Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

The journey travelled: a view of two settings a decade apart

Journal Item

How to cite:

Parry, John; Rix, Jonathan; Sheehy, Kieron and Simmons, Katy (2013). The journey travelled: a view of two settings a decade apart. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(4) pp. 385–399.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2013 Society for Educational Studies

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.819411>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

The journey travelled: a view of two settings a decade apart.

John Parry*, Jonathan Rix, Kieron Sheehy and Katy Simmons

Faculty of Education and Language Studies, The Open University, United Kingdom.

Inclusion is generally recognized as an ongoing, active process which reflects shifts in policies, practice and values as well as political choices made over long periods of time. Although intended as a transformative concept it can also represent a messy compromise between congealed policy positions and contradictory practices. Against this background of compromise and dissatisfaction, this study aims to examine how two schools with clear inclusive aspirations and intentions have weathered the last decade. Drawing upon two research visits ten years apart in which the schools were filmed and members of the school community were interviewed, this study reports on their perception of the journey travelled. Data from the study shows that in both cases there was a shift away from practices which were previously seen as being a route towards greater inclusion. The causes for these shifts were political, economic and social factors underpinned by the pervasive influence of the special education and medical model on the two schools' practice and principles.

Keywords: Policy; inclusion; collaboration; changing practice

* Corresponding author. Email: john.parry@open.ac.uk

Introduction

Inclusion has long been recognised for its “in-betweenness” (Corbett 1997). It is generally recognised as an ongoing process (UNESCO IBE 2008), an active process that might have no end (Flem and Keller 2000). The capacity to reach out to all learners is something that people work towards, continually strive for and which is not arrived at (Ainscow 2000). Bates (2005) in working with mental health services to develop inclusive provision recognised the need for people to be given time to explore the complexity of policy and practice, professional and personal values, and that they had to go on a journey, in which their attitudes gradually changed through the acceptance of various relationships.

Given this need for shifts in policies, practices and values, it is possible that those who do not recognise the need for change may view inclusion as an event rather than a process (Blamires 1999). However, the development of practice cannot be seen as a response to “a simple causal explanation or to linear and reductive prescriptions for change” (Benjamin 2002, 142). Comparative research on special and inclusive education suggests that practice which is developed reflects political choices made previously over long periods of time (Richardson & Powell 2011). The process is a messy compromise, mixing inclusion and exclusion, which can be seen in contrast to a more fluid concept of “continuous struggle” (Allan 2008).

The messy compromise is in evidence in policies around those groupings and issues associated with diversity (Black-Hawkins et al 2007) rather than in the hoped for “assault on oppressive vestiges of the past as a way of contributing to alternative futures” (Slee and Allan 2001, 176). Here can be seen a range of congealed policy positions around inclusion and ‘special’

provision which cannot shift because of the inherent contradictions which underlie them (Slee 2008). So, for example, intended as a transformative concept, the term 'inclusion' and its underpinning lexicon have become subsumed by those within 'special' education (Rix 2011), becoming part of an overall story of progress within a rhetoric of transformation (Richardson and Powell 2011).

Within many countries inclusion has become an option within the overall system. Countries which aim for inclusion nationally, such as Italy and Norway, can be seen to have increasing numbers in special education and to be replicating a range of exclusionary practices (Ianes, Demo & Zambottini 2010; Nordahl & Hausstätter 2009). In other countries policies on inclusion have been compromised by the range of marketisation policy initiatives. Within England, for example, this has included the traditionalist national curriculum, standardised testing, league tables and the investment in and development of a range of independent and alternative provision (Slee 2006, Rix 2011) resulting in increasing segregated and selective system (Rix 2006; Barron et al 2007). Within the US the legislation around high stakes testing can be seen to have lowered the quality of provision for children with special educational needs within areas which were already struggling (Harvey-Koelpin 2006), whilst the experiences in Sweden and the US suggest that policies aimed at extending school choice and autonomy, unless very tightly controlled, do little to raise standards (and may lower them) and also exclude the disadvantaged (Bunar, 2010; Söderström and Uusitalo 2010; Howe and Welner 2002, CREDO 2009,). Such changes have coincided with on-going and disproportionate referral of certain ethnic groupings and social-classes to categories for intervention and treatment (Slee 2008).

Against this background of compromise and dissatisfaction, this study aims to examine how two schools who express inclusive aspirations and intentions have weathered the last decade. There is a long tradition of case study examinations of individual settings or clusters of settings (eg: Vlachou 1997; Carrington and Elkins 2002; Peters 2002; Skidmore 2004; Black-Hawkins 2007), and a number of studies which have produced system wide case studies (eg: Richardson & Powell 2011; Rix et al, forthcoming). There have been no longitudinal studies however which have returned to a range of settings after an extended period to examine the experiences of people within those settings. This is the process undertaken within the current study, with the intention of identifying the kinds of barriers and facilitators which occurred in recent years in relation to the aims and practices the schools identified would lead to greater inclusion.

Methodology

School A was a mixed non-selective secondary school in an area of England with selective schools, which became an independent Academy in 2010 with an intake of 942 students. The school had a resourced unit designed for up to 40 students identified with Profound, Severe and Complex Needs. This unit had a full-time teaching staff of 9, whilst overall in 2010 the school had 74 subject teachers, 33 support teachers and 14 additional staff. The numbers of children identified with special educational needs within the school was nearly double the national average, as a result both of the resourced unit and the selective policy at other schools in the area. School B was a mixed secondary high school in Scotland. Staffing numbers inevitably varied across this period, but there were not significant changes. At the start of 2008, they had a senior management team of 5, 68 subject teachers, 15 support teachers and 9 additional support staff. The school served a very mixed catchment area, providing support for a wide range of pupils identified as requiring learning and behaviour support. In 2005 they had an intake of 877, with average number of school days

missed through absenteeism being a third higher than the national average and grades a third lower than the national average.

Each school was visited twice, on each occasion across a two-day period, following an initial visit at which informal discussions took place with staff at the schools. We captured the perspectives of 31 members of the school A community over two two-day visits in 2002 and 2009. We captured the perspectives of 50 members of the school B community over two two-day visits in 2002 and 2011 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Interviewee types and numbers at school A and school B in different years

These visits were lead by two academic researchers accompanied by a film crew of three or four, using two cameras and recording equipment to observe diverse practices in a range of settings around the school. The interviews and discussions took place separate from the filming of practice and ranged from short explorations of an issue which emerged during filming of practice (such as the students use of their targets). These interviews might last for a few minutes or involve detailed discussions which could last for up to an hour and a half. There were also discussions with small groups, in order to explore certain issues which emerged. All these interviews took the form of responsive, extended conversations (Rubin & Rubin, 2004). The material was subsequently transcribed for analysis. The data from the interviews was subjected to a thematic analysis derived from grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) which both informed the narrative of the edited films and informed the focus of subsequent visits and interviews. The academics produced reports and edited the film materials as the basis for teaching modules at the Open University. This material was subject to detailed analysis by other academics involved within the course production, but not directly involved in the collection of data, and subsequent write ups of the material were redrafted four times on the basis of response from the academics, critical readers and an external assessor. The materials were also viewed and discussed by over three thousand students and forty associate lecturers, further informing the academic discussion and analysis.

Findings

School A –Provision and practice in 2002

A focal point of the provision in this school in 2002 was a resourced unit for a group of pupils identified with ‘complex special educational needs’. Although located in a separate building the Head teacher in the unit believed that the school represented inclusion in action because the pupils were essentially ‘in the same school, in the same establishment working together...’ There were examples of pupils based in the unit regularly attending lessons in the main school supported individually by teaching assistants with relevant skills. In addition to the availability of teaching assistants, the key to the success of these placements was the attitude of the class teachers:

if the teacher is keen and the teacher’s enthusiastic, if the teacher cares, then everything else can literally fall into place. (Member of senior management team).

However the main school teachers often delegated responsibility onto the teaching assistants and in doing so implied that the educational needs of the pupils from the unit were different from the majority:

Having LSA support there it's really good. It gives me the opportunity to focus on the other pupils and be reassured that (pupils from the unit) are getting the attention that they need especially during practical as they are being watched at all times. (Main school teacher).

Other pupils spent most of their school day in the unit because the more subject based lessons were believed by staff to be inappropriate for them. For this group ‘social inclusion’ was the primary aim through involvement in the main school during registration, assemblies, lessons

such as music and art, and tutor group sessions. However even the social connections between groups of pupils were described in distinct ‘them and us’ terms:

very pleased with the rest of the group... they accept them into the room and are quite happy to work with them, encourage them on.’ (Main school teacher)

In view of the perceived successful inclusive practice taking place, few proposed any radical changes for the school when asked about future aspirations. Indeed with the school being regarded as a ‘beacon’ and ‘an example of the best practice of inclusion’ by the Principal Advisor in the local authority, school A seemed unlikely to deviate from their established aims and practices.

School A- Changes and new directions in 2010

By 2010, as part of re-development in school A, the unit had been relocated from an annexe to provision within the main building. For some this relocation, together with the continued involvement of selected children from the unit in designated main school lessons, highlighted the school’s progressive commitment to inclusion. However the head of the unit admitted that for other children ‘little or no inclusion’ took place ‘simply because what goes on out there in the main school is, is much too difficult for them’. Additionally the unit now represented an alternative for those children seen to be struggling in the mainstream, although the head teacher in the unit inferred that sometimes parents needed persuading about the benefits of such a placement for their child.

Several teaching assistants, who had been working in the school since the first visit, confirmed that the unit had become the full time placement for many pupils and the opportunities to work with the children they supported in the main school were increasingly limited. Several

interdependent reasons were suggested for this further shift away from inclusive practice. There was a perception that the group of children attending the facility at the time had much more complex needs than in the past. The head of the unit explained that as a result there was further pressure on his staffing budget because any increase in the numbers of pupils requiring costly individual assistance decreased staff availability to support students' integration into the main school lessons. Increasing class sizes in the main school were cited as another barrier to the inclusion of pupils from the unit, although there was a sense that their non- participation was frequently based on presumptions about their well-being:

There are some of our pupils that would really struggle to be included in mainstream. They couldn't cope with the busyness and the noise. (Deputy- head of unit)

Several staff felt that inclusion in School A had progressed 'as far as it can go' particularly for children identified with 'complex needs'. Others believed that if greater resources were available then the involvement in main school lessons could increase with 'no hindrance to the higher flyers in the group' (Unit teacher). This viewpoint hinted at the growing tension between a national standards agenda and the local commitment to including a wide range of pupils. Significantly the head teacher, although supportive of maintaining unit provision in the school, also linked the lower overall results of the school to the fact that the children from the unit were included in these statistics. In addition he believed that the selective system maintained by the local authority had a further negative impact on the standards because '38% of the students are creamed off to go to grammar schools' leaving the whole school with a disproportionate percentage of children identified as having special educational needs. Other teachers were also acutely aware of the pressures created by the need to maintain academic standards in the main school:

there's maybe twenty-five places available and maybe thirty want to do the subject, and a couple of mine (pupils from the unit) say well we want to do it as well, and it's do you give up a GCSE space to accommodate one of ours? (Teacher based in the unit).

Further differentiation of provision within the main school, not evident in 2002, had also taken place. A 'Gold Curriculum' group had been established for pupils at 'the lower SEN level of the mainstream school' who were seen to be 'struggling academically' (Head of unit). In addition there was the 'Emerald' group for pupils seen to have emotional and behavioural difficulties which followed a non- academic curriculum and was based in the youth group facility in the school. Set within the context of increased stratification of the school population, it emerged that the unit was no longer considered provision that might suit every child:

We have autistic children within the unit. But there's a severity of autism where the needs of those sort of children are I would think beyond what we've got. (Head of unit)

Within the unit itself the approach to teaching seemed to have become more distinct. One teacher described how liaison with the head of department in the main school provided the basis for her project work but for 'some other things I have to vary because it doesn't work with all of our children'. There was also more emphasis on children working in all age groups for significant parts of the day, following 'a sensory-based programme with very simple activities' (Head of unit). Correspondingly staff based in the unit felt that their role was more specialised and required more specific training because of the perceived increasing complex needs of the students. This further underlined the clear demarcation between the requirements of the pupils in the unit and the main school.

The positive social impact of the wide diversity of children within the whole school was increasingly valued as a reminder for all students of life beyond the intense academic pressures that they faced. However the interviews revealed that there had been a shift away from the regular opportunities for the ‘social inclusion’ of the pupils in the unit with their peers in the main school. These were now limited to lunch and break times in the playground in circumstances that appeared to be clearly under staff control:

the main school children come and join them and we’ll, we’ll take them and play little games with them, little ball game activities or take them for a little wander round the playground and, and socialise with them which is great for our kids. (Head of unit).

This pervading sense of ‘them and us’ seemed to be more entrenched as a consequence of the increasing exclusivity of the unit provision, to the extent that some staff felt that even social interaction was potentially problematic:

I think it would have to be invited, they have to be invited really by the pupils in our unit because otherwise you’re policing the mainstream kids really... (Learning support assistant)

School B – Provision and practice in 2002

At the time of the first visit to school B many schools were involved in the New Community Schools initiative, introduced by the Scottish Executive in 1999. This policy encouraged schools to develop integrated working and provision in order to engage more closely with families and the local community. The head teacher at school B recognised the need for:

‘the support and access to the skills and the professionalism of other groups of staff such as social workers, community workers, sports development workers to develop, extend and provide alternative curriculum for young people.’

The aim of establishing these networks more formally with social work, community and other support agencies based in the school providing local services, sat comfortably with family-focused aspirations underpinning many of the school’s principles and practices. The value given to parents’ perspectives was exemplified by one parent’s story:

when he did go back to school we had issues with – he was being tube fed um which he hadn't had before and the school said no problem. If you'd like to come in and teach us, SLA's and some of the staff what to do we'll be quite happy to do the feeding for him at school so that he can stay at school and continue his normal – normal day.

Listening to pupils was also identified as a key component of the collaborative matrix within the school. There had been a long established pupil council which had been extended into three separate groups to span all six year groups in the setting. The head teacher felt the monthly meetings represented ‘one of the ways in which I reach children’ and the pupils interviewed were similarly positive about the connection:

‘we can like say what we want to have and like if there's any problems that teachers might not know about we can say them and then we've got a chance of getting them fixed.’ (Pupil)

Alongside its work on increasing participation the school had developed a reputation for including young disabled people. One pupil commented that it had lived up to his expectations in terms of the support offered and ‘generally the whole access and the lay out of the place’. In defining inclusion during his interview, the head teacher emphasised that disabled children were ‘part of the community and need to be in the school.’ He also recognised that although it was ‘the

people that count' in making inclusive provision work, resourcing from the local authority was essential in moving 'the inclusion agenda forward'. This tension was reflected in the responses of some of the learning support assistants who talked about difficulties managing their personal workload and the need for more staff. Perhaps mindful of these strains within the system the head teacher was not fully committed to the possibility of all children being able to attend his school:

'There will still be some [students] that we can't [include] – can't manage and need to have other provision I believe'.

School B- Changes and new directions in 2011

By the time of the second visit, School B had been completely re-built on the original campus and the impact of these brand new facilities on the school community was in the foreground of many of the interviews. As one pupil commented 'I think when you're coming to a building that looks like that it kind of rubs off'. With improved access, lifts and 'more disabled toilets than disabled people' (Deputy head), the appearance was of a school that was well equipped to build on its aspirations of being inclusive. However the staff from the Additional Support Department felt that there had been no real benefits for them as a result of the re-build. They reflected on the fact that in the old building they were spread around the school with several bases situated on different floors. Now, with the department re-located to the basement of the school, in premises with smaller rooms to work in, they felt 'out of sight, out of mind' 'less integrated' and 'stuck away in the corner' (Learning support assistant).

The learning support assistants also observed that their role had shifted away from working in the main school classes to running small group and individual sessions usually within the

confines of the Additional Support Department. The reasons they suggested for this shift was the increase in the school of pupils identified as being disruptive or with behavioural difficulties. Significantly there had also been an organisational change within the school before the re-build in which the additional support team (which were designated to provide for pupils with learning difficulties) had been amalgamated with the behaviour support team. Consequently the role change, and perceptions of the learning support assistants, could be attributed as much to this re-organisation as any real shift in the pupil demographic. The head teacher also suggested that another factor was the strong pressure not to exclude pupils imposed by the local authority. In these circumstances he felt that the school had ‘just got into the habit of finding alternative ways of dealing with children.’ These ‘alternative ways’ involved removing more children from the classroom (but not from the school) and re-defining the school’s inclusive practice:

I know that inclusion doesn’t always mean being included in all mainstream classes – I know sometimes it’s being in the building and having individualised packages of work (Head of additional support)

Beneath the fabric of the new building, other shifts from initiatives that the school had held as central to their inclusive approach were also apparent. The head teacher’s aspiration to locate support services within the school had not been realised and there was a sense that the impetus for this change had been lost as long term resourcing of the New Community School projects failed to materialise. He felt that this was indicative of a climate where the rapid turn over of top- down policy initiatives meant that funding ebbed and flowed around different programmes in line with

fluctuating political priorities. For parents a consequence seemed to be more disconnection from their involvement in the general development of the school:

‘on the whole not that much more information about, you know, how to become involved in the school, or what else is going on the school – we don’t really see much information about that at all’ (Parent).

Some staff identified the magnitude of another government initiative, the Curriculum for Excellence, as a factor in the shift of priorities in the school. This comprehensive education reform was pre-occupying teaching staff although several interviewees noted that the new curriculum supported collaborative working with individual pupils at classroom level. Yet for some students the impact of the curriculum changes seemed much less significant and their potential as autonomous learners seemed to be a secondary concern in the planning of their learning experiences:

‘My targets are – don’t ask out for the toilet, don’t argue with the teacher and don’t ask out, I got to wear glasses that I got – and that’s my targets and they help me. ...I go down to my pupil support teacher and he sets them for me. And then take them to every class and every class teacher has to sign it for me.’ (Pupil – additional support unit)

Staff that had been present in the school in 2002 also recognised that there was less formal emphasis on taking account of pupil’s views and involving them in decision making. Senior staff members acknowledged that there had been slippage in convening regular pupil council meetings particularly with the recent building project consuming staff time and energy. Consequently there was a feeling amongst pupils that even basic information sharing needed to be re-established: ‘we’re sort of left, not on our own, but left sort of wondering what’s going on in the school currently and there’s not really much information you can get’ (Pupil). Plans were underway in

2011 to re-instate a variation on pupil councils albeit with much tighter controls exercised by the teaching staff and a more traditional power dynamic between teachers and pupils.

‘we think we need to have a bit more of a process that mixes democracy with selection to identify young people who will speak well and who can represent a much better cross section of the pupils’ (Deputy head)

The journey travelled – Discussion

Leiringer and Cardinello’s research (2011) provides an opportunity to situate much that has been written about the emergence of inclusive provision. They suggest that the physical spaces that are created in new school buildings become places when they are shaped by the processes and people that use them. Both schools were given the fresh canvas of new facilities at different points on their journey. However it is questionable whether either one seized the opportunity ‘to break with the rigidity of the division of places and the traditional exercise of power within educational spaces’ in order to create ‘new hybrid places that welcome diversity’ (D’Alessio 2012, 531). It seems that over the decade between the two research visits significant internal and external factors affected the direction that the schools took both leading up to and leading on from the opening of the new facilities.

The trajectory taken by both schools reflects the impact of both national policies and the consequent regional responses to any top- down agenda. The research period coincided with ‘an intensification in the pace and volume of reform efforts, directed from the centre by government bodies’ in which schools endured a ‘tsunami-like onset of innovation’ (Priestley et al. 2011, 267). School B experienced the direct consequences of the ‘policy crashes’ often associated with

increasing centralised control (Watson 2007, 101). Their ambition to progress as a New Community School floundered as the initiative slipped down the political agenda before their energies became consumed by the next swell of major change, the Curriculum for Excellence. Both schools rationalized their increased use of separate provision for specific groups of pupils as a necessary response to a centralised standards agenda which required a primary focus on pupil performance, league tables, a uniform curriculum and successful inspections. Such actions add credence to the view that the standards agenda can undermine the development of inclusion (Slee and Allan 2001; Evans and Lunt 2002; Burton, Bartlett and Anderson de Cuevas 2009; Thorpe and Shafiul Azam 2011) whilst creating a gap between intentions and the reality of actual practice (Rix 2011).

However the inevitability of the standards agenda creating a barrier to inclusion in schools has been questioned on several levels. Generally making a clean connection between any strand of education policy and the consequent enactment of those policies within schools and classrooms oversimplifies the dynamic to the single dimension of cause and effect (Priestley et al. 2011). Making this link overlooks the ‘contest and struggle’ that can occur as the policy filters down through the ‘complex layers of organisation’ (Slee 2006, 116). Bottery (2007) highlights that policy outcomes are frequently reshaped when applied to the series of local contexts and cultures with the resultant opening up of ‘implementation gaps’. These gaps allow room for individual schools to manoeuvre, to subvert the controlling policy by offering ‘conceptual, interpretive and implementational resistance’ (Bottery 2007, 158). From this perspective the standards and inclusion agenda are not necessarily diametrically opposed as they are unravelled at school level. For some schools the apparent ambiguity between the two policy frameworks may represent a

‘gap’ that can be explored in order to secure more inclusive outcomes (Dyson and Gallannaugh 2007). For others the standards agenda can shift the focus onto pupil attainment in such a way that the ‘school’s commitment to inclusion’ can become ‘narrowed and subverted’ (Ainscow et al 2006, 305). As the research evidence suggests that the journey travelled by both school A and school B took the latter course, questions arise around the underlying influences that facilitated such a direction of travel.

Although considerable time passed between the two research visits, there remained a clear sense of each school representing ‘a community of practice’ with a strong focus on ‘the way we do things here’ (Ainscow et al. 2006, 301). The robust nature of each school’s core values and practices could be seen to facilitate to some extent the development of inclusion within their community. In school A there remained a commitment to at least maintain the physical presence of the unit and the complexion of supporting a wider diversity of pupils within the school. In school B there was a renewed vigor about rejuvenating both pupil and parent councils in recognition of these key features of the school being overlooked amidst the other priorities. However the legacy of established approaches, traditions and principles in each school could also be seen to be barriers to further progression.

In both settings from the time of the first research, the roots of a ‘weak’ approach to inclusion were evident (Evans and Lunt 2002). Integration into the main school was described as being facilitated by individual or specialized support rather than changes to the school itself. In school A an incremental relationship existed between perceived level of difficulty, amount of support available and time spent by pupils in the main school. In school B inclusion seemed to be

label specific, available for those with physical impairments but problematic for others, and even then heavily dependent on teaching assistant support in the classroom. As time passed perspectives hardened in both schools and the inclusion of some learners in a classroom was seen to represent a ‘threat to the learning of other children’ (Thorpe and Shafiul Azam 2010, 170). There seemed little evidence in any of the conversations of ‘seeing difficulties in learning as professional challenges for teachers, rather than deficits in learners’ (Florian and Black-Hawkins 2011, 819). In the majority of the interviews with the range of education professionals there was a focus on ‘using teaching and learning strategies that are suitable for *most* alongside something ‘additional’ or ‘different’ for *some* who experience difficulties’ (Florian and Black-Hawkins 2011, 814).

It was evident on visiting both schools for a second time that some teaching assistants and teachers were becoming unsettled by the decline in their work supporting children in the mainstream classrooms. The indications were that: the ongoing journey for each practice community was neither stable nor static; the established understandings could still be questioned; and new priorities might emerge (Davies 2009; Ainscow et al. 2006). In school B the implementation of the Curriculum for Excellence was being used by some as a lever to discuss the wider participation in more inclusive classrooms for pupils who were at the time disconnected from the main school. However there was a sense from the research in both schools that the future shifts envisaged in the ongoing dialogues did not extend beyond the previous levels of integration and remained ‘a long way from a good collective understanding of inclusive pedagogy and curriculum’ (Nind in Dyson and Gallannaugh 2007, 485).

The journeys travelled by both schools through the decade between interviews therefore appeared to be shaped more by the enduring legacy of special education. Inclusion was a theme that was placed high on the agenda of both schools in 2002, but this was ‘closely related to managing students by minimising disruption in regular classrooms and by regulating ‘failure’ within the education systems’ (Armstrong, Armstrong and Spandagou 2011, 29). Both schools began their journeys with a narrow view of inclusion, one concerned with the education of specific groups rather than the education of all children (Ainscow et al. 2006; Rix 2011) and with the special educational needs discourse assuming its inherent dominance over practices and ideas (Booth 2011). Consequently such dominance made any shifts in direction away from the traditions of special education difficult and it stood as a major barrier to any radically different approach. With these starting points it seemed that there was little chance of these schools moving away from constructs embedded in ‘the institutional separation of ‘regular’ and ‘special’ schooling’ (Slee 2008, 99).

It was also evident that from the outset the attitudes to some groups of young people within the practice communities in both schools were based on the ‘underlying assumption of the deficient individual’ (Rix 2011, 264). The language of ‘us and them’ peppered the narrative of the interviewees and this theme fuelled the journey that both schools travelled. Perhaps these journeys would have re-routed if there had been more emphasis throughout on developing shared understandings of the relationship between difference and ‘normality.’ The experiences of these two schools suggest that in order to follow an alternative path ‘the focus must not only be on practice. It must also address and sometimes challenge the thinking behind existing ways of working’ (Ainscow and Sandhill, 2010, 412).

Conclusion

The journeys travelled by both these schools over the decade between visits highlights that beneath the imagery of progress, displayed in their new buildings and facilities, the reality of change is much more difficult to capture. Significant shifts in direction and emphasis were evident in the schools as they engaged with the process of developing inclusion and participation. In both cases there had been clear evidence of a move away from practices which were previously seen as being a route towards greater inclusion. People recognised much that had changed for the better, much that had not changed at all, and much that had created greater segregatory pressure. However these changes were sometimes unplanned and unexpected shifts caused by the interplay of political, economic and social tensions both within and beyond the school.

From exploring the developments in the schools it was apparent that the pressures impacting on their decisions and practices were connected to entrenched ideas as well as their current situations. Drawing from Kalberg (1994), Richardson and Powell emphasised that within education ‘the influence of legacies is particularly strong’ because they ‘cast their shadows’ over attempts to change and innovate’ (Richardson and Powell 2011, 135). In both schools the legacy of previous policies, practices and provision could be seen to reverberate in the journeys they had taken and in the future directions that they were planning. In seeking to understand the development of inclusion in schools, it is important to recognise that such perpetuating legacies can represent barriers to progress that have deep foundations and which have greater potential to block change than current difficulties a school foresees.

A clear theme to emerge from this study was the pervasive influence of the special education and medical model on the two schools' practice and principles. Despite their inclusive intentions, the direction that they took involved increasing separation of children in order to address the pupils' perceived educational needs. The heritage of special education is embedded in the education system as a whole and the schools readily drew on its practices. Special and mainstream do not exist as separate entities but are a self-serving conjunction spreading across educational provision underpinned by traditional concepts of child development and academic performance. Consequently until we explore and unravel this relationship and its ongoing legacy, it is likely that more schools will continue to travel a journey similar to those in the research.

Notes on contributors

John Parry is a lecturer in Education at the Open University in the UK. His research interests are: the development of inclusion in schools and early years provision; early intervention; and social interaction in inclusive settings. He has a particular interest in the application of research into practice.

Jonathan Rix is a Senior lecturer in Inclusion, Curriculum and Learning at the Open University in the UK. His research interests focus upon: policies, practices and language associated with inclusion; capturing diverse perspectives; and developing models to facilitate our thinking about the form and function of education. He has a particular personal and professional interest in issues relating to learning difficulties.

References

- Ainscow, M. 2000. Profile in *Theories of Inclusive Education: a students' guide*, ed. P.Clough and J.Corbett, 39-42. London: Paul Chapman.
- Ainscow, M., T. Booth, and A.Dyson. 2006. Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 10, no.4-5: 295-308

- Ainscow, M., and A. Sandill. 2010. Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 14, no.4: 401-416
- Allan, J. 2008. *Rethinking inclusive education – the philosophers of difference in practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Armstrong, D., A.C. Armstrong, and I. Spandagou. 2011. Inclusion: by choice or by chance? *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15, no.1: 29-39
- Barron, I., R. Holmes, M. MacLure, and K. Runswick-Cole. 2007. Primary schools and other agencies. *Primary Review Research Survey* 8/2. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Bates, P. 2005. *In praise of slow inclusion*. http://www.inclusive-solutions.com/pdfs/Slow_inclusion_paper1.pdf (accessed 12th October 2012)
- Benjamin, S. 2002. *The Micropolitics of Inclusive Education: an ethnography*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Black-Hawkins, K., L. Florian, and M. Rouse. 2007. *Achievement and inclusion in schools*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Blamires, M. 1999. Universal design for learning: re-establishing differentiation as part of the inclusion agenda? *Support for Learning* 14, no.4: 158–63.
- Booth, T. 2011. The name of the rose: Inclusive values into action in teacher education. *Prospects-quarterly review of comparative education* 159, no. 3: 303-319.
- Bottery, M. 2007. New Labour policy and school leadership in England: room for manoeuvre? *Cambridge Journal of Education* 37, no.2: 153-172
- Bunar, N. 2010. Choosing for quality or inequality: current perspectives on the implementation of school choice policy in Sweden. *Journal of Education Policy* 25, no. 1: 1–18.
- Burton, D.M., S.J. Bartlett, and R. Anderson de Cuevas. 2009. Are the contradictions and tensions that have characterised educational provision for young people with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties a persistent feature of current policy? *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 14, no.2: 141-155.
- Carrington, S. and J. Elkins. 2002. Comparison of a traditional and an inclusive Secondary school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive education* 6, no. 1: 1-16.
- Corbett, J. 1999. Inclusive education and school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 3, no.1: 53–61.

- CREDO. 2009. *Multiple Choice, Charter School Performance in 16 States*. Stanford,CA: Stanford University.
- D'Alessio,S. 2012. Integrazione scolastica and the development of inclusion in Italy: does space matter? *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 16, no.5-6: 519-534.
- Davies,J.S. 2009. The limits of joined-up government: towards a political analysis. *Public Administration* 87, no.1: 80–96.
- Dyson,A., and F.Gallannaugh. 2007. National policy and the development of inclusive school practices: a case study. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 37, no.4: 473-488.
- Evans,J., and I.Lunt. 2002. Inclusive education: are there limits? *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 17,no.1: 1-14.
- Flem, A., and C. Keller. 2000. Inclusion in Norway: a study of ideology in practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 15, no.2: 188–205.
- Florian,L., and K. Black-Hawkins. 2011. Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal* 37, no.5: 813-828.
- Harvey-Koelpin, S. 2006. The impact of reform on students with disabilities. In *Who benefits from special education: remediating (fixing) other people's children*, ed. E. Brantlinger, 119-144. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Howe, K., and K.Welner. 2002. School Choice and the pressure to perform – Déjà vu for Children with Disabilities? *Remedial and Special Education* 23, no. 24: 212–21.
- Ianes D., H.Demo, and F. Zambotti. 2010. *Gli insegnanti e l'integrazione*. Trento:Erickson
- Kalberg,S. 1994. *Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Leiringer,R., and P.Cardellino. 2011. Schools for the twenty-first century: school design and educational transformation. *British Educational Research Journal* 37, no.6: 915-934.
- Nordahl, T. og R.S.Hausstätter. 2009. *Spesialundervisningens forutsetninger, innsatser og resultater. Situasjonen til elever med særlige behov under Kunnskapsløftet*. Høgskolen i Hedmark:Utdanningsdirektoratet
- Peters, S. 2002. Inclusive education in accelerated and professional development schools: a case-based study of two school reform efforts in the USA. *International Journal of Inclusive education* 6, no.4:287-308.
- Priestley,M.,K.Miller.,L.Barrett., and C.Wallace. 2011. Teacher learning communities and

- educational change in Scotland: the Highland experience. *British Educational Research Journal* 37, No. 2: 265–284.
- Richardson, J., and J.Powell. 2011.*Comparing Special Education. Origins to Contemporary Paradoxes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rix, J. 2006. From One Professional to Another. In *All About Us*, ed. B.Rix, 351-361. London: MENCAP.
- Rix, J. 2011. Repositioning of special schools within a specialist, personalised educational marketplace - the need for a representative principle. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15, no. 2:263 —279.
- Rix, J., K.Sheehy., F. Fletcher-Campbell., M. Crisp., M. and A.Harper. Forthcoming. *Continuum of Education Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs: Review of International Policies and Practices*. Dublin: National Council for Special Education,
- Rubin, H., and I.Rubin. 2004. *Qualitative Interviewing- The Art of Hearing Data*. California:Sage Publications.
- Skidmore, D. 2004. *Inclusion: the dynamic of school development*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Slee, R., and J. Allan. 2001. Excluding the Included: a reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 11, no. 2: 173-191.
- Slee, R. 2006. Limits to and possibilities for educational reform. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 10, no. 2–3:109–119.
- Slee, R. 2008. Beyond special and regular schooling? An inclusive education reform agenda. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 18, no. 2: 99 -116.
- Söderström. M., and R.Uusitalo. 2010. School choice and segregation: evidence from an admission reform. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 112, no. 1: 55–76.
- Strauss, A., and J. Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research; Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Thorpe,A., and A.Q.M.Shafiul Azam. 2010. Teachers’ Perceptions of Inclusive Education in Mainstream Primary Schools in the United Kingdom. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences* 5, No. 3:163-172.

- UNESCO IBE. 2008. Inclusive education: The way of the future. Conclusions and recommendations of the 48th session for the International Conference on Education (ICE), 25-28 November, in Geneva, Switzerland.
- Vlachou, A. 1997. *Struggles for Inclusive Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Watson, C. 2010. Educational policy in Scotland: inclusion and the control society. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 31, No1: 93-104.