). The increasing focus on school performance and resulting publicity, particularly relating to failing schools and the publication of league tables (O'Hanlon, 1995) have compounded this issue. Market forces leading to open competition between schools and funding based on pupil driven formulae have been further barriers to inclusion (Rouse and Florian, 1997).

The past seven years have witnessed a rise in the number of disciplinary exclusions from full time education of around 450%. These are reported to reflect the pressures on schools and their reluctance to cope with indiscipline (Parsons and Howlett, 1995; The Children's Society, 1998, TES, 1998; Wallace, op.cit). Economic stringencies imposed on LEAs with limited capital resources have forced them to make use of their existing special schools (see Marlett and Buchner, 1992; TES, April 1996).
These, combined with the intransigence and resistance of the special school lobby which has taken up more entrenched positions (Daunt, 1995; Jordan, 1987, 1996) has slowed down the pace of inclusion. The complacency of central Government which, until recently, has been unwilling to produce directives to promote integration or inclusion has not helped. The 1981 Education Act placed a duty on LEAs to provide for children's SEN in ordinary schools but with conditions.

Critics claim that this did no more than express the desirability of integration, confirming an ideological stance embedded in conditions which served as loopholes or safety valves for LEAs to make efficient use of resources (Wright, 1995). The Education Acts of 1993 and 1996 have gone no further. Implementation is again to be carried out "within existing resources. Though revived, with the same wordings, in the 1981 and the 1993 Education Acts, the matter of resources still remains unresolved. This does not bode well for the future, given that any success with inclusion is inextricably dependent on the necessary resources being available (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1995). The current political agenda has recently been summarised in the Government's Green Paper (1997). This is discussed in Chapter 3.

The literature evidence is fairly convincing (see O'Hanlon, 1993, 1995, for a further review). The above have been cumulative factors exercising a negative effect on any movement towards inclusion. Education has been an area of considerable changes and uncertainties during the past two decades, with economic forces dictating priorities. Although it may well have been cheaper to include children in mainstream education, employment, productivity and economic potential overrode cost considerations. Inclusion was also overlooked.

Local Management, league tables and the reforms of the 1988 Education Act have been mainly aimed at raising standards, with the objective of making this country more competitive (DfEE, 1997). It was inevitable that perceived expensive changes focusing on the pupil population with lesser economic potential would not be classed as priorities. Hence, the focus
remained sharply on improving the performance of schools, on raising standards and on increasing accountability.

**Inclusion In The UK: The Present And The Future**

It seems that pressure groups and international law will ensure that inclusion continues to matter, irrespective of whether or not empirical foundations or administrative will exist, to drive it. Such a scenario does not deviate from practice in many other areas of education where the lack of any empirical or theoretical basis has not been a disincentive to change, in terms of adoption, commitment or indeed legislation; e.g. National Curriculum, Standard Assessments. However, cycles of endorsement and reversal of educational policies and practices are also common, e.g. mixed ability teaching (DfEE, 1997; see also Downey and Kelly, 1979). The same could apply to inclusion, especially if equity becomes an unaffordable concept. Therefore, how long inclusion remains in favour remains to be seen; it may not change too greatly from how it is now after a century of efforts; waves and tides to promote it. Can schools reform in fundamental ways to increase the participation of all children or will there continue to be cosmetic changes which maintain a dual system of mainstream and special education?

Much will depend on political will, public opinion, availability of resources and acceptance 'on the ground' by people most affected by it, particularly teachers and parents. Reaching their hearts and minds will be crucial as society cannot legislate for inclusion other than procedurally. There is a myth that only those with specialist training and qualifications are equipped to teach children experiencing difficulties in learning. This has been promoted by experts; such "expertism" (Troyna and Vincent, 1996) and "professionalism" create barriers to inclusion (Tomlinson, op.cit). If teachers do not have belief in their experience, expertise and competence, inclusion will be heavily resisted in practice whilst the rhetoric is wholeheartedly accepted in principle (Sebba and Sachdev, 1997). Words and not action will be the reality. The bedrock of inclusion is the pivotal role of the SEN Co-ordinator (SENCO); the support of schools' senior
management teams (SMT); the commitment of the staff; the quality of support; and the attitude of parents and pupils (Webster, 1999). The LEA's role will be to ensure that training and support are in place for 'front line' staff to make a difference.

SEN and Disability Rights legislation will make LEAs and schools more accountable and liable to claims of unfair treatment and discrimination from “disabled” children. It will maintain the focus on inclusion and will force LEAs to recognise and make equal provision for children experiencing physical and other difficulties, in a manner which does not disadvantage them. It is in this sense to be welcome though there will be the inevitable increase in litigation. This may divert funds from schools into the legal arena. On the positive side, central government is promising more funds for inclusion; £30 million for disabled access over three years (BBC 2000e).

INCLUSION: EFFICACY AND FINANCIAL DIMENSIONS

Inclusion and Segregation: Comparisons Of Costs

The costs of special education in comparison with mainstream education deserve scrutiny, not least within the current climate of LEAs being increasingly expected to deliver best value, i.e. value for money. Since the 1970s such pressures and accountabilities have been mounting (Lukes, 1981). The literature suggests that special education costs 4 to 5 times more than mainstream education (Fulcher, 1989; Goodlad and Lovitt, 1993; Lukes, op.cit; Audit Commission 1992; OECD, 1994). Luke reports that although special schools provide for 1.5 % of the total school population, they have 3.7% of all teachers, 12.2% of all educational support staff, 5.4% of all schools, and 4.2% of all education spending. It is interesting to study his summary of the position as far back as 1981. This is shown in table 2.3 below and is for the period between 1979 and 1981.
Table 2.3: The Funding of Special Education: Costs per pupil in each type of school p.a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Residential Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>£337</td>
<td>£505</td>
<td>£1479</td>
<td>£1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>£386</td>
<td>£567</td>
<td>£1648</td>
<td>£2095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>£436</td>
<td>£629</td>
<td>£1978</td>
<td>£2370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current position in relation to spending ratios has not changed significantly. The Audit Commission (AC, 1994), quotes a figure of around £4,000 for pupils experiencing moderate learning difficulties, which approximate to around 4-5 times the amount of spending in relation to pupils in the mainstream (at 1994 prices). It makes the point that for such pupils in special schools to be supported in the mainstream, the costs of additional help would lead to similar levels of expenditure. Pollock and Klipp (1991) made similar findings and argue that students educated in inclusive settings cost marginally less than their segregated peers. A recent study by Crowther et al. (op.cit) of costs and outcomes in respect of children categorised as experiencing moderate learning difficulties, also found that special placements were consistently more expensive than similar placements in the mainstream, sometimes by 80% or more. Transport costs also contributed to these, amounting to 37% of the difference.

In most Western countries, funding is allocated on the basis of identified needs, normally confirmed through an Individual Education Programme as in the US or through a Statement of SEN as in the UK (Goodlad and Lovitt, op cit; AC, 1994). Different weighted formulae, block grants and ways of allocating funding exist, (Marsh, 1998), leading to considerable investments, e.g. $16 billion in Washington over 11 years from 1975 to 1986 (Washington DC, 1991); in Denmark 1 to 1.5 of an additional teacher for every school with 200 children on roll, including 5 to 6 with Statements (Vislie, 1995); 0.3 full time equivalent of a teacher for a school of similar size in the UK to support children experiencing difficulties but without a Statement of SEN. In the U.K, central government allocates 20% of funds for 'additional educational needs' to LEAs in the Standard Spending Assessment (SSA). This is for children without a Statement of SEN (Marsh, op.cit). Special school investments are additional to these and are considerable if capital resources are included. There are also the costs of
professional assessments relating to special placements, e.g. estimated to be at around $3,000 per child, totalling around $99 million dollars in New York City (Goodlad and Lovitt, op.cit). In Southampton, the central professional and administrative costs of providing for children with Statements exceed £1 million per annum.

The average of 4 to 5 times more expenditure on special education is therefore an underestimate. Many 'types' of learning difficulty as classified cost significantly more, e.g. autism, challenging behaviour. Therefore, one line of reasoning is that, given that special education requires significantly more resources, there should be significant additional returns. However, current measures used have failed to show these returns; these may be due to the nature or inadequacy of these measures but nevertheless the hard pressed LEA is being expected to be accountable and to demonstrate gains.

Savings From Re-allocation Of Resources: Missed Opportunities?

The Audit Commission (1994) has found that in LEAs where special school numbers have been falling, LEAs have not re-allocated funds to mainstream schools and that special school resources have been maintained. Their estimation is that between 1986 to 1991, £53 million could have been re-directed to mainstream schools; this would be substantially more by to-day's values. LEAs failed to re-allocate around £500,000 of these funds every year. Their difficulty was linked to the need to maintain a dual system of education.

Mainstream schools are still having to search for additional resources. Marsh (op.cit) claims that this has been counter-productive to inclusion. His analysis shows an increase of Statements in mainstream schools from 62,000 in 1991 to 134,000 in January 1997. The number of special school placements has remained constant at around 1.2%, reflecting the nature of the activity that has taken place. Mainstream schools have accrued resources for their own pupils, diverting the focus from developing inclusive practices.
Alberta in Canada illustrates the financial impacts on practice if money is in plentiful supply. Various initiatives were supported and schools welcomed children who experienced the most severe learning difficulties because they carried public grants. The effect was dramatic, particularly with regard to the number of children who could stay at home and attend their local schools. Between 1975 and 1978, this rose from 12.8 to 81.1% of 0-5 yr. olds, from 8.3 to 56.1% of 6-10s and from 0 to 8.6% of 11-15s. When these incentives were removed in the mid-1980s and replaced by block formula funding, numbers fell sharply. Scarce funds were chased by the more vocal and powerful; children said to be experiencing specific learning difficulties gained more resources at the expense of those whose needs were more complex and severe (Marlett and Buchner, op.cit).

ANALYSES OF FACTORS AFFECTING INCLUSION

Forces For And Against Inclusion

Before concluding, I summarise below some of the factors which impinge on inclusion. A "forcefield" and "PEST" analysis are used to illustrate these. PEST stands for political, economic, social and technological factors. Forcefield and PEST analysis are management techniques which are well documented in the management literature (Carnall, 1989; Johnson and Scholes, 1990). Forcefield analysis is a means of illustrating the forces which act for and against a phenomenon under study. PEST analysis summarises the macro-dimensions into political, economic, social and technological factors. These techniques are used as a means of encapsulating the key issues surrounding inclusion around these dimensions. Figure 2.5 below summarises the issues in relation to inclusion.
Figure 2.5: Force Field Analysis to illustrate the forces working for and against inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces For Inclusion</th>
<th>Forces Against Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation, e.g. Section 10 of the 1976 Education Act, never implemented, 1981&amp;1993 Education Act.</td>
<td>Conditions in the legislation, e.g. effective use of resources, education of the majority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ability teaching/differentiation; access to National Curriculum which is every child's entitlement.</td>
<td>Key Stage Assessments, OFSTED inspections, accountability issues, performance/league table publications. Lack of SEN expertise in mainstream teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling school rolls/birth rates in the 80s</td>
<td>Availability of Special school places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport costs; cheaper if child attends local school.</td>
<td>More economic use of resources if children grouped according to their learning difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A human right; access to 'normal' peer groups.</td>
<td>Special schools, due to their smaller sizes, can offer a more sheltered and protective environment, especially to the more vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism (see Warnock, 1986)</td>
<td>Humane (see Warnock, op.cit); caring; protective duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from political rhetoric, interested pressure groups, e.g Integration Alliance; CSIE.</td>
<td>Not politically feasible nor acceptable to LEAs to close down a tried and tested system of special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Education and experiences therefrom</td>
<td>Local Management of schools and the expense of providing for SEN; witness LEAs difficulties in controlling their SEN Budgets (TES, April 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental choice/power and market forces; pupil driven formulae</td>
<td>Children experiencing behaviour difficulties; their effects on the image and performance of the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.6 illustrates the political, economic, social and technological realities affecting inclusion (all discourses). LEAs have opted out as far as possible (the political discourse) even though falling birth rates could have made it easier for more children to be included in the mainstream (the rights discourse). Being tied into a system of dual schooling maintained the status quo (the efficacy discourse) and provided other options for children experiencing difficulties in learning. The National Curriculum has also acted as a deterrent. Teachers have struggled to implement this with the existing majority of children experiencing learning difficulties in the mainstream, let alone those still in special schools (the efficacy discourse).
**Pros of Inclusion** | **Cons of Inclusion**
--- | ---
**Political (Political Discourse)** |  
Politically sound; appeals to parents and community; a vote winner. Supported by some pressure groups, e.g. Downs Syndrome Association. | Has to contend with pressure groups in support of special schools, e.g. Dyslexia lobby, National Autistic Society, Special School Heads/Governors.  
Complies with the law, cf 1993 Education Act | Very expensive and not easily affordable as resources already committed in special schools.  
Unlikely to be opposed by other political parties for fear of bad publicity | May have to explain failures if 'experiments' should fail, i.e. high risk with status quo safer.

**Economic (Efficacy and Pragmatic Discourse)** |  
Savings from special schools through elimination of transport costs, grouping and resourcing in mainstream. | Special Schools lead to 'economies of scale', i.e. cheaper to group children who are experiencing learning difficulties. Cheaper; resources committed.  
SEN Resourcing more easily afforded through small additions to mainstream school budgets | Available places in special schools must be used to avoid waste, duplication and inefficiencies.  
Larger numbers can be supported in mainstream through these small additions, e.g. this is the purpose of LEA's SEN Audits around the country. | Smaller numbers in special schools inefficient; may need to close them down to achieve economies.

**Social (Rights Discourse)** |  
National and international support for inclusion | Not a major issue in the U.K, except amongst directly affected groups.  
Desirable as a human right; in line with Government legislation and policy, e.g. Education Acts, 1996. | Social effects/benefits have not been proven.  
Integration and Inclusion are essential steps towards inclusion in the community. | Requirements within schools and wider society not yet in place and could take too long to organise.

**Technological (Pragmatic Discourse)** |  
IT has made available the resources children require for their SEN to be met, e.g. in terms of learning, communication, mobility, etc. This includes support for distance learning, schools collaboration, etc. | Specialised IT is expensive. Their use requires investment and training. Time, resources, etc cost money... may not fit in with priorities of schools as children who experience LDs are in the minority.  
IT = technological prestige= high status to children & schools. Opportunity to share solutions, form peer groups, e.g. Internet, World web, etc. | Inclusion presents a challenge for schools to solve, by using and developing existing technologies resources and expertise.

Abbreviations: LDs = Learning Difficulties  
SEN = Special Educational Needs  
IT=information technology
The balance between the forces for and against inclusion may change as a result of new SEN legislation, e.g. from SEN bill (2000). These may create further impetus (the rights discourse). If new legislation and practices were to bring about change, then the cost disadvantages of special schools and the improving economy may promote inclusion (the efficacy discourse). New technology, both in teaching and in information systems may also help an increasing number of children to attend mainstream schools (the pragmatics discourse).

LITERATURE CRITICISM

The problem of definition has already been discussed, particularly with regard to international comparisons. Inclusion is promoted in absolute terms even though it lacks empirical foundations. More generally, the following weaknesses apply.

Inclusion is a value and a process, not a state. It is a journey; not a destination. It is therefore difficult to research and measure. Research reports are snapshots at a specific point in time; most are not easily comparable though they can be informative and worthwhile. Reliability and validity of the data is problematic because many studies depend on official statistics which are lacking in these areas (CSIE, 1997). Inclusion is a fashionable concept, so that it is difficult to report against the tide (Jenkinson, 1997). There are exceptions, e.g. Kaufmann and Hallahan (op.cit). However, researcher bias is an issue as the current ideology and commitment to human rights promote inclusion (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, 2000). This may be influenced by unquestioned assumptions and acceptance relating to claims about inclusion being beneficial or necessary. In these cases, interpretation of findings requires caution.

The figures reported on inclusion are usually about integration and are misleading, especially when presented without the necessary contextual information, e.g. are some figures higher as a result of policies or local circumstances? (CSIE, 1994; 1997; Onions, op.cit). There are also unquestioned assumptions about inclusion relating to all children being
included. Yet it is well known that all simply does not always refer to all; it most frequently refers to only those children who have been thought capable of being included. Many with the most disabling difficulties have been excluded as if that was the natural expectation (Goodlad and Lovitt, op.cit).

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 2 has clarified a number of issues in relation to inclusion. These have included the rhetoric and reality dimensions from stakeholder perspectives as these are important to this research. Studies reporting on the perspectives and experiences of teachers, parents and children are obviously key to these; they represent the same groups central to my research. National and international practices have also been discussed enabling Southampton's circumstances to be assessed within these contexts. Many issues are raised in relation to the rationale, the costs and the desirability of inclusion. Inclusion seems to be favoured generally.

Southampton faces many of these issues in relation to inclusion and by researching its context, it may be possible to shed some light on how its circumstances relate to those of other LEAs and beyond. Southampton has a heritage of special schools and other provision. The extent to which these are used provides a measure of the extent to which it is becoming more inclusive. Southampton allocates public funds through an SEN Audit and other mechanisms, implements its own and national policies and deals with a whole range of education stakeholders. In this sense, it is no different to other LEAs and analysis of its practices may reveal insights into how inclusion can be promoted (CSIE, 1994; 1997). Chapter 2 provides the literature evidence for the study. How does this relate to broader theoretical considerations? These are discussed in chapter 3. Chapter 3 provides the theoretical model of inclusion which is used in this study. This is derived from Dyson's (1999) 'rationale and realisation' discourses and I distinguish these from the other discourses I have already described in my analyses.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter develops a conceptual framework appropriate for evaluating inclusion in Southampton. The aim is to explore appropriate theoretical foundations so that the study can move from the particularity of Southampton to enable some generalisation to other contexts. Dyson and Millward (2000) suggest that such theoretical groundings enhance the generalisation of findings. The approach is to construct frameworks or theoretical lenses through which may be viewed the rhetoric and reality of inclusion, e.g. in relation to SEN funding and practice, professionalism and discourses. The links between special education and other fundamental issues are also explored, specifically those relating to human rights, equality of opportunity, power and politics.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Theories of Special Education

The literature details a range of theories on special education, including some on inclusion. Clark, Dyson and Millward (1998) provide a comprehensive review. My focus is on the models and discourses likely to shed light on my research questions and circumstances.

The key points that emerge suggest a rejection of so-called essentialist theories within the psycho-medical paradigm locating deficits within children. This labels children, fails to safeguard their needs and reinforces the position of professionals and other stakeholders with vested interests. There is an increasing adoption of a social model of disability which considers contextual, political and social factors. This rejects the methodological individualism prevalent in positivist social research (Oliver, 1992), arguing that the experiences of 'disabled' individuals are more important. This social disability model has been subject to fierce
debate, (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1998), particularly the view that it promotes an image of disabled individuals as normal, denying that they may be a social class of their own and exposing them to dangers that their needs might be overlooked, especially at times of economic stringencies.

There is also an emergence of social constructionist theories which pinpoint the locus of the problem with regard to disability, in the minds of able bodied individuals and their peers. This asserts the value of disabled people, their individuality and their identity, calling for them to be positively recognised. It criticises oppression and the social, political and material disadvantages disabled people have to face.

Combining these theories reveal insights into the rationale and ideals for inclusion. If schools are steps towards an inclusive and democratic society, these theoretical perspectives can help uncover negative practices, experiences of prejudices and oppression and help researchers to be alert to the dangers of neglecting the experiences of disabled people. Barnes (1995) is particularly concerned about this. Which theory or model or combination of theories, best explains the rhetoric and reality of inclusion in Southampton?

Bailey (1998) suggests that there are two ideals in special education and for that matter inclusion. Labels are not acceptable and non-categorisation is more considerate and equitable. He also argues for assessment to be as functional as possible and to include curricular issues. There is real value in breaking down professional barriers; special education should be viewed as services and not placements. Again, would applications of this paradigm help with my study of professional, funding and placement practices in respect of inclusion?

Foucault (1977a) on the other hand, calls for an analysis of the way in which disabled identities and experiences are constructed. He illustrates this through the medical discourse of creating illness and madness and the complex power relationships that exist. The medical gaze shows how medical practitioners exercise power and retain credibility and authority.
Foucault (1977a) provides a "box of tools" to assess mechanisms for surveillance. Hierarchical observation includes a perfect gaze, sees everybody perfectly and provides the whole picture. Normalising judgments draw the distinction between SEN and non-SEN, without providing any clarity about cut off points, e.g. when do SEN arise; at what degree of complexity? These judgments only reinforce assessment of deviance. They enable professionals "to differentiate and judge over individuals holding them in a mechanism of objectification whereby they may be trained, corrected, classified, normalised or excluded" (1977b, p. 184-191). Following such assessments, children classified as having SEN are marked for perpetual surveillance for the whole of their school lives and beyond. Foucault argues that professional discursive practices reveal complex relationships between power and knowledge and how these exercise control over individuals who are subjugated to such power. By looking for 'points of resistance' (Foucault: 1976, p. 75) within both formal and informal discourses the influences of power can be discerned. The classroom equivalents might be teacher discourses and their point of resistance towards some children. Foucault advocates a focus on all discourses. This ensures that all voices are heard.

The above theories about special education have application to my research on inclusion, helping to identify and relate the issues that emerged in practice back to a theoretical framework. They raise important issues to some of my enquiries, e.g. how is disability viewed and constructed; what are professional practices; how does the LEA use its classification system; what are stakeholder perspectives; is there oppression? Are children's voices heard or are they being silenced by those of adults (Allan, op.cit).

Theories of Inclusion

More recently, Clough and Corbett (op.cit) have provided a comprehensive review of theories of inclusion. They propose five models. The first relates to the psycho-medical paradigm, with a focus on within-child deficit; similar to the 'essentialist paradigm' detailed above. The second relates to a sociological response which explicitly rejects the notion that deficits are
within children, promoting the view that difficulties are interactional and created, i.e. a social disability model. The third emphasises curricular approaches and their importance in relation to children's participation in learning; these can both enhance and obstruct curriculum access. The fourth is about school effectiveness approaches, with a focus on whole school systems and influences on learning. The fifth encapsulates disability studies critiques, arising mainly outside of education, with a political focus on the exclusionary forces exerted by the psycho-medical paradigm, i.e. more akin to the social constructionist model.

The links with and progression from theories of special to inclusive education are apparent in Clough and Corbett's work; they are based and build on previous theoretical viewpoints. Although the above models have evolved in distinct phases, they often co-exist (Clough and Corbett, op.cit). Historical developments are evident in such theorising. I will now detail a theoretical perspective to progress the approach I undertake in my research.

This is based on Clark, Dyson and Millward's (1998) post positivist approach to theorising special education and inclusion. They had earlier provided a number of models against which special education may be viewed. After rejecting the psycho-medical paradigm and reviewing social models of disability, they propose a post-positivist approach. This recognises that there are many facts and givens which empiricism could not add value to in the sense of either proving or disproving them. Oppression and social injustices could be viewed as givens, "a prioris" (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1998, p. 163); i.e. facts that research cannot invalidate. Many derive from laws or issues of human rights. It is therefore more productive that they be accepted as givens and as starting points within which to view the world of special education or inclusion. A principled examination which clearly states its fundamental values and principles can lead to insightful enquiry, albeit within a limited illustrative role.

Dyson and Millward (op.cit) cite the work of Skrtic and Ainscow, to illustrate the way such approaches have been used to generate theories of inclusion. Skrtic's (1991) claims have no empirical bases but are grounded
within a 'theory of knowledge'; he uses a logical 'tour de force' to argue about adhocracy (Dyson and Millward, op.cit, p. 27 and p. 20 respectively). Adhocracy is claimed to be the opposite of bureaucracy, a feature of stuck schools, i.e. those undergoing few positive changes (Ainscow, 1999). Whilst bureaucracy is rigid, non adaptable and supposedly accountable, with a focus on performance and standards, adhocracy is about being inventive and innovative. It leads to problem solving organisations configured to invent new programmes and solutions free from the constraints of bureaucracy or the convergence and rigidities of professional influences. Adhocracy is a feature of inclusive schools, alive, creative, dynamic and divergent to challenges. This may explain why traditional views about special education and the bureaucratic configuration of schools may be barriers to inclusion.

Ainscow (1999) provides some further clarification of what inclusive schools or what he calls "moving schools" might look like. He claims that there are six features: effective leadership, whole school involvement, collaborative planning, enquiry and reflection and staff development. Could any of these features be discerned in Southampton schools?

Clark, Dyson and Millward (1998) however, point to some of the dangers of these approaches. At best, they are wide ranging and principled; at worst, they lead to circular arguments, e.g. adhocracy requires inclusive schools which are essential for excellence. Their new paradigm is asocial and ahistorical; it points to an end in special education. They argue that values of equity and inclusion have to be realised within a determinate structure, i.e. within contexts that already have infra-structures in their facilities and provision for mainstream and special education. Real differences exist between individual children, their needs and the circumstances they are in. The articulation of values is different from their realisation which is grounded and influenced by prevailing discourses on special education.

Clark, Dyson and Millward (1998) argue that education is a complex world, with inevitable tensions, dilemmas and conflicts. Determinacy of provision forces choices and conflicts with inclusive responses to diversity.
It is unhelpful to think that theory or values will lead to action and more effective to interrogate complex, competing and conflicting relationships in context. They suggest a link between special education and other fundamental education issues as one way of exploring inclusion, especially when this is within an historical dimension of location, context and time.

Viewed through these lenses, it is possible to derive insights into how inclusion might be perceived and studied. If applied to the Southampton context, how could special education or indeed inclusion be explored at a particular point of the LEA's history and development? How is rhetoric different from practice and to what extent is this influenced by the presence of determinate structures, i.e. Southampton's special provision? How have discourses shaped and continue to maintain this determinacy? How can special education be linked with the fundamental issues that Southampton and other LEAs are facing in relation to human rights, equity and social justice? These are key questions, arising directly from the above theoretical position and I explore them. I do this using a theoretical model derived from Dyson's (op.cit) discourses on inclusion, summarised below.

**Discourses and Inclusion**

Dyson (op.cit) describes and distinguishes between four discourses: the rights and ethics; the efficacy; the political and pragmatic discourse. The first two are concerned with the rationale for inclusion, based on critical analyses of special education. The other two are about realising inclusion, including any transition from special education that might be required. The rights and ethics discourse focus on children's rights and the ethics of adult obligations; on a culture of delivering what is morally right in an equitable way. Its concern is on social justice which it claims only inclusive education can deliver. This is because special education is viewed as political and professional manipulation to preserve majority privileges and interests. Although veiled as offering sanctuaries for vulnerable children, special education is argued to be oppressive, even perverse, especially when advantaged families 'invent' forms of disability which are not stigmatising but carry additional resourcing.
With this has to be reconciled efficacy which we have already seen to be in favour of mainstream education (p. 24). The efficacy discourse examines the quality of provision in terms of costs and pupil outcomes. As with the rights and ethics discourse, it provides a critical analysis of special education, as practised initially within semi-segregated provision in mainstream settings. Dyson (op.cit) details research findings which expose the weaknesses of, and absence of any distinctive characteristics in, special provision. He cites the work of Ysseldyke, Algozzine and Epps (1983) which found no distinctive qualities in such provision and other findings which show that children did not make any better progress in special than in mainstream schools. He argues that there is a considerable body of empirical evidence to demonstrate the superiority of inclusive education in comparison with special schooling.

The political discourse concentrates on the struggles of disadvantaged individuals to participate in the lives of their mainstream communities. The pragmatics discourse is about finding practical alternatives. It helps to illuminate what inclusion might look like in practice and reflects the search for the characteristics of inclusive schools and practices.

The rights, ethics and political discourses serve to interrogate what schools actually are, how they may represent vested interests and how they may lead to oppression in disadvantaged groups. They serve to question the rationale. The efficacy and pragmatics discourse allow for an examination of school performance and focus more on outcomes.

Dyson (op.cit) warns against "thinking on inclusion descending from analysis to polemic, and for certain values to become ossified" (ibid.p. 43). He argues that inclusion should not be thought of as a single notion as there is a multiplicity of inclusions which can be arrived at in different ways. By adopting different discourses, the interaction between them constructs the 'target group' for inclusion differently, differentiating between those who are included and those who are either excluded, or at risk of exclusion, from schools. He points to eclecticism in the way the literature deals with inclusion and warns of the risks of reducing the four discourses into a
homogenous entity. He recommends the exploration of rigorous and reputable ways of enabling discourses to inform each other, to inform new ways of thinking and to promote 'mutual interrogation' (ibid. p. 44). Whilst the discourses help to analyse how children's circumstances are constructed, they can also be used to interrogate the perspectives of other stakeholders whose starting points might reveal opposite views.

Dyson's discourses summarise and are consistent with much of the theorising detailed above. I have used his four discourses as a helpful and structured theoretical frame of reference within which can be located some of the findings of my study. This starts with "givens" about rights, justice and the merits of inclusion. I use the discourses to interrogate the data with the aim of linking them to theory. This provides both rigour in analysis and facilitates generalisations. Where I require further theoretical models to structure my thoughts and analyse my findings, I use the literature detailed in Chapter 2, including the paradigms or reflections given below, particularly when using grounded theory methodology. Where I refer to 'the four discourse model' in my analysis, e.g. in terms of ethics and politics, these are specifically derived and related to Dyson's theory. On these occasions, my arguments are premised along the same lines as those detailed in his four discourses.

REFLECTIONS ON THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: DILEMMAS AND ISSUES

Links Between Inclusion and Other Fundamental Education Issues

Clark, Dyson and Millward (1995) advocate a theoretical position which emphasises the connection between special education or inclusion to other fundamental education issues. My literature review has helped me to identify the main dilemmas facing education practitioners and other stakeholders as being related to issues of rights, selection, equality of opportunity, power and politics. There are others but these are the ones most related to my research questions framed in an LEA context. I start with the issue of human rights. I then go on to detail the rest in turn.
Human Rights

The right to education is well established; it is enshrined in legislation. However, the right to an education in the mainstream has yet to become a reality for large numbers of children (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, 2000). The difference between the rhetoric of rights for all children and the reality that mainstream education is reserved for those in the majority has been the subject of debate for some time (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit; Barnes, op.cit). This has arisen as a result of some confusion in viewpoints about children having equal rights leading to discourses about equal opportunities. These discourses have shifted attention away from the experiences of 'disabled people' who feel marginalised or oppressed, by placing the emphasis on their needs for such opportunities to become accessible, i.e. a different emphasis and argument.

These have also led to benevolent, charitable approaches; the rhetoric being that the state is safeguarding their interests by providing cushions of support and by regulating competing individual interests. Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton (op.cit) argue that this is about preserving welfare, not human rights within an essentialist, individual-reductionist paradigm. The concept of human rights is constrained within an 'ethical critique of exclusion', (p. 9). This fails to consider the forces of power and control and veils the practice of safeguarding majority interests through the construction of needs in others.

Applied to education, this means not addressing the issue of seeing exclusion from the mainstream, from the perspectives of children who are segregated or marginalised. It also fails to address the requirements, i.e. for mainstream schools to change. This serves to maintain majority interests, accepting the shortfalls as realities so long as the majority of children can be educated in this way and teachers can cope. Rights are therefore differentiated to preserve the interests of the majority; as a group so entitled as belonging to the mainstream, they benefit. The problem is that those marginalised, by attracting individual responses, are not seen as a group but as individuals, thus failing to have collective impact. Traditional
individualistic approaches to disability focus on individual disabled people rather than the influence of a disabling society (Barnes, op.cit). Professionals and those in power construct their circumstances as individuals with special needs. It is this very power that, Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton (op.cit) argue, should be challenged. Needs theory keeps the focus on the individual and is about welfare rights. It encourages 'welfarism and benevolent humanitarianism because a model of care is substituted for struggle against political and social processes of oppression' (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit, p. 11). Human rights demand a challenge to all forms of discrimination for all groups of individuals who might be oppressed or suffering social injustice. The rights of the majority must not prevail over those of the individual. Inclusion is linked to a political critique of such power and control; a questioning of the social and political values they serve. It is crucial that concerns with principles of equality do not detract from the more fundamental task of providing conditions within which such equality can be achieved whilst valuing difference. Otherwise, inclusion will remain a technical and ethical polemic that does nothing to challenge oppressive practices (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit).

If education is a human right and the above arguments are accepted, then there should be no selectivity, no experience of marginalisation, exclusion or oppression. The circumstances of all children experiencing difficulties in learning would then be looked at in ways that remove the potential for inequality. This rhetoric can be satisfied if all children are able to receive an education and this is nearly the case in this country but not world-wide (see chapter 2). However, the circumstances of those excluded represent inequality in the sense of their human rights being denied because the system constructed for the majority does not work for them. Likewise, if equal opportunities require that all children should be given the choice of mainstream education, oppression and political manipulation arise through some having to be segregated. Promoting human rights might in these circumstances mean doing away with special schools and ensuring that all children can attend the mainstream. However, differentiation of the rights to learn and to be a participative member of the school community raises
issues. These are currently addressed and resolved through needs-driven theories, i.e. that some children's educational rights require differentiated placements so that they have equal opportunities to learn. The ethical and moral dilemmas such practices raise are inherent in the practices themselves but more fundamentally rest with the weaknesses and fragility of schools in meeting the needs of all children.

My experience of Southampton and other LEAs suggests that human rights are likely to be perceived within a narrower perspective of a right to education, not necessarily in the mainstream. I explore respondents' discourses to test this in my analyses whilst acknowledging that the pursuit of equal opportunities is important to all stakeholders. Does this work even where mainstream education is guaranteed? I shall now consider issues of equal opportunities including those of selection, de-selection, power and politics below.

*Equality of Opportunity?*

Given that education is socially constructed and imposed, it can only aspire to equality of opportunity. The reality is that the social order in a world of scarce resources tends to reinforce selection on pre-determined grounds, academic excellence being the key to elitist positions and to power (Tomlinson, op.cit). There is therefore a tension between the ideal of enabling success for all and differentially allocating scarce resources. Selection on the basis of ability has provided the criteria for such allocation. Within this paradigm, the conflict and polar positions separating the education of students judged to be able and those judged to be less able is readily apparent. Even amongst mainstream pupils, the selection process is evident. When viewed against children experiencing learning difficulties, the tensions between the ideal of equality and the reality of difference becomes even more irreconcilable. A selective process cannot at one and the same time provide equal opportunities for all and differentiate between the selected and the not selected. This makes it difficult to maximise the participation of all children in their education if other forces impinge on the key participants.
If the pressure is on academic achievement, this becomes the priority to which resources are targeted; the losers are children who experience difficulties and need help with learning. Where education is a filter to the world of opportunities, then it is essentially discriminatory. However, if it is about enabling children to reach their potential, it can become empowering. This is the essence of inclusion which is the hallmark of individuality and difference. Equality, equity and fairness are about values; few will have any problems with these. However, there is little congruence between the rhetoric of equality and the requirement for excellence in a market mentality and culture. Given this, to what extent are Southampton children provided with equal opportunities? Is there any evidence of practice that either promotes or hinders equality of opportunity? Are there processes of selection and de-selection?

**Selection by Ability**

Historically, in England and Wales, education has operated on a selective basis. The 1944 Education Act introduced a tripartite system of education, comprising grammar, secondary modern and technical schools, each with emphases of their own, but derived from a process of selection based on the 11+ examinations. This is a prime example of an essentialist discourse; the implementation of psycho-medical paradigms in practice. The selective factor was academic performance. Grammar schools were for those deemed to be the most able whilst secondary modern schools catered for the lesser able, the technical schools offering a more technical, vocationally oriented education. This categorisation was based on examination results (Cole, 1989; Downey et al, op.cit).

The appearance of comprehensive education has not greatly changed this process of selection. Setting and banding have been commonplace in such schools and in some LEAs grammar schools have continued to be popular. Indeed the White paper, *Excellence for All*, (DfEE, 1997), specifically recommends the use of setting by ability. Since the introduction of Grant Maintained, now "Foundation" schools, there has been increasing fear of the more popular schools becoming selective. Popularity is determined by
academic excellence. The publication of league tables has assisted in this process. The very existence of league tables emphasises the belief that education is easily evaluated against academic indicators. Such measures are constructs. They serve an essentially political, social and political function; a means of social engineering (Ballard, op.cit).

Education may be viewed as a process, the main purpose of which is that of sorting, selecting and allocating individuals in their preparation for employment, leisure and adult life. This seems to me, likely to lead to selective, not inclusive schools. Schools which are high in the league tables have become very popular in the marketplace (O'Hanlon, 1993). The existence of academic elites amongst their numbers brings them recognition, popularity and accolade denied other schools doing as well but on other measures. The whole education system will continue to be geared to academic and not personal excellence as long as the culture is about examination performance. To what extent is this the case in Southampton? Do teachers fear that they are unable to aim for high academic standards if they are expected to include an increasing number of children experiencing difficulties in learning? Is the focus on academic excellence perceived as a barrier to inclusion? How do beliefs about natural ability and elitism come through when viewed from their perspectives? These provide helpful lenses with which to view the impact of selectivity on inclusion.

The Context of De-Selection

Exclusion from full participation in schools is a process of selection which institutionalises inequality (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit). It can happen at all levels. Children of all abilities and needs can be excluded from various processes of learning, effective access to the curriculum, social interaction and full school participation. Inclusion is about removing such exclusive processes and states (Booth and Ainscow, op.cit). It involves taking account of, and removing all barriers that may have arisen as a result of gender, race, social class or intelligence. It is about providing all children with equal opportunities and removing practices which create or promote inequality of opportunity. This is central to the whole notion of
integration leading to inclusion. This fundamental principle of valuing all children provides the context for this study and is the central theme.

**Power and Conflict**

The output of education is veiled in political rhetoric. The extremes range from the holistic to the more utilitarian, i.e. from adopting a broad view of education with the emphasis on developing the whole child to enforcing a more specific and restricted focus, e.g. preparing for employment. Its purpose is therefore pre-defined. Within its filters are selective processes and practices emanating from and representing power. Some of these are discriminatory and promote inequality. Segregation is one of the most quoted examples of inequality, particularly in the United States where there continues to be concern about the practice especially with regard to ethnic minorities (Dunn, op.cit).

The context of inclusion has to be viewed within the opposing and conflicting forces which surround it. These include the practices and abuses of selection by assessment; the disproportionate numbers of children from ethnic minorities in the less desirable parts of segregated education (Heller, Holzman and Messick, op cit); conflicts within the legislation both here and abroad, particularly in the US; the aspirations, influences and pressures of influential lobbies and pressure groups (see Chapter 2). There are also the attitudes of stakeholders more directly affected, such as parents and staff of special schools (Jenkinson, 1997).

Professionals exert considerable power over the education and placement of children through what has been variously called ‘expertism’ (Troyna and Vincent, 1996), or ‘professionalism’. The medical, within the child deficit, model of assessment, promoting ‘treatment’ approaches in specialist, remedial settings, runs counter to inclusion as do the more prescriptive approaches to dealing with individual special needs. They promote the 'needs, not the rights agenda' argued earlier in relation to human rights. Parents are directly influenced by so-called expert advice. The more vocal are now increasingly having a say in where and how their children are educated, many insisting on mainstream settings (Jenkinson, 1997).
pattern until now seems to be that Governments exercise their powers to determine the purposes of education and legislate where they believe some protection is needed for children who experience learning difficulties; e.g. Public Law 1975 in the US (Abeson et al, 1981); the Education Acts of 1981, 1993 and 1996 in the U.K. I wonder about the politics of inclusion in Southampton. What are the risks of producing inequality? How do professionals either promote or hinder this process? Does "professionalism" affect the process of inclusion?

**The Current Political Agenda**

Education was one of the key issues in the last general election, the major political parties pledging commitment to the raising of academic standards, a process initiated and implemented over the past few years. This had the effect of making integration a lower priority, other issues such as school improvement, standards of literacy and failing schools having become much more prominent (TES, April and May 1996).

The Labour Government says that it remains committed to education. The White paper (DfEE, July 1997) emphasises education as being at the heart of government. This includes a reference to inclusion. Funds have been identified for inclusion, which the Government defines as children attending their neighbourhood schools. There is also emerging clarity regarding Government policy on inclusion and how it is to be achieved. The intention is that its Advisory Task Group on "SEN" will progress the debate leading to firm expectations and good practice. It seems that inclusion is once again on the agenda and suddenly the pace is quickening, as suggested by the reactions of other political parties and the media (DfEE, 2000; SEN Bill, 2000). However, it is still possible that inclusion will be widely discussed at government level, perhaps even enacted but with progress kept at the same slow pace in the nation's schools. Without specific and focused strategies, inclusion will proceed slowly. The current diversity in LEAs' practices will continue and the opportunity will be lost to change rhetoric into "excellence" for all (DfEE, 1997).
The United Kingdom, whilst being a signatory to the European Convention on Integration and indeed to the UN Convention on the rights of the child, appears to be very passive (UNESCO, 1988, Vaughan, op.cit). Promises by central government to change this (DFEE, 1997) will not happen if it is left to LEAs to achieve inclusion within their existing resources.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework emerging from the literature review is based on the consensus that inclusion is about meeting children’s needs in their local school. Underpinning inclusion are issues of human rights and equality of opportunity; a philosophy which is essentially moralistic and with strong socio-political undertones. These are reinforced by forces of community and co-operation. There are also tensions which conflict with them, e.g. conflicting discourses, competition and selection.

Inclusion is a national and political issue; indeed, it is a global agenda. It will remain an ideal as logically, this is the only tenable assertion. This is because all schools are unlikely to provide inclusion for all children at all times. However, if the notion of inclusion as a process is accepted, then more fruitful study becomes feasible, i.e. evaluating elements of inclusive practice whilst accepting that full inclusion may not materialise.

The literature review has informed the study in many ways. The initial intention to study the practice of integration needed to take account of developments in the field, including the introduction of new terminology, though not necessarily new concepts. This review was instrumental in leading to a change of title from integration to inclusion. Definition of key terms was also identified as an issue as confusion abounds in this field. The literature shows a general consensus and growing support for the practice of inclusion at the policy level. Moral and political imperatives are pressing for its acceptance as a human right. This study considers these forces and explores them with key players in Southampton, in view of the Government initiatives to promote inclusion.
THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE

Chapters 2 and 3 are helpful in establishing the research focus. Given the confusion around inclusion, research that is considering the rhetoric should include stakeholder perspectives of meaning. Parents, teachers and other stakeholders hold different positions (p. 14-19). Do they think that some children fare better in special education? Is the system perceived to be just and effective? These are key issues to explore and their meanings will be constructed through discourse. Within these parameters, Dyson's (op.cit) discourses provide the lenses to focus on the issues. His concept of multiple inclusions enables the construction of target groups so that the circumstances of some children may be looked at.

As my work is about securing children's entitlements, I have been attracted to the rights and ethics discourse and the rationale to support this. I have also needed to be acutely aware of the political discourse; if there are struggles for children to obtain social justice, I have a duty to deal with this. The research considers Southampton's rhetoric and looks at its policies and practices towards securing these rights within an inclusive approach. There are also, as Dyson (op.cit) points out, realisation issues, i.e. how to achieve progress towards inclusion. Part of being a researcher - and an education officer - is to examine efficacies and effective practice. The efficacy framework considers costs and outcomes; is Southampton making effective use of its resources? This is a key question for LEAs. I have looked at the costs of special and mainstream education. This enables some linking back with the literature and the issue of the efficacy and pragmatics discourses which surround it.

The research considers the ideology, the concerns and the constraints. Within the efficacy and pragmatics discourse, it considers the effectiveness of the provision made for children and the extent to which the LEA is realistic in its ideals, taking account of its financial circumstances. As more children are staying in mainstream schools, is there evidence that they are also making progress in learning? If the rights, ethics and political agendas are being addressed, what about efficacy and pragmatics? Is the LEA
pushing the rationale agenda too far at the expense of the realisation issues? Dyson (op.cit) suggests that interrogating each of the four discourses helps with understanding the position of different target groups and may lead to new insights on how to pursue inclusion. Table 3.1 summarises my approach to the study.

Table 3.1: Issues of Ethics, Politics, Efficacy and Pragmaties in relation to Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and ethics</th>
<th>Issues of Ethics, Politics, Efficacy and Pragmaties in relation to Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a rationale to re-examine Southampton's policy and practice of placing children in special education? How do stakeholders view this provision? Do they perceive this as a way of maintaining majority interests and is this their agenda? (How does this link with the political discourse? Is there really a sense of struggle for social justice?). Can special schools provide sanctuaries? Do some parents &quot;invent disability? &quot;What should the LEA do to secure the rights of all children, given a clear rationale to deliver social justice? Is this only possible through inclusion? If so, can this only be done in mainstream schools? To what extent are Southampton special schools promoting inclusion?; are they different from schools where children’s best interests are not secured? Should we be thinking about inclusive systems and not inclusive schools? In adopting a rights and ethics perspective, what is meant by inclusion? Is it about placement or learning? What do stakeholders think? Is there a difference between their rhetoric and practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Is there any evidence that special schools are serving vested interests? Whose interests? Their own staff and pupils or their counterparts in the mainstream? Do children and parents really feel oppressed? What evidence, if any, is there that they would prefer different school arrangements to those they are currently accessing? Or is the reverse true, that they are quite satisfied with the provision made? Do stakeholders perceive the LEA’s ambitions as rhetoric? Are they supportive in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>As Southampton spends £11 million on SEN, 50% which is taken up by special schools, what difference is this making to schools? Are children making progress? Can mainstream schools deliver inclusion? If so, is it not so much that children are having their rights denied but that schools of all types have to work together to deliver? How does this relate to the paradigm that schools sometimes create rather than remediate difficulties in learning? How does this affect efficacy assessment? When does efficacy start: before or after capital investments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmaties</td>
<td>What do inclusive arrangements look like? Is there any example of such practice in Southampton? If not, how could these be brought about? What can stakeholders tell us that could increase the likelihood of inclusive practice? If I were to arrive at rich descriptions of school practices, would it be possible to identify some determinate characteristics?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 shows the differences in analyses and insights which Dyson (op.cit) predicts will emerge. This enables evaluation of findings against this theoretical frame, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness and generalisability of the study. Clearly interrogating discourses provide a focus and structure to my research, raising issues which can be explored in relation to them.

My analyses, summarised in table 3.1, have been helpful in finalising my research questions within an overarching theoretical framework. This framework explicitly recognises the ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics dimensions and discourses of inclusion. It also includes other theoretical contributions from the literature, specifically the issues of rights, equality and inequality detailed earlier. There have been many questions and issues raised whilst exploring my theoretical framework. The following represent my final, revised questions:

**Question 1: To what extent is Southampton implementing its policy of inclusion?**
- What do children's school placements reveal about practice?
- How does Southampton compare with its statistical neighbours on inclusion?
- To what extent is it making effective use of its resources to promote inclusion?
- Given a policy of inclusion, are schools raising standards?

Question 1 seeks to place Southampton in its historical context. It explores the rhetoric of inclusion, considers statistical and other information, making it possible for other researchers to make comparisons with their own circumstances. It considers the extent to which the rhetoric of inclusion is matching the reality, as revealed in practice.
Question 2:

2.1: What is the rhetoric of inclusion from the perspectives of education providers?
- What are the views of teachers, parents, officers and other adults?
- Is there any evidence of tensions and conflicts between the LEA’s aspirations and the means to achieve them?

2.2: How is the reality of practice experienced by education recipients?
- What are the experiences of children and parents?
- To what extent is there a mismatch in the perspectives of providers and recipients?

Question 2 seeks to consider the rhetoric and circumstances of key stakeholders. It considers the aims, ideals, fears and aspirations of key stakeholders and seeks to illustrate the gaps that arise in practice. It does so by examining the matches and mismatches between the rhetoric of adults and the practice that is experienced by children.

Question 3: Is there any evidence of inclusive practice in Southampton?
- What do case studies of schools reveal about practice?
- Are there lessons for the LEA in terms of factors which influence inclusion?

Question 3 aims to uncover evidence of inclusive practice in schools.

Question 4: How can Southampton LEA progress its stated aim of promoting inclusion? i.e. how can it move from rhetoric to reality?
- What are the key issues emerging from this study?
- How can the LEA take appropriate action to build on strengths and remedy weaknesses?

Question 4 considers the solutions and action the LEA should undertake to make its rhetoric more of a reality. Chapters 5 to 8 deal with each question in turn.
INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted in two parts over a five year period. The first part -Stage 1- served as a pilot and also enabled the gathering of a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data to review the literature and provide a backdrop to the whole study. The methodology was tested and markers identified for further, in-depth exploration. Information was also collected on Southampton's practices in relation to inclusion.

I was initially drawn to the collection of statistical data; though their limitations had to be recognised. Stage 1 of the study combined both quantitative and qualitative elements, ranging from analysis, contextualisation and interpretation of statistical data to giving voices to some of the LEA's key stakeholders; listening, responding and trying to make sense of their experiences albeit within my limitations. My role as the Education Officer (SEN) influences, to some extent, what colleagues are prepared to say to me.

Henwood and Pidgeon (1996) suggest that there are powerful pragmatic arguments for using a principled combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in certain circumstances. This is particularly appropriate when simple counting techniques offer a means of surveying the whole corpus of data ordinarily lost in intensive qualitative research. This study used both methods, depending on their ability to inform the research process. However, use of statistical analysis is not pursued. The aim is to focus on the process of inclusion and to provide "thick descriptions" (Geertz, 1973), within a qualitative research approach, to enable appreciation of the LEA's local context and particular circumstances. There is no intention to claim universal applicability. In such a small scale study, statistical manipulation is both inappropriate and unnecessary (Henwood and Pidgeon, op.cit).
The second part—Stage 2—of the study built on earlier findings, with a particular focus on extending the range of qualitative data. I followed leads and broadened coverage of the key issues emerging whilst keeping a focus on answering the research questions. The aim was to learn from the pilot, deal with its shortcomings and build on its strengths. The methodology was similar though there was a greater emphasis on qualitative methods. These were more appropriate for in-depth exploration of issues.

I aimed for more than a snapshot of inclusion in Southampton; I wanted to explore what people say about inclusion, i.e. their rhetoric; what they do and how this is reflected in practice. The aim was to study both the rhetoric and the reality; the processes, systems and experiences. I used case studies, journal and diary analyses and was not over-concerned about the size of my samples although my diary records were large. As Popper (1968) has pointed out, massive research energies may never arrive at definitive proof as a single event amongst thousands may turn out to be quite different from the rest. My goal has been to expand and generalise my insights or theories to other contexts, which Yin (1984) calls analytic generalisation and not to enumerate frequencies or in Yin's words, statistical generalisation.

I realise that as a largely qualitative study, I need to make use of rigorous methods and procedures to enable my findings to be interpreted and generalised to other contexts. If I can achieve both internal and external validity, I can make strong links with my theoretical propositions within an overarching framework. This would enable theoretical generalisation even if empirical or statistical generalisation is unattainable. This is not an uncommon position in the area of qualitative research. If my research is non-generalisable beyond the specific circumstances it addresses, then it cannot render the expertise of other professionals, operating in similar circumstances problematic. An aim has been to optimise reader opportunity to relate my accounts with their own situations, to infer particularistic understandings from my study not necessarily mediated by general rules (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a). Simon (1978) observes that practitioners distrust the generalisability of their case studies until they read others written by their peers.
Chapter 4 deals in detail with my research methodologies, including the rationale for each of the approaches used. I have included my personal and professional beliefs, ethics and standards. These are for the sake of transparency to show my influences and interpretations.

**Methodology And Research Instruments And Procedures**

The study sets out to explore Southampton’s policy. It was deliberately designed to be a multi-method study to allow for triangulation at a later stage (Robson, 1996). This gives comparisons against which reliability can be assessed.

Denzin (1989) distinguishes between four different types of triangulation: data, investigator, theory and methodological triangulation. Data triangulation is a means of checking and validating data collected in a variety of ways to assess the reliability of the sources. Investigator triangulation refers to the practice of using different observers and interviewers to detect or minimise biases resulting from the researcher, enabling a systematic comparison of influences and perspectives on the research issue. Theory triangulation enables the data to be approached with multiple perspectives and hypotheses in mind. "Various theoretical points of view could be placed side by side to assess their utility and power" (Denzin,1989, p. 239-240). Methodological triangulation allows for within and between method triangulation, e.g. the use of subscales to measure a questionnaire item in the former and the combination of a questionnaire with an interview in the latter.

Denzin (op.cit) argues that "the triangulation of method, investigator, theory and data, remains the soundest strategy of theory construction", (1989, p. 236). Use is made of the first three in particular, e.g qualitative and quantitative data; respondent validation and checks by critical friends, colleagues and respondents. Theory triangulation is also used in the reporting of findings relating them to perspectives and hypotheses derived from the literature. I believe this combination has built in rigour to my methods.
There are some data which cannot be easily triangulated, where they generate a diversity and richness of responses. Ely et al (1994) use the term "crystallisation" in these instances. I have used this method with my vignettes and narratives. These are mainly based on my journal and diary analysis and the data from the case studies of schools. This approach helped to preserve a narrative flow whilst maintaining accuracy in my reporting. The main lesson for me has been how messy research can be (Booth and Ainscow, op.cit) and how one method does not eliminate or obviate another. The strategy is to use them appropriately, in an informed way.

I have lived this research and agree with Elliott (1991) in his view that research of this kind is about feeding practical judgment in concrete situations. The validity of the theories or hypotheses it generates depends not so much upon scientific tests of truth as on their usefulness in helping people to act more intelligently and skilfully. The study was conducted as follows:

**Initial Pilot Study: Stage 1**

1. Documentary analysis of the LEA's policies on inclusion.
2. Analysis of the LEA's records and statistical data.

**Wider Study: Stage 2**

3. Survey information on schools' responses to the LEA's SEN policy.
4. Structured interviews with a range of LEA staff.
5. Visits to two schools, one Primary and one secondary, representing the 5-16 phase of education, including analysis of their SEN documentation
6. Participant observation and interviews at the two schools.
7. Journal or diary analysis of key events within my day to day work as an Education Officer. This includes data from the LEA's city wide consultation on review of its SEN provision. This spanned both parts of the study. These are detailed after the next section.
Reasons for Choice of Methodology

The documentary analysis was considered to be most appropriate for identifying the policies in existence. In conjunction with the documentary analysis, the numerical and statistical data aimed to provide the background material on practice and to set the scene for the study. The interviews and case studies were intended to provide qualitative information based on the experiences of people; to illustrate Southampton's reality and to bring the study to life. My participation as an observer also added to the richness of the information that was collected. The journal and diary analysis was an efficient tool, because the nature of my employment enabled me to combine with the role of active researcher. This provided extensive data, including parental responses which arose from the LEA's SEN review.

Grounded theory methodology was also used to make sense of the data through coding and systematic analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Its concepts and procedures (see p. 82 below) were applied to the data to arrive at key analytical themes. These methods were economical and fit for the purpose intended; they addressed each of the research questions.

Documentary Analysis

An initial search comprised looking at a variety of SEN documents produced by Hampshire over the past five years. This was subsequently streamlined in order to include only those which related specifically to integration; inclusion is still new.

The criteria used were that the documents should be directly related to the LEA's SEN Policies and aimed at integration or inclusion, though this may not have been its sole purpose. They should also have been publicly accepted and recognised by elected members, schools or the DfEE for funding purposes. The following documents met the criteria:

3. The Inclusion Project (Hampshire, 1995)
4. Trial and Full Integration Grants (Hampshire, 1995).

Details in respect of these documents are included in Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Documentary analysis extracted key themes of relevance to this study. "Construct categories" were used in order to avoid drowning in a mass of data and to avoid the so-called "fishing trip" (Robson, op.cit). The guidance suggested by Holsti (1969), as adapted by Robson (op.cit), was followed as detailed in the steps below.

Figure 4.1 shows the approach followed. Though not each step figures in the report, the data were structured and categorised in this manner and revamped for reporting purposes. The model needed to be adapted to fit the purpose of this study. Moreover, efforts were made to ensure that these categories were exhaustive and mutually exclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>What is it about?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>How is it treated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>What values are revealed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>What goals or intentions are revealed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>What methods are used to achieve these intentions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>What are the characteristics used in describing people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>Who is represented as carrying out the actions referred to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>In whose name are statements made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Where does the action take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>What are the sources and levels of conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endings</td>
<td>In what ways are conflicts resolved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was guided by the following agenda (adapted from Jupp and Norris, 1996):

1. What public or institutional discourses are important in terms of knowledge of what is "right" and what is "wrong"?
2. What does a critical reading of documents uncover in terms of:
- what is defined as 'right' and 'wrong' and therefore what is seen as problematic?
- what is the explanation offered for what is seen as problematic?
- what is seen as the solution?
- which explanations are rejected or omitted?

3. What alternative discourses exist?

This was a time consuming process leading to numerous drafts and re-drafts.

**LEA Numerical And Statistical Data Analysis**

My main objective with the analysis of the numerical data was to make greater sense of the numbers; i.e. to identify stories these were telling us and their potential to present a context for Southampton's inclusive practices. I rejected a considerable amount of numerical data so as not to be swamped with irrelevancies; those selected met my criteria of being able to or having the potential to raise issues about Southampton's rhetoric and practice of inclusion.

The selected data on inclusion comprised the LEA's SEN Audit returns, its records used to monitor placements and expenditure on SEN, including *Form 7s*, i.e. its returns to the DfEE. Performance statistics which had been submitted to the Audit Commission and used for internal reporting were also used as were DfEE returns on accessibility of schools. Data gathering and analysis was at three levels. The first was at the macro level of the LEA; the focus being on the rhetoric and reality of LEA policy and practice; evidence of work towards or against inclusion; e.g. placements; funding practices, i.e. work at an LEA-wide level. The second was at the level of schools; the focus being on school dimensions; e.g. their rhetoric and realities; quantitative indicators are also included, e.g. exclusion rates, GCSE results. The third was at the level of key stakeholders; the focus being on identifying differences and integrating their perspectives and voices; e.g. in a grid showing frequencies of particular perspectives (p. 146); level of satisfaction in respect of policy.
Interviews

I opted for interviews as I wanted the opportunity for direct discussion to test my hypotheses, explore issues in depth and follow up unexpected responses with participants. Tuckman (1972) suggests that these purposes are well served by interviews. I had a clear focus and structure, did not ask leading or ambiguous questions and made sure that my questions were clearly understood. Respondents were encouraged to speak openly and honestly and were told that it was their views I was searching, not what they felt I might want to hear. My approach with children was non-directive. Moser and Kalton (1977) suggest that such approaches are helpful and the children interviewed were responsive to this style.

The advantages and limitations of the interview as a research tool are comprehensively covered in the literature, e.g. Robson, op.cit. Kitwood (1977), raises the tensions which arise between reliability and validity in proportion to the degree of interviewer control. I tried to achieve a balance by encouraging adult respondents to cover the ground I had planned whilst at the same time feeling relaxed and able to share their ideas with me. With teachers and officers, I stressed that I was not expecting them to support any particular view and that my position was non-judgmental. Tuckman (op.cit) advocates such approaches.

In the initial study, six individual interviews were conducted in private. These lasted for about 1 to 1.5 hours. Discussion also took place with headteachers of four special schools with no interruption. A consistent format was followed in that a structured questionnaire was used; this is attached as Appendix 10. Detailed notes, not verbatim, were made during the interview. This was the most effective way of recording for me; listening and making notes at the same time whilst not making the process too conspicuous and unnatural. Interviewees confirmed that they felt at ease in this way. These interviews are reported separately from those of LEA staff.
The stage two interviews were different in representing the views of children, parents and school staff. I interviewed a total of twelve people, comprising: two headteachers, two deputy heads, two teachers, one SENCO, two parents and three children. The interviews were semi-structured with adults. They were unstructured with the children, following a pre-determined theme to answer my research questions.

**Sampling**

The sources of data pursued were often selective and in some cases, opportunistic. I made use of information which was or could be made available within the constraints of time and the LEA’s systems and resources. Access and co-operation was an issue as far as the selected schools were concerned. Where I had access to responses from the survey of the Southampton community, I included these in the analysis. The main source of the survey was derived from the LEA’s consultation on its SEN review and policy (SCC 2000; 2001a).

Some of the individuals interviewed represented an opportunistic sample. This was the case in respect of some children and adults I interviewed at Hillside school. Other information was gathered more systematically; e.g. all LEA officers with a lead role on SEN strategy and practice were interviewed. I made use of rich research opportunities, having ready access to casefiles and other information deriving from casework. This enabled me to explore specific issues in depth. My journal entries provided rich sources of data from which I was able to select those of direct relevance to my theoretical and research framework. For example, it became clear to me fairly early on, that there were specific target groups whose circumstances might highlight important issues along my theoretical dimensions (see chapter 3). As the research progressed, themes emerged in respect of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. My journal entries on what appeared to be critical events, guided my analyses and my final selection and decision to focus on emotional and behavioural difficulties in that particular part of my research.
There were also constraints which needed to be taken into account. At the
time of the research, our schools and parents were being consulted
extensively on the LEA's review of SEN provision. It would have been
unethical to seek permission for them to help with my study; they had
already been saturated with a range of requests with this and other aspects
of the LEA's planning, e.g. school places; SEN policy and review. The data
had been gathered and there would have been no benefits to them from
being approached again. Their responses on the SEN policy provided
comprehensive data on inclusion. Although the response rate was 32%,
many respondents made extensive and helpful comments. In my analysis, I
was able to look at the whole range of views presented, from the "outliers"
and extremes, to "negative instances" (Miles and Huberman, op.cit; see also
p. 93) and those uncovering a theme.

I settled for this information as I also had extensive data from the SEN
review. LEAs were expected to reduce bureaucracy (DfEE, 1997); the
Council was anxious that this happened. I therefore selected teachers,
parents and children from my case study schools and from those who knew
of and volunteered to take part in my study. Once I had access to these
colleagues, I made sure that I was able to explore and follow up issues with
them in a systematic way. My regular contact with special school
headteachers gave me a further opportunity. Four took part in a short group
meeting organised to discuss provision for SEN. I was also able to pursue
discussion with all special school heads at a conference held to consider
issues of inclusion in practice. This enabled me to hear the views of
Southampton and Hampshire headteachers, i.e. all the stakeholders who
might represent the "other view of inclusion".

These samples go some way towards providing a comprehensive and
representative picture of perspectives in Southampton. Taken as a whole,
the sample consisted of over 400 diary entries, interviews with all officers
with a key SEN function and interviews and group work with Southampton
special school headteachers. It also included two case studies of schools, including interviews with parents, children and staff as well as participant observation over a wide range of activities within the LEA, both within the two case study schools and beyond, e.g. at SEN panels. Survey data from the LEA’s SEN review were also included and examined.

My initial selection had been aimed at providing rich and detailed descriptions of inclusion to increase the representativeness of the study. Having a fairly wide sample increased this likelihood. I was also more confident when relating my findings to the literature. Analysing them within an overarching theoretical framework enhanced their validity, allowing an assessment of the extent of their transferability to other contexts.

**Case Studies**

I chose to undertake case studies as I was aiming to understand the complex social phenomena of inclusion through the perceptions, practices and beliefs of stakeholders. This was to allow my investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of these real life events (Yin, op.cit). In line with Yin’s argument, I believe that case studies are not limited to exploratory phases of study but can be used to describe and test propositions. The literature confirms that some of the best and most famous case studies have been both descriptive and explanatory, e.g. Whyte’s street corner study (Whyte, 1955; Yin, op.cit; Denzin, op.cit; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The essence of a case study is to illuminate a situation, circumstance or decision; their reasons, context and outcomes (Schramm, 1971).

I asked ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions, focusing on contemporary phenomena and needed to make operational links which can be traced over time rather than mere frequencies and incidence. For example, a case study approach was pertinent to this and my approach in analysis was to use my theoretical framework to guide the interpretation of findings. My case studies focused on exploring perspectives and practices at two schools through interviews and participant observation.
Case Study Schools

Two schools, one primary and one secondary, were selected for this study. Selection was based on the criteria that the two schools should between them cover the full phase of statutory education; this therefore, eliminated infant and junior schools. They should take boys and girls and be broadly comparable with other Southampton schools, e.g. in terms of pupil population and demography. Though not necessarily exemplars of good practice, they should be able to illustrate how children experiencing difficulties in learning are being included in mainstream settings.

My choice was also influenced by the fact that my preliminary enquiries with regard to the research, were not only welcomed by the Headteachers and their senior staff, but were also responded to with interest and a commitment to participate fully in the study. I am known to some of the staff and have worked with both Headteachers for some time so that I felt reassured of their continuing co-operation. The Governing Bodies were also supportive. They had confirmed that they did not perceive my research as an additional burden and that they were genuinely seeking to examine their practices. The headteachers worked with me on identifying parents and teachers who would be interested and willing to take part. The case studies were conducted through analysis of school documents, structured and unstructured interviews and participant observation.

Milton Primary School

Milton had 299 pupils on roll, in January 1999. This is just below average for a Southampton primary school; the average is 308, with a range of 136 to 618. Milton has a Unit attached for children experiencing moderate learning difficulties and this may be a differentiating factor in terms of positive attitudes and practices towards inclusion. It combines two sets of circumstances, i.e. the school being both a mainstream setting and having a Unit attached.
Table 4.1 summarises the distribution of children categorised as experiencing difficulties in learning (SEN); eligible for free school meals (FSM) or who speak English as an additional language (EAL), at Milton school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milton School</th>
<th>% SEN</th>
<th>% FSM</th>
<th>% EAL</th>
<th>NOR</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Without Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So'ton Average</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSM= Free school meals; EAL= English as an Additional language; (S)= Statements; NOR= Number on roll.

It can be seen that Milton School has a high proportion of children identified as experiencing SEN. In comparison with the Southampton average, it has twice the percentage of children qualifying for free school meals and nearly twice as many Statements of SEN, if the ten children who attend the unit are removed from the calculation.

**Hillside Secondary School**

Hillside had 672 pupils on roll in January 1999. This is below average for a Southampton secondary school. The average is 753, with a range of 545 to 1176. Hillside was designed in the 1980s and acclaimed for its architectural excellence. However, it suffers from a range of defects with regard to physical access. It is on an incline and has too many steps, making accessibility difficult. Despite this, the school provides for a number of children experiencing physical difficulties, openly welcoming them and with a reputation within the LEA, for making effective provision in this area and in others generally.

Table 4.2 below summarises its position and provides comparisons using data from the DfEE's Performance tables (DfEE, 1998). Hillside is below average by these measures; the grades shown are in respect of GCSEs. The attendance figures are average for the city. These provide some very rough measures. They begin to illustrate how Hillside is viewed by the DfEE and the perception this can lead to. However, qualitative information from their OFSTED report suggests that Hillside is a successful school.
I compare and contrast the schools' rhetoric, as suggested by staff and in their documentation, with their realities, as identified in observed practice. The school documentation analysed include their prospectus, SEN Policies and reports to parents and Governors.

**Participant Observation and Interviews at schools**

I pursued participant observation (Robson, op.cit) in each of the two schools. This is to observe how children are included in schools; the practices which maximise their participation and the processes which inhibit these. It is to learn about the practices of staff; whether their responses are similar, irrespective of children's difficulties in learning; or whether some children are viewed more favourably than others and if so, why? I also wanted to find out how staff and children deal with institutional barriers to learning and the removal of physical obstacles.

I followed observation with interviews lasting around 30 minutes in order to explore in depth issues which arose. I conducted semi-structured and structured interviews with two parents, three children, five teachers and two headteachers from the two schools. This was to obtain a range of perspectives, from the service provider to the recipient; from the experience of giving to that of receiving whether from teacher, parent or child. My selection of participants was based on the criteria that they would be able to report first hand on either the rhetoric or practice of inclusion or both. They would be directly involved in schools or would be indirectly affected by its practice, e.g parents. They would also have a direct role in supporting children considered to be experiencing difficulties in learning.

The interviews focused on inclusive practice and explored staff perceptions of their work with children experiencing difficulties in learning; their
preferences, weaknesses and fears. My aim was to analyse the match or mismatch between their perceptions, intentions and practice. I also explored parents' and children's reports of their experiences; what has worked for them; what has been problematic and how these views compare with others?

*Journal and Diary Analysis*

I have chosen to maintain a research journal in order to capture some of the incidental information relating to inclusion, which frequently arise during my day to day work. Plummer (1983, p. 17) argues that the diary is the 'document of life *par excellence* chronicling as it does the immediately contemporaneous flow of public and private events that are significant to the diarist'. I have used it to allow the immediacy of experiences to be captured and to provide accounts of phenomena over time (Symon, 1998).

My journal entries include information from discussions and meetings and from files. This enabled me to provide comprehensive coverage and to make best use of opportunities in research. In many ways, key stakeholders channel their views to me because of the nature of my role. The richness of this information, volunteered instead of needing to be searched for, represents a huge research opportunity, enabling a range of voices to be heard. It is economical research. Having selected and summarised my journal entries, I discussed them with officers in my team who are involved in casework. This was to enhance rigour in my research approach. I explained that I was trying to illustrate the circumstances of some children in respect of inclusion and asked if my selection was broadly representative of the issues surrounding inclusion. If not, were there areas that needed re-thinking? e.g. where my analysis and interpretations were wrong or misleading or indeed where there were significant omissions. I had altered the names of children and families and focused discussion on the issues and how representative they were but was not surprised that colleagues knew the children who were being discussed. I had thought of this and knew that that there would be no breach of confidentiality as the information was already known to them.
The theoretical rationale underpinning my approach to my journal and diary analysis has been informed by the literature, particularly the work of Dickinson (1994) and Ricoeur (1988). In a sense, my journal and diary reports are both biographical and autobiographical by proxy (Dickinson, op.cit). Erben (1994) describes biographical method as the studied use and collection of life documents which include diaries, personal histories, and personal experience stories. It is an educative exercise, its axiomatic purpose being both the gathering and interpretation of data and a development in the moral reasoning of the researcher.

My reflections are illustrations of both my personal experiences and their moral influences. These are subjective. I decided to follow a hermeneutical approach within biographical method enabling me to be close to that which is to be interpreted whilst at the same time distanced from objectivity (Dilthey; 1976). Hermeneutics is about an appreciation of both that which is interpreted and the interpreting self. The so-called hermeneutical circle involves a dialogue with the researcher (Hitchcock and Hughes; 1995). My reflections constitute this dialogue, to consider my stance and to ask questions of myself and the reader. The aim is to clarify my interpretations and to stimulate further thinking on some issues.

I chose biographical narratives to report my research experiences. Ricoeur (1984-8) suggests that the understanding and meaning of lives can only be approached through narrative analysis. My research on inclusion is about lives and I illustrate people's experiences over a time period (Ely et al (op.cit)). I utilise a number of autobiographical accounts, including many by proxy, to provide an understanding of how their circumstances are experienced and understood. This is exactly the approach Dickinson (op.cit) used in her research with children experiencing learning difficulties. I make no strong claim in respect of the generalisability of these methods but would suggest that my study is not dissimilar from considerable numbers reported in the literature; e.g. Denzin (op.cit); Ely et al (op.cit).
Grounded Theory

Grounded theory is comprehensively documented and well justified in the literature since its introduction in 1967 by Glaser and Strauss; e.g. Corbin and Strauss (1990); Wolcott (1994); Guba and Lincoln (1985); Denzin and Lincoln (1998b). It is a general methodology used to develop theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analysed. The theory evolves during the research itself and is derived from continuous interplay between analysis and data collection. It differs from other methodologies in having no initial theory to be tested by the data and instead of being deductive, derives from processes of analyses, conceptualisation and induction, known as analytic induction (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit). It is a way of thinking about and conceptualising the data. The data is 'coded' into categories from which themes are derived. These themes emerge from the data and are tested through the 'constant comparative method' (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit); e.g. being constantly compared for relevance and topicality against the concepts emerging. Theories may be generated from the data and if existing theories are appropriate to the investigation, these are elaborated and modified as incoming data are compared and tested against them. Glaser (1978) argues that generating theory and doing social research are two parts of the same process.

I used grounded theory as a methodology because of its theoretical bases, its applications and its demonstrated potential to qualitative research. I needed to summarise and code large amounts of qualitative data and was looking for conceptual relationships between them with a view to generating theory. Grounded theory seemed highly appropriate for this purpose. I used the constant comparative method, including the systematic asking of generative and concept relating questions, i.e. comparing the data which arise; classifying and categorising them into themes; and refining these themes against my research questions and theoretical framework. For example, initial analysis of my interview data provided a number of concepts and themes on standards, discipline, teacher stress, expertise and training. These were tested against my research questions in terms of relevance and focus. They were then linked to my theoretical framework in
order to lead to 'theoretical sampling', i.e. sampling and selection of data linked to this framework. This enabled further refining of the data, e.g. through data comparisons and contrasts against theory. For example, issues on standards and behaviour were tested against the 'four' discourses on ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics (Dyson, op.cit). This helped identify issues of marginalisation and oppression so that I was able to re-focus the perspectives of teachers to the circumstances of children (see chapter 8). Appendix 13 gives an example of how grounded theory methodology was applied to the data.

I also saw theoretical sampling as an aid to generalisation (Flick, op.cit) and used this systematically. Strauss and Corbin (op.cit; p. 168) argue that 'theory consists of plausible relationships proposed amongst concepts and sets of concepts'. My approach in working towards grounded theory has been to look for these relationships, test them for rigour and arrive at 'conceptually dense' themes (Strauss and Corbin, op.cit; p. 169) which best capture the outcomes of my research activity.

Reporting Formats

I have chosen a variety of formats to enrich my reporting of the findings, ranging from texts to visual and numerical data. This includes a range of tools within the repertoire of qualitative researchers. The intention is to highlight, enrich and wherever possible, provide a version of participants' contributions which is as true to them as possible, to compensate for the limitations of my own words and perceptions. It is also intended to provide the context and the process of the research; to go beyond and behind the data, adding to it and enriching it.

With this in mind, I make use of "anecdotes", "vignettes" and narratives, to provide "living by words" in the manner detailed in the literature, e.g. Ely et al, op.cit; Ballard, 1999. Ely et al (op.cit) argue that "narrative is a method of inquiry and a way of knowing -a discovery and analysis- just as scientism and quantitative research have methods and ways", (p. 64). They suggest that narratives produce meaning and create a version of reality.
Manen (1990), Clandinin and Connelly (1994) and MacLean (1992) are some of the many researchers who have used anecdotes, vignettes and narratives in their work. I use visual displays to illustrate the data (Miles and Huberman, op.cit) and provide texts in which data is grounded and from which theory can be derived (see above).

I provide my own reflections when presenting my findings. These could have been termed discussions in the traditional sense. However, I chose to be reflective in order to convey these thoughts, reactions and feelings; I did not wish to disengage from the actual research process. As a participant, I am part of the data. However, I recognise the need to identify my views and those of others to reduce the risk of introducing bias and diminishing the credibility of the study. I indicate these views as mine where they are discussed (see House, op.cit).

**Theoretical Perspective on Methodology**

My background has been in the sciences, in the positivist tradition. I have, however, been influenced through my readings of the literature on qualitative research of the merits and limitations of both 'positivism', i.e following the tradition of the so-called hard sciences; and of qualitative methods. I am also acutely aware of the debate surrounding quantitative and qualitative research (Eisner, op.cit; Hammersley, 1996; Flick, op.cit).

I believe that qualitative and quantitative research have a valid role to play; one does not preclude the other (Wolcott, 1990, 1994). Qualitative information adds context, meaning, purpose and life to number crunching which can serve as snapshots and baselines to the processes under study (Wolcott, 1990; Ely et al, op.cit). There is no objective science and no absolute truth to be discovered; modern sciences which claim to do this are dysfunctional and misleading (Toulmin, 1990). Research reports are selective, based on the choices, whether conscious or not, of the researcher. They also represent an interaction and not a researcher-researched dyad (Symon and Cassell, 1998) as no researcher is or can be completely detached from their subjects, communities or culture (Hitchcock and
Hughes, op.cit). Facts are always theory laden; they are not independent of theories as they can only be viewed within a "theoretical window" and within a theoretical framework. Theories are value statements which are value laden and not value free (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a). A quantitative focus on making generalisations, although statistically meaningful, has no applicability in the individual case; qualitative research can inform and supplement this process (Flick, op.cit). There should be a willingness to consider both outsider and insider viewpoints; i.e moving from rejection of the emic (insider view) to a combination of the etic (outsider) and emic view (Guba and Lincoln, op.cit) and acknowledging the importance of subjective meanings and everyday experiences (Bruner, 1990).

Moving away from reductionist and deterministic perspectives to approaches which ensure that theories are valid and theoretically grounded (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit; Strauss and Corbin, op.cit) is important. This helps with the transition from deduction to induction and the sensitisation of approaches necessary for work in social contexts (Flick, op.cit). Eclectic and emancipatory research which maintains openness and reflexivity is productive (Hammersley, 1996; Flick, op.cit; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a).

There should also be a return to the:
- oral, i.e trends to conduct research in narratives, language and communication;
- particular; i.e. not abstract or universal questions but specific, concrete problems not arising generally but occurring in specific types of situations;
- local; not universal applications but valid in respect of local circumstances;
- timely; i.e. within a temporal and historical context (see Toulmin, 1990).

I am aware that my study is on a relatively small scale and that my focus is on providing an account of the Southampton context. There are other accounts to be discovered; these are outside the scope of this work. Attempting anything more was unrealistic and inappropriate. I also
recognise survey limitations in terms of their reliability and validity (Robson, op.cit). I was anxious not to lead people into telling me what they may think I wanted to hear without the opportunity to probe their responses. Having reviewed the literature on inclusion, I had also become aware of the difficulty with efficacy research (Chapter 2). I considered this carefully and decided to follow another direction in view of the limitations of my research circumstances.

**Ethical Principles and Values**

There are inevitably ethical dilemmas in any type of research. These must not be overlooked as "naivete about [...] ethics itself is unethical", (Mirvis and Seashore, 1982, p. 100). This research has been influenced by my own professional standards, as required within the code of ethics which apply to psychologists; in my case, the British Psychological Society and the Association of Educational Psychologists. I have also been guided through my readings of the literature, especially Sieber (1992), and House (1990).

Sieber (op.cit) suggests the following core principles to guide ethical choices:

1. **Beneficence;** minimizing risks to participants whilst maximising research outcomes.
2. **Respect;** demonstrating courtesy and respect whilst preserving the autonomy of individuals as persons, particularly those who are not autonomous; e.g. infants and individuals experiencing learning difficulties or senility.
3. **Justice;** applying research procedures with due care and consideration, including fairness, in a manner which is honest and non-exploitative and ensuring that those who bear the risks and costs are the first to benefit from the research outcomes;

A commitment to equality, openness, mutual respect and non-coercion, combined with a concern to promote self esteem also informs this process (House, op.cit). These values guide and are reflected in the study. All data
from interviewing, observation and journal entries were discussed with respondents and reported with their full knowledge and permission.

An inevitable dilemma was whether or not to name my LEA. I thought about a fictitious name initially but quickly became aware that my work circumstances are easily traceable. I also realised that it would be impossible to refer to LEA documents which others could examine in assessing my claims without clear referencing. I had obtained specific permission to name the LEA from both the Director of Education and the Leader of the City Council. My main task was therefore to anonymise the identity of respondents. However, there were risks of LEA officers being identified even though they had been anonymised. Officers wished to be open and transparent about their views, freely volunteered and had the option of withdrawing themselves and their data from the study. For one officer, such research is a measure of the LEA’s 'emotional literacy', its willingness to be open and honest about its aims, ideals and aspirations; "if there are issues the research unravels we should all know".

VALIDITY

I have addressed some of the issues surrounding validity in both qualitative and quantitative research, in recognition of the fact that apparently sound methodologies are no guarantees to validity (Woolcott, 1994). I have seen validity to be best linked with "relevance" (Woolcott, 1994); credibility, dependability, confirmability and "fittingness" (Lincoln and Guba, op.cit). I have adopted the following criteria (adapted from Symon and Cassell, op.cit) to assess the rigour of my research:

1. Resonance, i.e the extent to which the research process reflects the underlying paradigm.
2. Fittingness; i.e the 'fit' between the situation studied and others to which the concepts and conclusions might be applied (Lincoln and Guba, op.cit).
3. Empowerment, i.e. the extent to which the findings empower the audience to take action (Sieber, op.cit).
4. Applicability, i.e. the extent to which the audience can apply findings to their own contexts. This is not to be confused with replication of findings as contexts and circumstances are continuously changing though replication of methods should be possible; I have included sufficient detail for this purpose.

I have also looked for contrary evidence and not only data that supports my argument (Miles and Huberman, op cit). This is in recognition of Popper's (op.cit) assertion with which I agree, which is that no amount of evidence can prove me right but any amount of evidence can prove me wrong. Controls which I have used included a critical friend playing "devils advocate" who critically questions and challenges my analyses; this helped to deal with "researcher bias" (Flick, op.cit). I made a constant search for negative instances (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit), checked and rechecked the data and carried out purposeful testing of possible rival hypotheses and interpretations (Miles and Huberman, op.cit). I also made careful notes, to facilitate analysis, e.g. objective note taking followed by more creative interplay within a conceptual scheme (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973). Finally I conducted an audit of the data collection and analytic strategies along the lines suggested by Lincoln and Guba (op.cit), making sure collection methods were explicit and that data were accurate and complete and were used to document analytic constructs (Marshall, 1990). These enabled 'thick descriptions' (Geertz, op.cit) and conceptual density (Strauss and Corbin, op.cit); they are means of increasing validity. If situations and methods are sufficiently well described, this enables 'comparability' and 'translatability' in the sense of facilitating comparisons (Goetz and Lecompte, 1984). Elliott (1969) argues that theories are not validated independently and then applied to practice. They are validated through practice.

Lincoln and Guba (op.cit) have argued about the desirability of replacing the concept of generalisability with that of 'fittingness'. If I applied this criterion to Southampton, my question would be the extent to which its circumstances match those of other LEAs. By including detailed information, I make it possible for others to arrive at a judgment as to the
fittingness of the Southampton findings to their own particular contexts. This helps to assess the applicability, comparability and translatable ability of these findings to others (Goetz and Lecompte, op.cit). As Goetz and Lecompte (op.cit) argue, it provides the basis for comparisons. I strive towards translatability by providing a clear description of my research stance and techniques, including their rigour (Schofield, op.cit). With a clear appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of my study, it should be possible for other researchers to aim for 'naturalistic generalisation' (Stake, 1998). They should be able to make use of my findings in order to understand other similar situations. I recognise the consensus that qualitative research is not the most appropriate way to generate universal laws; in fact, I agree with Cronbach (1982) that that it is not a useful or attainable goal for any kind of research in the social sciences. Nevertheless, by providing rich and thick descriptions, this enables the analysis of similarities and differences between situations and LEAs, facilitating reasoned judgments about the extent to which my study could provide 'working hypotheses' (Cronbach, op.cit) for other research. The danger relates to emphasising superficial similarities and differences but my aim has been to identify key issues of significance.

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

If a study is to have the credibility and validity to enable it to make any claims, it needs to provide evidence of the rigour of analytical procedures. The above briefly summarised this and I now proceed to provide further details below. My aim was to arrive at three levels of understanding: the meanings and interpretations of respondents, my own interpretations and connections with my theoretical framework. Lee (1991) suggests that these are ways to enhance confidence in research findings.

I have used the following key steps in dealing with my data. These are detailed at length in Miles and Huberman (op.cit) as a means of establishing rigour in interpretation of qualitative data and I used them systematically. Mason (1996), amongst others, e.g. Flick, op.cit, suggest that such systematic checks ensure rigour. Many studies have of course
included these procedures in their analyses though some have mainly relied on triangulation (see Denzin and Lincoln, 1998b; Strauss and Corbin, op.cit; Coffey and Atkinson, op.cit).

1. Checking for representativeness
I constantly checked against the danger of generalising wrongly from specific instances. I knew that some of my respondents represented interest groups; for example, the officers, special school headteachers and parent groups lobbying for either inclusion or special schooling. I had to stand back and look for "outliers", i.e. the extreme and exceptional views supporting or negating a position. Going back to the data showed some of the risks of confirming the 'elite' views of officers against those of parents or children. In the end, I looked for discourses supporting a particular viewpoint, assessed these against status and employment position and weighed them against their outliers. This was the particular approach used to make sense of the findings from my officer and headteacher interviews. It was also useful in interpreting the views of parents who attended our inclusion festival and SEN consultations. Some other controls arose during SEN panels, e.g. a view that corroborated or negated one expressed from an unexpected source (see Bill and Special Heads responses below).

2. Experimenter Effect
My employment status, compounded by the role of researcher, was a problem I needed to control. There were implicit and explicit power relations to be managed; I needed to ensure respondents responded in an open, frank and trusting way. Would they tell me what they want me to hear and to do? The risks of complicity or compliance were an issue although anonymity and confidentiality had already been guaranteed. The survey data, however, had the advantage of not being directed at me as a researcher. It was a response to an LEA issue commissioned separately from my research. My case studies of schools could be a particular problem as were my interviews with colleague officers. I dealt with these issues by making several visits to the schools before starting my interviews, making myself familiar with colleagues, being seen as an interested visitor, looking at other business -e.g. site and access issues- and generally making myself
accepted. With officers, I made clear my intentions, aims and objectives. I also checked their views against other positions they may adopt at other times. For example, an officer (Bill) was very passionate about inclusion in his interviews; at the SEN Panel, his views were often less than inclusive, seeking practical outcomes. I followed these up. With the schools, I checked my findings with the school psychologist and also observed with particular care, the participation at meetings of other staff from these schools. Consistencies, contradictions and conflicts were noted, followed up and taken into account during the analyses. A contradiction was apparent in the claims of 'all' special heads as supporting inclusion; two headteachers became very concerned at the low referral rates to their school and questioned if there was an LEA's inclusion agenda (Appendix 13).

I kept thinking conceptually, looked for dissident views from my own and others and found triangulation of methods already detailed helpful. Looking for alternative explanations to my first inclinations became a good discipline, an effective way of testing my own discourses.

3. Triangulation

I used triangulation by:

1. Data source, e.g. officers and teachers; these helped to construct my grid on page 146.

2. Method, e.g. documents, case files, interviews, and survey observation. Documents proved useful for the purpose of triangulation. Case files were revealing and interviews highlighted conflicts according to roles.

3. Data type, e.g. qualitative and quantitative information. The LEA statistics confirmed respondents' views that more children were staying in the mainstream and were receiving full time education. Some found this to be an additional burden.

Throughout the study, I re-evaluated findings, made comparisons and abandoned data which became less credible, e.g. if the informant presents another view to the one he had originally asserted. There were times when practice was clearly contrary to what was claimed pointing to the differences between rhetoric and reality. The use of multiple findings and
modes of evidence helped. For example, the themes of raising standards and concerns about disruptive behaviour were apparent in responses to the consultation on the SEN policy and the LEA's review of provision. Further confirmation was also apparent from other sources, e.g. schools' responses to requests for children's admissions and journal entries. The following illustrates the correspondence and similarities between these sources:

"Raise standards? Manage behaviour? Attract parents to our school?" {A}
"Southampton's No Exclusion Policy is not realistic [...] we suffer the consequences" {B}
"Schools are facing [...] balancing acts of raising academic and behaviour standards" {C}
"Schools are unwilling to sign up to no exclusion" {D}

A and B are extracts from my journal entries and responses to the SEN review of provision and are similar to C and D which were responses to the SEN policy, see pages 128 and 130 respectively. Appendix 13 provides a selected range of other responses. I also had doubts about some interview data which I rejected; these were from a Learning Support Assistant (LSA) who could not separate my role of researcher from that of an Education Officer and from a parent whose claims were not substantiated in discussions with colleagues involved in the child's education and from examination of the casefile.

4. Weighting the evidence

Evidence was weighted in favour of those that came from primary sources. I preferred data that was reported first hand, that I could find repeated in observation, especially from informal sources and events. My diary entries were a rich source. I made comparisons to test and develop my theoretical and explanatory positions, cross referenced against my sampling strategy. Searching for negatives, looking for surprises and testing my explanations, helped me move towards 'analytic induction' (Denzin, op.cit), based on firmer foundations.
5. Checking for outliers
I wondered if there would be strong enthusiasm for inclusion and sought "outliers", those who are opposed to it. I pursued this, knowing that my sample included officers who may have a particularly favourable view of inclusion. I expected special school heads to have the opposite view. They said they were totally committed to inclusion even though this could mean the closure of their schools. I was also aware of contradictions (see p. 91).

6. Checking for Extreme Cases.
Likewise, I was intrigued by the extreme differences in some parental perspectives on supporting or rejecting inclusion. Parents were both fighting for their special schools and claiming oppression from having mainstream places denied for their children. I was interested in those who had adopted polar and unmoveable positions.

7. Surprises
I discovered the theme of children's worth towards the end of this research. I had initially interpreted the circumstances of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties as illustrating instances of oppression. It was only when a teacher and officer colleagues provided another explanation that this insight was developed. Likewise, there were surprises when comparing the special school data with the kinds of learning difficulties children experience. I had anticipated a greater number of children segregated for reasons of behaviour; I found the highest percentage of children in special schools were those experiencing moderate learning difficulties.

8. Looking for Negative Evidence
I sought evidence to challenge and counter the interpretations that were emerging during the research. It might be tempting to select some data and reject others in developing a theme. In order to deal with the risks of bias and selectivity, I searched for negative instances to an emerging theme and tested this both through triangulation and against my theoretical frame of reference. For example, whilst examining the rhetoric that everyone was committed to inclusion, I pursued instances where this was not practised.
The more I searched, the clearer it became that children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties did not receive a favourable view. I unexpectedly found negative evidence in respect of physical needs. I thought this was unlikely from what I had heard. Children at Bluebell (p. 118) provided some resonance; here were profoundly disabled children who were unable to attend the mainstream. My sampling was theoretical in the sense that I was testing an issue to check if it could be confirmed and where possible to disprove it.

I applied alternative explanations to the data to build scenarios, then questioned the credibility of the source by relating back to the role of the informant, e.g. if an officer, then they follow the party line on inclusion. If a teacher, then they may have an opposing view.

10. Making Sense of Repeated findings.
I used this strategy when working in my two case study schools. I also checked them out against my observations and diary analyses. I found some findings which were often repeated in more than these two settings, e.g. worthy and less worthy children, training and school tensions and pressures. Appendices 11 and 12 illustrate many of these themes.

11. Checking out rival explanations
I did this intermittently. As I gathered more data, rival explanations became more feasible. Which ones were the more credible? Cross referencing with some of the above checks helped decision making. My surprise findings were particularly illuminating and provided the impetus to go back and re-check the data, e.g. the belief that children experiencing behaviour difficulties would be more likely to be segregated because they caused the greatest concern in the mainstream turned out to be questionable and to require further exploration.

12. Member checks and respondent validation
I am aware of the weaknesses of respondent validation (Bloor, 1997). I sought and obtained critical commentaries of my work from officer
participants and from colleagues at the case study schools. My work was also read by the chief inspector, a senior EP and the professional development officer. They had not been part of the study and raised some issues with me, particularly where they too had access to and had been familiar with the data, e.g. SEN policy survey, inspector reports and SEN review consultation. This generated new insights and rival explanations ruling out spurious relations, e.g. to think about third variables when two appeared correlated. This happened once where I had to justify one particular account about Bluebell and whether placements at the school were value for money. I needed to make sure that the analyses were not simply about the goodness of the results (see Robson, op.cit); they had to be rigorous and systematic. Linking these to a theoretical framework within which the findings can be located was a useful tool to enhance rigour.

Methodological Issues: Limitations

The following methodological issues are acknowledged and have been dealt with in the manner detailed below.

1. Quantitative Elements

Reliance on records and statistical data is fraught with difficulties, not least because of inaccuracies and sometimes poor reliability of the data (Government Statisticians Collective, 1996; Hakim, 1996). The study made use of quantitative information which I considered to be fairly reliable and valid, not limited to face validity. This was partly because it was derived from the LEA's SEN Audit and other management information systems (MIS) records, making it objective and verifiable. The SEN Audit Data is sufficiently refined and rigorously moderated to have acceptable levels of reliability and validity. These have not been measured as such but are likely to be high, given the inclusion of clear written criteria and guidance on procedures to ensure rigorous moderation. Inherent weaknesses relate to criteria but these have a consensus, a county and a national norm where available; and objective measure or indicators where these are difficult to quantify, e.g. behaviour. The SEN Audit mechanism can be further refined to improve the reliability and validity of its data but is sufficiently objective
and open to replication for the purpose of this study. Likewise, MIS records such as budget information are permanent and are open to scrutiny. Categories have been used for numerical reporting and that these may leave out other significant information. LEAs are tied into arbitrary classification and funding systems but these are not necessarily comparable between any of them. Where weaknesses exist in the data these are indicated.

2. Case Studies
Case files and records on children are often incomplete, failing to give the whole picture. These inevitably stress the author's perceptions of the issues which can be misleading if interpreted uncritically and without a clear context and focus. I have heeded Stake's (op.cit) advice to bound the case, conceptualising the object of study, to select phenomena, themes, or issues - i.e. the research questions to emphasise- and to seek patterns of data to develop issues. I also sought to triangulate key observations and bases for interpretation, to select alternative interpretations to pursue and to develop assertions or generalisations.

3. Interview Information
There was a danger of drifting into endless narratives. Methods used were to establish structure and purpose in the reporting whilst maintaining credibility in the approach and authenticity in the data. I followed the guidance given in Woolcott (1990). The information was sorted into categories; the questions asked were organised and reported under a number of headings, e.g. definition, observations of practice. I included some raw data, my summaries, feelings and inferences in order to 'tell it as it is' (Coolican, p. 235-236). Whenever possible I also checked reports with respondents to ensure meanings were shared and as intended as opposed to being constructed by me. Draft reports of their own interviews, were analysed by two LEA colleagues, to ensure that interpretations were not merely of my construction or imagination. Though I would have wished to have done this with other participants too, I did not feel able to make a further imposition on their time. Main themes were identified and progressive focusing adopted in an endeavour to arrive at "illuminative evaluation" (Parlett and Hamilton, 1972). I was finding myself having to
reflect on and to redraw my conceptual map, moving from data to concepts in order to evolve some element of "grounded theory" (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit). This was a lengthy process. I realised that the information given was only as good as the source and that my constructions were limited to what people chose to say. Inevitably, there were mismatches of perception or of meaning. "The impossibility of seeing the world from another person's head remains the eternal nightmare of the researcher" (Eraut, 1978, p. 28). As an insider researching the organisation from the inside, there were risks of strategic compliance from respondents (Alexander, 1991) or insider contamination from me (Sandbrook, op.cit); colleagues perhaps saying that which would present them in an enlightened way or which would not offend.

CONCLUSIONS

This study confines itself to being plausible, credible, authentic and recognizable, offering clarification and order amongst the mass of information the LEA has accumulated but had not necessarily reported. It uses a number of methods, including quantitative and qualitative information ranging from numerical data to individual views and perspectives. Such an approach permits elements of triangulation and respondent validation (Cohen and Manion, 1996, Robson, op.cit), the aim being to build in as much rigour in the design as possible. The methodologies have been informed in each case by the existing literature, e.g. documentary analysis (Holsti, op.cit); case studies (Stake, op.cit; Yin, op.cit); interviewing (Tuckman, op.cit) and participant observation (Robson, op.cit). The analysis which includes coding, theoretical coding and theoretical sampling, was intended to lead to theory which is grounded in the data and research findings (Glaser and Strauss, op.cit).

The next three chapters detail my findings, focusing in turn on the general overview as derived from the LEA's records, key stakeholders' perspectives and case studies of two schools. The final chapter brings the whole thesis together and summarises the conclusions.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter starts with an analysis of quantitative data in order to set the context and provide the statistical backcloth to the study. This illustrates the extent to which children are either treated differently or are marginalised in Southampton. It is linked to Bailey's (1998) concern about exclusion, raising issues about discrimination in terms of access, educational opportunities or equity of treatment. This chapter aims to answer my first research question:

1. To what extent is Southampton implementing its policy of inclusion?
- What do children's school placements reveal about practice? How does Southampton compare with its statistical neighbours on inclusion? To what extent is it making effective use of its resources to promote inclusion? Given a policy of inclusion, are schools raising standards?

It considers the evidence of practice and the extent to which this either illustrates the reality of inclusion or whether this is merely rhetoric masking other practices. It also enables some tentative conclusions to be made about children's placements; the costs and differences between special and mainstream placements and the changes the LEA has achieved since local government reorganisation. It is recognised that the statistical data and evaluation only add insight when one goes behind and beyond the figures. I have attempted to do this in order to illustrate Southampton's context and circumstances. This helps to illustrate my findings within my theoretical and conceptual frame of reference, i.e. examination of policy and practice through discourses and methodology of grounded theory. Consideration of discourses helps to evaluate the extent to which the LEA subscribes to each in practice. The data provide some indicators not only of the extent to which children are included; they may also reveal the steps the LEA is taking to translate some of its rhetoric on inclusion into reality.
Key Strategies

The key documentation on inclusion was detailed in Chapter 4. What does this say about the LEA's aspirations, i.e. its rhetoric? This section summarises the outcomes.

1. “All our children”
   This policy formulated and implemented by Hampshire has enabled Southampton to maintain children in local mainstream schools and obviate the need for special school placements as mainstream schools were given additional funding to include children.

   The net effect was to contract the continuum of placements, i.e. from the more extreme placements such as in residential special schools to more local and mainstream placements. This practice lays the foundation for further contraction in terms of increasing numbers of children in the mainstream whilst further reducing special school placements. Southampton is continuing this strategy to maintain children in city schools; only one placement has been made out of the city since local government re-organisation in April 1997.

2. “The Inclusion Project”
   This Southampton project started in 1994 aimed at improving attendance and at reducing the number of disciplinary exclusions in two secondary schools. Both schools report an increased ability to support students at risk of exclusion. Over a period of two years, six of the sample population of twelve students were considered to be no longer at risk of exclusion; only two were excluded. Teacher ratings of students’ behaviour and attainments also confirmed improvements in these areas. Appendix 4 gives details of this project and its outcomes.
The project focused on taking a number of preventative measures, ranging from identifying early warning signs; providing respite on the school site; changing support and pastoral arrangements in schools; to increasing peer group support. Teachers at the schools confirmed that it led to greater differentiation and improved curriculum access. Risk times, i.e. when pupils were more vulnerable, were carefully structured, and communication with parents improved. Since LGR, Southampton has expanded this project to other schools. The progress and evaluation of these follow up activities are given later (p. 119).

3. **"The SEN Audit and Greater Delegation of SEN resources"**

This is an LEA wide system for identifying and resourcing SEN in schools. Since LGR, Southampton LEA has been spending around £4 million per year to support children experiencing difficulties in learning. Children experiencing learning difficulties of "high incidence", i.e. high frequency, are funded exclusively through this Audit. There is no centrally retained budget for these needs.

Difficulties in learning of "high incidence" are reserved for specified LEA categories or groupings, i.e. children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties, moderate or specific learning difficulties. Low incidence needs are in respect of children experiencing severe autism, language and communication disorders, severe learning or severe physical or sensory difficulties. These children receive additional funding from a centrally held budget; this tops up the allocations made through the SEN Audit.

4. **"Trial Integration and Full Integration Grants"**

This was a small sum of money to provide incentives for mainstream schools to accept children from special schools. The response was variable. Initially, few children were able to return from special to mainstream schools. Southampton has continued this policy and encourages schools to use these grants. The numbers of children and schools benefiting from this has risen from five in April 1997 to a total of 106 by April 2000.
Vermont Special School which makes provision for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties uses this source of support. Between 1997 and 1998, its staff made use of this grant to return five children to mainstream primary schools. Since that time, they have successfully returned another fifteen in primary schools. All children have been supported for an agreed period with each of the receiving schools and all are doing well with additional support from the Vermont school's outreach service. Four children transferred to their secondary education in September 1999 and are reported to be making progress.

Analysis of the above LEA initiatives shows a move towards more inclusive practice. Some of these were written before inclusion came on the agenda, e.g. *All Our Children* (1992). However, it is possible to interrogate the policies within the theoretical framework of discourses detailed in chapter 3. Viewing them through this lens shows that issues of ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics, are influencing practice, e.g. reductions in special schools and only one out city placement. They may not have been explicitly expressed as such in the documents but the outcomes of the objectives set are evident. The move towards educating all children in the city (SCC 2000a) is a recognition that they should have similar rights to other children in not having to leave their home to receive an education (rights and ethics). This is also applicable to children who are avoiding disciplinary exclusions (rights and ethics; also political as they are able to avoid struggles for education). Efficacy and pragmatics discourses are also apparent, e.g the SEN policy states that savings from private placements will be invested locally (SCC, 2000a). It costs less in the long term to educate children in the city (efficacy), especially as local schools are becoming more able and willing to be inclusive through additional resourcing and support (pragmatics).

There is also another dimension. The distinction on funding between high and low incidence needs places more monetary value on the identification of the latter as the former carries no financial advantage to schools. This is an example of how psycho-medical paradigms are used in LEAs. Such a distinction risks devaluing the needs of some children. Children
experiencing high incidence needs have their allocations guaranteed but school staff may perceive them as being unable to secure any further central funding. Conflicting discourses arise. Foucault's (1977a) observations about how such classifications construct disability also apply. Normalising judgements deriving from the medical gaze influence LEA practice. The effects and contradictions of such LEA practice are evident. What is not explained, however, is why the LEA is unable to abandon firm determinate structures, on this occasion funding based on classification. With local management of schools, there are other ways of funding school and if complete consistency in the rhetoric is to be achieved, the LEA may consider addressing these contradictions.

Policy Outcomes: Reality of Practice.

LEA records show that 99.9% of children are receiving full time education; of these 0.9 are in special schools. The remainder are those who are unable to attend school, e.g. for medical reasons, and those who have been permanently excluded and are awaiting alternative placements (SCC 2001a). Of the latter group of 46 pupils, 22% were receiving education for less than 10 hours a week; 27% between 10 and 20 hours a week; and 52% more than 20 hours a week in the academic year 1999-2000. Though this falls short of full time education, records show that attendance for all three groups was at an average of 80% and that, in spite of their difficulties and circumstances, pupils are reported by the LEA Support Services to be engaging in learning. Nevertheless, this is still a significant number for whom the LEA needs to improve arrangements and this is an issue nationally (DfEE, 1997, Mittler, 2000).

Distribution of Southampton Placements

Southampton placed fewer children in special schools, following "All Our Children" (1992), as this was County policy. This led to an annual increase in the numbers of children placed in the mainstream, combined with further reductions in out of city placements (Appendix 2).
Table 5.1 below shows the number of Southampton children, aged 5 to 16, issued with Statements of SEN, placed in each type of setting in April 1997. Statements are provided to children experiencing the most significant difficulties in learning, following statutory assessment of their needs, i.e. under the terms of the 1996 Education Act. This assessment is essentially multi-disciplinary, involving parents and professionals from statutory agencies. This takes place at Stage 5 of the DfEE's Code of Practice and if it is considered that a child's difficulties in learning require help which is "additional to or otherwise different from that normally available in a mainstream school", then a Statement of SEN is issued. If not, a Statement is not prepared and a Note in Lieu of a Statement may be issued. Children without Statements and considered at lower Stages of the Code of Practice, i.e. usually 1 to 3, but including Stages 4 and 5 where a Statement is not issued, are expected to be helped from within their school's resources. Schools are allocated additional resources for children experiencing difficulties in learning; some LEAs delegate these through an "SEN Audit" funding mechanism, e.g. Hampshire (DfEE, 1994; Ramjhun, 1995, Bowers, op.cit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Special (s)</th>
<th>Independent (Special)</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Mainstream (Units)</th>
<th>Education other Than at school</th>
<th>Unplaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals in Mainstream: (1.49% + 0.25%) = 1.74%  
Special Schools (1.44% + 0.05%) = 1.49%

Figure 5.1 illustrates the distribution of placements in mainstream and special provision.
In 1997, 1.63% of the school population are being educated outside of the mainstream. 1.53% are in special schools. 0.1% are not in school at all, either for reasons of ill health or because the LEA has not been able to secure placements for them. This is the position in many LEAs. Recent DfEE (1999) guidance on pupils out of school reflects the national concern about such issues. Southampton is addressing this but will need to look beyond the data as the figures may be incomplete. They mask many areas such as attendance patterns, levels of engagement in learning and the time taken to achieve placements. As inclusion is about all children the issue is about ensuring that no child is disenfranchised and this will require careful planning and provision. This will go towards addressing the legal requirement in April 2002 for LEAs to provide full time education for all children, including those out of school.

Table 5.1 reveals the extent to which the LEA’s model of special education is implemented through special school placements as opposed to providing special services reaching out to children. Bailey’s (1998) view is that the latter should be increasingly promoted. This is beginning to be recognised in the SEN policy (see also details of outreach services on p. 118). Currently there is an equal distribution of children with Statements of SEN in mainstream and special schools. This is comparable with other LEAs (DfEE, 1998). However, as the criteria for Statements depend on LEA policy, particularly the extent to which it has delegated resources to mainstream schools, such comparisons require caution. What can be said is that Southampton is placing similar numbers of children experiencing equally complex needs in both types of settings.

Special School Placements and Comparisons.

Table 5.1 shows that in April 1997, only 1.53% of the overall school population were in special schools, compared with Hampshire’s lowest figure of 1.71% and the national average of around 2%. Table 2.1, p. 27 provides 1991 comparative data in relation to Western Europe; see also table 2.2, p. 33 on changes which have taken place in special school placements between 1993 and 1999 in England.
Table 5.2 provides a comparison of Southampton's special school placements with those of its comparator LEAs in 1998. These percentages serve as performance indicators for each of the LEAs; i.e. they are assessed against these by the Audit Commission. This table shows the percentages of children aged 0 to 19 and not 5 to 16, representing the change in measurement by the Audit Commission since 1998. This illustrates the influence of external forces on LEA data collection procedures and requirements, the focus being on percentages in types of schools as variously described by LEAs. As indicators, they have the potential to promote inclusion, given this central monitoring and reporting.

Table 5.2: Percentage of children aged 0-19 in special schools in Southampton and its comparator LEAs (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 suggests that Southampton is amongst LEAs with the lowest percentages of children aged 0-19 in special schools in April 1998. Figure 5.2 illustrates Southampton's position in relation to its statistical neighbours.

![Figure 5.2: Percentage of children aged 0-19 in special schools in Southampton and its comparator LEAs (1998)](image_url)
There are issues about the data reported by each LEA, particularly as there is no uniformity in the type and range of provision for children experiencing difficulties in learning across all LEAs. Are special schools all similar? What are the children's attendance patterns?, e.g. full time; part time? Are children dually registered at both a special and mainstream school? LEAs' reported summaries do not always show such information. There may also be variations in practice so that it is dangerous to make comparisons out of context. There are further issues in respect of the reliability, validity and comparability of these data as it is difficult to control a multiplicity of factors to make meaningful and accurate comparisons. They are included for the sake of giving the complete picture, especially as this is the kind of data that has national acceptance. They are used for benchmarking (Chapter 1, p. 2). It should be noted, however, that, at best the data show the percentages in each type of school, depending on how they are collected and reported. At worst, they make assumptions about inclusion based on percentages of children attending the mainstream, losing the point that inclusion is not about placement but about learning. Evaluation of engagement in learning goes well beyond deriving percentages. The main value of the data is that it gives a picture of mainstream and special placements in LEAs whose circumstances are similar. It can also show trends and illustrate the changes which each LEA is trying to make. As long as the above weaknesses in the data are recognised, it may enable other LEA officers to compare practices, set and match targets and comply with central government's requirements. The data if taken as a whole can illustrate how a group of LEAs with broadly similar circumstances are working. Southampton's data can inform other LEAs in their own analyses and in this sense, some of this information can be evaluated in other contexts with caution.

Reductions in Special School Placements

Table 5.3 shows reductions in special school placements Southampton made since LGR. This gives both 0-19 and 5-16 data in December 1997, 1998 and 1999 respectively. April 1997 data are provided to show the
position at LGR; since then data has been compiled in December every year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Summary of reductions in special school placements made by Southampton LEA since April 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/age in special schools (0-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/age in special schools (5-16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows clear progress towards enabling more children to receive their education in the mainstream. This relates to children considered to be experiencing the most significant difficulties in learning. Figure 5.3 clearly illustrates this trend.

The consistent reduction in special school placement suggests that not only is the LEA implementing a policy of inclusion or integration; schools are also affected by this. Clearly, such changes in school populations require acceptance of different philosophies and practices. At the same time, the perceptions and reactions of stakeholders must be recognised. There are three possible scenarios. The first is that the changes have gone unnoticed. This is unlikely, given the magnitude. Reductions may, however, have been viewed as due to an increasing ability to include more children. The second is that the changes have been accepted with mixed feelings, in recognition of the need for practice to become more inclusive. Ethics, rights, politics, efficacy and pragmatics issues may all have had an influence. The third is that the changes are too fast, leading to resistance. Whilst recognising the rights, ethics and political issues, those relating to efficacy and pragmatics may be seen as being compromised.
Chapter 6 provides some insights into stakeholder perspectives on the pace of inclusion. What is clear here is that Southampton has achieved with its schools a position whereby more children are in the mainstream. This is consistent with national trends and compares favourably with international practices (Chapter 2). Southampton's rhetoric articulated in its policy appears to be leading to some changes in practice.

Influence of the Psycho-medical paradigm on SEN Classification and Funding

Nearly 20% of children have been identified on the LEA's SEN Audit to be experiencing learning difficulties at Stages 1 to 3 of the DfEE's Code of Practice, i.e. without a statement. This suggests a total of around 20% of children experiencing significant difficulties in learning being educated in the mainstream in addition to those placed in special schools. The identification and classification process highlights the language of special education the LEA subscribes to. This may be for historical reasons but nevertheless is indicative of the mechanisms and labelling it is tied into.

Tables 5.4 and 5.5 show the distribution into Steps or Stages and the costs for 1997 and 1998 respectively. Steps followed by an S refer to high incidence needs statements (see p. 100). 'Steps' are roughly equivalent to Stages on the DfEE's Code of Practice (see Appendix 3). Figures 5.4 and 5.5 illustrate the individual costs of Steps 1, 2, 3, 2S and 3S. These are for the financial years 1997 and 1998 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4: SEN Audit Data for the year 1997 (Southampton schools).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Total no. of children on Audit = 6037; representing 19.5% of Southampton school population of 30,931).*
It would appear that Southampton schools are identifying a significant percentage of children perceived to be experiencing learning difficulties. The percentages of 19.5 to 19.9% of the school population are in line with the Warnock estimate of 20% and below the top end of the national range of 30% but well in excess of the average of 10.9%. (see DES Warnock Report, op.cit; Audit Commission, 1998).

Very few of these children could be described as experiencing serious learning difficulties prior to the SEN Audit and the DfE’s Code of Practice requirements for a register of SEN. Indeed, 82 to 83% of children receiving funding from the SEN Audit are at Stages 1 and 2; around 18.07% are on Step 3 to 3+, and these are the children whose needs are significant, long term and complex. Yet the costs for these two groups were roughly the same in 1997 though changing in 1998. Southampton LEA is therefore allocating significant resources for children perceived to be experiencing difficulties in learning to receive additional help in the mainstream. The majority of these experience difficulties which are ordinarily met in the mainstream, yet they are attracting considerable resources through the
Audit, nearly 50% of the total allocations. Marsh (op.cit) argues that this has been the trend nationally since the process of formal assessment came into force, being seen as one way of attracting more resources in schools. £4.2 million are allocated annually to schools through the SEN Audit. Southampton, like other LEAs, is considering how to measure outcomes from investment.

SEN funding mechanisms in LEAs run the risk of rewarding the identification of learning difficulties, reflecting deficit approaches. Funding levels increase as difficulties become more severe and are in inverse proportion to success. These could act as barriers to inclusion. As Marsh (op.cit) suggests, the risk is that they may take away schools' focus on learning and encourage them to seek funds and to collect information which may have little application in the classroom.

On the whole, the distribution of children's placements across types of schools and the reduction in special school placements suggest approaches deriving from discourses and philosophies about ethics, rights and politics. Parents and their children seem to have a choice in types of placements and most are receiving education. This does not necessarily mean that political struggles are few or that the LEA has a rationale along ethics, rights and political discourses. Other discourses are apparent. e.g. in the LEA's consideration of efficacy and pragmatics issues. Reducing out of city placements leads to efficiencies and increases resources for developing local options, i.e realises both efficacy and pragmatics aspirations whilst based on ethics, rights and political rationales. However, the other side of the equation is the pressure on stakeholders. their perspectives on the ability for children to gain from, and for adults to deliver from these initiatives. This is an equally important perspective. Whilst the changes detailed may be indicative of progress towards inclusion, there maybe some individuals who may feel the reverse of what is claimed (p. 148-57).
Given the investments in mainstream schools, it is worth exploring the range of learning difficulties they are making provision for. This can reveal the extent to which some children are more likely to be in the mainstream than others. Table 5.6 illustrates the position in April 1997. This is based on the SEN labels used by the LEA. These labels represent the ‘best fits’ used to record the primary and most significant need. Children experience a multiplicity of needs and the classification of SEN in this manner is an administrative exercise. In spite of their limitations, all LEAs use these labels to provide statistical returns to the DfEE.

The distribution is of children experiencing the most severe, long term and complex needs to the extent of requiring a Statement of SEN. Whilst the numbers in special schools represent the actual numbers, those in mainstream schools relate to a small percentage who have been so identified with a Statement. There are many more whose difficulties are milder and who are being given help without a Statement. As many as 0% are on Stages 1 to 3 of the DfEE’s Code of Practice (Table 5.4, p.108). The table only refers to children with Statements, totalling around 2.5% of the school population. It excludes children experiencing profound and multiple learning difficulties. All of them are placed in an independent school (Bluebell) as Southampton schools consider themselves unable to meet their needs. Their numbers at Bluebell have remained unchanged at twenty.

SEN classifications run counter to a philosophy of inclusion (Foucault, op.cit). They represent “official” data as recorded by the LEA and are included as a summary to illustrate the distribution of children experiencing a variety of needs in mainstream and special schools. These classifications or categorisations illustrate LEA practice and confirm the focus in statutory assessments in that so-called primary needs, i.e the most significant, persistent and complex learning difficulties, are identified and categorised. In the past, some categories always led to special placements, e.g. severe learning difficulties. These data illustrate the destination of children experiencing difficulties in learning, the practices and foci of professional
practitioners, and the current dominant practice of categorisation in LEAs for resourcing and placement purposes. The influence of the psycho-medical paradigm is explicit. Foucault's position on normalising judgments is well illustrated, including the children categorised for 'perpetual surveillance' (see p. 48). When more data become available such information can help compare positions and assess children's progress and transfers from one type of setting to another. As long as deficit categorisations continue, there are likely to be incentives for stakeholders to prioritise some groups over others, e.g. dyslexia lobby (Tomlinson, 1999). This will be a deterrent to inclusion.

Southampton Units are integral parts of mainstream schools, enabling children who are placed there to attend some classes. Attendance in mainstream lessons vary from Unit to Unit but range from 25% to nearly 90% of lessons.

Table 5.6 The distribution of Children with Statements of SEN in Southampton (April 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>Mainstream Placements</th>
<th>Unit Placements</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>% Special</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning D</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional D</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1998, there have been changes in this distribution. By August 2000, there were 419 children in special schools; i.e. a reduction of 106 or 20% of the 1997 total. Other changes had also taken place. Only four children experiencing profound hearing impairment were in out of city schools; there was no out of city placement for visual impairment. More children experiencing physical difficulties were attending their mainstream schools even though the number in the local special school had stayed constant. There was also more children diagnosed with autism in the mainstream; there were four of these who previously would have had one choice only and this would have been a special school placement.
The numbers of children experiencing complex learning or behaviour difficulties attending special schools have stayed the same. This may be indicative of schools' attitudes and levels of responsiveness to these groups. These seem unlikely to change unless substantial changes are brought about in schools (Appendix 1).

Table 5.6 shows clear differences in the distribution of children perceived to be experiencing different types of learning difficulties who are in the mainstream. This is not markedly different from other findings in the literature. For example, a survey of 14 LEAs, found similar distributions suggesting that 'the nature of the disability is linked to the kind of provision a child is likely to receive' (Rathbone, 1998). These LEAs used similar labels as Southampton. Compared with the averages, Southampton performed less well in terms of mainstream placements for children experiencing severe learning difficulties, moderate learning difficulties and emotional and behavioural difficulties. The position was better with the rest.

Within the constraints of the arbitrary labels in use within Southampton it would appear that children experiencing learning difficulties represent the largest group to be categorised; 49% of the total. 51.81% of these children are in special schools (see also p. 137). Mainstream schools seem more prepared to provide for some difficulties compared with others, e.g. physical difficulties are received more favourably. This is similar to Sleeter's (op.cit) findings about teachers' differential responses to "normative and non-normative" difficulties, with the exception of children experiencing multiple and profound learning difficulties.

Profound and severe learning difficulties, emotional and behavioural difficulties show the least favourable responses as reflected in placement outcomes. Statements for learning difficulties (47.3%) and emotional and behavioural difficulties (17.25%) account for 64.55% of all Statements and 1.81% of the school population. This reflects the levels of concern in respect of curriculum differentiation, children's attainments and their behaviour.
Numbers of children experiencing physical and learning difficulties are equally distributed between mainstream and special schools. However, there would seem to be no reason why the former group could not be increasingly attending their mainstream schools, once accessibility is improved. The Rathbone research (op.cit) also questioned this. This is because most of these children experience mild to moderate difficulties in learning; teachers might feel more confident with meeting such needs of lesser complexity.

The distribution of children experiencing difficulties in learning reveals teachers' concerns about behaviour and curriculum (Appendix 11). The largest groups segregated are those requiring differentiated curricula or behaviour management. This suggests that teachers are more concerned about the majority of children for whom they are responsible and with whom they could achieve the standards set by the government. It may explain why children experiencing the more complex difficulties are in special schools. It also explains why children who are likely to be disruptive are referred to special education. This suggests that the rhetoric about disruptive children is not matched with the reality of their placements; they are not the majority group segregated. There are other differences which are explored through stakeholder perspectives in chapter 6.

The categories used are indicative of a prevailing psycho-medical paradigm; diverse and disparate identities are collapsed into labels (Oliver, 1990b). This practice is arguably segregative, Oliver would say 'oppressive', within an LEA aspiring to be inclusive. Clough and Corbett (op.cit) stress that paradigms can co-exist but this is also illustrative of how some LEAs have to promote inclusive practice within their determinate processes and structures; their a prioris and givens (Dyson, op.cit). The numbers of places in types of special schools influence the extent to which a particular group becomes more likely to be segregated. This could be the case in respect of children experiencing learning difficulties; empty places are difficult to justify to stakeholders, particularly teachers, parents and politicians.
Financial Considerations

Tables 5.7 and 5.8 show the costs of placements in different types of establishments for Southampton children who hold statements of SEN. Standard costs (S.C) of mainstream places have been averaged at £2,000 to account for variations in funding between infant, junior and secondary school places.

Table 5.7: Costs of Mainstream Placements (N= 428)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of placement</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>High incidence</th>
<th>Low incidence</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>€233,185.</td>
<td>€231,142.</td>
<td>€464,327.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Units</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>@ an average of €6k per place</td>
<td></td>
<td>€426,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream + Units</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>€890,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Place Costs (SC)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>@ an average of €2k per place</td>
<td>€864,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€1,754,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs of special school placements for 501 children are four times more than for 432 children with Statements of SEN, in the mainstream. Whilst it is often argued that the children segregated are usually perceived to have significantly greater needs, the cost difference is significant. Whilst outcomes in Southampton are yet to be formally evaluated, it is known that mainstream placements, on balance, lead to greater educational and social benefits (Crowther et al, 1998). There are efficacy issues for Southampton to consider. It would need to consider doing so within an appraisal of other issues relating to rights, politics and ethics balanced by considerations of capacity and pragmatics.

Examples of costs with regard to current Southampton placements

Table 5.9 illustrates the costs of placements in different settings. Examples are of children in special and mainstream schools with similar needs; including those in the mainstream receiving high incidence funding, i.e. entirely though the SEN Audit with no additional costs to the LEA. They have been matched as far as possible, ensuring that their needs are very
similar. If they went to out of city schools in the past, this was due to lack of local provision and not due to the children experiencing any greater level or complexity of need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Difficulty (as classified)</th>
<th>Typical Cost in special school</th>
<th>Typical Cost in mainstream</th>
<th>Difference between special and mainstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>£ 4,500</td>
<td>£ 3,000 (SC+SEN Audit)</td>
<td>£ 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>£ 10,000</td>
<td>SC+15 hrs LSA: £ 5,900</td>
<td>£ 4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism (LEA school)</td>
<td>£ 12,000</td>
<td>SC+25 hrs LSA: £ 8,500</td>
<td>£ 3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism (out city school)</td>
<td>£ 30,000 minimum</td>
<td>Max: £ 10,000</td>
<td>£ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impairment</td>
<td>£ 6,700</td>
<td>SC+15 hrs LSA: £ 5,900</td>
<td>£ 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and behavioural Difficulties</td>
<td>LEA school: £ 6,700</td>
<td>SC+ 25 hrs LSA: (£1,000 through Audit; i.e £2,000)</td>
<td>£ 3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and behavioural Difficulties</td>
<td>Out city school: £ 30,000 minimum</td>
<td>SC of £2,000+£ 1,000 through Audit</td>
<td>£ 27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit in mainstream: £ 6,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>Out City school: £ 22,000</td>
<td>£ 6,700 (unit cost)</td>
<td>£ 15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>Out City: £ 20,000</td>
<td>Unit cost in mainstream: £ 6,700</td>
<td>£ 13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Impairment</td>
<td>LEA special: £ 12,000</td>
<td>SC of £2,000+15 hrs LSA £ 5,900</td>
<td>£ 5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Impairment</td>
<td>Out City school: £ 22,000</td>
<td>£ 5,900 as above</td>
<td>£ 16,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that special school costs, whether in LEA special or in out city schools, are greater than in mainstream schools. These exclude the costs of transport which are significant components. In Southampton, total transport costs for 467 children are £ 1.4 million, i.e. an average of £ 3,000 per child. If capital costs are included, special schooling becomes even more expensive. Crowther et al (1998) have found similar higher costs in respect of special school placements for children experiencing moderate learning difficulties. The literature suggests that this does not necessarily lead to additional benefits (see Chapter 2).

Southampton spends £4.5 million on its special schools yearly, excluding costs of placements at Bluebell School (£ 300, 000) and out city schools (£ 600, 000), i.e. a total of £4.8 million. A further £7 million is spent on children experiencing difficulties in learning who are in mainstream settings, including units and off site facilities; £5 million on mainstream schools and the rest on hospitals, home tuition and pupil referral units. Evaluation of the use of SEN funds in 30 mainstream schools by the LEA's inspectors suggests that this is effective in 90% of the schools visited. Issues identified are related to budgetary accounting; children, on the
whole, are receiving the support they have been allocated. 30% of schools spend more than their allocations to support children experiencing learning difficulties (SCC, 2001c).

The questions could be posed. First, if a selected number of successful mainstream schools could have an additional £0.5 to £1 million in their budgets, how much of this £4 million could be used to successfully support some of the currently segregated children? Or could the money be redirected to support all children in the mainstream? This would be an average of £47000 per school; i.e. between 85 schools; or £130 for every child on school rolls, based on the current population of 30,931. A comprehensive school with 1,000 on roll would receive another £130,000. This would provide five additional teachers, once transport and other capital costs are added, and five classrooms in each year group for children’s difficulties in learning to be effectively met. The second question could be what would be the options; the obstacles and the developments needed within and beyond schools? This study begins to shed some light on these issues (chapter 6, p. 127-136). It would seem that staff in many schools are not ready to take on greater challenges and may wish any additional funding to provide services from other agencies, not themselves.

Costs vs. Placement Issues

These issues were explored with a range of LEA officers and other colleagues. Their views were collected over a period of time and from discussion in a range of settings, e.g. at school, panel meetings (see also Appendices). The consensus is that it would be naïve to think that monies re-allocated would lead to greater inclusion. LEAs work in complex political, financial and legal circumstances which have an impact on the pace of progress they are able to make. Even if there was the will to re-allocate current special education expenditure, it is questionable whether mainstream schools would want or are ready for this. As a headteacher said: “We have the money but can’t get the staff [...] we are simply not ready for more inclusion”. There is potential for creativity but this needs to be thoroughly explored and agreed with all stakeholders.
The majority of children (20 out of 30) in private, i.e. independent and non-maintained placements are in one school within the City (Bluebell School). This school has considerable facilities, experience and expertise in supporting children who are experiencing profound and multiple learning difficulties. Their needs are considered too difficult to be met in the mainstream or indeed in any of Southampton's special schools. The children require individualised curricula, a range of therapies, specialised equipment and nursing care. Whilst these can be provided, it would appear that staff in Southampton schools do not, on the whole, feel able or ready to work with these children, there being a lack of training and expertise in this area to match that already available at the independent school. There are also logistical problems so that it would be difficult to consider transferring the children to other environments, even if this met with the support of the parents and professionals involved.

Placements at Bluebell School cost around £0.3 million per annum. However, these could not be re-directed into alternative provision without significant capital expenditure. There will need to be a new building which is completely accessible to wheelchairs for instance. This will need to be considered within the LEA's SEN review. Placements in Southampton special schools only include children experiencing more complex, significant and long term needs than in the past (special headteachers' view; see page 137). The main referrals are in respect of those children whose needs mainstream schools are considered unable to meet.

Since September 1998, there have been two major developments, initiated by LEA officers with the support of two special schools. These projects have supported children experiencing learning and behavioural difficulties in their mainstream schools through outreach support from special school teachers to their mainstream colleagues. Initially, the first project supported a total of thirty children in mainstream schools; these children were causing concern because of emotional and behavioural difficulties and had been at risk of disciplinary exclusions or would have required a special placement for their needs to be met. An investment of £42,000 in the special school for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties helped
for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties helped provide outreach support. Following the success of this approach, a similar initiative was started in September 1999, this time focusing on the needs of children experiencing complex difficulties in learning, either related to autism or language and communication disorders. The service was created by re-organising staff time to provide outreach support and maintaining funding to the school for 85 places even though the school roll had dropped to 75, i.e. at around a cost of £45,000. Recent indications at October 1999 suggest that children being supported in this way are making good progress in their mainstream schools. Not only have they been able to continue their education in their local school but the quality of their learning and the support they have received has been assessed to have been high by both LEA inspectors and the schools themselves. Teachers have also reported that they have been effectively supported. Both services are being expanded in 2000, following a further allocation of £94,000 from the DfEE.

The outreach projects have been helped by and build on earlier initiatives within Southampton, primarily associated with the Southampton Psychology service. These have extended the “Inclusion Project” reported earlier, (p. 99); but have been more systematic, carefully planned and implemented. The Service Level Agreement from the Psychology Service shows that schools have been allocated additional time from the Psychology service. Services have included training of school staff on Anger Management (see Herrick and Sharp, 2000); individual work and counselling with children, parents and staff and implementation of systematic and agreed strategies, with the support of senior management teams, to promote inclusion in learning. The service also provided intensive intervention with children whose behaviours placed them at risk of disciplinary exclusions.

Schools which have taken part in this initiative have reported satisfaction with the service, leading to differences in the strategies they have used to manage learning and behaviour. They are asking for an increase in this type of intervention as they claim that this has helped children’s progress in terms of their personal, social, educational and emotional development.
Satisfaction measures were derived from teacher ratings and reports, e.g. teacher assessment and children's performance on standardised measures including reading tests and personality assessments. These also recorded perceived changes in the attitudes and approaches of staff and feedback from the pupils themselves (Sharp, 2000).

A significant indicator for the LEA has been the marked reduction in the numbers of children excluded for disciplinary reasons from school. These dropped from 113 in 1996-1997 to 43 in 1998-1999 and to 21 by August 2000 (OFSTED, 2001). Teachers also confirmed that as more children were remaining in their mainstream schools, they were being supported to make an active participation in learning and in school life generally (SCC 2001b). The LEA is also making use of funds to promote the inclusion of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties, totalling £508,000 in 1999/2000. £400,000 have been allocated to enable secondary schools to make effective provision to manage behaviour and learning. Another £108,000 have been allocated to deal with truancy and to improve attendance (Southampton, 2000d).

Outreach services to support more children in mainstream settings through re-direction of resources and savings, in addition to other LEA initiatives, e.g. Educational Psychology, confirm the LEA's willingness to pursue inclusionary steps. In this way, it is acting precisely as recommended by the Audit Commission (Audit Commission, 1996) in re-directing resources from special to mainstream schools (Ramjhun and Ferry, 1999); e.g. Netley Court and Vermont Schools use resources released from reductions in numbers to support their outreach services. Southampton is also engaged in quality assurance initiatives within the City's mission of raising school standards (SCC 2001c).

Clearly, there are efficacy and pragmatics issues. Special schools are expensive but they are viewed by school staff to be necessary if children's needs are to be met (see chapter 6; Appendices 12 and 13). Dilemmas are evident. Rights, ethics and political issues appear to account for the efficacy and pragmatics of inclusive moves in Southampton; hence, Bluebell and
special schools continue to have key roles for now and the future (SCC, 2001a). Realism seems to mean facing up to constraints; pragmatism overriding rights when resources are not available and cannot be reasonably expected (SCC, 2001a). Power is also at work; without political support, radical changes are impossible. Some children will be selected and others de-selected from some forms of provision. The psycho-medical paradigm appears to be influencing the LEA's practice; there are links between the power of professionals, children's placements and their funding.

Special school arrangements are expensive and may not represent effective use of resources if other options can be explored. However, as Southampton is politically committed to providing special schools (SCC 1999), it does not have this choice though SEN resources are being used effectively within the current dual arrangement. Further efficiencies will require political and policy changes, e.g. additional funding to address capital shortfalls or a policy change in respect of special schools to allow re-distribution of resources. In terms of the efficacy paradigm, Southampton provides clear illustration of how being locked into a dual system of education clouds assessment of whether or not it makes effective use of resources.

**Accessibility of Schools**

Physical accessibility of schools is crucial to inclusion. However, it only constitutes a basic requirement as physical access does not guarantee children's participation in learning. The accessibility of Southampton's 91 schools has been assessed according to the DfEE's criteria in terms of wheelchair access to teaching accommodation and washroom facilities (DfEE, 1996). Relevant areas mean classes, libraries and other areas used for teaching and learning, e.g. halls, dining areas. A school is considered to be completely accessible if all parts are accessible to wheelchairs. Table 5.10 shows the position in 1993; (Coopers and Lybrand, 1993). Table 5.11 is an update from the DfEE (DfEE, 1999).
Since April 1998, Southampton has been carrying out a programme of building improvements, involving budgeted expenditure ranging from £100,000 to £140,000 annually. A further £39,000 are provided for SEN equipment to support mainstream placements of pupils experiencing physical and sensory difficulties. There are also plans for one secondary school on each side of the city to be appropriately resourced. Though these investments are aimed at improving physical access, there are other benefits, e.g., additional facilities such as lifts and more space from new accommodation. Whilst no formal strategy has been agreed, facilities are being made available in key locations, though always prioritising schools with immediate needs when a child selects a particular school. Table 5.11 shows the position of Southampton schools in January 1999, including comparisons with other LEAs.

### Table 5.10: Accessibility of Southampton and Hampshire schools as at January 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>All relevant areas</th>
<th>Teaching accommodation (50% or more)</th>
<th>Washroom Facilities</th>
<th>Completely accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
<td>28.99%</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Average</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1993)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since April 1998, Southampton has been carrying out a programme of building improvements, involving budgeted expenditure ranging from £100,000 to £140,000 annually. A further £39,000 are provided for SEN equipment to support mainstream placements of pupils experiencing physical and sensory difficulties. There are also plans for one secondary school on each side of the city to be appropriately resourced. Though these investments are aimed at improving physical access, there are other benefits, e.g., additional facilities such as lifts and more space from new accommodation. Whilst no formal strategy has been agreed, facilities are being made available in key locations, though always prioritising schools with immediate needs when a child selects a particular school. Table 5.11 shows the position of Southampton schools in January 1999, including comparisons with other LEAs.

### Table 5.11: Accessibility of Southampton Schools as compared with its Statistical Neighbours (January 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to:</th>
<th>All relevant areas</th>
<th>Teaching accommodation</th>
<th>Washroom facilities</th>
<th>Completely Accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%+</td>
<td>50%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saford</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 shows improvements, particularly in secondary schools. Southampton also compares favourably with its statistical neighbours on the measure of complete accessibility. It ranks fourth out of 13 in this
respect. It is third in terms of access to teaching accommodation and slightly below the national average in all areas measured and reported to the DfEE (DfEE, January, 1999).

By October 1999, four primary schools had been made fully accessible on the East side of the City. They have been provided with disabled toilets, ramps, stair lifts and other facilities. On the West side, similar improvements have been made to ten schools. Three schools in the inner city have also benefited. One secondary School, on the East has had a number of improvements made, including disabled toilets; new buildings to provide more places have also incorporated facilities for people who are physically disabled. Another Community School, on the West is now fairly accessible as new buildings are at ground level; the provision of disabled toilets is the remaining priority. Hillside Community School has had a number of adaptations, including additional ramps and a new medical room; the outstanding requirement is for a lift. Three new and expanded school buildings are proposed; they are expected to be fully accessible.

Southampton’s position on complete accessibility of its schools is poor, especially in respect of secondary schools. It has a number of school buildings, some having been built at the turn of the century and the newer ones dating back to the 1960s and 1970s, which did not take access as a consideration. This is similar to other LEAs (NUT, 2001). In the 1970s, access does not appear to have been a priority. However, if Southampton’s schools are to become more accessible and inclusive, a programme of investments will be required. This is planned (Southampton, 2000d). With the implementation of the Disability Discrimination in Education Act 2000, all buildings will have to be physically accessible. The NUT (2001) report shows that Southampton is like other LEAs in using schools access initiative funds to improve access. In the LEAs studied, LEA and school staff, 'had extremely positive attitudes to including pupils with physical or sensory impairments', (p. 1). Planning on school access had also improved. Given the capital investments needed for improvement, Southampton appears to be making effective use of the resources at its disposal. It is having to be pragmatic whilst needing to show efficacy in its building and access programmes.
**Southampton's Performance**

How are Southampton schools performing in comparison with those in its statistical neighbours? Given the high levels of investment, what have been the returns? These are complex questions. My main reason for attempting to answer them is to indicate how children are perceived to be performing on a number of normative measures. If inclusion is working, then there should be evidence of more successful learning and these measures are the only ones which are reported, with national currency and substance.

Table 5.12 shows that, at Key Stage (KS) 1, children are improving their performance every year since 1997 in all areas assessed. Scores are from 0 to 100. Performance is slightly below the average for similar authorities, except for Maths and Science where it is better.

**Table 5.12: Key Stage 1 Performance: Southampton compared with its statistical neighbours.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Southampton 97</th>
<th>Similar LEA 97</th>
<th>Southampton 98</th>
<th>Similar LEA 98</th>
<th>Southampton 99</th>
<th>Similar LEA 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English TA</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read test</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write test</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spell test</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths test</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English TA</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: TA = Teacher Assessments*

Table 5.13 shows Southampton's position to be similar at KS2; Southampton children continue to make consistent progress year on year. There are variations in comparison with children's progress in similar authorities. Performance is below average except for Science.

**Table 5.13: Key Stage 2 Performance: Southampton compared with its statistical neighbours.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Southampton 97</th>
<th>Similar LEA 97</th>
<th>Southampton 98</th>
<th>Similar LEA 98</th>
<th>Southampton 99</th>
<th>Similar LEA 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English TA</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read test</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write test</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths test</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English TA</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14 shows the position for children at KS3. There are improvements for English in 1998 and for Maths in 1998 and 1999. Performance in Science showed a fall in 1998 and is picking up but is still less than in 1997.
Table 5.14: Performance at Key Stage 3: Southampton compared with its statistical neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Soton 97</th>
<th>Similar LEAs 97</th>
<th>Soton 98</th>
<th>Similar LEAs 98</th>
<th>Soton 99</th>
<th>Similar LEAs 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 shows the position for children at KS4, i.e. GCSEs. This shows progress from 1997 to 1998 though there is a fall in performance in 1999. The 1997 and 1998 are above average in comparison with similar LEAs.

It seems that Southampton children are making progress in learning every year; there are deviations in the patterns shown but these are small and unlikely to be significant in themselves. Southampton also compares favourably with its statistical neighbours; its performance improves, especially by key stage 4, where it is above average in every area. There also seems to be evidence of successful inclusive practice. There have been gradual increases in the percentages of children included in mainstream schools and the year on year improvements also suggest that standards are rising. Further improvement may be possible, given the levels of investment. The drop in performance at Key Stage 4 in 1999 is a matter of concern but seems likely to be a cohort effect working its way through. The LEA’s OFSTED report confirms both inclusive practice and improving standards (OFSTED 2001). The data suggest that rights, ethics and political issues have been addressed in the sense that children are making progress within current arrangements. The LEA also appears to have taken the appropriate efficacy and pragmatics approaches in promoting inclusion.

Summary

This chapter has explored Southampton’s context and the provision it makes at a particular point in time. It illustrates the extent to which a percentage of the school population may be said to be excluded from mainstream education, raising issues of selectivity on the basis of ability and behaviour (see chapter 3). If there are questions of equity and social
justice in relation to mainstream attendance, this applies to this small and decreasing percentage. It also shows how values of equity and inclusion are affected by the LEA's determinate structures and the difficulties in moving from rhetoric to practice.

The power and politics implicit in professional discourses reveal the extent to which they are reflected in placements and their impact on change. An interrogation of the data reveals the constraints the LEA is facing in moving towards inclusion. Some barriers derive from issues of efficacy and established practice, e.g. funding. Curriculum differentiation and the standards agenda are also issues. Southampton has needs to consider how to tackle these and to find ways of helping schools to be more inclusive, i.e. the pragmatics dimension. The challenge is to achieve these tasks in a climate of 'Best Value'; the discourse of the current government.

Chapter 5 illustrates many of the similarities Southampton shares with other LEAs, e.g. in respect of SEN funding and placements. DfEE annual reports, e.g. DfEE (1998); confirm these practices. The Rathbone research provides further illustrations of these similarities (Rathbone, op.cit). Southampton faces the same issues of accountability at a time when schools are increasingly seeking funds to provide for SEN and develop more inclusive practice (see Marsh, op.cit). Its reality is also the same as that of other LEAs; it has to deal with reducing budgets, delegate more resources to schools and attempt to be more inclusive whilst still having to maintain special schools. These issues are well described in the literature, e.g. Marsh (op.cit); Clough (1998). Wolman and Parish (1996) confirm the position in America; in other words, these dilemmas extend beyond the circumstances of English LEAs.

Chapter 5 has answered the question with regard to Southampton's performance based on official records. It illustrates some of Southampton's rhetoric and the progress made with respect to the targets implied in this rhetoric. What is the reality as perceived by stakeholders? This is the topic of the next two chapters.
CHAPTER 6
PERSPECTIVES ON INCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with my second research question on stakeholder perspectives on inclusion. It considers their rhetoric and their perception of reality. I answer two questions:

1. What is the rhetoric of stakeholders who have to provide education?
2. What is the reality as perceived by recipients of this education?

I start with teacher concerns before interviewing special school headteachers. I conclude the first part of the chapter with interviews of education providers, exploring with officers and teachers their understanding of inclusion, i.e. their rhetoric, and issues of significance to Southampton, e.g. responses to behaviour and pupil diversity. The second part of chapter 6 explores the circumstances of education recipients.

VIEWS OF EDUCATION PROVIDERS

School Staff

The following extracts from responses to consultation on the SEN policy and review provide a perspective on thinking across Southampton schools with regard to inclusion. Statements included are those which are broadly representative of all the data in being supported by at least 5 similar comments from a total of 32 individual responses. All of them were from teachers and governors. Parents only responded to the review on SEN provision and these were mainly those with children in special schools.
Responses have been grouped under themes. These range from teacher concerns about the limitations of mainstream schools to their focus on raising standards and their need for training. Appendices 11 and 12 provide other examples; the aim is to show the range of responses to inclusion.

Concerns about Inclusion

There are times when inclusion in the mainstream represents exclusion, e.g. child educated on a 1:1 and not working with others; [...] some elements of inclusion dialogue are about ideals [...] these need to be balanced with [the] reality of school pressures. There is no expertise for some children. Others risk being overlooked. This interferes with raising standards. Discipline is a real problem in schools. (Primary Head (HT); representing 9 similar comments; all from mainstream (M)).

Schools are facing complex balancing acts of raising academic and behaviour standards and promoting the inclusion of increasingly challenging people. We are well aware of our moral and legal obligations but the strategies to help us deliver are very thin. There is only so much we can do in the mainstream. 40% of our children have learning difficulties and are on the [SEN] Audit. (Secondary HT); representative of 12 similar comments; all M).

Some schools have limitations of logistics or circumstance which act as a barrier to inclusion. They should be allowed some degree of specialisation to make closer links between mainstream and special. Differentiation is a fallacy when you have children with extreme learning needs [...] How do you cope with able children and those with severe learning difficulties? autism [etc]? Mainstream and special can and should work together; this is the only way forward to raise standards (SENCO, Secondary School); representative of 12 similar comments; all M).
These concerns about reconciling ideals with reality were frequently mentioned. There were many others of similar tone, suggesting tensions in teachers' minds about the task they face. The value that children 'with SEN' might bring is not mentioned. These views are along the psycho-medical paradigm in expressing beliefs about specialisation and segregation. They illustrate the impact the curriculum has in teachers' minds and show the tension between the ideals and the pressures in schools. If academic standards are over-emphasised, other factors, e.g. children's emotional welfare and development, are at risk of being overlooked. Twelve comments raised concerns about the Government's agenda to raise standards without recognition of classroom pressures. Teachers identified a threshold beyond which they felt their expertise did not extend; e.g. seven comments expressed concerns about the 'curriculum and other needs of children with severe learning difficulties'; twelve raised issues about managing their challenging behaviour; three stressed the fact that they were mainstream teachers and that they had not been trained to teach children with complex needs. Ten were anxious that they were not able to meet or were at risk of overlooking the needs of other children. Overall, concerns were about curriculum differentiation and behaviour management. Similar views are reported in the literature, e.g. Mitter (op.cit); Clark et al (op.cit).

Dyson's (op.cit) four discourses about ethics, rights and politics point to the urgency to make changes in schools so that children at risk of being marginalized from the mainstream benefit. The opposite holds in the discourses of the above respondents. They claim that mainstream school circumstances do not constitute an effective way forward; in other words, efficacy and pragmatics issues reported in the literature (e.g. Dyson, op.cit) are viewed in the opposite way. In their view, mainstream schools are not ready and are not able to cope without the support of special schools.
These teachers' arguments emphasise the pressures in schools. What is not addressed is how to provide for children who may not be effectively educated in mainstream or special education or those who are left out altogether. The impact of determinate structures (Dyson, op.cit) is apparent; if special facilities are available, why seek other solutions? The issues are as perceived by teachers. These might be upheld by parents whose children gain more from mainstream education through the absence of pupils who might disrupt or place teachers under pressure. On the other hand, others might argue the opposite, if they were seeking a right to their children's participation in the mainstream, e.g. Grants and Disability Group; p. 153-4); they might feel oppressed and denied their human right; to them, pressures and efficacy issues are less relevant. What is likely to take precedence are their own needs and a requirement for equity and justice. The tensions between psycho-medical paradigms, social disability and social constructionist discourses are clear and are diametrically opposed.

This scenario illustrates the potential struggle between supporters and opponents of inclusion. The dilemmas arise when conflicting views and requirements dictate the shape of education provided (Appendices 11 and 12). The LEA's context influences practice. Novel approaches may be resisted unless decisive measures are taken and supported, e.g. as in Newham (Jordan, 1996). Power and politics then become potent forces, either promoting or inhibiting change.

*Children Experiencing Behaviour Difficulties*

Schools are unwilling to sign up to 'no exclusion' [...] the pendulum has swung too far towards keeping pupils with behaviour difficulties in mainstream at all costs. They devalue and ruin your work. My view is that they should not be excluded from full time education but this need not be in a mainstream school. (Secondary HT) representative of 27 similar comments; 24 M; 3S)
This headteacher suggests that the burden on mainstream schools to include children experiencing behaviour difficulties is becoming unreasonable. His response is one of many, frequently repeated in this study, particularly the view about disciplinary exclusion and the problems of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties (see Appendices 12 and 13). The notion that every child is entitled to full time education but does not have to be in a mainstream setting deserves scrutiny. It leads to questions about the purpose of mainstream schools and their admissions criteria; e.g. whether places are unlikely to be available for some children. It also raises issues about why full time education should be provided at other than a mainstream school. As there are alternatives, e.g. individual teaching, special schooling or arrangements outside of school, these might make exclusion from a mainstream place appear to be justifiable in some cases. However, this could also be viewed as reflecting a discourse about some children not being the responsibility of mainstream teachers. Amongst responses, there were conflicting discourses about the rights and interests of three groups; namely mainstream teachers, mainstream children and those placed elsewhere. For example, some teachers emphasized the needs of the other children in their class and the risks to their learning from classroom disruption (Appendix 11). They believed some children are 'better off elsewhere'.

What is clear is that these arguments are about safeguarding their needs. Views of this kind do not sit easily with Dyson's (op.cit) four discourses about ethics, rights and politics in particular. The tensions arising from the efficacy and pragmatics requirements may not be sufficient to abandon aspirations for every child to be included. If there are advantages for all children to be in mainstream education, then there are educational, ethical and moral arguments to be considered. If there are risks to any child's education, then dilemmas arise as to what may be best but only if there is a range of alternatives. These dilemmas are contextual as some countries and LEAs are reducing special school placements (chapter 2). Clearly, some stakeholders require to be convinced of the best approach for children likely to be disruptive or whose needs are perceived as being too extreme, e.g.
those who are 'severely physically disabled' (Appendix 11). Their discourse is in favour of these children needing to be outside of the mainstream. Viewing this from the perspectives of children so excluded from the mainstream, questions arise about their rights, the ethics of alternative provision and the efficacy of making this available, given the lack of evidence that this is better for them.

Clark et al (op.cit) have argued that 'inclusion threatens the interests of too many groups, not least those of many teachers' (p. 169). This neatly sums up and explains the above perspectives. What is not explained is how to ensure equity for these children. As teachers are expected to meet the needs of other children, questions might be asked about the circumstances of this group and how they are different. The risks they present to learning in classrooms are the perceived threats; removing them is argued to be the solution. What is left out is how best to help children so excluded and how or when they could be returned to their local school. Very few do (chapter 2; p. 34-5).

The Role of Special Schools

Special is not second best option [...] some children's conditions are so severe and intransigent that only the most expert approach will work. [It is] callous to suggest that mainstream is a serious option for them. (Bill, Chair of Governors, Special School) representative of 9 similar comments (6 S and 3 M). Mainstream comments were about the lack of expertise and facilities for children whose needs were considered too severe, e.g. in terms of mobility although most concerns were about toileting. These stressed the need for support from special schools and saw a clear role for them to work closely with mainstream schools).
When we refuse to recognise that special education is extremely positive and life enhancing, we place a lower value on those who cannot benefit from the mainstream. Some lose out and are lost in mainstream classes. (Judy, Governor (Special School)).

Bill and Judy view special schools as having superior expertise. As special school governors, their concerns for children's development through rehabilitative and expert approaches are evident. These are views within the psycho-medical paradigm, reinforcing expertism and practices of segregation.

Research is unclear about the distinctive characteristics of special schools and this is relevant in respect of the above claims (Dyson, op.cit). The literature does not unequivocally support special schooling. Jupp (op.cit) argues that special schools are oppressive. Dunn (op.cit), Jordan (1996) and Buckley (op.cit), amongst many others, see no advantages in special schools. Analysing the governors' views within the four discourse framework (Dyson, op.cit), reveals further insights. These special school governors are not voicing the rights, ethics and political discourses in the manner of those children and parents feeling oppressed (chapter 2, p. 16-18). Their discourses are different in suggesting that children experiencing physical difficulties derive more advantage from being in special schools.

There is also an argument about efficacy and pragmatics; their view is that special schools deliver these. Their focus is on placement and not on how services could be re-organised to meet children's needs in a range of settings. Such discourses from some of the LEA's significant partners are likely to have an impact in shaping special provision. These are powerful voices; they have political influence. Their values are grounded in psycho-medical paradigms; the medical gaze (Foucault, 1977) is evident. The risks of viewing 'disability' in this way include the shaping of professional practice and the maintenance of complex power relationships which social disability theorists have called manipulation and oppression (Clough and Armstrong, op.cit).
There is also an alternative view which is worth discussion even though it was raised by a single respondent. The problem was encapsulated thus:

Do children really prefer to leave their peers, to receive expert treatment in special schools? [.. not sure] this is right? Why are they different? Can’t they stay in their locality. Going away means losing their friends [...] they lose out (Teacher and SENCO in a mainstream school).

The dominance of the psycho-medical paradigm is clearly being questioned. The ethics and practice of treating children differently; the message that this gives and the opportunities that they are being denied require careful examination in each case.

*The LEA's role*

There is a feeling at the chalkface that the LEA has no real notion of the pressures of existing socially inclusive approaches on those facing the realities of the classroom. [It is] easy to be inclusionist when you are far removed from these pressures, but if you are the teacher, your perspective may be tempered by the considerable demands placed upon you. There are limits to our capacities; these have been exceeded. We are mainstream teachers. (Head of Year/SENCO, Secondary), representative of 12 similar comments; 7 (M) and 5 (S)).

The inclusion debate is being held without teachers' views or needs being heard [...] the LEA must provide strategies. We need more training on curriculum differentiation and managing behaviour. We face too many demands to raise standards. (Primary HT) representative of 6 similar comments; all M).
Both teachers are concerned about the increasing pressures in the classroom. Their voices highlight their starting points, stressing their needs. Teaching some is perceived as burdensome, an unreasonable challenge especially as training has been for 'mainstream teaching' (Appendices 11 and 12). Children's discourses on their circumstances, if they are perceived to add to teachers' burdens, might present a different picture. The articulation of values from a range of conflicting perspectives raises moral, political and other issues for the LEA to consider.

**Inclusion Requires Adequate Training and Resources**

We welcome approach of SEN Policy and are committed to inclusion; [...] we need funding, training and the right staffing to make this work. [...] how to adapt the curriculum for the less able so as not to leave anyone out and deal with disruption. We are committed to raising standards but need the right resources. (Primary HT), representative of 7 similar comments; all M).

This was one of the more accepting, pragmatic but conditional approaches. If inclusion is to be promoted, resources must be available. Curriculum differentiation and managing disruptive behaviour are again mentioned, showing the importance teachers attach to these (Ainscow, 1999; see also chapter 3). Issues of efficacy are also raised, e.g. dealing with the whole class 'without leaving anyone out'.

**Responses to SEN policy and SEN review**

10 out of 32 responses on the SEN policy consultation did not comment on inclusion; another 7 were broadly supportive, all from infant and junior schools. There was a mixture of feeling towards inclusion; respondents were more frequently opposed to it. This is not different from other findings; e.g. Jordan (1996). This reflects teachers' realities not only in Southampton but
nationally. There are many pressures on schools and some teachers are clearly feeling they cannot face further demands (p. 128).

The respondents quoted are saying that they cannot teach all children in mainstream settings and see a role for special schools (Bill and Judy; Appendices 12 and 13). There is no discussion as to how a special school is special or how it can transfer its expertise in mainstream settings to promote inclusion (Ramjhun, 1998, 1999). The question that Booth (1981) posed in the 1980s about special schools is still to be answered (p. 26).

Discourses from the above respondents continue to be influenced by a model of disability; the need for expert treatment and the overwhelming pressures on mainstream teachers and their restricting circumstances (e.g. SENCO, p. 128). Whilst rights and entitlements are sometimes acknowledged (e.g. HT, p. 128), these are linked to conflicts arising from the needs of majority stakeholders (HT, p. 128; SENCO, p. 128).

On the whole, the responses to the SEN policy consultation place the emphasis on raising standards and on ensuring that the needs of the majority of children are met; how this may disadvantage some children is not so clearly expressed. However, the responses consisted entirely of teacher and governor views. The few parents who responded to the SEN review were those with children in special schools. They wanted "special schools because they doubted that the LEA would provide the resources to mainstream schools [which] are not ready." (SCC 2001). On the other hand, teachers believe more work is required before schools can be inclusive. They see a role for special schools (Appendix 11). This is in spite of the fact that they are already including an increasing number of children (chapter 5, p. 105-8). Or this may be because of it.
Headteachers of all six Southampton special schools report that the needs of the children attending their schools have changed over the years. This has also been previously recognised in Hampshire in its *Learning Difficulties Review* (1995). All headteachers report increased complexity and severity of needs; two said that their population has "changed beyond recognition". The two heads of schools for children experiencing moderate learning difficulties (MLD), stated that these children present teachers with significant additional problems, usually in relation to challenging or bizarre behaviour but increasingly with language and communication delays and disorders. "We no longer admit children with straightforward MLD" is how one of them put it; "in the past, they would have been admitted to our SLD (severe learning difficulties) schools".

The headteacher of a school for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD) said that the children's difficulties are more severe and complex, compounded by lack of care arrangements. The closure of children's homes has not helped. He had this to say:

> We would not have been expected to cope with these children a few years ago; they would have been placed out-county. Their circumstances are extreme. They have no home [...] are in trouble with the police; the odds are stacked against them. We are the end of the road; there is nothing else. Nobody wants them.

Special headteachers are concerned their numbers are falling whilst the needs of children admitted are rising. Their discourses reveal a concern about "their changing role and the pressures on all schools, including the limitations on other agencies". Re-analysing the data in chapter 5 on distribution of placements (table 5.6, p. 112) was revealing. The two headteachers of the primary and secondary schools for moderate learning difficulties were asked to discuss some children whose files have been carefully studied. Their
school sizes had not changed greatly in terms of place numbers. The aim was to check if any of their children could be returned to mainstream education. It became clear that the changed population they were referring to comprised about 20% of their intake over the past three years; the rest had been there for some time and were admitted under previous criteria of moderate learning difficulties, solely based on IQ scores, i.e. intelligence quotients. This was the case for those in the secondary school. For them, a return to mainstream education was judged to be difficult and too late. The perception of the intake having changed beyond expectation seems somewhat exaggerated but emphasizes the headteachers' realities of the pressures they face.

As children experiencing moderate learning difficulties represent a large group of the special school population, it is interesting that they continue to be segregated. This contradicts the often quoted belief that it is mainly behaviour that troubles mainstream teachers (Janet, p. 186, Derek, p. 158). A return of a large group of these children would, however, affect mainstream schools, their performance and league positions. This is likely to be resisted. Most already have significant percentages of children experiencing difficulties in learning; the range in Southampton schools is from 30 to 50%, with an average of 40% for children at stages 1 to 3 of the SEN Code of Practice. If children experiencing moderate learning difficulties were returned to mainstream schools, this would effectively halve the percentage of children in special schooling.

The discourses of special school headteachers reveal the influence of the psycho-medical paradigm and the power and influence of professionals, e.g. notions of 'straightforward' MLD; SLD placements and the use of IQ and diagnostic labels (see also Appendices 11 and 12). They were very much aligned in support of the role of special schools. These discourses do not fully explain why Southampton teachers may see behaviour management as the most important consideration in the mainstream. The placements at the school for moderate learning difficulties show how this provision lightens the load on mainstream teachers. Behaviour may enter the equation in the sense
that it is a further demand and an obstacle to teacher tasks. This may be seen as common in both mainstream and special school populations. Three of the special school headteachers above take this view. As one of them said: "Differentiating the curriculum is hard enough; [...] difficult behaviour can make this impossible".

The Views Of LEA Staff

The Principal Educational Psychologist, the Assistant Director for SEN, the SEN Inspector and one Education Officer for schools were interviewed. A headteacher of a local special school (HT) and an SEN Co-ordinator from a local secondary school (SEnCO) were also interviewed. To maintain confidentiality, the officer group has been anonymised as EOs; eg. EO1. Teachers ran no risk of being identified. The themes which have emerged, including the areas of congruence and divergence, are summarised below. The themes included here and elsewhere were those mentioned at least on five occasions or separately by three interviewees. They were also included if these same themes had been raised elsewhere during the study, e.g. in the SEN policy survey or if there was some substantiation in journal entries. Those not triangulated in this way were excluded. Where summaries are given, the respondent with the strongest view is listed first (see Appendix 8 for questionnaire used). I start with an analysis of views on inclusion, then move on to explore their perceptions of practice.

Views on Inclusion

All those who were interviewed said that inclusion is morally right, and that children should be educated as close to home as possible. "It is basically a human rights issue to attend your local school [...] they should not have to travel great distances [...] it puts the stress on equality of opportunity for all" is how one respondent put it. Another view was that "it should be a norm for all". One respondent was more cautious:
I believe this to be right in principle but worry if it can be afforded or if all schools could reach the point of being able to provide for all [maybe] schools will make token gestures but no more. Is the expertise available? Some children may lose out (EO3).

Other views were that:

Being included means being accepted (EO); being part of the community and being able to partake in learning. It is about every child's right to learn" (EO1). "It is not an add on to present settings. For inclusion to work, there must be fundamental shifts in the cultures and ethos of schools; it requires a sea change of opinion amongst all stakeholders. [EO1, repeated in other responses].

One stressed the "attitude of tolerance" (EO2). EO1 summed up inclusion as "an ideological, moral, political and educational imperative which is only subscribed to at a philosophical level [it] lacks political teeth and is only encouraged to allow society to be at peace with itself". "Either you have it or you don't; it's the anti-thesis to exclusion" (HT); was one view fairly typical of the rest.

The moral, human rights and equal opportunities elements of inclusion are clearly articulated. The proviso seems to be affordability and ability to deliver, i.e efficacy and pragmatics. My analysis also shows how respondents have been influenced by their role, e.g. the EO3 is concerned about schools' expertise and readiness for inclusion. This is a pragmatic stance which includes recognition of efficacy in the sense that currently, the dual system of mainstream and special education is needed. The headteacher visualizes aspects of what inclusion should mean. The EO1 is concerned about lack of implementation. The EO2 seeks tolerance; stressing issues of equality and acceptance.
This range of views is strongly expressed in the literature, e.g. Jenkinson (op.cit); Allan (op.cit) and Ballard (1999). The attitude of tolerance is pertinent; it is less than complete assimilation but could make differences to some children's circumstances; e.g. Souza (op.cit) for whom such tolerance would have prevented her from being scarred (chapter 2). Other views approximated to this, centering around these themes representing all the discourses in support of inclusion but falling short of action.

My aggregation of these views was that they considered inclusion to be an absolute, "a superordinate concept which sees all children as having equal rights" (EO3, EO2, EO1). One dissenting view was that inclusion as a concept was flawed as "there was nothing so unequal as the equal treatment of unequals" (HT). Unequals in this context referred to children who were experiencing "greater difficulties" in learning than the majority of their peers. The respondent defended his view as being "deeply rooted in his convictions and beliefs about what it means to be a child with SEN".

Children Experiencing Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties: Fitting into the System?

If you don't fit, you are not wanted [.....] behaviour which upsets the status quo makes teachers vulnerable and leads to all kinds of reasons as to why the child can't cope and why others should not suffer [.....] it's not good for the school; these children need expert handling; ordinary schools don't have the time or the expertise. This is what special schools are for; they offer a unique opportunity [...] a sanctuary, a life line which we must not sneer at. The two [types of schools] can work together [I] don't see how one can't go with the other; they are part and parcel of [doing] the same thing. We all want to do the best for children" (HT).
This headteacher of a special school depicts the dilemmas of managing difficult behaviour in the classroom. He sees a role for special schools and for some children to be rescued from the mainstream system if children's needs are to be met. The arguments are about efficacy, suggesting that mainstream education is inappropriate and that special schools are lifelines to some. With these can be reconciled the rights, ethics and political dimensions but in reverse; in the sense of protecting children's interests and not about opportunities to be with their mainstream peers. This lifeline is reminiscent of the views of many who see special schools in similar roles dealing with children teachers say they cannot teach (Florian, op.cit). There are views here about the needs of children and the capacity of teachers within a separatist or expertism discourse; (e.g. some cannot cope; no time or expertise from teachers; Appendices 11 and 12); many of these are strongly supported in the literature (Chapter 2).

Key Factors for Success

Respondents argued that inclusion could only be delivered through "quality teaching from trained and experienced teachers" (HT, EO3, EO2). Teachers needed to feel valued and supported within and beyond school, particularly by their employers and by parents (HT, EO, EO3, EO2). They also stressed the need for a reduction in expectations; they stated that the task of differentiating the curriculum has grown with more children staying in the mainstream. Training was therefore vital, particularly in respect of curriculum differentiation and managing behaviour (SENCO, EO2, EO3). The provision of appropriate resources, e.g. physical adaptations, staffing and equipment was also necessary (EO, EO1, EO2). The difficulty would be gaining a commitment to the education of all children and to valuing “diversity and individual differences” (EO2, EO1, EO3, EO). Sound leadership and a supportive and committed Governing Body would be important (EO2, E01, E03). Acceptance by peers, parents and the local community would also help (SENCO, HT, EO1). Barriers to inclusion were considered to be related to teacher time and expertise (HT, SENCO, EO);
unrealistic pressures (HT, SENCO, E03) and the absence of genuine multi-agency working (E01, E03, HT).

"People must see improvements [and benefits for them] to buy it. It should not be an appeal to altruism or to people’s consciences” (HT). This is how this headteacher respondent summed up inclusion; the SENCO had also offered a similar view. However, this fails to take account of the moral argument for inclusion; the ethics of segregation or the views of those who feel oppressed (chapter 2, p. 16-18). It is a charity discourse, one that seeks personal benefits and rewards. If this were turned around to be viewed from the perspectives of children, this would be interesting; e.g. what they might have to say about their expectations of teachers and schools and what they might be seeking in schools.

Responding to Pupil Diversity

All the respondents stated that some children were easier to include. They considered that the range of difficulties in learning which children experience, require a diversity of approaches and facilities. Officers stressed that these can all be delivered in the mainstream. Teachers suggested that diversity necessitated a range of provision including special schools. They argued for diverse, as opposed to differentiated curricula. They stressed the need for training and re-inforced some of the concerns reported during the survey on the LEA's SEN policy. They expressed anxieties about children whom they felt they could not teach. They said that there were two difficulties: curriculum differentiation and disruptive behaviour. As the SENCO said: "We can differentiate up to a point [but] could not deal with children with SLD and autism. Nor can we deal with children who are severely physically disabled; it's not a problem if their needs are only to do with access." The headteacher agreed with this and added: "we do our best for children who help themselves [but] cannot tolerate rudeness and indiscipline. Why should we?"
Responses closely match the view of an EO who suggested that "children's needs depend on their type and severity of problem; the more familiar teachers are with these problems, the more confident they are". All the respondents stated that those children experiencing moderate learning difficulties were the easiest to include in the mainstream. It has already been shown that this is not necessarily happening in practice (p. 113-4; p. 136-7). Children experiencing physical disabilities or a visual impairment were the next groups if rank orders based on the responses are used. They also said that children experiencing severe learning difficulties including challenging behaviour and those experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties were the hardest groups to teach. They were the least popular, because of the difficulties they present (see also p.130 and Appendices 11 and 12). One respondent summed up thus about children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties:

These children challenge the 'status quo'; they are unpredictable and leave teachers feeling helpless and uncertain, in fear of their authority being undermined, assault or recrimination. I am not surprised schools are reluctant to admit them (HT).

Other respondents reported an increase in the number of teachers concerned about unfounded allegations of assault and litigation, feeling very vulnerable (EO, EO3, EO2), e.g. the EO stated that "teachers are having to manage disruption with their hands tied behind their backs". My analysis of the most significant concerns in relation to behaviour suggests that these are related to teachers' fear of losing control and authority (HT x 3, SENCO). School staff are not considered to have the time and expertise in these fields (HT, SENCO, EO3). Some are said to be becoming anxious and fearful because of the uncertainty and unpredictability when dealing with indiscipline (HT, SENCO).
Respondents argued that mainstream and special schools "can work together" (EOsx2; HT). They saw "no role conflict" (EOsx3; HT; SENCO); "special and mainstream schools have worked together for years; why not now?" (HT). They gave examples of mainstream and special schools working together to support children in the mainstream. They quoted the outreach services from special schools to the mainstream to support children experiencing moderate learning and emotional and behavioural difficulties. They considered that these were 'excellent initiatives and should be expanded' (HT); 'hundreds of children have benefited (EO2)'; 'these are good value' (EO2).

E03 felt that the peripatetic language service "linked in nicely with the outreach services" and has helped with the "LEA's drive for inclusion". This team supports children experiencing severe language and communication delays or disorders in the mainstream (EO1x3, EO2). Peripatetic teachers supporting children experiencing a range of learning difficulties in the mainstream are also considered valuable, e.g. physical difficulties and sensory impairment (EO3, EO1). The headteacher pointed out that his school was helping with the re-integration of "children from the special school for severe learning difficulties". He detailed the work of that school and how this has enabled some of its pupils to have access to a range of opportunities in the mainstream, in playgroups, schools and colleges.

These examples show the ways in which special and mainstream staff can work together. Similar practices have been reported in the literature; e.g. Hegarty (1993); Thomas (op.cit). The themes are about novel approaches and creativity; combining resources so that the rationale of ethics and politics, and the realisation of efficacy and pragmatics issues can be addressed to promote inclusion.
Five respondents (EO, HT, EO3, SENCO, EO2) said that there had been an increase in (their perception of) inclusion but that the level was variable. The SENCO felt that it depended on headteachers and their staff and had little to do with LEA policy. She considered the attitude of parents to be crucial; this determined whether or not inclusion would be considered or sustained. She felt that there was need for consistent dialogue with parents and other stakeholders. Another respondent (EO3) detailed areas of practice as to be most improved with regard to children experiencing moderate learning difficulties, physical difficulties and visual impairment but that there were "still difficulties with emotional and behavioural difficulties". The dissenting view was that there was little inclusion in the city due to lack of resources and support (HT).

**Discourses: Range and Diversity**

The following grid provides an illustration of the differences in the discourses which emerged through the interviews. Whilst this was a small sample, the range and distribution of these discourses are worth study. The grid is a frequency count and simply shows the number of times or instances these discourses emerged from each group. Resources relate to human, financial and environmental facilities. Ideology is about respondents' beliefs and ideals. Responses have been divided into groups; e.g. those believing in the rights of all children and those more concerned about the needs of the majority not being disrupted. The differences between them are clear.

![Figure 6.1: Grid showing differences in key discourses according to roles and responsibilities](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Rights of all</th>
<th>Rights of majority</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
<th>Separatist</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Pressure &amp; Stress</th>
<th>Change dual System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes: 42 No: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes: 1 No: 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There were quite a few pragmatists, i.e. those more concerned about feasibilities and practical issues. Officers appear to be keen on change so that the rights of all children can be promoted, based on their ideology of inclusion. Teachers identify difficulties with this approach, believing that there should be occasions to separate children, maintaining the status quo until the education system is ready to include more children in the mainstream. They are influenced by the role of professionals and the expert approach some children are thought to require. They are anxious about having resources, training and staffing in place so that they can cope with the increasing pressures which they perceive to be imposed upon them. Officers wanted the dual system of mainstream and special education changed; teachers did not share this view.

Given this difference in perception and approach, it is interesting to visualise what might happen to inclusion if the role of LEAs is weakened by central government or indeed if LEAs ceased to exist. Figure 6.2 below illustrates the change in scenarios from A to B. This derives from the forces which operate, i.e. the influence of the LEA would have diminished whilst that of schools would have grown. Parents' influences are shown to be the same but they could favour special placements if so advised by schools. With no LEAs, the other two forces will grow even more. It will be for parents to promote their views and challenge those of schools and professionals where necessary.

Figure 6.2: Changing the Balance of Forces Operating in regard to Inclusion
WHAT DO PARENTS, CHILDREN AND TEACHERS THINK OF INCLUSION?

In this section, I report my findings from my diary analyses as narratives; they are intended to convey a range of perspectives on inclusion. The following examples have been selected from over 200 entries that could have been used. They are included only if they are supported by other entries and are able to illustrate themes, i.e. where they can be triangulated against other data, e.g. structured interviews or SEN survey.

Schools' Responses to Children Experiencing Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties.

Sanchez, Julie, Dwight and Carl are children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. They represent four out of twenty children whose circumstances relating to their school admission were similar. They show schools' reluctance to admit children who have a reputation of being disruptive.

Sanchez is eight years old and has been experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties at his previous school. In June 1999, his parents decided to transfer him to Mayflower, the primary school nearby. However, the headteacher was refusing to admit him and a number of meetings were required before he could start at his new school. The problem appeared to be Sanchez' reputation and this was based on the fact that he had been difficult to manage previously. However, since his admission two years ago nothing more has been heard of Sanchez; he seems to be doing well at school and making progress.

Julie, aged fourteen is another child whose admission was resisted. The difference was that she had a Statement of SEN and had been previously excluded from school. She was perceived to be "disturbed". She was so unhappy at her previous school that she had tried to jump from a window.
The headteacher was concerned about admitting a child with such a reputation. He had admitted a number of disabled children and had "never complained". These children had been well supported; "they do not disrupt the school community". He was therefore unhappy at having to admit Julie. Her placement worked well initially but eighteen months later she was permanently excluded for theft. The headteacher felt vindicated. There was no appeal against the exclusion. Julie had this to say: "what's the point trying. Nobody listens. I never had a chance. They just looked for any excuse [and] they finally got rid of me."

Dwight is six years old and his circumstances were very similar to those of Sanchez. His transfer to a new school for "a fresh start" was strongly resisted. His mother had given up her employment to help him. It took many meetings over a period of around twelve weeks before he could be admitted. Dwight's mother felt intimidated and thought that "it was going to be an uphill struggle but would not give up". He was eventually admitted and has been making progress, providing another example of how children can succeed in spite of their previous difficulties. School staff worked hard with him once they had overcome their initial fears. However, Dwight seems to be another child whose reputation preceded him.

Carl provides another example. He is eleven years old and his admission at secondary transfer was likewise resisted on the grounds that his behaviour might be 'difficult to manage'. There was little evidence from which these conclusions could have been reached. However, the strength of opposition to his admission was high. In all these cases, the children told their parents that teachers would not listen.
Reflections on school responses to children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties

Out of over 200 journal entries, 75 show that the admission of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties is resisted by schools. 42 others show that there is no objection to admitting children experiencing physical or other difficulties which are not too 'unusual' or 'extreme'. Extreme difficulties relate to those causing problems of physical or curriculum access, e.g. severe physical and learning difficulties. They may also be related to other requirements; e.g. personal care and toileting requirements. Unusual difficulties refer to the kinds of difficulties teachers are most unfamiliar with; e.g. autism or tourettes Syndrome. Notions of unusual or extreme also fitted with descriptions officers and teachers had provided earlier in their interviews (see p. 143-4).

Schools tend to negotiate levels of funding and assistance in order to admit children whose needs are not so extreme or unusual (58 entries). The data on 'unusual' or 'extreme' needs can be ranked in the following order of perceived severity (i) severe autism (ii) severe learning difficulties, (iii) severe physical impairment and (iv) severe language disorders. Moderate learning difficulties and language delays rarely caused concerns (7 entries). However, negotiations became difficult where children have a history of disruptive behaviour (75 entries). Appendix 12 provides examples of schools' replies to requests for admissions. These illustrate teachers' concerns about the admission of children who might be disruptive. Children holding a Statement of SEN for behaviour difficulties seem to cause even greater anxiety. A typical response is shown below.

Some children we cannot cope with. Dealing with their disruption takes us away from others; they miss out. This impacts on our work. How can we raise standards [in] this way? [...] we all know when Bruce is away. School is much calmer and happier [...] we can get on [...] teach without fear of disruption (HT, Secondary).
Responses about children experiencing medical needs or sociable children experiencing learning difficulties are very different. Out of 21 applications made in the past 18 months, all were admitted with few issues raised.

Questions could be asked about whether these children appeal to compassion and humanity and make teachers feel more charitable, i.e. whether they promote charity discourses. Their circumstances reflect such a sharp contrast from those of children experiencing behaviour difficulties. My diary evidence suggests that school staff are reluctant to accept children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. This supports Sleeter's (op.cit) findings about teachers' preferences for normative as opposed to non-normative difficulties.

Parents' Perspectives

27 diary entries show a range of parents' perspectives on inclusion. Some (12) only want mainstream education; others (15) prefer special education for their children. The examples illustrate this difference in preference in a sample of over 200 parents.

Mrs. Bull and around 200 parents who attended the SEN review meeting favour special schools. Mrs. Flowers and Mrs. Rose are grateful that their children are able to be in the mainstream. Mr. and Mrs. Grant are bitter and resentful of the fact that their children have been unable to secure this and have to be in special education.

Mrs. Bull: Kevin's mother

Mrs. Bull is a parent who seems to be extremely anxious that her son, Kevin, should have a Statement of SEN. She feels that Kevin should attend a special school and is very open in her views about him. As she says, with him present: "How can you not see that he is brain diseased; he will never be brain of Britain". However, everybody who has worked with Kevin is
convinced that he experiences few, if any, difficulties in learning, and that he is well placed and settled in the mainstream. As his headteacher says: "Kevin is a normal, happy and popular boy who is doing exceedingly well at school". In spite of all assurances and advice from a range of professionals, including Kevin's teachers and educational psychologist, Mrs Bull remains unconvinced and seeks a diagnosis of autism from the health authority's autism assessment service. When this diagnosis is not forthcoming after a two week residential assessment, she becomes very angry. She threatens the hospital staff and they have to close their unit for the day. She also insists that he has a place in the school's "unit for children with moderate learning difficulties". He does not need this but she threatens to keep him at home if this is not made available. Kevin is offered a place as she has kept him at home for a few months previously and there are concerns about his safety. Kevin never speaks when she is around; he is so different in school, being very friendly. He is articulate too but does not seem confident enough to express his views outside of the school setting.

March 2000: Review of SEN Provision

This review is conducted at two meetings, each attended by around 100 parents. Its purpose is to consult on the LEA's review of its special school provision, including the possible closure of a special nursery. Parents are anxious as they suspect that decisions had already been made about the school's future. They talk about their support for special schools and their fears about the inadequacies of mainstream schools. All the parents have children attending special schools; none with children in the mainstream had attended. Although this makes it difficult to arrive at a balanced perspective, it is clear that the parents in attendance are determined to "fight" for their special schools.
Mr. and Mrs. Flowers: Alex's parents

These parents are delighted that their child, in spite of experiencing severe physical disabilities, is transferring to a mainstream secondary school. They had written to acknowledge the support of the LEA in providing ramps, additional staffing and disabled toilets. The school had been 'wonderfully welcoming and supportive'. 18 months later, they write to say that Alex is happy and making progress, participating in school life and in his local community. The Annual Review also confirms this.

Mr. and Mrs. Rose; Ann's parents

Ann's Annual review meeting confirms the progress she has made. Parents are pleased. She is eight years old and has just started to read. She can write her name. Her speech is also much improved. She is reported to be happy, popular and conscientious. Ann has Down's Syndrome and is exceeding all expectations.

Mr. and Mrs. Grant

Mr. and Mrs. Grant are two parents who are passionate about inclusion. They have two children experiencing profound and multiple learning difficulties. They tell a meeting of people about their struggle for their children to attend a mainstream setting. There is only one child in Southampton experiencing such profound difficulties in a mainstream school. Twenty other children have been placed in Bluebell school as the local special school is not accessible.

Mr. and Mrs. Grant say that this is unjust and discriminative. They reject arguments about school accessibility or staff expertise. Anything short of a mainstream placement is unacceptable to them. LEAs should ensure this. However, they argue that many take the convenient option, bowing to pressure. They feel "let down". Their children "would have liked to go to the local school but were not allowed".
In December 1999, Southampton holds a festival of inclusion, organised in association with Southampton's Council for Disability, a voluntary and independent body whose membership comprises many individuals "with a disability". The City Council provides a poster which summarises the aims and aspirations of its departments, ranging from Education to Social Services, Housing and the Environmental Department. There are many comments welcoming the City's aims and vision to be an "inclusive" City. "About time too" was how one visitor summed this up and there were consistent reinforcements and echoes from all the others about the urgent need to address "inequalities and oppressions within mainstream society".

A severely disabled person who is confined to a wheelchair delivers the key speech about how Southampton could promote inclusion. This emphasises the need for schools to be more welcoming and not to discriminate on the grounds of disability. Access issues are not mentioned; the emphasis is on changing attitudes. 21 parents and 15 young people tell me that mainstream schools should be expected to provide for all children. They say they have been waiting too long and that there is no excuse for segregation which they call, in the words of one parent,

"an abuse against the person; [..] an attack on human rights [and] a morally reprehensible act." [She says, she hopes] "professionals will stop looking at the disability [and] have a conscience."

All these parents are forceful in their views; all had experiences of either themselves or their children attending special schools. Their message is clear. Southampton has to be more inclusive if the bitterness expressed by these parents and young people are not to be repeated. They argue that they are a minority group forced to develop their own cultures, suggesting that the majority culture is one of oppression and discrimination to preserve the status
quo. They stress that legislation to promote their rights and inclusion are mere rhetoric to help society cope with its conscience. Their discourses stress that there is no place for special schools. They reflect social constructionist perspectives and support discourses about the rationale and realisation of inclusion (Dyson, op.cit).

The above examples show the diversity of responses towards inclusion. Over 200 parents seem to prefer special schools. Diary entries show equally large numbers wanting mainstream education; over the past three years, a total of 135 Statements of SEN had been issued for children whose parents expressed a strong preference for mainstream schools. Such diversity is also reported in the literature; there are as many parents wanting inclusion as those favouring special schools (see chapter 2; p. 16).

**Children's Perspectives**

My diary entries show a similar diversity in respect of children's experiences of inclusion. Peter is welcomed in mainstream education; his example illustrates the contrast with the circumstances of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties.

Peter

Peter is severely disabled and has no speech, he only communicates through eye contact and through his speech synthesiser. He is popular in school and is reported to be making good progress despite achieving at below average levels in all academic areas. His teachers say that "they are proud to have him in school". Peter receives full time LSA support funded by the LEA and the school has found this "invaluable in ensuring Peter's well being and inclusion. Other children benefit; he is a pleasure to teach".
Peter's example reinforces some of the stories in the literature about successes of children experiencing physical difficulties; e.g. Shaughnessy (in Howarth, op.cit; chapter 2, p. 19). Issues of efficacy and pragmatics were not raised other than that teachers viewed Peter's attendance to be natural and as expected. The ethics and politics were in favour of him belonging to his school community.

Karl

Karl has had a multiplicity of medical diagnoses ranging from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, autism and Tourette's Syndrome. His parents have actively sought these diagnoses. He believes that he is 'no good [that] he is worthless and has no future'. He gets very depressed about it.

Karl has always been in mainstream education but in April 1999 his parents decided that he should attend a residential school over a hundred miles away. He says that he does not want to leave home. He thinks "he is sick in the head and needs help if he is not to end up as a nutcase". His mother has told him that no mainstream school can help him. However, Karl is doing well at his school. He is amazed that he is and wonder if it is anything to do with his medication, "his magic and mood pills". He has been prescribed ritalin for ADHD and says they make him less depressed.

An SEN tribunal in November 1999 upholds the LEA's view that he is appropriately placed in mainstream education. Six months later, Karl is continuing to make progress. He has regained confidence and seems to have a promising future. He thinks so too.

My pills and my parents have kept me going. Yeah; the school has helped too [...] they are not experts but I have got better. Perhaps I would have done better at boarding school but I don't know [...] if I would have coped. I didn't really want to go, you know. I had no idea this was being discussed [...] phugh.
Imran

Imran is six years old and attends Fairplay Primary. He had been reported to be failing to make progress. The LEA's Special Needs Panel considered that his needs should continue to be met at Fairplay and that a teacher adviser should help the school. A few weeks later, this teacher recommends a transfer to a special school on the grounds that Imran was of 'low ability and was failing to keep up with his peers'. Investigations revealed that Imran was happy and settled; his teachers were not looking for a transfer but had been advised to pursue this by the adviser in spite of parents being resistant to the idea. A year later, Imran is still making progress.

A variety of children's experiences has been described. Karl ran the risk of having to leave home. Kevin did not have a choice about the type of school he could attend. Dwight was not asked about his views; the head made assumptions based on his previous history. Julie, likewise, did not feel understood or supported; "nobody listens".

On the other hand, Peter's view was heard in spite of his lack of speech. His teachers and LSA helped make his schooling a success. Ann too is making progress; so is Alex who successfully transferred to the secondary phase of his education. However, the Grants argue that their own and at least twenty other children have been denied the opportunity of mainstream education; there may be many more. These examples show the influences of adults and how these impact on children's experiences.
Teacher Perspectives

In December 1999, two teachers ask for and attend an interview with me on inclusion. Derek is the headteacher and Sally, a Head of Year. Derek says:

We ask for children to be transferred to alternatives from the mainstream when we've run out of ideas; this happens when we've exceeded desperation point. We are stressed out [..] exhausted.

Derek draws a line to show his position. It is a bipolar continuum to illustrate teacher ability, from being confident to not coping and feeling vulnerable and burning out.

Figure 6.3 below show this. Derek says that they only ask for help when they need it but says that some children are impossible and too challenging; they worry about safety, other pupils and the children's wellbeing. These are discourses of despair, helplessness and despondency. They could also be about selection and rejection. Teachers expect the LEA to have solutions for the very few they cannot deal with but not in their school. Derek is committed to inclusion but there comes a point when "realism" has to take over.

Figure 6.3: Teacher Response to Pressure
Sally stresses the importance of their school retaining the right reputation so that they can maintain a 'good intake'. Some parents will not want to send their child to a school where "too many children have SEN"; the school needs to be competitive in the marketplace and needs good results. Teachers' jobs and the school's future depend on these. She says:

There is no recognition or accolade for being good at [meeting] SEN [...] the public and everybody else are only interested in exam results. We do well here. We take many expelled from elsewhere; the only children we can't cope with are those whose behaviours are off the wall [...] extreme. We've got parents and everybody else on our backs. Disruptive children should be in special schools; they present a risk to other people's safety [this] vast site cannot be properly patrolled.

Sally articulates the view that schools are in the market place; this is consistent with other reports in the literature, e.g. O'Hanlon, 1993; Florian and Rouse, op.cit. There are, however, decreasing degrees of freedom and increasing vulnerabilities with regard to children exhibiting behaviour difficulties. They add to the risks. Security is an issue nationally, the vulnerability of children is a concern for schools (Noakes et al, 2000).

**Teachers Working With Children Experiencing Hearing Difficulties**

From April 1997 to June 1998, the LEA conducted a review of its provision for children experiencing a hearing impairment. Two distinct and contrasting perspectives emerge. The first advocates that profoundly 'deaf' children have their own culture and should be taught separately in their own deaf community. The second argues that they should attend the mainstream with their peers. Clearly, these are forces to be considered in any inclusion drive and are consistent with other reports in the literature; e.g. Brunt (op.cit).
SUMMARY

This chapter has documented teachers and other stakeholders' views on inclusion. A strong theme is about recognition of the additional task that inclusion brings within the current standards agenda. There are fears amongst teachers about their ability to cope. Mainstream schools have no further capacities; staff energies are not limitless. Special schools are seen to have a value and a role; they can work with mainstream schools. However, they are viewed as discriminative by some and oppressive by others.

Chapter 6 reveals how some children are seen as being more difficult to include than others. The circumstances of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties are clearly illustrated. Chapter 6 details a range of views on inclusion and how its rhetoric impinges on reality. It has provided an overview of perspectives. Chapter 7 deals with case studies of inclusion in greater depth and specificity by looking at case studies of two schools.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers my third research question: is there evidence of inclusive practice in Southampton? I explore this through case studies of practice at two Southampton schools, using observations and interviews with teachers, parents and children. The structure used is to start with the aims of the senior management, exploring with them their vision and values. This is followed up with exploration of the experiences of other stakeholders; the purpose is to examine both the rhetoric of the management and the reality of key respondents, i.e. the staff, parents and children whose accounts are detailed below. Appendix 13 shows how I used this and other information in deriving my themes from grounded theory methodology.

HILLSIDE SCHOOL

The Perspective of the Senior Management Team (SMT)

The team of headteachers (Phil) and two deputy heads (Karen and Lynn), one of whom is also the SENCO, say that inclusion is about "serving all children and making them welcome and successful". They have pursued this philosophy since the school opened 15 years ago. Hillside has succeeded in being inclusive by having “staff with the right attitude and approach; this is the essence of inclusion in an inclusive community of staff and pupils”:

A Hillside person.. has a passion to help children excel [...] whatever their abilities. It does not matter who you are or what you are; it only matters that you are here and play your part in our community (Karen).

Each child is unique. Our philosophy is that of equality of opportunity [...] the variety of personalities enriches our school community. Our children do so well here and if only, the wider community could be as welcoming [...] the public sometimes express prejudices; these can cause setbacks." (Lynn).

Phil, the headteacher explains how the school has evolved since its opening:

You can't impose inclusion. It is a system of beliefs and values; [...] an attitude and a way of life. We set out right at the start to recruit 'Hillside people'... they have to share our passion about equality of opportunity and entitlement. Our aim is to promote mutual respect and support [...] a sense of community...of belonging...Hillside as one. The whole school works this way, from staff to children and we recognise the support received from parents. We follow a planned approach.

Phil claims that these factors are crucial to inclusion; his school is inclusive in the sense that there is an "inclusive ethos and a whole school approach". There are posters outside his office; these clearly state the school's aspirations on being an inclusive community. Lynn comments that inclusive practice has arisen directly from their policies and practices about mixed ability teaching, ensuring every child participates in learning. She goes on to say:

A key role of education is to support students to become good members of society. If the society in school is inclusive, it teaches tolerance inside and outside of school.
The school has admitted children experiencing severe physical difficulties outside of the immediate catchment area over the years. There are now twenty, twelve of whom require wheelchairs for mobility. Phil says he does not see the disability; he sees children and a moral duty to do the best by them. He has always aspired for Hillside to be the resourced school for children experiencing physical difficulties. This has not happened because of the investment required, estimated at nearly £0.75 of a million 10 years ago. This has not deterred him from admitting pupils with such needs. He sees it as his duty; "they are children first".

The two deputies stress that they have a passion about meeting the needs of children experiencing "any type of learning difficulty". Staff work extremely hard to ensure full participation. The timetable is carefully prepared to ensure lessons are in accessible areas. Planning extends to breaks and in each other’s homes. Staff are frustrated that the top floor is not accessible. For some lessons children have to be pushed in wheelchairs across the Art room and have to use umbrellas and cycle capes to move between classes when access is only available from outside. Staff are "totally committed". Both stress the "Hillside community" and the role of all children. This is how Lynn puts it:

At assembly, they welcome and give every opportunity for everyone to have their say; they do not push in at the dinner queue and are always so pleased when their peers achieve success. They take pride in this and celebrate every time.

The school has twelve children whose physical difficulties were obvious and many more experiencing less overt difficulties in learning. A total of twenty adults and children, chosen at random, were asked their views and said "we are a close knit community; care for the children and support each other; we would not have it any other way (2 teachers); I like it here; the teachers are your friend;[they] care for you (nine Y8 pupils); being in a wheelchair does not bother me, when I need help it's there, everyone cares (Y7 pupil); many of my friends have a physical problem; good that they are here (Y11 pupil). Four pupils in a Y8 Art class had this to say; they were
working with Sandi, a 'physically disabled' girl: "Marvellous, what Sandi can do; she is always helping us [...] it's good she is here". One Learning Support Assistant (LSA) said that: "Everyone matters; we make everyone feel welcome".

Karen argues that Hillside staff succeed "in spite of all the odds which get in the way of inclusion", e.g. learning, social and physical barriers. She believes that inclusion:

has been about building staff confidence... giving all classes additional help. We employ 22 LSAs and plan to increase this to 30 LSAs for all 30 classes. Teachers feel well supported by their LSAs who are all carefully recruited on the basis of ability and experience. They have remained a stable staff resource [...] trained over a period of time. The school continues to invest in their continuing development.

Funds allocated by the LEA through the SEN Audit are used to employ additional LSAs. In the financial year, April 1999- March 2000, a total of £180,000 has been allocated for this purpose. Phil argues that there is no need for concern about using LSAs to support children's learning. They may not be qualified but if they have the right attitude and training, they can help hard pressed teachers in class. With current limited resources, LSAs are more affordable. They "lighten the teaching load and are a vital and well respected part of the team".

Karen details the key factors in helping Hillside succeed. These are about having "a culture of excellence and success for all; a sharing and ownership of the school philosophy". She feels that the message that "Hillside is where everyone belongs is a shared one". She also considers it important that "staff are made comfortable and that they feel listened to and valued". Staff training and "helping with curriculum differentiation are crucial; giving teachers and children additional LSA support, and "to implement IEPs (Individual Education Plans) is important".
Karen describes the circumstances of Kerry, an extremely able, popular and attractive year 11 pupil whose boyfriend attends the nearby special school for physical disabilities. They have been going out for some time and are regularly seen around the school, helping each other; "a true example of inclusion". She talks about Adam who has a diagnosis of Down's Syndrome.

Adam is a living example of inclusion. He is successful socially and academically. He is not so confident outside of the school setting but his peers are there for him, anticipate his anxiety [...] respond to his signals. Differentiating the curriculum was challenging but the attitude of staff was one of confidence and an expectation of success. Adam thrived on this and pupils encouraged him when he wants to say something, they make a point of waiting and asking for his turn when he would not initiate the request. It is lovely to see.

The school's records are discussed in respect of disciplinary exclusions over the years, particularly their ability to maintain these at very low levels. Phil explains that he views permanent exclusions as a failure on his part. He says that it is "a moral duty to keep children in school". He worries about those who are permanently excluded. He says: "I have gone right off kids going out of school; it de-schools them and makes them worse. I see no role for Pupil Referral Units (i.e. for disruptive children)".

Phil explains that the school has a culture of acceptance and tolerance and that rules are communicated and re-inforced in a consistent way. He says he "preaches inclusion in assembly [...] he involves the staff and pupils; makes them feel they have the power [...] and that they are supported." He will only use permanent exclusion as a last resort. As he puts it:

We only exclude when we've exhausted every option [...] and only when a pupil is bucking the system and does not want to be a part of the school community.
He advocates a culture of no exclusion and is disappointed that he did not succeed in pursuing his publicly stated wish of no permanent exclusion. The five members of staff, one parent and seven pupils I have spoken to, see him in heroic terms. The deputies say that the school song for assembly 'tells it all': "We can do it; if anyone can, we can." The main message for the school is: "Look after each other".

Karen summarises "what works for them". She talks about having a 'tutor and house system' whereby one tutor supervises 30% of the work of their pupils; an unusual arrangement which gives "stability to the school and ownership of the kids". Tutors are actively involved in supporting pupils and following pupil progress, challenging colleagues if necessary. Year Heads, have clearly defined curricular and pastoral roles and Heads of Departments liaise with each other in order to improve departmental links. Pupils' understanding of school rules is very good and received the highest rating in a recent European Survey of 400 schools. Hillside has a programme of induction which is "to make kids welcome"; "this lasts forever until they complete their education".

A group of individuals approached at random had this to say; some were interviewed; other comments were more informally derived.

We pride ourselves in making everybody welcome and help them reach their potential (teacher); our kids receive a good deal; we have such a good bunch of staff and pupils (Head of Year); we are lucky to work here [...] such a lovely, welcoming school [...] we plan our work with our teachers [...] to do the best for the children (LSAs). We get on well with each other; our teachers are like friends [they] are very caring (Y7 pupil). I have loved my time here; it's a lovely, caring place. We look after each other (Y11 pupil). Why can't we have lifts for our friends? Please can you help us write to the education people; it would make things better". (Y8 fully ambulant, non-disabled pupil).
Karen summarises the obstacles, Lynn and Phil agree with her account. She is frustrated by conflicting advice especially with regard to Health and Safety and says:

Advice about fire precautions...what you can and cannot do; staff have found these very confusing, especially about lifting. If you need a hoist every time, what do you do in an emergency? The advice is to hoard all our physically disabled students in one area.

She is also concerned about the scarcity of funds for health and safety training purposes. She says that "because of the large number of our LSA staff, we do not have enough funds to train them all [...] lifting and manual handling courses are expensive and we continually overspend our budget". She is concerned at the inaccessibility of the building. Staff work too hard and this is reflected as "a tiredness factor in both staff and students, arising from a sense of frustration [and from being] overwhelmed with the day to day pressures and demands".

She feels these cut across the school's "inclusive philosophy but won't stop [them] from working in this way". The school includes children experiencing a variety of needs, e.g. children experiencing difficulties associated with autism, Tourette's or Downs Syndrome, including social and behavioural difficulties.

The school's figures on disciplinary exclusions have been increasing over the past two years, particularly in respect of fixed term disciplinary exclusions. Although the total of permanent exclusions is amongst the third lowest in the City at nine, fixed term exclusions are four times this number, i.e. 36. This is from Autumn 1995 to Spring 1998. The range of fixed term exclusions for the same period for Southampton secondary schools is from 0 to 89. Permanent exclusions range from 2 to 28. The averages are 30.8 and 14.5 respectively. Clearly, permanent exclusions have been avoided wherever possible but the sanction of fixed term exclusions has needed to be used. In the summer of 1999 alone, there have been four permanent exclusions from Hillside.
When asked Phil explains that the current social climate, with more dysfunctional families, is to blame; i.e. "those socially, economically or emotionally disadvantaged, who experience severe internal crises, conflicts and strife; parents who do not understand the school ethos and the way the school works or those who do not share the school's values or educational pursuits". Turbulence is another factor; this is the number of children having moved to the area with a long history of troubled and troublesome behaviour. The school attracts families from a distance because of its good and caring reputation leading to large intakes from out of its catchment area. Many of these out of area children had 'a history of behaviour difficulties and had been excluded from other schools'. This did not preclude their admission as Phil felt "every child is welcome". The pressure of league tables, at both Key stages 3 and 4, was also a factor as staff were having to demonstrate performance against national averages in relation to educational attainments at the expense of other measures.

The Perspective of the Senior Management Team: Discussion

Phil feels that exclusion is an issue his team needs to deal with. As some children are entering the school later, they may not have had sufficient opportunity or preparation to mature into Hillside students. However, there is a paradox and an inconsistency. If community is so important to Hillside, this raises issues about those who have to be excluded. If inclusion cannot be imposed why is it that exclusion can? When this happens, there are questions about whether this is a reflection on the staff and the children or whether it is simply a matter of some children not being able to cope in large communities. The Senior Management team expresses a passion for all children to excel. If everyone is committed, shares the same passion and is prepared to work against the odds, then the whole community benefits.

Observations show evidence of a caring ethos; i.e. a caring, calm and welcoming approach. The reception area is quiet and welcoming, children appear to be interacting happily in the playground. Conversations overheard and lessons observed appear to confirm the view that Hillside staff and pupils work well with each other. Conflict seems rare; indeed, it
was not apparent during visits. There is also evidence of work on "Disability rights". This is a "high profile and very important activity every year" (Lynn).

Examining the vision communicated by the school's SMT shows that it is not just theirs; it was shared and articulated by many of the staff and pupils. Three of the last five reports from the school inspector had confirmed this. The OFSTED report had also made comments and had praised the management as having achieved a "welcoming, caring ethos [...] providing effectively for pupils with a wide range of needs".

Analysing staff discourses gives insights into the school's practice. The team makes use of all SEN funds to support children, provides LSAs and recruits staff with the right attitude able to share their passion for children to excel. Staff are supported, leading to goodwill. Planning and differentiation of the curriculum is thorough; this is also confirmed in inspectors' and OFSTED's reports. However, in spite of this there are times when there is a "tiredness factor" because of the pressures of staff but this does not deter them in pursuing inclusive goals.

On the whole, Hillside represents the antithesis of autocracy (Skrtic, 1991); the sharing of the vision of the management team emerges clearly from the school's SEN documentation, OFSTED reports and views of stakeholders interviewed. There appeared to be a close match between the rhetoric and the reality. The main issue was about fixed term exclusions. However, staff felt well supported and SEN resources were used for the purpose intended unlike some practices described in the literature, e.g. Marsh, op.cit. Comparing Hillside and special school costs shows that the former are more effective as children are able to remain in their community. Their maximum SEN allocations are £150,000 for 300 children, i.e. £500 per child, a total of £2,500 per SEN place after adding standard costs of £2000 per child. This compares with a minimum of £4500 for a special school place. The team also sees the role that society and the wider community play in inclusion, building on the work schools do.
Adam's Perspective

Adam has a medical diagnosis of Down's Syndrome and has been assessed as likely to experience moderate to severe learning difficulties. He has been at Hillside for five years and in mainstream education, except for a very short time in a special school. He says that he has enjoyed his schooling at Hillside. He was nervous about coming at first, wondering how teachers and other children would respond to him. He had been pleasantly surprised. He says: "Everybody has been wonderful and kind".

Adam finds some school work difficult but feels that he has been very well supported by his teachers and particularly his LSAs. His work is carefully differentiated; targets and teaching approaches are detailed to be easily followed. "The work makes sense. It's not too hard. Jane and Vic help me with reading and sometimes with the answers. It's great!" He has also "got many friends who help" him. His best subject is german; his workbook is full of work marked as competent. This is very neat and well presented. He is proud to be taking G.C.S.E exams in german, music, graphics, drama and double science.

Adam believes he is doing very well at Hillside. There are, however, occasional problems when some children "call him names", especially outside of school and at the bus stop. He says he copes with name calling better now, that it is very rare and that his friends "stick up for him", challenging the culprits. He also says he is much more confident and at school, has "absolutely no worries." Dr Handy...Jane...Vic...take care of these". Adam's reports of the past six years show "steady and consistent progress". They detail few concerns and predict positive progress. The LEA inspector had also commented at the 'extreme care and the length the school goes to [...] to differentiate the curriculum'.

Children's Perspectives
Adam's account suggests that Hillside is achieving its aims of being inclusive; he is succeeding. His experiences are a welcome change from those told by many others with a diagnosis of Down's Syndrome or of other difficulties, whose experiences have been those of rejection in terms of accessing mainstream education, e.g. Brandon, op.cit; Allan, op.cit. Adam's inclusion is different, compared with that of Souza (op.cit); his teachers have differentiated the curriculum to ensure his progress. Nobody has complained about how taxing this is; there was not the same concern that many teachers report about curriculum access for children experiencing severe learning difficulties (Ware, op.cit).

In September 2000 Adam obtained six GCSEs with E to G grades. He also obtained a certificate of achievement with distinction in numeracy. Had he stayed in a special school, he would not have been entered for GCSEs. This raises issues about whether other children like Adam, many of whom are still in special schools should be given the same opportunities. The LEA has a role in exploring this with schools. Adam's teachers said that his GCSE grades are not as important as his sense of achievement and the opportunity he was given by his school.

There was no concern from Hillside that his grades might reflect on the school's performance profile, yet there may be schools which might have resisted his examination entry (see chapter 6, p. 159). Adam went to Hillside as of right; nobody objected. Indeed he was welcomed. There was no political struggle from him or his parents to gain his admission. The staff made good use of resources. All, including Adam, reported that they had been well supported. Outcomes in terms of his placement and progress were good.

Adam's account is similar to the example of Tordis (Stromstad, 1999). Tordis is an adult with Down's Syndrome who has become a fully participative member of her society. Adam may be on course to achieve a similar level of participation as long as his local community is supportive. The psycho-medical paradigm was conspicuous in its absence. The SMT were adamant that no Hillside staff "would look at labels; we see a child,
one that is the same as everyone else". Other staff had also emphasised this point. The power and politics was about how to include; the shaping of attitudes and the removal of physical and other barriers as illustrated below.

**Sam's and Katie's Perspectives**

Sam is 'physically disabled' and is in a wheelchair. She is fourteen years old and transferred to Hillside, about two years ago, from a special school for children experiencing physical difficulties. Katie is fourteen too and has always been in the mainstream. Sam tells me:

I won't look back [...] I feel much more normal now; I have always wondered why I did not come here sooner [...] Sunhill was a good school but it isn't for me [...] the work was not at my level and I felt that I did not have many friends [...] I was an odd one out and looked forward to my sessions at Hillside. I could not wait to come here full time. I now try to do everything [...] I am going skating soon.

Katie interjects and says:

Why shouldn't she be here. The system is wrong you know, very wrong. Why shouldn't everybody go to a normal school [...] I have learned so much from Sam since she's come here [...] that she is the same as everyone else [...] better than many [of the other children]. I would not have known that...about disabled people. Having so many in our school has been good for us, we've learned from them and what it is like [...] to be disabled. I have a disability too, being dyslexic but nobody notices or makes snide remarks [...] we don't do that here. Nobody would allow it. We look after each other. The teachers are very good. They are your friends and they like us.
Sam echoes Katie's views and says: "They act as your friends and not as teachers [...] everybody is the same. We are equals". Sam goes on to tell me about the access issues and the lack of facilities.

The toilets are too far away. The disabled facilities are in the community block which is a long way to go. You are only allowed a few friends there as there is not enough room. There is also no room at the canteen [so that] you have to eat in the community block.

Sam states that the teachers have "gone to great lengths" to ensure all her lessons are in accessible areas. Information Technology presents a problem but she is helped upstairs by her teachers and her friends. Sam sums up her experience of Hillside thus: "It is sometimes a struggle to get around or to keep up with the work but it's been every bit worth the effort. Nobody has ever complained about my disability; no, it's never been an issue."

Sam's circumstances show how children can be ambassadors to schools, i.e. how they can influence attitudes towards disability. It is probable that her personality was a significant factor. Sam felt misplaced in a special school where she felt insufficiently challenged.

Katie's views are interesting. If, as she says, everybody has a right to mainstream education, the question relates to how this can be facilitated. Katie implies that children who are not in mainstream schools might feel oppressed, supporting Dyson's (op.cit) discourses on ethics and politics. She draws a distinction between visible and invisible "disabilities"; this is a factor that influences attitudes (Brandon, op.cit). Her words highlight the two way process of inclusion. This is influenced by both "disabled" and "non-disabled" peers; there are benefits for both groups. Within a social model of disability framework, it would appear that Hillside staff and pupils place the focus on the person, not the disability (see Mason, 1996).
Ben's Perspective

Ben is in his first year at Hillside but is frequently in trouble because of his behaviour. He is one of two boys, both of whom are in foster care. His older brother attends the school for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Ben talks about Adam and says that he "has a wonderful personality". He is very fond of Adam and is pleased that he is at Hillside. He would have liked his own brother to attend too. He says:

Hillside is a good place [...] gives everybody a chance. You don't feel bad about having problems [...] people try to understand and help you. Nothink's too hard. I do mess about [...] and deserve to be given detentions. The teachers are fair. [...] you know where you are [...]. Dr Handy [...] he talks to you, listens [...] does not think Oh, here he comes again.

Ben says:

It's good that Hillside takes everybody in, disabled or not, everyone should get on with life. I have learned from having people like Adam and others in the school, especially the ones in wheelchairs. They are human, aren't they? It tells you about hardship and how lucky you are. I am not the only one with problems [...] I just need to look around."

He talks about his strong sense of justice and fair play and that "what I will never accept is anyone being unfairly done [...] being bullied or made fun of. We are all the same aren't we?" Ben says that he likes Hillside because people are fair. When things go wrong, he accepts he is to blame. He says "but then, I would have been thrown out at another school. Look what happened to my brother (Jack) or to us at home".
Ben echoes Sam's and Katie's views about tolerance, acceptance and the valuing of diversity. Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton (op.cit) report similar views. Many parents are also passionate about this (Penman and Murray (op.cit); Billington, McNally and McNally (op.cit), pleading for professionals to see their child not their labels or disability. Ben wants fairness and justice, not judgments to be passed too quickly. Everyone must be given a fair chance; prejudices and stereotypes are unhelpful. Armstrong, Clarke and Murphy (op.cit) detail similar views about the experiences and wishes of children in care. Ben's views also echo those held by Jupp (op.cit); everyone belongs; no one is different.

There is a great deal of evidence in the literature about school's attitudes to children like Ben. On the whole, these tend to be negative, (e.g. Wallace, op.cit). Armstrong, Clarke and Murphy (op.cit) provide insights into how children like Ben feel about the way they are treated; their perceptions of rejection and feelings of difference. Hillside and Ben appear to be exceptions.

Ben mentions his brother's circumstances which illustrates his position in respect of Dyson's discourses on ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics. He would have liked his brother to be included too. Re-framed within the lens of the above discourses, this did not happen probably because of mainstream schools not being able to meet his needs. Jack's rights to education, the lack of political struggle (now articulated by Ben) and the perceived efficacy of a special school probably accounted for his eventual placement. The same lens provide insights to account for the similarities in children being taken into care, following family breakdown.

A Parent's Perspective

Mrs. Smith, Adam's mother, is a school Governor and knows the school very well. She recalls her experiences of the schools Adam had previously attended, then confirms the shift of emphasis at Hillside.
Hillside was ready to adapt what they were doing... before it had always been “Oh dear, I don’t think we can handle this particular problem or “this is going to be very difficult for us because of his difficulties, etc.” There was not hostility but it was not the same welcoming. Nobody asked questions; the SENCO said yes. I could not believe it [...] phoned the Head to double check. I was suspicious but there was no need.

The absence of conditionality and level of decision making had surprised Mrs. Smith. This in itself confirmed the welcoming approach to Adam as one of the new children, ‘no different from the others’. Mrs. Smith said that her main worries were that Adam was one of the first children with a medical diagnosis of Downs Syndrome to be attending mainstream schools. She was advised against mainstream education very early on:

We were told we shouldn’t be doing this and that special schools have the resources to meet his needs. Everybody said this and it took us a long time to be convinced that we were doing the right thing. But we knew once we observed Adam’s reaction to his day a week at a special school. He really hated it. He used to cry going and hide his lunch box. He was happy, relaxed and enjoyed school on the days when he went to the mainstream.

Mrs. Smith describes her experiences as they have emerged over time:

Adam has stayed alongside his peer group throughout and he has not been excluded from any lessons on the grounds of his learning difficulties so he very much feels a member of the school community and of his particular tutor group. He has been able to stay at this level academically; he has quite a strong identity and belonging there.
Mrs. Smith claims that:

The whole school ethos is right from the Head and staff, right through to the pupils themselves [...]. They want everybody to have equal opportunities and to realise potential. Everybody has a part to play [and] teachers are prepared to tailor what they provide. That has to be the most important bit I think makes the school successful. Everybody, from teachers to support staff, all subscribe to a whole school approach."

Mrs. Smith's experience is not unique. Arrondelle and Arrondelle (op.cit) had similar success with their daughter. Mrs. Smith comments on the influence and power of professionals and the anxieties and indecision caused. Such influences are well described in the literature, e.g. Troyna (op.cit); Murray and Penman (op.cit). She concluded that special schooling was inappropriate for Adam and has been impressed with Hillside's ethos, its welcoming approach and the way in which everybody is encouraged to be part of a caring community.

Mrs. Smith hoped for social integration initially and saw academic achievement as a bonus. She wants Adam to be able to function in society and make a contribution. Hegarty (1983) found many parents share similar aspirations. Mrs. Smith seems to subscribe to a social model of disability. She was not concerned about Adam, being one of the first children with a diagnosis of Down's syndrome, to enter mainstream education nor was she dissuaded from it. Viewed through the lens of the ethics, rights, politics and pragmatics discourses detailed in chapter 3, the position seems clear. Her views support all four discourses in the manner reported in the literature; her accounts of Hillside staff and pupils also reflect this. In her struggles, she had to counter practices and beliefs emanating from the psycho-medical paradigm. Adam's example partly shows how faulty these can be or how perceived risks can be countered with the right attitudes and approaches. Buckley (op.cit) argues that attitudes and practices in special schools are not conducive to children's progress; they fail them.
**Hillside School: Concluding Commentary**

The visits to Hillside raise issues about children experiencing physical difficulties not attending their mainstream schools, especially if they are easily accessible. A sense of community seems to be important for inclusion to work. It is also important for pupils to be with their peers to enable friendship formation and consolidation. The example of Kerry shows that when allowed to be together children develop friendships and that taking some away from their mainstream schools may deny them these opportunities. This was the case with Samantha and to some extent, operated in reverse with Kerry. Mrs. Smith is critical of professional practices that could promote these barriers.

The staff, pupils and parents suggest that Hillside is working towards being an inclusive community. My observations and analyses also support such a view. However, there is one issue that is not fully explained. This is about children excluded for disciplinary reasons. One way to view this may be to conclude that even in a school which sets out to be inclusive, there are many conflicts and contradictions in practice. There are parallels in the literature. For example, Dyson and Millward (op.cit) uncovered similar issues at three comprehensive schools in the North East of England. They suggested the concept of "ambiguity" to explain these conflicting forces; "a complex interaction of more and less inclusive tendencies" (p. 145). My findings support this; even within the most inclusive schools there will be times when the ideal of inclusion will not be achieved. Hillside is another example of a school which, "despite its more or less inclusive tendencies", tends to find disruptive behaviour an ambiguous force. Staff are less willing to find solutions to problems when their authority is challenged beyond acceptable levels.
MILTON SCHOOL

A Headteacher Perspective

Sue has been the headteacher of Milton Primary for ten years. She says that she is committed to inclusion. She believes that:

inclusion requires a whole school approach [...] you can't impose it; if you do, you create fear and resistance amongst school staff who feel they won't be able to cope.

Like Hillside, she had selected her staff who share her thinking, the aims and the aspirations of her school. However, she had to work with them in promoting inclusion. She felt this was needed for an innovation which requires a fundamental shift and change in attitude. Sue explains how the "Unit" for children experiencing learning difficulties developed at Milton. It previously "had a bad name" before Milton was formed from a merger of Warner First and Middle Schools. The Unit was separate then. When Sue took over the headship, she decided with her Governors that the Unit would be part of the school and just another class, "Maple Class and not the Unit". The children have since then been on the mainstream class registers and are the responsibility of classteachers though they are supported by Maple staff.

She says that "inclusion works successfully when children don't stand out...when they are able to cope with what is being offered". She stresses that she is being specific about children who are disruptive and are threatening to their teachers and their peers. They stand out.

This defeats the whole purpose; you can't practise inclusion this way, not when plans are constantly disrupted. The other children lose out.
She says that behaviour is a major barrier to inclusion, especially when this disrupts the learning of other children. Teachers feel inadequate when they cannot cope. Schools and children need a safety net; a sanctuary when crises arise. She claims that there are six essential and inter-related components to inclusion. These are successful curriculum differentiation, effective behaviour management and a contingency plan in the event of crises and emergencies. Peer tolerance and acceptance and consistent parental and community support are also important as are policies tempered with humanity. Sue feels that:

learning difficulties are easier to address, especially when you don't have to deal with troublesome behaviour. Staff are more understanding and sympathetic [...] they are prepared to go the extra mile with children who respond and do not disrupt their plans.

Sue feels that teachers needed to take the lead and deliver local and national expectations. In other words, children needed to trust their judgments; this would be beneficial to all. The problem with inclusion is that teachers are not receiving adequate training on SEN within their initial teacher training. "There is very little child psychology and too much cramming on curriculum. There is not enough about how children learn or about behaviour management".

She believes that the key to inclusion at Milton has been the implementation of a whole school approach.

This is well established [...] all staff are confident about the help to expect. Ann ensures they are all well prepared and supported. All staff are trained. The ethos of the school is one of acceptance [...] of each other's diversity and difference.

Sue stresses that she is "very clear about what the school expects, the emphasis on having the right ethos, attitudes and commitments". The school serves a socially deprived area, with high levels of unemployment
and poverty. It is amongst the highest in terms of children being eligible for free school meals and on the register for SEN. When asked about how she knows that her school is succeeding she refers to her school's returns for the SEN Audit. These show consistent decreases of children at the higher stages, i.e. children have been making progress according to teacher observations and assessments, including standardised tests. These have fallen from 46% in 1997, to 42% in 1998 and to 41% in 1999. The School Inspector's report praises its successful approach with the management of behaviour and learning. The local press also confirms that Milton is one of the most improved schools in the City.

The school excludes very few children for disciplinary reasons. There has only been one permanent disciplinary exclusion in five years and 5-6 fixed term exclusions per year. Sue confirms that she only excludes when "the children represent a serious risk to staff and children and when they no longer respond to strategies" including her own intervention. She says:

When I am forced to exclude, I feel awful and know I have failed the child, my staff, parents, everybody. It is a terrible experience. In times like these, the support of other agencies is crucial; otherwise, the child runs the risk of everything falling apart, [...] when they are in care or the family needs help.

She describes the requirements for successful inclusive practice. These include "depth and strength of character " in school staff. They should be able to listen, to keep calm and to talk openly and sensitively, taking account of the other person. Children should feel that they are liked and respected and that "if teachers appear strict, it is because they care [...] and that discipline is not an exercise of power but about setting standards, expectations and limits." Sue says that the pace of inclusion is vital. "Take people with you [...] be clear about your sense of purpose; show that support and resources are there. People got to know what's there." She thinks that good preparation with realistic lead times are vital; "do not swamp people all at once". Contingency plans are necessary:" If it does not work, provide an escape mechanism".
Sue says that she and her staff work closely with parents; they "can either make or break inclusion [....] Get it wrong and expect a deputation on your doorsteps." Ann, the Teacher in charge of Maple ("the Unit") confirms similar views. She asserts that she "does not have to convince staff to meet the whole range of needs in their classes. They know there is good back up and that the paperwork will be done for them". When inclusion does not work, it is "when children have negative feelings. They are the ones we don't truly understand; the environment they live in, the deprivation they face; their day to day living and circumstances; this is the real desperate challenge we face for some [...] putting ourselves in their shoes can be a sobering and transforming experience". They both stress the importance of providing support to staff to deal with the "problems deprivation brings".

My observations and reading of inspector's and OFSTED reports suggest that Milton is a caring school, with a calm and structured approach. Staff look happy and calm; children appear to be on task. I also observe some of the "Maple" children. They appear to be similarly engaged. Sue asserts that problems arise when children exceed the limits and persistently flout the rules, challenging the school community. Then, only when staff, headteacher and everyone else can no longer cope, does the school resort to the sanction of children being removed from the classroom. If this works for Milton, there may be lessons here for other schools anxious to avoid children's disciplinary exclusions.

Issues and concerns about behaviour are well documented in the literature (Mahoney, 1995; Cooper, 1993). Sue is mainly concerned about children likely to disrupt teachers' plans. In terms of the pragmatics discourse, e.g. inclusive practice, there are insights and lessons that could be learned from Sue's advice and experiences. What about the rights, ethics, political and efficacy elements in the manner detailed in the literature (Dyson, op.cit)? Sue tempers these with the rights of teachers and other children in her discussion of disruptive children. I did not feel that there was any disagreement with any of the principles with regard to other children.
Whilst subscribing to a social model of disability and recognising the curricular requirements for inclusion, she had concerns that aspirations needed to be realistic and incremental. Her school is not ready for all children.

The theme emerging is about realism; ensuring demands do not exceed school capacities. The school's practice also highlights issues of efficacy. Inspectors' reports clearly show improved learning outcomes for children. This suggests successful inclusion for the 41% of children reported as experiencing difficulties in learning, i.e. nearly half the school's population. At a maximum of £1500 for the highest level of SEN audit allocations, the evidence would suggest value for money. Most children on the SEN register seem to have improved, according to the school's summative records. The case files of a random sample examined in depth confirm the summary to be accurate. The LEA inspector confirms the same. Milton used to be second from bottom of the Southampton league table; it has now climbed four places, in spite of still having the "Unit" children having an effect on their general performance. It met all its City targets last year in terms of literacy and numeracy.

A Parent's Perspective

Mrs. Clark is John's mother. John is seven and experiences learning difficulties. He was transferred to Milton 18 months ago after an unsettling time at his previous mainstream school. Mrs. Clark was unhappy with that school and felt that they did not care. She says:

This school is a gem. I had a bad experience of my son's previous school; they could not cope with him and could not wait to get rid of him. It was always John's fault; they wanted me to send him to a special school. When I saw the unit at Milton, I was very impressed. The staff were so caring [...] they were like parents. I was looking for teachers who care. I was instantly reassured. I have not looked back. John has blossomed.
These seemed to be expressions of gratitude from a satisfied and loyal parent. She said she had observed the headteacher's response to a child seeking attention at the time of her visit. This secured a calm and helpful response, the headteacher making time to answer the child's queries sympathetically and sensitively.

It was not too much trouble [...] the child came first. I have also found the teachers to be always there. [...] Mrs. N (Ann) is like a mother; she cares about the children, thinks and plans for them. You feel your child is well looked after; can't ask for more.

In her contacts with the school she deals mainly with Mrs. N and not the class teacher. She is pleased that John is accepted as "one of the children". She is also "delighted" about the progress he has made. At seven, John is just beginning to learn to read; he can read a few words and syllables. He is also able to copy write; his pen grip is much better; "not so clumsy and tight and his writing not so spidery. Most of all, his behaviour is now more or less perfect; he is so happy and settled. Teachers here show commitment, devotion, caring." Mrs. Clark then goes on to talk about her fears. As she put it:

I was afraid that John will have the same experience that he had at his other school. This was a dreadful school [...] teachers without the time for kids; without devotion. They should not be there [...] you feel you get round the teachers [...] you have to prove yourself. But Milton was such a refreshing change. You could trust them with your child.

Mrs. Clark asserts that:

children speak louder than the teachers. You can tell whether the school is good or bad. It's kind of a feeling you have. My worst fear is John not being accepted by his peers.
Mrs. Clark details the requirements of a successful school "like Milton". They have to "be caring, protective but not overwhelming". Children should be helped to be as independent as they can be. "You need to watch other children so that no one feels frightened, scared or different". Teaching should be seen "not as a job but as a vocation". Teachers must have a good rapport with children and parents. "Some things you can train for, some things you can't. You need to have insight about the children and relate to people". She says that a partnership with parents is vital; "keeping them informed, making them feel welcome".

Mrs. Clark's stressed her negative experiences of John's previous school. This had echoes of reports in the literature particularly the requirements for parents to prove themselves and to be on their best behaviour so that their children can be accepted by teachers; e.g. Allan (op.cit); Grant (op.cit). Milton seems to be achieving the kind of partnership Mrs. Clark values. This has helped her overcome her experience of previous oppression with trust.

Viewing her experiences through the lens of the four discourses of ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics (Dyson, op.cit) provides clear analyses of differences of schools' approaches to inclusion. The power and politics, particularly those applying in her previous circumstances must have been overwhelming. She tackled these and exercised a choice. This has implications about more passive parents who are easily intimidated and who do not.

**Teacher Perspectives**

Lesley and Janet are two teachers who teach Key Stage (KS) 1 and KS2 children respectively. They talk about the school and the way they work with children who experience a whole range of difficulties in learning. They illustrate this by describing the composition of their classrooms and the needs they are trying to meet. They claim that their school is being inclusive "in meeting a whole range of needs in moderation, though without a great deal of additional resources."
children are not engaged in learning? Or are teachers struggling to meet too many classroom demands that they cannot cope with behaviour as well?"

They say it is both to a point but also stress their catchment area; theirs is not:

A school from the leafy suburbs. We don't get the support from parents always. We also don't fully appreciate the children's circumstances; whether they've slept the night before, ate at all or had an argument with mum or in the playground. It's how the child feels [...] you could say good morning but if it's not to him first, he gets upset; there is no way of telling [...]. We cope here because we've always done.

Janet stresses that it is not children experiencing the most extreme or noticeable difficulty who miss out. She says:

I worry about little Mary who doesn't say boo to a goose...sat in the corner and easily left out. She may be there but may not have a clue about what's going on. We provide for children like her through careful planning but there is always a risk [...] they are the first to lose out when things go wrong; when a child explodes.

Janet goes on to talk about the Literacy and Numeracy hour; these are too proscribed:

Some children sit through the beginning and might as well not be there. It can wash all over them. We may be teaching concepts they don't understand but they are still required to sit there. We need to differentiate but can't; we are constrained by regulations. Children with behaviour difficulties need to be interested in their learning, you need a way in but being prescriptive takes away that chance.
When asked about how they would feel if they were expected to include all children, their reply was: "Threatened". They claim that they are not threatened about children experiencing physical or severe learning difficulties. They could deal with these with help; their main worry is about children experiencing severe emotional and behavioural difficulties. Given that Milton already has much experience in this area, Janet explains why she is so concerned:

There are limits to what you can do. The strains are enormous. Our school has no further capacity to raise standards, deal with learning and manage even more behaviour problems. We could not be a Vermont (the local school for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties); not have 5 in a class with a superb teacher and LSA. Could not do it.

Why not ask if the help was there? I then perceive some anxiety from both, a certain degree of uncertainty that the additional help may not be there; disbelief perhaps. Lesley says:

You are not going to expect me to do more paperwork, keep records. I already work well into every evening, where will I find the time. Teachers are seen to be scrounging layabouts with long holidays no one else has. We need help if we are to include more children. Many will just leave. There is a common perception teachers should be able to cope but why the heck should I? I want to but where is the help.

When asked about the requirements for inclusive practice, they stress the need for planning; "plan and be prepared to be flexible". Setting realistic targets is important; "work set must be right so that children can do it; but you never know beforehand, so be prepared for the unexpected". There should be a focus on needs and an awareness maintained of "how the children are doing, especially your little Marys". They say that all children and staff should "enjoy their work and that every child is supported.". Resources should be in place and used effectively. They go on to say that
"effective teaching and management techniques should be regularly updated through training but that parental partnership and support is vital".

When things go wrong, this is through lack of planning; "missing things". Teachers "are often exhausted; not having the time or the energy to do any more". At these times, they risk forgetting about the bottom group, those at the tail end of ability. A lack of "expertise for proper curriculum differentiation complicates things further". There is also the temptation at times to delegate tasks to an LSA with minimal training even though the children may experience the more serious needs. However, for them, "the worst scenario is having to deal with behaviour problems"; this distracts them from their planned activity. Lesley goes on to talk about Milton's planning process:

We engage in medium and long term planning. We look at each subject over an eight week period and produce eight sets of objectives for each. Everything is covered every half term, with detailed planning sheets. We then look at each group of children and differentiate for them. Ann helps us with those who require more extensive differentiation and does all of that for the Maple class.

Lesley and Janet say planning makes all the difference in the classroom, enabling them to ensure that all children are engaged as much as possible. In spite of all this planning,

There are still some little Marys [...] this can go on for years before anybody notices. Children cannot be learning at all times. They switch on and off, key in on different things. Hundreds of factors account for their learning styles. You must deal with these; be aware of their needs; have the right planning [...] If every child has a fundamental human right to learn, then all the other thirty have that right. One child should not take the right of all the others. There are many children here who would benefit from other children in a special school.
These teachers suggest that there is a difference between schools in urban and rural areas. There may be but the literature confirms that many schools also succeed, in spite of so-called deprived catchment areas, e.g. NCE (1997). They are also concerned about some children losing out as they do not draw attention to their needs. This is not different from many other instances reported in the literature; e.g. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). Clearly, this is an ongoing problem and many children are still at risk of being excluded from their education and losing out. What could we find through the lens of the four discourses on ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics? This reveals dilemmas. Dyson (op.cit) had predicted that interrogating the circumstances of different groups would reveal diverse insights. Discourses about children presenting with behaviour difficulties were different from those about other children from all four perspectives.

Their rights, the ethics of their belonging, the efficacy of their placement and the pragmatics of keeping them at Milton were voiced as being problematic. The reverse applied to children who "lose out"; their needs were seen to be compromised by pressures on teachers, disruptive behaviour being one of the most significant. Janet and Lesley had said that 'physically disabled' children were welcome but they just could not cope with severely disruptive behaviour. LEAs have a role in supporting its teachers deal with such stresses.

Re-framed within the four discourse model (Dyson's (op.cit); p. 51), their discourses are about the rights, ethics and politics of a different target group; their own and that of children who are not disruptive in class. To them, the efficacy of special schools for disruptive children is not in doubt; their pragmatics discourse would be that mainstream schools are already overstretched with too many initiatives. Help is needed from the special sector. Are these really separatist discourses, de-selecting some children? Once again, I could detect evidence of conflicts and contradictions in inclusive aspirations; the ambiguity reported in the literature (Dyson and Millward, op.cit).
REFLECTIONS ON VISIT TO MILTON SCHOOL

My visits and interviews at Milton have enabled me to identify various elements of successful inclusive practice. Most accounts were consistent and what was said was borne out in my observations. The school seemed to offer a calm, structured and purposefully busy environment, with teachers and children working happily together. There were, however, some inconsistencies. Teachers said that they subscribed to inclusion, wanted to make children feel welcomed and to be part of the school. They said that they took account of children's circumstances, their emotional states and responsiveness to learning. Yet, in spite of all the children who were successfully included, there were times when some misbehaved (p.186) or when planning was inadequate (p.189). There were also fears about sustaining some children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties.

On the one hand, teachers were saying they welcomed all their children whilst at the same time believing that some should be elsewhere. They were concerned about other children who were at risk of having their education disrupted. They saw new initiatives as impossible burdens, are torn between what is morally right and what is practicable. No one seemed to want any child to be disadvantaged but it seemed that they were becoming less tolerant of disruptive children. This is in spite of successful practices in behaviour management. Sue, Ann, Janet and Lesley are confident about "meeting the needs of children with learning difficulties"; they were anxious about those who disrupt. Their discourses were different in respect of these two groups.

CONCLUSIONS

The Milton and Hillside interviews have confirmed elements of inclusive practice at both schools. These capture a picture of these two schools at a point in time. I therefore used other methods of triangulation, e.g. checks with peers, the schools' educational psychologists (EPs) and analyses of the OFSTED and the more regular LEA inspectors' reports.
It is too early to say that Hillside and Milton schools are adhocratic in the manner described by Skrtic (op.cit). They seem to be trying to be innovative, inventive, dynamic and problem solving, e.g. Hillside's inclusion of physically impaired children reflects these qualities. However, the same could not be said of either school about children who were disruptive. Nevertheless both Hillside and Milton appear to be "moving" schools (Ainscow, 1999), as they strive to become more inclusive. They have many of the features described; e.g. leadership, whole-school and staff involvement, collaborative planning and staff development; Ainscow, 1999; p. 49). Both have inclusionary and exclusionary pressures (Booth, 1995). This is consistent with the literature, confirming that schools cannot be inclusive at all times. Ambiguities are likely (Dyson and Millward, op.cit). The main area of concern in both schools relates to social behaviour.

My interviews also raised issues about less inclusive practices elsewhere in Southampton; both parents who were interviewed described previous negative experiences. The literature reports similar themes; e.g. Allan, (op.cit). This confirms the inconsistency of practice in Southampton which is not surprising, given the variety of schools and differing perceptions of their practice. It is difficult for whole systems to be permeated by a consistency of approach. Policies formulated at local and national levels are not always implemented in the way intended, being subject to changes by those affected by them (Fulcher, 1989).

It is claimed that "inclusion cannot be imposed" (Phil, p. 162). This contrasts markedly with exclusion which is imposed. Successful inclusive practice requires a caring approach which generates a sense of belonging and community. A calm and accepting approach is necessary. Within supportive schools, children make progress. Adam's example shows the potential that exists and that may be untapped. Other children may be able to achieve similar successes if they are given the opportunity. Such issues of equity require exploration.
Discourses about rights, ethics, efficacy and pragmatics are influenced by work pressures so that some children attract more favourable responses than others. The rhetoric of school staff include conditions and contradictions; aspirations and practices show ambiguity. Psycho-medical paradigms influence perspectives as do the continued existence of determinate structures, e.g. special schools. There are tensions between inclusion and people's perceptions of meritocracies. Reconciling these key forces is necessary for inclusion.

SUMMARY

Chapter 7 answers my third research question and suggests evidence of inclusive practice in Southampton. It details the attitudes and approaches necessary for successful inclusion. Inclusion is seen to be about having a passion for children's learning and valuing diversity. Inclusionists reject discourses centring around disability and are prepared to work hard, e.g. Hillside staff. They work in teams. Theirs is a social model of disability; a rejection of the psycho-medical paradigm.

Schools reveal an ambiguity in their ideals. There is a tension between a desire to be inclusive and the difficulty caused by disruptive behaviour. They are complex organisations and there are times when conflicts arise in practice. As Clark et al (op.cit) have pointed out, organisations derive their practices through the interplay of their key actors; however, hard a school tries to implement policies, the influences of these key players will shape the eventual practice. There will be times when the rhetoric fails and non-inclusive practice emerges. Chapter 7 provides lessons for the LEA in respect of its role in supporting schools to promote inclusion. Using similar case study methodology in other schools might provide additional insight into how an LEA can support their progress, especially if the different stages of developing inclusive practice can be identified and understood. Chapter 8 is a synthesis of themes and analyses from previous chapters.
INTRODUCTION

Chapter 8 expands on the answers to the research questions given in chapters 5 to 7. The key themes that arise are discussed within my theoretical framework. The chapter concludes with recommendations and a consideration of the research applications beyond Southampton.

Question 1: To what extent is Southampton implementing its policy of inclusion?

- What do children's school placements reveal about practice?
- How does Southampton compare with its statistical neighbours on inclusion?
- To what extent is it making effective use of its resources to promote inclusion?
- Given a policy of inclusion, are schools raising standards?

The analysis in chapter 5 shows that Southampton has a number of key initiatives to promote inclusion, e.g. outreach services. Special school placements and disciplinary exclusions show reductions. Physical accessibility of schools is improved. These inclusive trends are similar to those taking place nationally and internationally. Standards are also rising. The LEA compares more favourably in these respects, particularly with its statistical neighbours. This would suggest that its policy and practice of inclusion is not rhetoric in the sense of being insincere or of being grossly exaggerated.
However, there are discourses along psycho-medical paradigms from influential stakeholders, e.g. headteachers and governors. Their positions are clearly articulated, e.g. "schools will not sign up to a no exclusion policy; some children need special schools" (p. 130, Bill and Judy, p. 132-3). On the other hand, other stakeholders feel that there is oppression and that social justice is not consistently secured; e.g. Grants, p. 153.

The types of placements made show clear differences. Children experiencing specific learning difficulties are invariably attending a mainstream school. This is in sharp contrast with children experiencing severe learning or behaviour difficulties. However, children experiencing learning difficulties represent the largest group in special schools (p. 113; p. 137); this belies the argument that teachers are mainly concerned about disruptive behaviour. It suggests concerns with standards and illustrates the impact of the curriculum on selection (see also Clough and Corbett, op.cit; Ainscow, 1999).

Chapter 5 raises issues about efficacy. Special schools are more expensive. Whilst the LEA continues to provide them, it is re-directing special school savings; e.g. falling special school numbers are used to fund outreach services (p. 119). On the other hand, the funding of Bluebell placements diverts significant resources from mainstream schools. If re-direction of resources was possible as expected of all LEAs (Audit Commission, 1994), then the pragmatics of making mainstream schools more inclusive could be facilitated. Southampton could be criticised as being too passive in relying on places becoming vacant in special schools. However, this cannot detract from some of the achievements already made.

The LEA is using its own discourses of rights, politics, efficacy and pragmatics in complying with its duty to meet children's SEN in mainstream and special schools and to secure effective use of resources. This is the role of LEAs and the majority of Southampton stakeholders are supportive. If they were not, there would have been strong resistance shown. What is not so apparent is how current arrangements are changed by the circumstances of children and parents who may feel marginalised.
To them all dimensions relating to rights, politics, efficacy and pragmatics would be as detailed in the literature, i.e. that special education is neither desirable nor effective and that ways should be found to enable mainstream schools to be more inclusive (Dyson, op.cit).

LEAs have to deal with a range of competing discourses, some more powerful than others; e.g. medical discourses have the support of the law and lead to monetary benefits, many LEAs using categories to allocate funds (Bowers, op.cit). In wanting to move from policy to practice, any LEA will need to confront its own reality, i.e. its own politics and its heritage of schools and practices. Few LEAs can abandon these determinate structures; Newham is an LEA where power and politics exercised the ultimate driving force in the 1990s (Jordan, 1992; 1996). As democracies, LEAs have to listen to their community of stakeholders.

**Question 2: To what extent is there a mismatch between the rhetoric of inclusion, as promoted by education providers, and its reality, as experienced by recipients?**

- What are the views and discourses of teachers, officers and other education providers? What are the experiences of children and parents?
- To what extent is there a mismatch in the perspectives of providers and recipients?

Chapter 6 shows the extent of the mismatch between the LEA's aspirations and the perceptions of its key stakeholders. The SEN policy consultation shows the concerns of teachers and school governors. The diary analyses provide the comparisons with recipients' experiences. Within the group of providers, there are differences of perspectives on what is achievable and how. The main consensus is that inclusion is perceived to be morally right though not fully achievable.
What are the views of teachers and other education providers?

Teachers stress the pressures in schools and the value of special schools (Bill and Judy, p. 132-3). The rhetoric of providers is about capacity and realism (Derek, p. 158). Linked to these tensions are the expectations to compete in the education market place (Sally, p. 159). Chapters 6 and 7 show that teachers are using essentialist discourses to fit their situation (p. 186-90). They question the efficacy of arrangements in the mainstream; e.g. lack of expertise. They consider more inclusive practice as unattainable. Their position in relation to the four discourses of rights, ethics, efficacy and pragmatics reflects majority interests. This supports Tomlinson's (op.cit) view that the education system in its dual form enables effective arrangements to be made for the majority of children in the mainstream through segregating some in special schools.

The perspectives of some officers are different, reflecting an approach based on rights, ethics and politics that promotes inclusion (p. 146). They are in favour of changing the dual system of special and mainstream education. However, their discourses include recognition of classroom pressures and the obstacles that may arise. This has implications for the LEA's policy of inclusion and how it is reflected in practice. Clark et al (op.cit) stress that consistent change exactly in line with either local or national policy is an illusion.

What are the experiences of recipients?

Chapter 6 details the experiences of parents and children as recipients of the education system. There is evidence of both satisfaction and frustration in the provision made (p. 151-55). The only difference is that, because of their smaller numbers, the wishes of parents with children in special schools, might be seen as a minority view even if all of them were to vote for mainstream education. The percentages segregated nationally and internationally, are not high compared with children in mainstream education. In Southampton, less than 1% of the school population is in special schools. Alternatively, if all responses were from this group, this
may seem like a majority vote. Responses from parents to the SEN review (SCC, 2001) suggest a balance in preferences for special and mainstream education. This is consistent with the literature, e.g. Cole (1989).

One of the key themes of chapter 6 relates to the experiences of children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Their circumstances are in contrast with any rhetoric claiming inclusion (see also Mittler, op.cit). Their rights to mainstream education, the ethics of resistance to their acceptance or inclusion lead to many questions, not fully explained by issues of efficacy or pragmatics. The language of education, the power exercised by professionals and the politics of practice all impinge on their circumstances. These support other findings which show differential responses to children's needs, e.g. Sleeter, op.cit.

Question 3: Is there any evidence of inclusive practice in Southampton?

Chapter 7 shows the extent of inclusive practice in two Southampton schools. It reveals the ambiguities which exist in schools in their search for more inclusive practice. They show the impracticality of obtaining absolute consistency at all times. Schools are in constant states of change and their policies are subject to inconsistencies in practice. Dyson and Millward (op.cit) have arrived at similar findings.

Chapter 7 illustrates some approaches to inclusion. There are many parallels in the literature, e.g. Alderson (op.cit). The case study schools show the care taken in ensuring that the curriculum is accessible to pupils. They show how schools can deal with rather than create learning difficulties (Clark, Dyson and Millward, 1998). At Hillside the barriers to physical access are overcome; at Milton, the curriculum is planned to address the needs of 'Maple' and other children experiencing learning difficulties. However, similar planning and problem solving is not so apparent in teacher discourses about children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Both headteachers express a sense of failure when a child has to be excluded. They claim that exclusions arise when strategies have been exhausted and the child fails to respond appropriately. On the
other hand, Janet (p. 186) states that she cannot show the same care and support to children 'who batter' teachers. Lesley expresses pride about the achievements of other children, e.g. the 'example of Jack is so lovely to see (p. 186). Chapter 7 does not explain why such ambiguities in inclusive practice are more likely to arise for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. This is a key issue discussed in relation to the theme of worth below.

**Question 4:** How can Southampton LEA progress its stated aim of promoting inclusion?
- What are the key themes arising from this study?
- How can the LEA take appropriate action to build on strengths and remedy weaknesses?

The following themes were selected as they arose directly from grounded theory methodology, being 'grounded in the data'. They were the most consistent themes, strongly supported by the evidence, thereby enhancing validity. They also linked directly with the issues identified as being fundamental to inclusion detailed in chapter 3. Clark, Millward and Dyson (1998) suggest that linking inclusion with a discussion of such issues is important.

1. **Raising Standards: Opportunity or Threat?**
2. **Values: Equality of Opportunity**
3. **Discourses and Inclusion**
4. **Power and Politics**

**Raising Standards: Opportunity or Threat?**

Chapters 2 and 3 highlight the conflicts between raising standards and inclusion, e.g. Clark et al (op.cit). If raising standards in schools is a national issue (DfEE, 1997), then additional tasks impinging upon this might be seen as burdensome. Education operates in a market economy; teachers' performances are evaluated through children's attainments. The issues of selection and de-selection (chapter 3) are relevant in that these
processes might be used to make teachers' tasks more manageable. How do these explain what is happening in schools?

Chapter 5 shows that standards on the whole, are rising in mainstream schools. However, chapters 6 and 7 document concerns in this area. Sally (p. 159) argues that there is 'no accolade in excelling at SEN'; feeling that the survival of schools depends on examination results. This makes it difficult to address other tasks such as responding to individual needs and to diversity, i.e. inclusion. Such views imply selection on the basis of criteria linked to attainments. If the performance indicator is based on examination results, children's abilities and potential for high attainments are likely to be welcomed as positive factors. Those requiring curriculum differentiation or behaviour management cause anxiety (p. 179-81).

Another issue relates to teachers' workload. Janet and Lesley feel that tasks have grown at a relentless pace (p. 188). Inclusion is seen to be an additional expectation and is resisted by some teachers. They see a role for special schools and for an inclusive system of schools. In educational terms, these translate into selection. The data explain how the forces of selection and de-selection work in schools competing in the market economy and how they are maintained by determinate structures, e.g. the power and politics of the LEA and the availability of special schools. The issues raised are how, in terms of ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics, it is the latter two which have the greatest impact on teachers in being most directly related to their work. Selection may be perceived as necessary if teachers are to achieve efficacy. The pragmatics of schools becoming more inclusive is questioned on grounds of capacity. The ethics and politics dimensions are viewed from the perspective of teachers' roles, i.e. to raise standards for the majority. Serving the interests of the majority implies de-selection and oppression of those left out. LEAs may need to consider the adequacy of current arrangements. Have special schools failed in these respects? If they have, why continue with de-selection from the mainstream? Addressing these questions involves circular arguments about inclusion. By developing inclusive systems of schools or by providing for an increased range of opportunities in the mainstream, LEAs may begin to
address these perceived injustices. This has been the approach for integration and could be attempted with inclusion (Hegarty, 1993). Raising the attainments of the majority of children is an old and longstanding challenge (Cole, 1989). Adding the SEN dimension to a task not yet completed, is making teachers feel more vulnerable, e.g. 'children at the margin', p. 187; p. 202. This illustrates the impact of the curriculum and how "the success of any truly inclusive initiative" (Clough and Corbett, op.cit; p. 21) might rest on this. It also offers support to theories focusing on how the curriculum can meet and create difficulties in learning (see chapter 3).

Values: Equality of Opportunity

Chapters 2 and 3 detail the theoretical considerations in this area. Equality of opportunity was selected amongst these as it was explicitly mentioned as one of Southampton's key values. What does the research reveal and explain in relation to these values?

The survey data, interviews and journal entries illustrate this issue. The latter highlighted a theme about the value or worth of children. A teacher who had been involved in admitting Sanchez also pointed it out (p. 148), by specifically raising the issue of worth. Responses to requests for children's admissions provided further evidence (see Appendix 12). Officers raised similar issues when discussing journal analyses. Thus emerged the concept of children's value or worth. Linking this with the LEA's own values helped explain many of the issues being researched, e.g. standards, selection and rights.

Special school placements show that attendance in the mainstream is not an automatic right in spite of the LEA's rhetoric on inclusion. If mainstream education was a right for all children as some inclusionists would argue, e.g. CSIE (1994; 1997); then this has not been achieved. Children do not have equal opportunities in this respect. Practices are variable and potentially discriminative, e.g. Adam would not have been entered for GCSE exams if he attended a special school; Sanchez and Julie's admission
were resisted. Other than children in special schools, pupils at risk of being denied equal opportunities to participate in the mainstream are those whose needs are in danger of being overlooked or those who have been excluded (Rosenthal and Jacobson (op.cit); Wallace (op.cit). The first group is referred to as 'children at the margin'. The second group is discussed in relation to the concept of worth.

*Children At The Margin*

Chapter 7 reveals concerns about children at risk of being overlooked and being unable to participate in learning. Janet (p. 187; p. 189) refers to them as "little Mary's" (see also Appendix 11). These children are at the margin, occupying positions between high and low achievers. In Southampton, this could be a high percentage; 37% of pupils in mainstream education at the lowest stage of the DfE's Code of Practice (p. 103). Classroom pressures and a focus on results risk distracting attention from them. Funding and legal pressures on meeting identified needs compound this, e.g. funds for Statements of SEN (see Marsh, op.cit).

Figure 8.1 illustrates these pressures on teachers and the risks of children at the margin not participating in learning with their mainstream peers. Those excluded altogether are in special schools and the illustration shows a clear break, with no links. Children in Box 1 are priorities and receive support as needed. Those in Box 2 run the risk of being left out, with patchy or no support. Those attending special schools have had all links severed but receive intensive support. Chapter 7 provides illustrations of the risks to children at the margin.

*Figure 8.1: Pressures on Mainstream Teachers in meeting the needs of children in the mainstream.*

1. Mainstream Children: 61% of school population in mainstream classes
   - raising attainments
   - whole class teaching & management, e.g. behaviour and differentiation.
   - meeting needs of majority
   - targeting bright and able children
   - Children with Statements of SEN
   - Children at Stages 2 to 3 of C.o.P
   - Support is provided where needed.

2. Children at the margin: 37% of school population in mainstream classes
   - Children at Stage 1 of C.o.P
   - Children who are not demanding of teacher attention and whose difficulties in learning remain unidentified.
   - Support here is patchy.

3. Children in Special Schools: 2% of school population
   - Support is intensive

Mainstream Pressures
There is an issue of equal opportunities in respect of these children. There are moral, ethical and practical dilemmas. In terms of rights, ethics, efficacy and pragmatics, the argument for their inclusion does not always apply, e.g. because of the risks to their education. However, mainstream education is, on the whole, considered to be more beneficial than special schooling (Dyson, op.cit). Inclusion also implies that no child should be 'at the margin'.

An 'inclusive meritocracy' about inclusion suggests a contradiction in terms. This refers to the ethical and moral forces 'pushing' for inclusion being 'pulled back' by those arising from issues of efficacy and pragmatics and deriving from expectations of academic attainments. Figure 8.2 is a push-pull illustration (see Carnall, op.cit) to depict this contradiction.

![Figure 8.2: Push-pull forces in relation to inclusion.](image)

Themes 1 and 2 above show the risks, i.e. if teachers are forced to concentrate on children they perceive to be deserving on merit, leaving out those who show no promise of returns. A moral dilemma arises if inclusion is resisted because the only valued outcome is measured in terms of academic returns. Children who may not meet these expectations include those at the margin. Southampton's SEN policy 'puts children first' and is child focused; inclusive meritocracies have to be addressed. Part of the answer might lie in the professional development and support of teachers. If teachers engage in limited curriculum differentiation (Udvari Solner and Thousand, op.cit), the risks are great. These risks increase if teacher capacities to manage in classrooms are exceeded, e.g. because of indiscipline. Issues of equal opportunities and injustices then arise.
The Concept of Worth

My summary of the history of inclusion shows the progress made, especially for education to be available to all children. This position has been reached in this country though this is not the case world-wide. Poverty, race and gender issues continue to cause concern (DFID, 2000) but the progress towards inclusion is recognised, e.g. Dyson and Millward (op.cit). Central government is emphasising the worth of all children; the expectation is that every child will be prepared for a productive contribution to society (DfEE, 2000). This implication of equal worth has to be balanced against the means to deliver the educational, social and economic agenda. The right to full time education for children excluded from school came into force in 2001 but there is still differentiation of such rights.

The literature shows the frustrations some parents experience in securing education for their children; "some teachers will not teach their children" (Florian and Rouse, op.cit). Issues are often about class organisation and control (Eason, op.cit); difficulties are also viewed as being within children, i.e. within psycho-medical paradigms. Responses differ depending on children's needs, e.g. Sleeter's (op.cit) normative and non-normative categories; teacher anxieties about 'mentally disabled children' (Bowman, op.cit). Explanations on how teachers construct notions of who they can and who they cannot teach are illuminating.

Chapters 6 and 7 show concerns about children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Some are perceived as not belonging; 'they have a right to full time education but not in the mainstream (p. 128); they batter teachers (p. 186), disrupt teaching plans (Sue, p. 179) and make them feel vulnerable (p. 181). Even schools aspiring to be inclusive find many of them too challenging (Hillside; p. 167; Milton, p. 181). The data show more favourable responses to others. Peter (p. 155) is considered to 'bring many benefits to schools'; in spite of his disability and lack of speech; staff say: 'We've learned a great deal from him.' His teacher was pleased that
she had been allocated additional support for him; this helps ‘provide for
Peter and benefits the whole class’.

Appendices 11 and 12 also show similar responses in respect of children
experiencing physical disabilities. These contrast markedly with responses
relating to children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties
(p. 148-51). Teachers seem willing to seek solutions for many children
experiencing a variety of needs. This does not apply to the same extent to
those who could be disruptive (p. 186).

These concerns were initially considered to be a reluctance to seek
solutions in respect of disruptive children as a consequence of classroom
pressures. Re-examination of journal entries led to a more powerful
perspective suggesting that such reluctance might be based on a perception
of worth. Subjecting this emerging theme to rigorous examination led to
further insights. Responses and critical appraisals were sought from
colleagues to re-examine the journal data. Do the data show children being
excluded because of teacher fears or is there another explanation, e.g. open
discrimination, teacher selectivity? What does it say about values? Worth
was not mentioned. Some of the data, e.g. the experiences of Sanchez and
Julie (p. 148), had previously been interpreted as indicative of oppression.
Further analysis showed that there were also issues of worth; this was
judged on whether children added 'value to' or disrupted teachers' plans.
Attempts to identify people's values clarified issues of individual worth,
identifying a key theme. There are other examples in the literature, e.g.
Pilgrim (op.cit) on "bad" and "sick" children; Dyson and Millward (op.cit)
on the "deserving" and "undeserving needy". Teachers were constructing
notions of worth in their judgments and responses to the types of children's
needs they were expected to meet. Appendices 11 and 12 illustrate some of
the differential responses made in respect of children. Two 'types' of
children emerge from the data:

1. Worthy children, i.e. those experiencing normative difficulties; e.g.
   arising from physical or sensory difficulties (see Sleeter, op.cit and chapters
   6 and 7).
2. Less worthy children, i.e. those whose behaviour and difficulties, make them less likely to add value to the school, and who make life difficult in their communities (chapter 6).

Teachers do not consciously categorise in this way and their perceptions are likely to be affected by the pressures they face. Nevertheless, responses risk being influenced by such notions of worth, given the conflicting expectations on teachers and pupils.

The concept of worth captures some of the issues that children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties pose to education. The rights, ethics, political and pragmatics discourses provide insights, especially on how teachers deal with all elements for all children. Following Dyson’s recommendation to use these discourses to interrogate the circumstances of target groups was revealing. Discourses about children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties were very different from those experiencing physical difficulties (e.g. see Appendix 11, p. 138; p. 150-1; p. 190). There were conflicts about meeting the needs of all children and dealing with the few who disrupt or who experience difficulties in learning (chapters 6 and 7; Appendix 11). These shaped discourses, the theme being about how teachers face up to inclusion; they viewed this to be achievable with some children only. Milton staff had confirmed this. Discussions with the EOs, SENCO and special school headteachers added support to this theme of worth. It could be argued that if teachers dedicate time to an activity, they are likely to evaluate the opportunity costs and outcomes. Some children will give them more confidence of returns. This may lead to children being perceived as having worth against pre-determined educational measures, especially within a competitive climate.

Teachers’ greatest anxiety appears to be about managing difficult behaviour; this has a direct impact on their efficiency. Educational achievements are the success indicators they are judged against. These do not emphasise the extent to which they are helping children to overcome learning difficulties or improve their behaviour. Teachers may view some children as being more worthy, especially those likely to attain high
academic outcomes. This would boost teacher confidence and lead to public recognition of their performance. Other children whom teachers see as worthy will be those who co-operate, enabling the operation of conducive learning environments.

Children with "normative difficulties" (Sleeter, op.cit) also fall into this category, especially if teacher stress and workload are not increased and there are staff benefits (Appendix 11). "Less worthy" children are those who disrupt classrooms, interfering with the task of raising standards. Educational, social, political and personal outcomes may be clouded, if not diminished in teachers' views, if children disrupt lessons. The concept of worth is helpful in explaining the perspective of teachers on children with whom they are likely to be the most or the least effective.

This shows how some children may be viewed in relation to dimensions within and beyond schools. Who measures worth; teachers, parents, other children or politicians? Their perspectives within an agenda of national and economic survival and prosperity are crucial. The construct of emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD) is well established; see Galloway (1994), for instance. As Galloway (op.cit) claims, it has outlived its value. Worth is another concept that integrates the modern elements and realities of the classroom. The pressures of the curriculum, the focus on educational attainments, teacher stress and their workload, are issues which influence how children's qualities may come to be differentiated by teachers. What is the worth of having a particular child in a class, for the teacher, the other children and the school? What would parents and other stakeholders think? These are important questions, broadening the construct of EBD by looking at the environmental context. The research unravels consequences which might arise; e.g. the press, risk of parent deputations and the issues surrounding behaviour (p. 182).

Discourses and Inclusion

Chapters 2 and 3 provide a review of some of the literature on inclusion and include a theoretical framework based on a model proposed by Dyson
This examines how ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics issues are constructed in relation to inclusion. This was also used in coding, classification and interpretation of the data. The themes arising from the discourses of professionals and parents are given below.

**Professional Discourses**

Chapter 5 illustrates some of the administrative procedures in education; e.g. the way in which LEAs work and maintain records. Chapters 6 and 7 illustrate a range of discourses. Whilst there are discourses promoting inclusion, some express the view that children who experience difficulties in learning have a deficit requiring remediation through specialised approaches not ordinarily available in mainstream schools (chapter 6; p. 132). The literature on the influences of the curriculum supports this view (Clough and Corbett, op.cit; Ainscow, 1999). This is reinforced by legislation (1996 Education Act) and by the DfEE's Code of Practice (DfE, op.cit).

Many Southampton stakeholders subscribe to medical models, i.e. about deficits and disabilities (Bill and Judy, p. 132; Derek, p. 158; see also Ballard (1999) and Billington, McNally and McNally, op.cit). They are concerned that children are falling behind their peers and becoming isolated. They believe that special schools represent a solution. However, this risks isolating children even more by taking them away from their mainstream peers with no guarantee that they will improve in their attainments or that they will return to their mainstream schools. Imran's example in chapter 6 shows the potential for such risks.

Teacher discourses centre around advocacy, particularly to safeguard the needs of the majority of children (Janet, chapter 6). These discourses give rise to debates about equity and equal opportunities, especially when concerns exist about those who are likely to be disruptive (Sanchez, Julie and Dwight, p. 148). There are beliefs about disability ranging from medical and charity discourses to those which disadvantage some children (chapters 6 and 7; see also chapter 2). Such discourses are reflected in the
labelling and categorisation of children's difficulties in learning; they also translate into different outcomes (table 5.4; p. 108). Their logic and validity are rarely questioned (p. 134).

The funding data in chapter 5 show how LEAs and its professional practitioners classify and fund children's learning difficulties according to their perceived severity and complexity. This risks rewarding failure as funding is allocated in inverse proportion to children's progress, i.e. if children's needs become less severe, their funding allocation also reduces. These practices are within the psycho-medical paradigm. They contrast with the discourses of officers promoting inclusion. Tomlinson (op.cit) argues that such practices are entrenched and that vested interests have to be abandoned if they are to become inclusive. This would threaten the rationale and 'raison detre' of some professions (Troyna and Vincent, op.cit).

Parents' Perspectives

Chapter 6 shows the influences and experiences of parents and how these relate to inclusion. Mrs Bull and those parents attending the LEA's consultation on its SEN review, hold unequivocal positions. They support special schools. Others believe that special schools have no roles and are equally strong in their expression of the injustices and oppression they feel they have experienced, e.g. The Grants; guests at Inclusion Festival. They provide clear illustrations of conflicting, potent and irreconcilable forces surrounding inclusion.

These explain the political contexts in which LEAs operate. If they wish to promote inclusion, LEAs can either take drastic action like Newham, in which case, political support will be crucial (Jordan, 1996). Or they could gradually make changes in schools; the process will be piecemeal but some parents may be more likely to accept this. The inability of mainstream schools to be fully inclusive forces choices for segregation, denying rights (p. 153-4). Where children are at risk of exclusion from the mainstream, this also highlights the potential for oppression (p. 153-4). The task that
emerges is about changing attitudes so that parents may have more credibility about the provision they are being offered. The advice and guidance they receive from professionals will be crucial, e.g. Mrs Smith, p. 176.

**Power and Politics**

Governments exercise power over the activities of schools. Successive U.K. governments have tightened their control of education since the 1980s (O’Hanlon, 1993). Whilst inclusion is promoted, higher values are placed on children capable of high levels of attainments (Cole, 2000). This is one way of differentiating by economic value in terms of children's potential and their contribution to national prosperity. This promotes selection, segregation and competition (Rieser, 2000). The publication of league tables is a means of communicating political values and agendas. The naming and shaming of schools and LEAs represents uses of power, focusing on narrow measures which determine league positions.

Inclusion has not been fully embraced by the UK government in spite of its declared commitment to the Salamanca Statement (DfEE, 1997). It makes clear the role of special schools and reinforces the rhetoric of parental choice; where parents express a preference for a special school, their wishes should be met unless there are compelling reasons not to do so. Although inclusion is a fundamental human right for children, it will be for their parents to decide on their placements. Chapter 2 detailed the perspectives of parents on inclusion. How are the politics of power explained in the Southampton context?

Chapter 5 shows the LEA's political commitment to special schools. It is implementing the government's agenda to raise standards. Its systems and processes reflect the political forces impinging on its work. They also show the roles and influences of professionals. What is not explained is how these political forces will need to change if the LEA's policy of inclusion is to be progressed.
Chapters 2 and 3 summarise a selection of the literature supporting the view that inclusion is a matter of fundamental human right. All children have a right to education but many miss out. What does this research show?

This study suggests that inclusion is perceived by many to be a privilege reserved for those children who can gain from mainstream education. Not all children are seen as having an automatic right to attend the mainstream (p. 128; p. 130). Appendix 12 details some of the tensions that arise when a child's right to learn conflicts with the interests of his or her peers.

Education law protects these majority interests by imposing conditions for inclusion. These conditions contradict with human rights and disability legislation, including the 1989 and 1993 UN conventions. They allow for budgetary and other factors to be considered so that assessments of rights are tempered by financial and other circumstances, i.e. efficacy and pragmatics may be given precedence over rights. For example, the placements at Bluebell reflect the consequences of capital and practice shortfalls. There are also other anomalies. SEN funding systems may provide more resources to some children at the expense of others; e.g. those excluded compared with those attracting significant additional funding in the mainstream or those placed at independent schools (chapter 5). Limited resources have an impact on inclusion forcing LEAs and schools to decide on priorities, sometimes leading to unequal funding. This could lead to unequal recognition of rights as some duties have to be discharged by law and are therefore priorities whilst others are not so pressing. Examples might be children with Statements of SEN in schools and those outside the system, having been excluded altogether. To what extent does such visibility or invisibility affect rights?

There is another element to the human rights issue. This relates to the rights of all children to learn without any disruption. However, this principle of all children's entitlement to learning ceases to apply when some are excluded because they cannot help but disrupt. If factors beyond the child
are considered in relation to potential for learning or disruption (see model on page 13), it seems equitable for these to be also taken into account when a child's right to learn with their peers is removed. No child would deliberately want to disrupt their own learning, so the locus of control is also important. These are all issues leading to disparate responses because of the diversity of the classroom. It is this very diversity that makes the resolution of the above issue complicated. Arguments about the rights of the majority may conflict with human rights, i.e. of all children. A focus on disruption risks conceptualising some children as being different. Inclusion is about all the factors that might influence the learning process.

*How Can the LEA take appropriate action to build on strengths and remedy weaknesses?*

This question relates to the recommendations that can be made from this study for the LEA's consideration. The following section deals with these, linking them with the key findings. It includes a brief discussion of the LEA's role and concludes with a summary of recommendations. LEAs have key strategic and operational functions that impact on the way schools work; e.g. the way they are funded or the policies and practices that are promoted in relation to inclusion.

In terms of strategy, Southampton has a role in reconciling the conflicting forces that are likely to arise in its pursuit of inclusion. Although its SEN policy summarises its inclusive aims, it has not yet formulated an action plan that details its priorities, the roles expected of special and mainstream schools or the resources to be allocated to promote inclusion. These need to be articulated and a timescale specified so that its stakeholders can take informed action to influence the LEA's plans. Inclusion has an impact on the whole community and the collaboration of key services, e.g. health and social services, will be important to ensure a co-ordinated and coherent approach. As the headteacher (p. 137) claims, social services' policy of closing children's homes has had an impact on the children he makes provision for; schools should not "be the end of the line".
Chapter 5 shows that the groundwork for integration is firmly set in Southampton. However, as far as inclusion is concerned, teachers within such a compact area feel unable to include all children. Some request specialisms as a result of previous circumstances and history (SENCO, p. 128).

The LEA might therefore consider the development of “resourced schools” to cater for specific difficulties, resources permitting. This may be particularly appropriate for children experiencing physical difficulties, e.g. by allowing the LEA to follow a strategic programme of access improvements. It may also enable schools time and resources to develop the necessary expertise so that children can have a range of options within an inclusive system of mainstream schools. Whilst this still does not mean children being able to attend their local school, it is one way of enabling them to stay in mainstream education. Shortfalls in provision may also be examined, e.g. for “total communication” and special care facilities. This would help the LEA work towards its ideal of inclusion over a period of time.

Southampton should consider reviewing its policies and practices, particularly in respect of funding schools through the SEN Audit and by checking that spending on the earlier stages represents value for money (chapter 5, p. 108-110). There may be potential to re-distribute SEN expenditure, specifically in relation to special school placements. There is evidence to support this change; use of SEN resources at Hillside and Milton demonstrate value for money (p. 169 and p. 183). The process of SEN classification also promotes labelling and other practices within the psycho-medical paradigm which work against inclusion. The quality of the provision schools make for different varieties of difficulties in learning could also be examined to determine why there are differences between them. Southampton should explore ways of increasing schools' abilities to include more children and to enable those segregated to make successful returns, given current levels of investment. This applies particularly to children experiencing moderate learning difficulties who represent such a large proportion of the special school population. Officers suggest a need to
build in the processes and infra-structures for staff to be supported in
promoting inclusion; e.g. training programmes; monitoring and inspection.

Behaviour management is a significant area of teacher concern in
Southampton (chapters 6 and 7; Appendices 11 and 12) and nationally
(chapter 2). The LEA offers the inclusion project and outreach services to
mainstream schools to help with the management of learning and
behaviour. These could be expanded. The LEA might also consider
providing support in classrooms such as extra resources to manage crises;
e.g. specialist behaviour support teams. The success of the LEA's drive to
reduce disciplinary exclusions (p. 120) implies that teachers are dealing
with children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties who
previously would have been out of school. The LEA should explore how
best to support them with this task.

Special school staff may also require support to provide outreach services
and to develop new roles if their schools are to become resource centres
(DfEE, 1997). This is likely to require sensitive and insightful
management. Some special headteachers wonder if the LEA has an agenda
on closing their schools. Given the success of many special school
initiatives, e.g. part time integration of some children in mainstream
schools, these could be explored further to provide opportunities for those
who may be completely excluded from the mainstream.

Teachers are requesting training on curriculum differentiation and on
managing learning in the classroom, raising issues of professional
development and support. These may reduce the need for children
experiencing learning difficulties to require special placements and the risk
of some not participating in mainstream classes. Teachers will also require
the incentive and motivation to promote inclusive practice. The strategies
that worked at Hillside and Milton schools were to gain their confidence
and to provide them with resources and support, e.g. LSAs in each class at
Hillside; administrative support at Milton.
Three main areas emerge in respect of training. The first relates to differentiation of the curriculum; this is viewed as necessary as many children are deemed to be beyond the competence of mainstream teachers. This illustrates the impact of the curriculum and the concerns about curriculum access and the standards agenda.

The second relates to classroom management. This is about having the resources and skills necessary to promote learning in class. The teachers who said they were committed to inclusion saw these as necessary (p. 135). Officers also considered these important. The third is about behaviour management. This is to help teachers deal with children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Some teachers and officers have found Southampton's projects on emotional literacy and anger management helpful and are asking for increased investments in these (Sharp and Herrick, 2000; p. 113). Teachers at Hillside advocate the promotion of positive attitudes, leading to a sense of belonging and community; in their words, "the welcome that lasts forever". The question is whether training can promote this. Ainscow (1999) argues that developing the right attitudes and cultures is fundamental to the re-structuring of schools for inclusion.

Finally, inclusion costs money. Whilst a dual system of education operates, funds will be required to support new initiatives. In the medium to long term, this could reduce overall costs whilst improving the quality of education provision. Capital investments will also be required if some children's circumstances are to be addressed, e.g. Bluebell. £11 million are spent in special schools; as numbers fall, resources could be re-directed towards supporting mainstream schools further; e.g. improving access, staffing and other resources.
Summary of Recommendations for Southampton LEA

Southampton faces a number of tasks if it is to promote inclusion. At the strategic level, it needs to confirm its policy on inclusion, detailing its aims and its expectations of how key stakeholders can work together to turn these into reality. This will help to influence practice in schools with the LEA taking the lead on an agreed way forward, providing the foundations from which inclusive practice can develop.

It will need to deal strategically with issues arising from SEN and 'Disability' legislation; e.g. in terms of school access and disability discrimination and in ensuring that a range of facilities exist to meet the needs of all children in the city. Chapter 5 shows the nature of the task to be addressed; chapters 6 to 8 detail the range of stakeholder perspectives that will require reconciling and the practices that are prevalent.

At the operational level, Southampton will need to address issues of equality and inequality, e.g. with regard to the needs of children whose perceived worth may be affected because of reasons of disruptive behaviour or lack of potential for high attainments. The risks to the learning of children 'at the margin' will also require addressing through careful inspection and quality assurance measures in schools aimed at ensuring effective curriculum differentiation and children's participation in learning. The LEA has a role in championing children's rights and educational entitlements and the responsibility of ensuring that teachers and other education providers can deliver services of high quality and of a nature that can promote inclusion. Roles of advocacy must therefore be supplemented with resources, training and other initiatives that support the professional work and development of teachers.

The findings show that Southampton is achieving its aim of becoming a more inclusive LEA. They also show that such success is not achieved without costs. The pressures on mainstream teachers should not be underestimated nor should the dilemmas faced by special school staff be ignored.
The LEA has a role in facilitating the recruitment and retention of staff and the development of schools in order to raise standards and promote inclusion. Southampton stakeholders are confirming that they have mixed feelings towards inclusion. Future planning needs to take these into account. The LEA also has a key role with schools to ensure a consistency of approach in working towards inclusion. Changing attitudes and cultures will be an important task.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Sieber (op.cit) suggests that researchers owe a debt to their participants and that their research should have purpose, direction and a potential to benefit those who take part. It should advance knowledge and practice; in this case the understanding, development and promotion of inclusion in Southampton. It raises awareness of participants, challenging assumptions and expectations; e.g. in relation to equity and social justice. It illustrates the tension between power and politics, e.g. the standards agenda and the issue of behaviour.

I have learned about the issues that inclusion brings to an LEA's agenda; e.g. how it is influenced by history and local circumstances, in Dyson's (op.cit) words, an LEA's determinate structures. The Southampton context shows change towards inclusive practice to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Schools are at different stages of developing practice which further research might illuminate; e.g. Mrs. Clark's comparison of Milton with another Southampton school (p. 184). Another lesson has been about the ambiguities that can be expected in the progress of schools; if an initiative does not have the full and undivided support of stakeholders, this is inevitable. Inclusion, however morally desirable, does not seem to have achieved a state where all practitioners wish to promote it in busy classrooms and schools.
This study supports the theories of special education and inclusion summarised in chapter 3. It illustrates how participants construct special education or inclusion in a range of discourses. Psycho-medical paradigms are particularly evident at the level of LEA practice. Social disability discourses are expressed mainly by parents and 'disabled' individuals though also by officers and teachers; e.g. Phil in particular. Curriculum theories find support in the discourses of teachers on curriculum differentiation and the issue of standards. Links are also made between inclusion and issues that are fundamental to its implementation, i.e. selection, equality of opportunity and politics.

Applying the findings to other contexts

The literature review in chapter 2 illustrates the national and international position in relation to inclusion. Southampton, like many LEAs, has 'determinate' (Clark et al, op.cit) structures and systems for special education. Given that the national agenda is the same for all English LEAs, some of the data provided on Southampton and its 'statistical neighbours' can serve to assist with comparisons, including their location within a national and international context. Though caution has to be exercised, the statistical similarities between LEAs may be viewed as the starting points of other studies. If researchers are satisfied that they have met the burden of proof in terms of transferability to their own situations, their studies can be informed by the similarities and differences that apply and the insights revealed. As the literature on qualitative research suggests, that burden of proof on transferability rests with the reader, i.e. the researcher contemplating transferability to their own contexts and circumstances (e.g. Denzin and Lincoln, 1998b; Lincoln and Guba, op.cit).

Question 1 reveals the nature of the task if Southampton is to include more children in the mainstream. Data on disciplinary exclusions and on special school placements show the range of activity that is needed in other LEAs (CSIE (1997); see also Appendix 10). Few have closed down special schools. All would, however, need to look beyond the rhetoric to appreciate the realities inclusive practice raises. Some questions need to be addressed.
Have mainstream schools reached a ceiling in terms of the numbers of children to include? Will a greater percentage of children in the mainstream be able to have their needs met? Are teachers able and willing to carry out this task? Chapter 6 suggests that this is not yet the case. Other LEAs will therefore need to ask similar questions, once they have assessed their starting positions. They may look to some of Southampton's initiatives, e.g. outreach from special schools and the LEA's inclusion project. They may also compare their funding practices to see if there are better ways to promote inclusion.

The tasks for all LEAs will be to ensure that issues of rights, ethics, politics, efficacy and pragmatics are addressed in relation to inclusion. Southampton is not following the example of Newham in the 1990s in closing down special schools (Jordan, 1992; 1996); any recognition that mainstream schools are not ready to include all children would rule against this. The risks of closing down special schools without guarantees that mainstream schools could cope are too great; doing so, would be political folly. Other LEAs would need to make their own assessments.

Southampton stakeholders are divided in their support for special schools. The desirability or superiority of special schooling (an ethics discourse) is not challenged sufficiently. Nor are there overwhelming cries of oppression or injustice, except from a few whose voices do not carry sufficient weight for change (a political discourse). The political discourse therefore supports a dual system of education. The efficacy discourse is also not expressed in policy, no decisions have been made to re-direct resources from special to mainstream schools unless vacancies arise in the former. However, until there is acceptance that mainstream schools can be inclusive (a pragmatics discourse), the current pattern continues. The literature suggests similar forces and issues in other LEAs, e.g. DfEE annual statistical reports; Jenkinson (1997); Ballard (1999); Armstrong and Barton (op.cit). LEAs provide special schools and fund SEN in similar ways to Southampton {CSIE (1994); (1997); Marsh (op.cit)}. 
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This study highlights the circumstances of particular target groups whose inclusion is resisted in schools, i.e. less worthy children. These target groups are unlikely to be different elsewhere if the issues causing concern to teachers and others are the same. The literature clearly depicts the circumstances of such target groups at risk of being oppressed or marginalised (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit; Barton, 1989); in other words, these circumstances apply beyond Southampton. Therefore, there are lessons that could be learned from the Southampton context, especially the way these could be compared with another LEA and further tested against existing theoretical discourses on inclusion. I have used such a framework; other studies could build on this.

The sample of Southampton stakeholders constitutes a large group. The literature shows that their mixed responses to inclusion are predictable; there is no consensus amongst parents and other education stakeholders in wanting inclusion. The consequence of this would have been reflected differently in practice. No country has reached a position of full inclusion (Pijl and Meijer, op.cit; Helgeland, op.cit). The only consensus that might therefore be reached is that there needs to be significant changes if the inclusion of all children is to become a reality nationally or internationally.

Chapter 6 shows how the issues of rights, ethics, efficacy and politics are interpreted from the perspectives of education providers and how these differ from those of recipients. This is consistent with the literature evidence, e.g. reports of successful and failed examples of inclusion (Sebba and Sachdev, op.cit; Jenkinson, op.cit). Other LEAs will need to judge the extent to which some of these perspectives might apply to their own stakeholders and to determine the key issues for them. In Southampton, the dominant issues are about raising standards, managing behaviour and the pressures on schools. The literature suggests that these are as applicable to other contexts (DfEE, 1997). Given the legal framework relating to these issues, their implications are the same calling for comparable measures to address them.
Furthermore, the case studies of inclusive practice may have wider applications. These illustrate practices of inclusion. There are sufficient details for other researchers to question and if possible, extract elements of good practice. Comparisons and contrasts may be made with other studies, e.g. Thomas' (op.cit), Alderson's (op.cit) or Dyson and Millward's (op.cit) study of inclusive schools. The issue Southampton faces in translating its policy into practice may not be different in other contexts. Indeed, existing studies of inclusion would support the view that all LEAs are likely to face ambiguity in their search for inclusion, in the sense that their policies might be re-interpreted in the context of their schools and by the teachers who have to deliver inclusion first hand. It would be surprising if this was not the case, in which event the distinctive characteristics of LEAs which have overcome such ambiguities and succeeded in being completely inclusive will have been known about already and well publicised.

The recommendations arising from the study clarify the role an LEA has in promoting inclusion. Key themes were derived from grounded theory methodology and were grounded in data that had been rigorously analysed and tested against a theoretical framework. These should increase credibility in wider applications of the Southampton findings.

If, in the unlikely event that Southampton was an atypical LEA, this would have been identified, given the frameworks already in place to evaluate the work of LEAs; e.g. Audit Commission and OFSTED inspections. Kemmis (1980) suggests that understanding the general can be enhanced by studying the atypical. Whatever arises out of the Southampton context that might appear to be atypical, might be usefully applied to illustrate either what is possible or should be avoided by other LEAs. These are unlikely to relate to other than minor differences in practice for the reasons already given about LEAs' circumstances and statutory functions being similar. Such minor differences might be for instance, Southampton's outreach services or funding practices. However, their analyses might reveal potential or barriers to avoid in other LEA's searches to become more inclusive.
Finally, by locating my findings within a theoretical framework of ethics, politics efficacy and pragmatics, this enables their translatability in other contexts. The rationale and realisation discourses integrate Southampton's findings and enable theoretical generalisation even if empirical generalisation is not attainable. Southampton shows a mixed picture in relation to discourses on inclusion. It illustrates how the rationale discourse is influenced by that of realisation. If the two were the same then progress towards realisation would have been quicker. The forces of politics, the pressures and constraints on schools and the needs of children interact in conflicting ways, making for a complex relationship that slows down progress or change. Newham may have shown how with political support the rationale and realisation of inclusion can be promoted but there may be underlying issues and tensions which continue in the way they do in Southampton and elsewhere, e.g. the circumstances of children excluded from schools, teacher stress and the standards agenda.

I have found no evidence that the rationale and realisation discourses on inclusion are in direct conflict with each other. Southampton stakeholders repeatedly confirm their moral commitment to inclusion; irrespective of how they frame this, rationale is not the issue. Their concern is with realisation, i.e. how to include even more children. The implication of increasing inclusion by itself suggests that they see realisation not to be in conflict with the rationale for it. This may start answering the question as to whether or not there are opposite poles between realisation and inclusion (see Dyson, op.cit; Paul and Ward, 1996). Examining national and international data on inclusion with regard to school placements, suggests that because LEAs, like Southampton, are striving to include more children, they are working within a continuum, i.e. increasing mainstream placements whilst continuing with special schools albeit reducing their numbers. Such issues can be explored further.

Chapter 4 (pages 95-97) detailed some of the methodological issues in this study and how they were addressed. The findings highlight a number of issues for the LEA to address, particularly in relation to its strategic roles and functions on promoting inclusion. Improvements in future research
may be achieved through in-depth interviews of systematic and representative samples of teachers and children. First hand data, derived from direct interviews with children in a variety of schools would be particularly useful to illustrate their perspectives in greater depth, focusing on their experiences and discourses. Case studies of schools which are either more or less inclusive than Milton or Hillside may also clarify the factors that have an influence on inclusion. Moreover, longitudinal studies may track children's progress in mainstream and special schools and examine their career options and life chances in relation to their school history, i.e. whether they became segregated or were always included.

CONCLUSIONS

Inclusion is essentially a moral and political dilemma even though it is now established as a matter of fundamental human right (Mittler, op.cit). Like education, it is a moral undertaking (Armstrong, Armstrong and Barton, op.cit). It starts with schools acting as inclusive communities, promoting the valuing of diversity and difference. It is about all children participating in learning confirming the key roles of teachers and other stakeholders in this process. The notion that mainstream schools can provide for a whole diversity of pupils is currently questioned; abandoning a range and variety of schools adds to the complexity of the task. It is not surprising that responses to inclusion are mixed and that the issue for LEAs is whether or not to dismantle an established dual system of mainstream and special education. The most powerful forces derive from key stakeholders; they represent the power and politics inherent in LEAs (Jordan, 1992; 1996). Inclusion will ultimately derive from these key forces and legislation coupled with changes in politics will also have an influence. Southampton's challenge is to ensure that its aspirations to be inclusive are realised in a manner that safeguards the interests of its education recipients.
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APPENDIX 1

SOUTHAMPTON LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

Introduction
Southampton City Council became a local education authority upon gaining unitary status in April 1997, following Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). Previously all education services were the responsibility of Hampshire County Council. Southampton was in one of 4 Divisions, known as South West Hampshire, incorporating the New Forest. A number of special schools and other provision were in place prior to LGR, as were budgetary arrangements for supporting children experiencing learning difficulties both within and beyond mainstream schools. There was a range of established policies and practices which Southampton has adopted, e.g. SEN Audit, All Our Children.

The city has a population of over 200,000 citizens, of whom 30,931 are of school age. In December 1997, 2.8% of this population had been issued with a Statement of SEN. Approximately 20% of the school age population were identified as experiencing learning difficulties according to data submitted by schools for the LEA's SEN audit. This audit is the principal mechanism for enhancing individual school budgets to meet the needs of children on their SEN Register. The SEN audit has been a significant refinement of the budgetary mechanism in the Hampshire Local Management of Schools (LMS) scheme. Southampton has adopted this mechanism and has commissioned Hampshire LEA to continue this activity on its behalf until 2001.

Schools
Southampton has 91 schools, 71 primary, 14 secondary and 6 special. There are 2 special schools for children experiencing moderate learning difficulties (MLD), 1 in each of the primary and secondary phases providing a total of 220 places. There are 2 schools for emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD); (one in each of the primary and secondary
phases providing a total of 86 places), a school for children experiencing physical difficulties (covering the age range 2 to 16, from nursery to Key Stage 4, providing 75 places) and a school for severe learning difficulties (covering the age range of 2 - 19, with post-16 provision located on the main site and in a separate off-site house in the community, 90 places). Southampton's provision also includes a number of resourced mainstream schools that support children in particular areas of learning. There are 2 primary schools with units attached to support children experiencing significant learning difficulties described within the LEA as MLD; an infant and a junior school with special resources for children experiencing a hearing impairment (HI); a mainstream based resource for children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties (that has historically dealt with Key Stage 2 only, but extended its range from April 1998 to include Key Stage 1 following developments initiated since LGR). There are 2 secondary schools, 1 has a resource for children experiencing HI but offering "oral" approaches to teaching only, without any facility for signing and total communication and another a secondary school resource for children experiencing specific learning difficulties with regard to literacy.

Review of SEN Provision

The LEA is currently reviewing its school provision in the following areas:

- Children experiencing EBD, in order to provide facilities to avoid out of city placements.
- Children experiencing hearing difficulties who require signing and total communication approaches so that they may have effective access to the curriculum.
- Reviewing previous practice with regard to the placement of children described as experiencing profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD).
- Multi-agency planning and collaboration with Health and Social Services departments in order to ensure the delivery of coherent and co-ordinated programmes of support and intervention.
School Places Review
The LEA is reviewing its school places in order to address surpluses and shortfalls in provision. This activity presents opportunities for inclusive education, especially since surpluses are already leading to schools volunteering for innovation and change. The expectation is for positive change and progress, within a supportive climate and framework where differences and diversity are valued and positive initiatives encouraged. The commitment is to support the learning of all children.

Southampton's Corporate Strategy
The LEA's corporate strategy is best described in the words of its Executive Director: "Even Better Schools". This implies recognition of the work schools are already doing and a continuous aim for further improvements. Within this key ambition are embedded drives to ensure:

- Equality and Entitlement
- Effective Behaviour Management
- Raising standards in educational achievements and
- Inclusion.

The LEA has had its Educational Development Plan and its Behaviour Support Plan approved by the DfEE. Inclusion is a significant feature of these plans, amongst other national government priorities. It is intended that there will be year on year reductions in the number of special school placements as mainstream schools increase their ability to become more inclusive.

Corporate Policy on Equal Opportunities
Documentation confirms that Southampton has a strong and clear corporate policy on Equal Opportunities. This has been in force for some time and underpins the City's commitment to ensuring equality of opportunity for all its citizens. This policy is strictly monitored and is carefully implemented, e.g. employment and interview procedures; positive action to increase representation of disabled people and minority groups in the workforce; policy monitoring.
New Southampton Proposals

Newer Southampton proposals and practices are as shown below.

1. Children's Services Development Plan.
   This is the local authority plan to provide for children to enable all children to live at home with their families and to attend their local schools. Both Education and Social services, as the local authority and "Corporate Parent", have signed up to this policy.

2. Including all Southampton children within City schools and provision.
   This does not mean all children attending their local mainstream schools. However, in aiming to arrange provision within the City boundaries for all children, this practice will have the effect of contracting the inclusive education-segregation continuum by removing the element of out of city placements which represent the more extreme form of segregation. The main effect is illustrated below, a contraction from position A to position B representing the whole spectrum of placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position A:</th>
<th>Mainstream → Resourced school → Mainstream Unit → Special School → residential/out of city placements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position B:</td>
<td>Mainstream → Resourced school → Mainstream Unit → Special School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since April 1997, 6 children have been returned to the City from out-city placements. A further 12 placements have been avoided through inter-city provision; indeed, only 2 out of city placement has been made since LGR. The current total is now 5, reduced from 19.

3. Improving the accessibility of Southampton schools through a corporate strategy.

4. Improving the physical accommodation and teaching staffing and facilities in its special schools.

5. Reviewing the mechanism of the SEN Audit for resourcing schools.

**Vision for the future**

Southampton’s Director of Education has a very clear vision for the City. He wishes it to be a City for Lifelong Learning; reflected in effective strategies achieved through quality assured policies and practices. This is a commitment shared by all of its senior LEA managers and by elected members.
APPENDIX 2
EFFECTS OF HAMPSHIRE’S “ALL OUR CHILDREN” POLICY.

This policy was agreed in April 1992, following consultation with parents, schools, Governors and politicians. The intention was to maintain children within the County through increasing school’s ability to respond to the diversity of children’s SEN. Placements in out county, residential schools were avoided unless there were exceptional reasons, which were that no suitable provision was available locally or that the nearest provision in Hampshire was not within reasonable travelling distance.

This policy coincided with the setting up of the Further Education Funding Council (FEFC). Hampshire made savings of £19 million by reducing its out county placements by 159 over a period of three years (from 1992 to 1995). These were passed on to mainstream schools to reduce the pressure on local special schools; a move which caused concern from special school staff. They considered that expectations on making local provision for a greater complexity and severity of needs had increased without any further resources to support them. The savings were achieved through specialist staff training, development of new specialist resources, e.g for autism; and language impairment and with post 16 placements becoming the responsibility of the FEFC. Table A2.1 below shows the reduction in Out county placements for the past 8 years. By 1997, these were reduced by a total of 410 placements.

Table A2.1: Reductions in Hampshire’s Out County Placements for the period 1990 to 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Post 16</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year on Year Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>143 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>116 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>59 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>59 (17.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-9 (3.2% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>14 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-15 (5.5% increase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3:
INFORMATION ON HAMPSHIRE’S SEN AUDIT.

Introduction
This is a system which was devised in Hampshire to identify and make provision for children experiencing learning and behavioural difficulties in mainstream schools. It is broadly based on the stages of the DfE’s Code of Practice for Children with SEN (DfE, 1994) and represents a stepped approach to funding, based on the level and severity of a child’s needs.

Schools make a submission every November and this is moderated by a group of officers, headteachers and other professional advisers. This is a rigorous process which takes 3 days to complete. Decisions are checked by independent parties and moderated with reference to written criteria. These determine the level of funding which are at 3 steps, each step carrying a specified amount of money. The intention was that the SEN Audit would enable schools to provide for children at the pre-statutory stages thereby obviating the need to seek support from the LEA. Since April 1996, the SEN Audit has been extended to provide for the needs of children at all stages of the Code of Practice if they had "high incidence needs".

High Incidence Needs:
High incidence needs is a category used for children experiencing learning, emotional, behavioural or specific learning difficulties. The budget for "high incidence needs" was delegated to mainstream schools so that they could provide for SEN without requiring the LEA to engage in complex administrative and statutory procedures. This became known as "Greater Delegation of Resources". Some £8million were allocated to mainstream schools in the county.

Low Incidence Needs:
The LEA retained the budget for children considered to have "low incidence needs". These were children who were experiencing (i) severe learning difficulties, including challenging behaviours; (ii) severe language
and communication disorders; (iii) difficulties defined as being on the continuum for autism or (iv) severe difficulties associated with a physical disability or sensory impairment.

The LEA decided the classification for this group of children but the main criteria were that the above would represent the primary difficulty which would be complex, severe and long term. Either of these needs on their own would merit the issue of a statement of SEN.

Low incidence needs attract funding from the LEA for children at Stage 5+ of the Code of Practice, i.e. at post statutory stages. This is an amount to provide for the identified needs less Step 3 funding as the children would also be receiving funding to this level from the SEN Audit.

Greater Delegation:
Southampton LEA has adopted this to reduce the need for statutory assessments and statements and provide greater flexibility for schools to be responsive to the needs of children.
APPENDIX 4

THE INCLUSION PROJECT

Introduction
This project has been reported in an LEA internal document and has not been published for public circulation. I have provided a summary below, based on documentary analysis. It was started as an LEA initiative in March 1994, piloted in the South West Division of Hampshire. It was initially funded by the LEA but was supported through grants from the DfEE from March 1996 onwards. It became one of 63 national pupil behaviour and discipline projects to be supported in this way. The project ran in 3 phases; Phase 1 in 95-96, Phase 2 in 96-97; with Phase 3 completed in 1998. Its aim was to enable students "at risk of permanent disciplinary exclusion" to remain at school by: (i) identifying who they were and (ii) working with students, parents and school staff to develop effective strategies to achieve that purpose.

The objectives were to reduce permanent disciplinary exclusions by implementing effective pastoral support for "at risk" students both at home and at school. Teaching and curriculum approaches were tailored to the needs of each "at risk" students. Other sub-objectives included developing the role of the Pupil Support Services, i.e. the Educational Psychology and Education Welfare Service (EWS), in school based intervention; exploring ways of multi-agency working; improving parent relationships with the school and monitoring and evaluating teaching methods. There was also a focus on developing the skills of staff in managing disaffected students, on implementing preventative strategies for EWS intervention as identified and on identifying ways of disseminating information about the project to the staff in Southampton schools. The sample comprised 12 students considered to be "at risk".

The project was based in two secondary schools on each side of the City. It was managed by a Senior Educational Psychologist and by a Steering Group comprising a Secondary Phase Inspector, an Educational Welfare Officer and lead members of school staff.
Results:
The following results were reported by the Project Managers:
Teacher ratings were measured by questionnaires at the beginning and end of each phase. These focused on students' behaviour and attainment. The categories used were whether (1) behaviour and (2) attainment was: Better; Same or Worse.
In school 1, out of 28 teachers completing the questionnaire, the responses were as follows:

Appendix 4: Table 1: School 1: Teacher Ratings (N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In school 2, out of 36 teachers, the responses were as follows:

Appendix 4: Table 2: School 2: Teacher Ratings (N = 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative data is based on a small sample but is included here in order to illustrate some of the results of the project. The summary below based on qualitative analyses, supplements these.

The project has been successful, particularly with year groups 7, 8 and 9. Parents, initially hostile, became very supportive. Although all students had difficulties or disadvantage in the home setting, only 2 were excluded. Placing all students, and especially Year 10/11, with staff who have effective classroom control was important; some staff could not cope. More flexibility was also needed in curriculum/staff support arrangements. Furthermore, there was need for "respite care" for teachers, and students in school. It was important to boost the self esteem of these students and to recognise the mental health issues which arose.
This project is clearly relevant to inclusive education. At its most basic, less exclusion logically means more inclusion.
APPENDIX 5
TRIAL INTEGRATION AND FULL INTEGRATION GRANTS

Trial and Full Integration Grants

These were fixed sums of money of £500 and £1200 respectively allocated to schools from the LEA's SEN Budget. The aim was to enable LEA special schools to return those children they considered to be ready, to the mainstream. Those fully ready, i.e. ready to make an immediate, full time transfer; would receive support in the form of full integration grants. Those for whom re-integration was more tentative, perhaps attending in the mainstream part time only were allocated trial integration grants.

The scheme was administered by the LEA in association with schools and the grants were intended to be incentives to mainstream schools to which they were directly allocated. The money was to be used to provide additional, usually non-teaching support to children. The process required was that there should have been a full Annual Review, including parents in attendance.

The take up was slow; during the year 1995-96, 3 allocations of full integration grants were made and only 1 trial integration grant. The reasons for this are not well understood but are considered to be related to the following:

- The incentives were too small.
- The population of special schools is considered to have increased in complexity so that there are very few children who could be returned and successfully supported with a fixed, time limited grant.
- The LEA's policy of integration remains to be implemented in respect of children in special schools returning to the mainstream.
- Mainstream schools do not consider themselves ready to accept nor do special schools feel able to return children to the mainstream.

Southampton is reviewing the position in the light of the DfEE's Green Paper (DfEE, 1997). Although in April 1997, there were only 5 grant allocations, this total had risen to 106 three years later.
### APPENDIX 6

**ACCESSIBILITY OF SOUTHAMPTON SCHOOLS**

Southampton Primary Schools:

Data available on 69 schools only. Total = 71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>73.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extent of Wheelchair Access to Teaching Accommodation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%age of Schools</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of schools with zero accessibility to teaching accommodation = 22 = 31.88%

**Wheelchair accessible washroom facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southampton Secondary Schools:

Data available on 12 LEA Schools only; 2 are Grant Maintained. Total = 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extent of Wheelchair Access to Teaching Accommodation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Accessibility</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of schools in range</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of schools with zero accessibility to teaching accommodation = 1 = 8.33%

**Wheelchair accessible washroom facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7
FOLLOW UP OF STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

A 7.0: Follow up of Issues arising from Structured Interviews:

A 7.0.1: Children experiencing PMLD:

- A number of respondents reported the inability of the local special school for children experiencing severe learning difficulties to provide for those who additionally experienced a profound physical or sensory disability. This is because of cramped conditions, very limited teaching space, steps and generally inaccessible areas in parts of the school. It has also been reinforced with the LEA's practice of placing these children elsewhere, either in a special care class in an alternative special school some five miles away or in an independent school catering for profound and multiple disabilities in the city. These placements were preferred because of their environmental sensitivity and because of the availability of all the Health provisions, particularly at the latter school. Health professionals also recommended these placements because of these facilities.

I found that 20 children are placed in special care facilities at a cost of £16,470.00 p.a. each, i.e. at a total of £329,400.00 p.a. These same placements cost £8,911 p.a. each if placed in local special schools as in other parts of the County, i.e. a total of £178,220. This would represent a saving of £151,180 p.a.

Respondents who mentioned this are concerned that the practice represents:

- increased segregation which is not entirely necessary as children who experience PMLD are integrated in their special schools outside of Southampton. Few of these other special schools have special care classes; therefore the question could be posed as to why the practice continues.

- questionable use of public resources; one year's savings would more than provide the additional facilities the children need to attend their special schools with high levels of support.
 Whilst the contribution of the special care facilities is in no way questioned since they provide a much valued and necessary service, respondents believe a review is required, especially following Local Government Re-organisation and the LEA is considering this.

A 7.0.2: Children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD):
The Headteacher of the local primary school catering for children described as experiencing EBD reported that 50% of the children on his school roll have been ready for re-integration into mainstream education. Their difficulties are not such as to warrant a special school placement. However, the headteacher is concerned that:

- local mainstream schools may not have the resources, staffing or expertise to ensure the continuing and successful development of the children. Their behaviour may deteriorate again if re-integration is not "properly planned and supported" with outreach work from his school. This is in spite of the fact that some mainstream schools are making successful provision for children experiencing similar difficulties.

Location/school circumstances/staffing/resources and ethos are the key issues which the headteacher is considering in order to determine whether or not some of his children should be returning to their local school community.

- the pressures on mainstream colleagues are inordinately high, with expectations continually increasing. There is no "let up", little room to manoeuvre so that unsurprisingly, mainstream colleagues are reluctant to take on what they perceive to be "yet another challenge". "Morale is at an all time low", teachers feeling "they are being fired at from all quarters" and very vulnerable. Training, both at initial teacher training and at post qualification stage is also totally inadequate. Too much emphasis is given on "curriculum matters"; very little, if any, is given to behaviour management. "Psychology and applied behaviour analysis seems to have disappeared completely from the teacher training curriculum".
A7.1: Participant Observation: Information from LEA working party on Hearing Impairment:

A 7.1.1: Children experiencing severe hearing impairment:
There appears to be two diametrically opposed schools of thought on whether or not these children should be included in mainstream education. The "deaf lobby" advocates segregation in their firm belief and conviction that deaf children have their own culture which should be valued and respected as an entity in its own right. They are totally opposed to any idea of severely hearing impaired children being taught with their peers in the mainstream as:

- their communication needs are so different, requiring as they do signing/total communication.
- manual communication methods conflict with any oral/aural approach.

The implications are:

- severely hearing impaired children should be in their own segregated community where they can promote their own culture and values which are different from those of the majority community.
- hearing impaired requiring different teaching approaches should not be together and must be kept away from each other if their education is not to be affected.

The challenge for inclusive education will be considerable when addressing the needs of severely hearing impaired children.
LEA Officers:

Inclusion is one of the priorities in the Government’s Green Paper. It is defined as enabling all children to attend their local school.

1. What are your views on inclusion?
2. Do you think that inclusion is the same thing as integration? If so, why?
   If not, why not?
3. Have you seen examples of inclusion in practice?
4. If yes, how successful was this?
5. If the inclusion you have seen was not working, what could have been the reasons?
6. Based on your experience of good practice, what do you consider to be:
   the essential requirements for inclusion?
   desirable?
7. How would you evaluate the benefits or otherwise of inclusion?
8. What is the extent to which inclusion is practised in Southampton schools?
9. How could Southampton LEA implement a policy of inclusion?
10. What should the LEA take particular care with in respect of the implementation of such a policy?
### APPENDIX 9

**MAJOR HISTORICAL MILESTONES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

Figure A 9.1 below presents a timeline, summarising the key milestones in special education which are relevant to inclusion.

*Figure A 9.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>First institution for the Deaf: Academy for the Deaf and Dumb founded in Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>First school for the blind in Liverpool; training in music and manual crafts; no education given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>First school for the blind to offer education; Yorkshire School for the Blind set out to teach reading, writing and arithmetic as part of vocational training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Workhouses; asylums for idiots for &quot;mentally defective children&quot; in Highgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>First educational provision for physically disabled; &quot;Cripples Home &amp; Industrial School for Girls&quot; set out to teach a trade, including very basic, rudimentary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>First Home for Physically Disabled Boys in Kensington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Five asylums established for &quot;mentally defective children&quot;; three purport to offer education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Foster Education Act- school boards to provide elementary education, not specifically &quot;disabled children&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>London School Board- class for the &quot;deaf&quot; in public elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Scotland: Blind children taught in ordinary schools (years after passing Education (Scotland) Act).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>London Board: Blind children taught in elementary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>London School Board-14 centres for the deaf attached to ordinary schools, 373 children on roll. 23 centres for the blind attached to ordinary schools, 133 children on roll; some teachers themselves blind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Leicester School Board: special class for &quot;feebleminded&quot; children. London Board: School for special instruction of &quot;physically and mentally defective children&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Growth of special schools- 24 schools for &quot;defective children&quot; in London; other boards follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Committee on Defective &amp; Epileptic Children to differentiate between those who could be taught in ordinary schools and those who could not. Recommended that physically disabled children of normal intelligence should be taught in ordinary schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 10:


Table A10.1: Permanent Exclusions as a Percentage of School Population in 1997-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>% age of School Population</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>% age of School Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 11

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEW OF SEN POLICY (SEP), SEN REVIEW (SER) AND JOURNAL ENTRIES (JE)

Issue of Disruption:

I could not ask my staff to do any more. Raise standards? Manage behaviour? Attract parents to our school? When will this government understand we are exhausted.

(Headteacher, Secondary) (JD).

I am constantly being asked to have some children in my room [...] some of them are simply out of control. Teachers cannot teach and have them in their class [...] too disruptive. They present an unacceptable risk to the learning and safety of other pupils.

(Headteacher, Primary School) (JD).

We are having to keep too many children in the mainstream. Southampton’s No Exclusion Policy is not realistic [...] we suffer the consequences.

[Head and SENCO, Primary School]. (SER)

We must retain the sanction of permanent exclusions. Schools must be allowed to be orderly communities.

[Deputy Head, Secondary], (SEP)

We cannot recruit teachers; I am sure it’s because of the impossible demands being made on us all. Discipline is a problem!

[Chair of Governors]. (JD)

Too many children are not being sent to special schools [...] explains why our numbers are down. Is there an agenda here?

[Special school governor] (JD)
Children need to be able to learn with each other. Schools are not for disruptive children. Teachers cannot deal with the whole range of needs as well as indiscipline. [Governor] (JD)

How can we teach discipline if some children do not have to conform? [Headteacher, Infant School] (SEP)

We must recognise that [...] some children cannot be managed in mainstream, [...] they are better off in special schools [...] we could all do better. [SENCO, Secondary] (SER)

I used to love teaching [now] I spend my time firefighting. [Deputy Head, Primary] (JD)

Standards:

SATs are a nightmare for some children; they can't even keep still. How can we be expected to improve our results when we face daily disruption in everything we do. [SENCO, Primary] (JD)

Our GCSE results have suffered [...] we have too many kids from outside of catchment. [SENCO, Secondary] (JD)

We do well with our kids, [...] all are welcome here. Our SEN department is very good but look at our league position [...] our work is not recognised. [Deputy Head, Secondary]. (JD)

It is impossible to do any more...we've done too much already [and] badly. There are too many demands and initiatives [the] pace is relentless. I worry about not having sufficient time for some children because others make take too many demands. [SENCO, Infants] (JD)
I set out to be a mainstream teacher [not] a social worker or behaviour expert. The pressures on teachers are growing by the day...expectations are unreal. I am disillusioned [some] children should be in special schools. Because of them, others suffer. [Teacher, Primary] (JD)

We have too many kids with SEN and already struggle to meet their needs. I wonder sometimes if we leave some out [as] they do not demand attention. [SENCO, Secondary] (JD).

**Expertise and Resources:**

We have done our best for children with special needs but are we good enough? Have we done the best for them? Have we overlooked any? [SENCO, Primary School] (JD).

Where is the training and the money to help us with all the demands being piled on us? [SEN Governor] (SER)

**Special Schools**

We have many physically handicapped children in school. The more severely disabled children simply need expert treatment [...] only found in special schools. Physio, OT and Speech therapy...all under one roof. [Headteacher, Primary] (SER).

Our school is not accessible. We would need 3 lifts; 1 in each block [...] and toilet and changing facilities. We have expertise on the curriculum but have a lot to learn on PD. [Head, Secondary] (SER)

We have 6 excellent special schools. Why not use them? [Head, Primary] (SER)

We have very little space and few facilities; we could not take severely disabled kids. [Governor, Primary] (SER)
We have accumulated our expertise over many years and changed our role several times. Where else would disabled children do better? [Governor, Special] (SER)

Our outreach service is very much in demand. We are pleased to offer our expertise to mainstream schools but special is best for some children. Mainstream schools have too many pressures. [Teacher, Special] (SER)

**Role of Experts**

We cater for MLD, autism, speech and language disorders; these children fail in the mainstream. They are not ready for them. [Special Head] (SER)

We offer an integrated highly specialised service for disabled children. Conductive education, physio and the levels of curriculum differentiation we provide are simply not available in the mainstream. [Special Head] (SER)

We have problems with some children in spite of being a school for ebd. [..these children] won't last long in mainstream. [special head] (JD)

Even in special schools, our greatest concern is about managing behaviour. Yet we have 8-12 in a class. We are also taking in children with SLD. [Special Head] (JD)

We get very few referrals nowadays. Does the LEA have an agenda [..] to close our school. [Special Head] (JD)

Our numbers are falling every year; we are admitting very few. What is happening? [Special Head] (JD).
Inclusion

We are fully committed to inclusion. With the National Curriculum we can maximise children's learning opportunities but need considerable resources [if] we are not to leave some children out. [Head, Infants] (SEP)

Children should have every opportunity to attend their local school [if] their needs can be met there. They should have all the opportunities to learn with their peers [Governor, Primary]. (SER)

We are already inclusive. We welcome children with physical and learning difficulties and do our best with them [..] but the LEA must accept that there are limits. [We] simply could not cope with more children with SEN..it would destroy everything we're trying to do. [Headteacher, Primary] (SEP)

We need more expertise and facilities for inclusion [...] wide corridors, LSAs, disabled toilets and TIME to make sure we can attend to the needs of all the children in class. [Headteacher, Junior] (SER)

I spend hours writing IEPs and know that some of the targets are not being addressed with some children. There is not sufficient time and the expertise is not there; I end up teaching some children myself [..] not those with Statements necessarily but those at Step 1 [of the SEN Audit]; [SENCO, Primary] (JD)

We have admitted a child with Down's Syndrome and have had a lot of help from Netley Court[outreach service] but he takes up so much time [and ] resources. It is not fair on the others. [SENCO, Infants].(JD)
45% of our children are on the SEN audit. We have large classes and can't find support staff. How can the LEA expect us to do more? Keeping the ones we have in the mainstream is already very challenging. [Head, Junior]. (JD)

Tom is attending here but we are not sure what he is gaining from his placement. He needs every piece of work differentiated for him [...] he has to work on his own with his LSA most of the day. This cannot be right. [Teacher, Junior] (JD)

When the class says: It's only Howard, I know how they view him and his disabilities. We do our best for him but could not say he is successfully included [SENCO, Junior]. (JD)

Ricky spends most of his time outside my office. He is too disruptive in class. Surely, this is not inclusion [secondary head] (JD)

**Rights**

Children have the right to learn but some interfere with this and should be elsewhere. [Head, Infants] (JD).

Teachers have rights too [...] to teach children able and willing to learn [Head of Year, Secondary]. (JD)

It is a real dilemma, isn't it? How do you teach little Johnny who will never learn to read and attend to the rest of the class? How about their rights? [Head, Infants]. (JD)

We have to safeguard the education of our children and the welfare of our staff. Some children put the rights of others at risk. [Governor, Primary]. (JD)
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Surely children have rights to attend special schools where the mainstream could not possibly meet their needs. [Governor, Special] (JD)

As teachers we have rights not to be attacked [or] to have the Government impose on us impossible tasks. How can we raise standards, deal with problem behaviour and help every child who needs help.[Teacher, Primary] (JD)

There is so much litigation nowadays. Are there risks that by spending too much time and attention on children with learning and behaviour difficulties others [who are] as needy are neglected? [Chair of Governors, Secondary].(JD)

How can school deliver high standards of learning and discipline if expectations are so unrealistic? Some children will make more progress in special schools [Head of Year, Secondary]. (JD)

Parents’ Responses

In favour of Special schools

It’s all about money. You won’t send X to Moor House (in Surrey). Can’t you see the system is failing him. Mainstream schools are not good enough. He needs speech therapy daily. [JD].

A has suffered because he has been inappropriately placed in mainstream schools. [JD]

We see a role for mainstream and special schools. J is doing well at his special school and although we would have liked him to attend the same school as his sister, he is doing well. We are pleased. (JD)
We need special schools.[SER]. We are opposed to greater or total inclusion as we do not believe our children will be given the resources they need in the mainstream [SER].

Against Special Schools

Going to special schools carries a stigma. I won't allow it for Gemma [JD]. I went to a special school [...] did me no good. [you] can't send Kevin there. I'll fight it [JD].

I think the idea of these [Early Years] centres is a good one. They are local; saves travelling across the City [JD]

Sam is doing better now in the mainstream. She should never have gone to XX special school [JD].

SEN review

Selection of responses: Respondents were given 3 options to comment on: (1) total (2) greater inclusion or (3) no change. Their responses are summarised in Southampton's Report to the Education Committee of March 2001 (SCC 2001). The following provides some of the raw data that went into the report.

Total inclusion is not an option. We are not ready to close down our special schools in Southampton. They have a clear role and can help our mainstream schools. [HT- representative of 43 similar comments, including 5 from parents].

We prefer the no-change option, not because we do not want change [but] because we do not believe the LEA will put in more resources for greater inclusion.
We believe that special and mainstream schools can work together. They can co-exist and should not have to be in competition. We are not. All schools whether mainstream and special set out to provide for children. [Special Head-representative of 17 similar responses; 6 from mainstream teachers; 11 from special out of which there were 8 Governor responses).

We need our special schools for children with behaviour difficulties and for those with severe learning difficulties and challenging behaviour. [Chair of Governors, Secondary, representative of 12 similar comments].

Why should children have to travel vast distances for their education? When will the LEA listen to parents and provide for children in their local schools. [Parent, representative of 6 similar comments from parents].

We support greater inclusion. We cannot keep still and no change is not an option. Total inclusion is a dream. It will not come true until we have more resources in schools. [Governor, Mainstream Infants].
APPENDIX 12:

EXTRACTS FROM SCHOOLS' RESPONSES TO LEA REQUESTS IN RESPECT OF THE ADMISSIONS OF CHILDREN TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS (APRIL 1999-SEPTEMBER 2000 DATA).

**Positive Responses (N= 42)**

We will be happy to admit S in September; in fact we offered a place when the family visited us. Will the LEA consider some LSA support and some adaptations to meet S's physical needs {S is physically disabled and is in a wheelchair}.

We are confident we can meet K's special needs [K is a physically disabled girl who also experiences moderate learning difficulties]. We will need full time LSA cover to ensure she can get around school, have physio [and] have support in lessons, etc.

We have met with the EP and parents and are happy to admit B. In spite of his physical difficulties, we would welcome him to our school. He clearly has great academic potential.

S can start in September. She will need support [as] the curriculum will require differentiation. She is such a polite and pleasant girl; it will be good to have her here.

**Uncertain responses [N= 12]**

We are not suitably equipped to meet D's needs. He is too severely disabled; our school is not sufficiently accessible and we are short of disabled toilets.

We have no experience of dealing with such complex and challenging needs and already have too many other children with SEN. B's needs are beyond our resources and expertise.
We have never admitted children with Down's Syndrome before so are unsure. With additional help we are prepared to admit this child.

**Negative Responses**

It is unreasonable to be expected to admit A. He has a long history of learning and behaviour difficulties. Our school is already in special measures and this will make it harder for us to reach our targets.

45% of our children are on the SEN Audit. We could not take more. B has behaviour difficulties which are so severe, mainstream is not a realistic option for him.

We have discussed C with our Governing Body and our unanimous decision is that C should not be admitted to this school [C has a history of behaviour difficulties]

We are not convinced that D should be transferring to a mainstream secondary school. He has severe learning difficulties and should continue to receive special education. [C experiences mild to moderate learning difficulties and has been attending a unit attached to a mainstream school].

This school is on such a vast campus that we would have real concerns about D. He runs off when he cannot cope with the pressure of school [D ran off from school about 2 years ago but had not done so since].

We have no experience of children with Asperger syndrome. We are trained for 'mainstream teaching'. E should go to Red Lodge [a special school for children experiencing moderate learning difficulties].

We have worked very hard at reducing exclusions in our school. F is too violent and disruptive; he will damage all the work we have done.
Our SEN staff are already stretched; they could not cope with more disruptive children. There is no evidence that G has improved sufficiently to succeed here.

H has attended Vermont School and should transfer to the Polygon. He is so violent and challenging. He requires a special school.

**School Transfer Process**

All secondary transfers of children with Statements of SEN are discussed with Heads and/or their SENCOs by officers within SEN services. This is a protocol that was agreed with Secondary Heads' Conference in September 1999.

This process has highlighted significant differences in the way secondary schools respond to requests for admissions. With some this is relatively straightforward but this can become protracted and difficult with others. This is related to the shortage of secondary school places but also highlights varying attitudes towards some children. Invariably, it is hardest to persuade schools to admit children experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Over the past 18 months, 1 school (has asked to be) and was eventually directed to admit 3 children; the process of negotiating their admission had taken 3 hours but without success. That same process had taken half an hour at another for 9 children (Hillside). Another school had spent 2.5 hours refusing to admit 1 child experiencing mild learning difficulties. Such is the variability.
APPENDIX 13

WORKING TOWARDS GROUNDED THEORY: EXAMPLES OF CODING AND CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES

My initial classification for coding purposes emerged from the raw data. I sorted and classified many responses from interviews, SEN policy and review surveys. I decided on classifications linked to my research questions and derived from my theoretical framework detailed in chapter 3. I saw this as an opportunity to work on theoretical sampling both to provide rigour and to enable generalisation of my findings. Some examples are given below.

Discourses of Rights, Ethics, Politics, Efficacy and Pragmatics

Examples were: (a) 'unethical for disruptive children to ruin the education of other children; special children need special schools [...] small classes and expertise [...] special facilities' (coded under ethics) (b) 'Parents should have choices [of] schools; children should not be denied the help they need'; 'it is callous to leave some to flounder in large classes'. The opposite views were that 'all children should be able to stay in their community, attend mainstream classes, etc' (coded under politics) (c) 'no child should deprive another of the right to learn'; 'why are some children allowed to get away with murder, what example does this set?' (rights) (d) 'mainstream schools are not an efficient way to meet some children's SEN; 'you will need an adult for each child'; only special schools can cater for some SEN [...] they have the specialist staff under one roof'; 'how do you cope with a child with an IQ of 40 in a mainstream class' (efficacy) and (e) 'there is no expertise in mainstream schools; nor are the resources available' (pragmatics).

Selection and de-selection

Maintaining special schools/the status quo; anxieties about change; acknowledging the shortfalls and pressures on mainstream schools; teacher and parental expectations; pressure of SATs and GCSEs; popularity of schools and competition between them; academic and non-academic children and their contributions.
As I started analysing frequencies, I found some themes to be more potent and prevalent than others. This led to a re-classification and I was able to refine categories under key themes. The following reflected more accurately what respondents were saying; totals are given against each. All are from interviews and the SEN surveys; further details are in Appendices 11 and 12:

- **Raising standards** (a total of 27 entries): Responses stressed the need for schools 'to do well', 'to raise attainments', 'to improve SATs and GCSE results', 'to attract parents on the basis of performance', 'to attract more funding', 'to gain a good reputation. Themes were about raising standards and the difficulty of doing this.

- **Managing difficult behaviour** and minimising risks to other children in the classroom (32 entries). Concerns were about how disruptive behaviour 'affected teaching', 'disrupted the class' 'and the education of the other children' and how 'some children lost out as they did not get the help they needed because teachers were having to spend their energies controlling the class and 'dealing with those who sought attention all the time'.

- **Human Rights** (see Appendix 12). Issues were raised on how the rights of some children sometimes came into conflict with the rights of others and how teachers had to reconcile these conflicts. The initial key theme was about disruption and the effect on the classroom. My later analyses, when going beyond the data, suggested another dimension, about children's worth (see page 204).

- **Training** (43 entries). Teachers made frequent reference to the need for further training. There was confirmation that they had been 'trained to work in the mainstream', that they 'did not set out to work in special schools [...] so could not be expected to be specialists'. Most were seeking training on 'managing difficult and challenging behaviour [...] dealing with confrontation and maintaining class control'. There were also requests for training on 'differentiating the curriculum', 'to make it accessible to the slow learner [...] especially as more children with severe learning difficulties were attending mainstream schools'.
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