

Durham E-Theses

Special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools

Robert Taylor Watson

How to cite:

Watson, Robert Taylor (1989) Special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6529/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Special Educational Provision for Pupils with Physical
Disabilities in Special and Ordinary Schools.

Robert Taylor Watson B.A.

M.A. (Education)

University of Durham

Faculty of Social Sciences

1989

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



24 JUL 1990

ABSTRACT

A search of the literature shows it is unsatisfactory to organise special educational provision according to categories of handicap. The thesis argues that teachers' perceptions of the nature of physical disability affect their recognition of physical handicaps to childrens' educational progress. The literature indicates that a range of educational provision is required to meet a continuum of special educational needs. It is argued that Statements written under the 1981 Education Act do not ensure that appropriate special educational provision is specified for children with physical disabilities. The thesis suggests that the aims of education for physically disabled pupils should not be distinguished from those for children in general, since curricular objectives for all pupils should reflect individual needs. Evaluation of examples of special educational provision shows the significance of certain resources and features of organisation for physically disabled pupils. The literature suggests that LEAs, teachers and other professionals influence the range of special educational provision available for these pupils. The thesis investigates how the 1988 Education Reform Act may affect the appropriateness of special educational provision for physically disabled pupils in special and ordinary schools. It evaluates the significance of the entitlement of physically disabled pupils to the National Curriculum.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following without whom this work would have been impossible:

Judith and Roger, without their patience, support and encouragement I would never have been able to complete the thesis.

Jack Gilliland, my supervisor, for his help and support during the research and writing of the Thesis. Without his inspiration during an earlier Advanced Diploma Course I would never have undertaken a higher degree.

The staff of the University Library Education Section, for their professional expertise and willing help.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

CONTENTS

Abstract	Page	1
Acknowledgements	Page	2
Chapter 1	Page	6
Introduction and Context of the Thesis.		
Chapter 2	Page	11
The Development of Special Educational Provision for pupils with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools.		
Chapter 3	Page	28
The definition of Physical Disabilities and the development and use of the term 'Physically Handicapped'.		
Chapter 4	Page	46
The Origin and Use of the Concept of Special Educational Needs.		
Chapter 5	Page	67
Planning and Implementing Effective Special Educational Provision to meet the Special Educational Needs of Children with Physical Disabilities.		
Chapter 6	Page	85
Identifying and Meeting the Curricular Needs of Pupils with Physical Disabilities.		

Chapter 7 Page 107

Features of a Range of Special Educational Provision for Pupils with Physical Disabilities and their significance for the placement of such children.

Chapter 8 Page 130

The influences of Teachers' Attitudes to Pupils with Physical Disabilities on the Special Educational Provision made for them.

Chapter 9 Page 144

The development of successful whole school approaches to meeting the Special Educational Needs of pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools.

Chapter 10 Page 162

The Future Role of Special Schools for the 'Physically Handicapped'.

Chapter 11 Page 180

The Implications of the 1988 Education Reform Act and its likely influence on Special Educational Provision for Children with Physical Disabilities.

Chapter 12 Page 202

General Discussion and Conclusions.

Bibliography Page 224

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1 Page 13
Educational Provision for Handicapped Pupils, January 1983

Figure 2 Page 14
Special Schools for Handicapped Pupils, Schools, Pupils
and Teachers: Time Series, 1973, 1974, 1978 to 1983(1,2)

Figure 3 Page 15
Pupils: Type of School

Figure 4 Page 16
Schools: Type of School

Figure 5 Page 71
Comparison of the types of physical disabilities found in
ordinary and special schools at January 1971

Figure 6 Page 218
Educational Provision for children with Special
Educational Needs

Chapter 1

Introduction and Context of the Thesis.

1.1 The purpose of this thesis is to examine special educational provision for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. The thesis investigates the assessment of physical disabilities and their possible effects on childrens' educational progress. The development of the current range of special educational provision is traced from the 1944 Act and its categories of handicap, to the publishing of the Warnock Report and the 1981 Education Act. Trends towards more equal opportunity for all children, irrespective of social background, learning, sensory or physical disabilities, are considered. The thesis involves analysis of the features of special educational provision and considers the so-called 'integration' of pupils with physical disabilities. The implications of the 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA), for the provision and placement of pupils with physical disabilities, are also examined. Two issues particularly relevant to the thesis are the introduction of a National Curriculum for all pupils and the future of special educational provision under the Local Management of Schools, (L.M.S.).

1.2 The first of ten major issues to be investigated is the development of various types of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. This analysis focusses on features of the organisation of special educational provision such as the existence of separate special schools or units for "the Physically Handicapped". The thesis examines the use of such labels and categories of handicap, by means of a search of the literature. It also evaluates their influence on the features and range of special educational provision for physically disabled children.

1.3 The second issue to be examined is the extent to which the literature suggests it is helpful to recognise the existence of distinct groups of children with physical disabilities when planning educational provision for them. This involves consideration of the development and use of the term "physically handicapped" which is carefully examined, along with the the origins and uses of other apparently related labels such as "physical disability". The reliability of the criteria used to identify pupils by these terms is also investigated. The thesis examines criteria which the literature suggests are used by LEAS, support and assessment staff, head teachers, teachers and parents to distinguish physically disabled pupils from other children. An important consideration for the thesis is whether it is still appropriate to label children in terms of physical

handicap, following the 1981 Education Act with its emphasis on the special educational needs of individuals.

1.4 The nature of physical disability is the third issue to be considered. The distinction between physical disability and physical handicap is examined in discussing the appropriateness of learning situations for children to whom such labels are applied. The thesis considers whether there are particular benefits which appear to follow from features of special educational provision which are said to be specifically for children with physical disabilities.

1.5 The thesis investigates the roles of the Warnock Report and the 1981 Education Act in contributing to the development of the concept and use of the term Special Educational Needs (SEN). A search of the literature leads to discussion of their influence on special educational provision for children with physical disabilities, which is the fourth issue to be considered. This involves reference to examples of reported perceptions and use of the concept of Special Educational Needs.

1.6 The fifth issue to be examined is the adequacy of special educational provision available for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. Investigation of recorded observations of such provision allows comment on the issue of whether there are any specific features which contribute to the success of

special educational provision for these children. The analysis considers provision of resources, types of organisation and access to learning situations for children with physical disabilities.

1.7 The sixth issue concerns the appropriateness of aims and curricular provision for children with physical disabilities in special or ordinary schools. Examples of criteria used to distinguish specific aims of education for children with physical disabilities, from the aims of education for children in general, are examined. The relationships between curricular objectives, methods and learning situations for pupils with physical disabilities, are also considered.

1.8 The range of existing special educational provision and possible alternatives for children with physical disabilities is the seventh issue to be investigated. Reference is made to the effects of the historical basis of provision for physically handicapped children in special schools. The influence of developments such as the integration and re-integration of pupils with physical disabilities is discussed to evaluate their role in developing particular features of provision.

1.9 The eighth issue to be considered is the significance of teachers' attitudes to children with physical disabilities and their influence on the

educational provision made for such pupils. The thesis examines evidence of different views on the validity of concepts such as SEN and teachers' recognition of 'physical handicaps'. The thesis evaluates the relative significance of teachers' perceptions of these concepts to those involved with the implementing of various forms of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. The implementing of whole school policies for children with special educational needs and the future of special schools for physically disabled children are investigated. The thesis evaluates their significance in the range of special educational provision for such pupils.

1.10 A further issue examined is whether examples of current special educational provision for children with physical disabilities reflect official policy expressed in D.E.S. Circular 1/83, which concerned the implementation of the 1981 Education Act. The implications of the draft D.E.S. Circular revising 1/83 in response to the 1988 Education Reform Act is the tenth issue to be examined. This includes discussion of the appropriateness of the National Curriculum for children with physical disabilities.

Chapter 2

The Development of Special Educational Provision for Pupils with Physical Disabilities in Special and Ordinary Schools.

2.1 The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the development of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities, in special and ordinary schools. The literature is examined in order to discuss comment made on the suitability of the particular structure and main types of provision which have developed for such pupils. The role of Government Legislation in structuring the development of special educational provision is discussed. The appropriateness of provision founded on categories such as physical handicap (ph), is also evaluated. This chapter examines the opinions of various writers on how the perceptions of handicap held by LEAS, teachers, support and assessment staff have influenced the development of special educational provision. Opinions on the issue of whether there have been significant changes in the organisation of special educational provision for the ph since the 1981 Education Act are examined. This leads to the evaluation of the role of the latter in shaping current special educational provision for children with physical disabilities.

2.2 Before the 1981 Education Act special educational provision was organised by the D.E.S. using labels or categories expressed in terms of childrens' so - called handicaps. These categories were termed educationally subnormal moderate or severe (ESN M or S), visually impaired, hearing impaired, blind, deaf, maladjusted, epileptic, physically handicapped and delicate. The special educational provision for children in these categories consisted mainly of special schools, some of them residential, and units in ordinary schools. Examples of these types of provision were usually said to be for groups of pupils such as 'the deaf', 'the blind' or 'the physically handicapped'. Figure 1 gives full details of the numbers of children identified according to each of these categories and their placements in special and ordinary schools in January 1983, immediately prior to the implementing of the 1981 Education Act. In figure 2 the statistics for the years 1973 to 1983 show that during that period the proportion of children identified as having physical handicaps was consistent at about 10% of the total number of children placed in special schools. Figure 3 shows that the proportion of pupils placed in special schools, expressed as part of the total pupil population in the years 1978 to 1987, peaked in 1983. Since there was little change in the definition and number of children identified as ph during that period there is a possibility that more children with physical and other disabilities were being placed in ordinary schools.

FIGURE 1

TABLE A22/83 [A24/82]
EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR HANDICAPPED PUPILS(1,2)

	January 1983												
	Blind	Parti- ally sighted	Deaf	Parti- ally hearing	Phy- sically Handi- capped	Deli- cate	Holo- ducted	Educationally sub-normal		Epilep- tic	Speech Defect	Autis- tic	Total
								Medium	Severe				
Assessment and place- ment during 1982													
Pupils newly assessed as requiring special educational treatment	74	241	172	530	1,561	972	5,255	9,753	1,995	89	781	98	21,521
Pupils newly placed in special schools or boarding homes	83	224	179	555	1,518	915	4,776	9,843	2,087	86	615	86	20,967
Handicapped pupils in January 1983													
Attending special schools(3)													
Maintained													
Day pupils	110	1,055	1,135	683	9,247	2,562	6,379	52,350	25,321	323	794	349	100,508
Boarding pupils	119	210	258	235	650	989	4,232	4,347	560	61	65	61	11,787
Non-maintained													
Day pupils	79	135	200	73	372	21	25	396	41	7	50	28	1,427
Boarding pupils	304	386	746	368	826	223	1,135	598	123	301	190	54	5,454
Attending maintained and non-maintained hospital special schools													
	24	4	16	-	465	37	349	32	2,207	45	10	97	3,266
Attending designated special classes at maintained primary, middle and secondary schools													
	11	150	532	2,447	586	305	1,458	8,203	188	73	1,308	117	15,378
Boarded in homes													
	-	-	-	-	-	1	313	6	18	-	-	-	338
Attending independ- ent schools under arrangements made by authorities													
	59	37	319	93	568	148	4,376	486	703	44	152	308	7,293
Receiving education otherwise than at school(4)													
	8	5	32	55	629	212	2,645	239	422	25	194	23	4,489
Awaiting admission to special schools(5)													
Day pupils													
Age 5 and over	2	20	1	33	121	52	586	1,986	138	3	112	9	3,063
Under 5	6	10	10	34	161	9	12	147	292	-	90	6	777
Boarding pupils													
Age 5 and over	5	12	9	10	33	44	730	178	34	10	56	11	1,132
Under 5	2	3	10	9	4	-	1	6	3	-	3	-	41
All pupils	929	2,027	3,268	4,040	13,642	4,603	22,241	69,174	30,050	892	3,024	1,063	154,953
Pupils awaiting admission for more than a year(6)													
	4	13	8	23	53	14	130	539	86	3	41	1	915

- (1) Due to differences in the coverage and form of analyses some of the figures in this table are not comparable with those published for previous years. See also paragraph 12 of the explanatory notes.
- (2) The figures in this table are not comparable with those shown in tables A19/83 to A21/83 as they are derived from a different source.
- (3) Excluding hospital special schools.
- (4) In the form of tuition in hospitals, in other units (eg units for opacities) and at home.
- (5) Including some pupils at present attending ordinary schools, but excluding children in special classes for handicapped pupils in such schools.
- (6) These figures are also included in those relating to pupils 'Awaiting admission to special schools' shown above.

FIGURE 2

TABLE A20/83 (A22/82)

SPECIAL SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED PUPILS
SCHOOLS, PUPILS AND TEACHERS: TIME SERIES 1973, 1974, 1978 TO 1983(1,2)

		1973	1974	At January		1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
				1978						
Hospital schools										
Schools										
Maintained		140	140	137	133	131	127	119	112	
Non-maintained		0	0	5	5	4	4	3	3	
Total		140	140	142	138	135	131	122	115	
Full-time pupils										
Boys		5,324	5,372	4,933	4,589	4,414	4,010	3,703	3,468	
Girls		3,057	3,800	3,388	3,191	3,022	2,855	2,685	2,400	
Total		9,381	9,172	8,321	7,780	7,436	6,865	6,388	5,868	
Teachers(3)										
Full-time teachers		1,174	999	1,192	1,215	1,174	1,092	1,017	934	
Full-time equivalent of part-time teachers(4)		38	43	30	28	31	30	31	41	
Other special schools										
Schools										
Maintained		1,216	1,250	1,343	1,356	1,357	1,360	1,350	1,350	
Non-maintained		104	104	106	105	105	102	99	97	
Day		934	975	1,036	1,042	1,043	1,053	1,046	1,042	
Boarding		386	379	413	419	419	409	403	405	
Total		1,320	1,354	1,449	1,461	1,462	1,462	1,449	1,447	
Full-time pupils by category of major handicap										
Blind	Boys	546	549	687	632	632	599	601	570	
	Girls	464	446	506	522	494	489	479	426	
Partially sighted	Boys	1,265	1,266	1,246	1,229	1,254	1,142	1,061	1,012	
	Girls	762	787	830	815	810	719	670	662	
Deaf	Boys	1,879	1,923	1,936	1,868	1,786	1,698	1,601	1,557	
	Girls	1,549	1,574	1,541	1,462	1,460	1,359	1,266	1,168	
Partially hearing	Boys	1,240	1,278	1,161	1,052	838	803	777	697	
	Girls	973	978	809	811	619	584	565	515	
Physically handicapped	Boys	5,606	5,930	6,975	7,140	6,901	6,663	6,525	6,316	
	Girls	4,053	4,264	3,333	3,478	3,408	3,075	2,963	2,814	
Delicate	Boys	3,284	3,090	2,801	2,606	2,411	2,309	2,282	2,177	
	Girls	1,993	1,877	1,640	1,441	1,311	1,219	1,209	1,072	
Maladjusted	Boys	7,934	8,528	10,262	10,233	10,640	10,544	10,533	10,789	
	Girls	2,253	2,615	3,072	2,875	2,972	2,693	2,644	2,606	
Educationally sub-normal(5)										
Medium	Boys)		31,057	33,801	34,294	33,903	34,415	34,441	34,129	
Severe(6)	Boys)	49,083	14,616	12,901	13,101	13,343	13,456	13,713	13,964	
Medium	Girls)		20,546	21,694	21,622	21,107	21,403	21,120	20,647	
Severe(6)	Girls)	31,307	10,786	9,752	9,870	10,043	10,144	10,307	10,499	
Epileptic	Boys	794	851	1,115	1,138	1,021	971	878	844	
	Girls	554	631	804	808	736	704	652	603	
Speech defect	Boys	1,605	2,031	2,468	2,324	2,075	1,824	1,537	1,407	
	Girls	779	993	1,339	1,217	1,036	867	715	625	
Autistic(3)	Boys	..	200	384	381	420	429	400	374	
	Girls	..	72	147	172	192	183	180	173	
Total	Boys	69,236	71,319	75,737	75,998	75,224	74,853	74,349	73,836	
	Girls	46,687	45,569	47,467	47,093	46,188	45,839	44,670	43,810	
Total		115,923	116,888	123,204	123,091	121,412	120,292	119,019	117,646	
Teachers(3)										
Full-time teachers		11,671	11,646	14,557	15,096	15,255	15,280	15,340	15,414	
Full-time equivalent of part-time teachers(4)		507	478	463	460	482	493	512	501	

FIGURE 3

Table A27/87(A) Pupils : type of school

January of each year	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
All schools (thousands)										
Total	9,195.7	9,094.2	8,933.0	8,720.1	8,501.5	8,276.1	8,096.3	7,955.9	7,831.9	7,721.1
Part-time	189.1	193.8	196.5	202.5	215.6	235.1	247.5	259.8	267.1	271.1
Full-time	9,006.6	8,900.4	8,736.5	8,517.7	8,285.9	8,041.0	7,848.8	7,696.1	7,564.8	7,450.0
Under 5(2,3)	468.2	464.5	453.7	437.5	428.5	433.5	475.2	486.4	483.4	484.4
5-15(2)	8,197.0	8,085.2	7,919.1	7,697.3	7,442.2	7,186.7	6,970.7	6,822.1	6,699.8	6,596.0
16 and over(2)	341.4	350.6	363.8	382.8	415.2	420.8	402.9	387.5	381.6	369.6
Maintained										
Nursery:										
Total	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.4	49.2	49.7	49.5	49.7	49.5	49.6
Part-time	34.4	34.3	34.4	34.6	35.7	37.0	37.2	37.7	37.7	38.0
Full-time	14.3	14.4	14.2	13.9	13.5	12.7	12.3	12.0	11.8	11.6
Primary(1):										
Total	4,642.0	4,518.3	4,360.8	4,176.5	4,006.7	3,844.1	3,765.9	3,747.8	3,761.0	3,792.2
Part-time	142.3	147.5	150.5	155.5	167.8	183.5	194.5	205.8	212.7	215.3
Full-time	4,499.6	4,370.8	4,210.3	4,021.0	3,838.9	3,660.6	3,571.4	3,542.1	3,548.3	3,576.9
Under 5(2,3)	426.1	421.8	409.4	394.2	384.7	391.7	432.8	443.3	440.1	441.0
5 and over(2)	4,073.6	3,949.0	3,800.9	3,626.8	3,454.2	3,269.0	3,138.6	3,098.7	3,108.2	3,135.9
Secondary(1):										
Total	3,851.3	3,872.0	3,866.1	3,839.9	3,798.0	3,740.9	3,645.6	3,525.8	3,388.5	3,239.5
Under 16(2)	3,576.7	3,589.4	3,573.5	3,530.2	3,456.9	3,395.1	3,318.2	3,213.8	3,083.9	2,947.7
16 and over(2)	274.6	282.7	292.6	309.7	341.1	345.9	327.4	312.0	304.7	291.8
Independent(4)										
Total	521.4	523.5	527.8	527.2	521.1	516.5	515.2	516.3	519.4	531.1
Part-time	11.5	11.2	10.7	11.4	11.0	13.3	14.3	14.8	15.1	16.2
Full-time	509.9	512.3	517.0	515.8	510.2	503.2	500.9	501.5	504.3	515.0
Special(5)										
Total	132.4	131.7	129.7	128.1	126.5	124.8	120.1	116.3	113.6	108.7
Part-time	0.9	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6
Full-time	131.5	130.9	128.8	127.2	125.4	123.5	118.6	114.7	111.9	107.1

(1) Including middle schools as deemed.

(2) Ages at previous 31 August.

(3) Pupils who became 5 years of age by 31 December are excluded from Table A27/87(D).

(4) Excluding non-maintained special schools.

(5) Maintained and non-maintained special schools.

FIGURE 4

Table A27/87(C) Schools : type of school

January of each year	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
All schools (thousands)	30,650	30,559	30,466	30,195	29,769	29,420	28,910	28,519	28,175	27,959
Maintained										
Nursery	593	593	596	588	582	575	565	561	560	558
Primary	21,372	21,309	21,242	21,018	20,650	20,384	20,020	19,734	19,549	19,432
of which										
Middle deemed										
primary	702	754	760	768	754	757	686	648	621	603
Secondary	4,711	4,694	4,680	4,654	4,622	4,553	4,444	4,382	4,286	4,221
of which										
Middle deemed										
secondary	601	620	636	644	659	648	647	637	623	610
Special	1,480	1,489	1,488	1,487	1,469	1,462	1,450	1,433	1,405	1,382
Non-maintained										
Nursery	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Independent	2,379	2,361	2,348	2,339	2,338	2,344	2,331	2,311	2,285	2,276
Special	111	110	109	106	102	100	98	97	88	88

Figure 4 shows that the number of special schools started to fall. The proportion of special schools out of total numbers of schools was consistent however from 1978 to 1987, implying that the rolls were falling in such schools.

2.3 A resume of the history of legislation affecting the assessment and educational provision for children with physical disabilities given by Hurst (1984), revealed it has had a significant effect on provision for the physically handicapped. Hurst noted that the 1918 and 1921 Education Acts referred to 'defective', (physically or mentally), also epileptic, blind and deaf children. This suggests that the Acts assumed that children in each category had certain characteristic needs. Such a view was perpetuated by the 1944 Education Act in which 11 categories of handicap were identified including that of 'physically handicapped' and the related categories of 'delicate', 'epileptic' and 'diabetic'. The latter was only a separate category until 1953 when it was merged with that of 'delicate'. The resulting ten categories were formally used by the D.E.S. until 1983 for the collection of statistics. Until that time special schools designated to provide for the children in each group formed the basis of special educational provision for a significant proportion of the children who were thought to require it. The rest of this chapter reviews the influence of this history of labelling and assessment on special educational provision. It is argued that this use of categories has

had an effect upon the range of provision in both special and ordinary schools.

2.4 The system of assigning children to categories of handicap became the foundation for placing some children in a rigid system of special schools. These were supposed to provide for what were perceived to be distinct groups of children. The basis of this type of organisation can be considered unsatisfactory. It led to children being placed in particular special schools merely because they appeared to fit into an existing category of handicap, rather than because the provision available was actually appropriate for their individual needs. Placement may thus in itself have led to some inertia, which could have been a factor in the continued existence of particular types of provision such as special schools for the PH.

2.5 Barton and Tomlinson (1981), expressed dissatisfaction with professionals' rigid identification of categories of disability in providing for children they themselves referred to as "handicapped". It was not clear what they actually meant by this term. They noted that "labels tend to envelop the handicapped so that other aspects of their person are hidden or even denied". Barton and Tomlinson's views were not apparently supported by objective research but their opinions are nevertheless worthy of note in this thesis. They commented that in the past the medical profession has been one of the most

powerful means of "excluding the handicapped", ie. from ordinary schools. Certainly the D.E.S. categories of handicap mentioned in paragraph 2.2, especially that of physical handicap, are based on a medical model. Before the introduction of the S.E. Procedures in the mid 1970's, Doctors for example had the power to ascertain pupils as 'Physically Handicapped', 'E.S.N.' etc.. According to Barton and Tomlinson these labels thus assumed social legitimacy as well as implying the need for distinctive educational provision. This led to the placement of the children concerned in special schools said to be for specific categories of handicap.

2.6 Swann (1983) claimed that placement of children in educational establishments labelled as being for a stated category of handicap such as PH did not in itself necessarily reflect pupils' educational needs. He suggested criteria used in placement merely reflected perceived handicap rather than attempts to make appropriate special educational provision. Swann suggested that schools for the physically handicapped were not in fact providing special education, unless they had methods or equipment designed to meet the needs of such children. This implied there are weaknesses in assessments of the needs of such pupils. Placements of children in segregated special schools for the PH may therefore be unsatisfactory. Swann, in this context, reported the comments of one handicapped child who stated " I'm not my disability, I'm me. I have dyslexia and I've

had polio, but I'm not a 'dyslexic' or a 'cripple'. I'm me." This child's reported comment showed that children, as well as parents and professionals, were possibly dissatisfied with the use of labels based on handicaps.

2.7 Swann (op cit.) suggested that staff in special schools perpetuate the worst aspects of stereotyping pupils by implying that their schools have some sort of professional mystique. In fact Swann noted that the education provided in special schools may to some extent only be distinguished in terms of the children being categorized by their bodies, rather than by attempts to meet their needs. This view is especially significant when considering the placement of children with physical disabilities in special schools. Swann noted this was exemplified in children being placed in special schools labelled as suitable for 'spastic' or 'backward' pupils. It appears from this line of argument that Swann suggested there may have been no significant advantages in special school placements. He referred to the hiding of children with handicaps in special schools, which he claimed perpetuated ignorance and stereotyping. Swann's views confirmed the doubts of the Warnock Report (D.E.S. 1978) about the efficacy of the placement of children in special schools for the ph and other perceived handicaps, merely because such schools already existed.

2.8 Special schools for children labelled according to the physical description of their pupils were

considered by Brennan (1982) to be self-perpetuating being enshrined in Statutory categories of handicap during the period 1944 to 1983. He noted the important role of the assessment of childrens' special educational needs in the provision eventually made for them, which he said was influenced by the views of the professionals concerned. In chapters 4 and 11 there is discussion of the issue of whether the changes in assessment since the implementing of the 1981 Education Act have altered the range of provision available for children with physical disabilities and their placment within it. Brennan claimed that, given uncertainties about assessment, it was "surprising that special schools do as well as they do". He expressed doubts because the special schools were largely organised to take account of the statutory conditions of handicap to which reference has already been made. Brennan suggested the existence of special schools as such influenced a system of assessment, which allowed them to be seen as the "only method" of organising special educational provision. Like Swann (op cit.), he said this system of provision reflected insufficient assessment of pupils' special needs. This evidence of dissatisfaction with special school provision for children with physical and other disabilities helps to explain the trend away from such placements revealed in the statistics discussed in paragraph 2.2.

2.9 Barton and Tomlinson (1981) pointed out that the identification of "handicapped children" will always

depend on what criteria are adopted in any research which is carried out. They noted that during the 1970's it was reported that there was a 49% increase in numbers of children in schools for the "physically handicapped". They claimed this was evidence that placement of children in such schools was because the establishments existed, rather than because the children needed such provision. Barton and Tomlinson argued it was difficult to concede that this period of developing affluence saw an increase in physically handicapped children. This increase, shown in figure 2, may have been merely because of changes or motives in using such labels. This view is supported by the evidence of Swann and Brennan noted in paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8 respectively that special educational provision had its own inertia based on an established structure of assessment and segregated provision. In the period 1961 to 1970, Barton and Tomlinson confirm that with the exception of the categories of blind, partially sighted and delicate, the increases in numbers in every other category were greater than the relative increases in the total population of school children. The increase in numbers of pupils so ascertained was also reflected in an increase in the number of special schools and units specifically provided for them during that period. These expensive developments appear to have resulted from the view that previously there was felt to be insufficient special school provision for children with perceived categories of handicap. During the 1970's LEAS were able to fund an increasing number of special school places.

2.10 Bookbinder (1983) suggested that despite the 1981 Education Act, staff in ordinary schools would continue to refer pupils who they consider are having difficulties, with a view to having such pupils segregated from ordinary classes or schools as they have always done. This is despite the intention of the 1981 Education Act to achieve objective assessment based on childrens' individual special educational needs. Bookbinder claimed this was because staff in ordinary schools would see that the continued existence of special schools, said to be for children with specific categories or disabilities, may offer the chance of alternative placements for pupils for whom they are unable to provide. He claimed that the continued existence of such special provision has also led assessing professionals to try to fit children into various categories. Writing as the implementing of the 1981 Education Act was beginning, Bookbinder claimed Statements of Special Educational Needs could be 'tailor made' to suit existing provision. This reinforces the point made with reference to Brennan in paragraph 2.8 and Barton and Tomlinson in paragraph 2.9. Bookbinder suggested that there is too much assessment and not enough monitoring of provision under the 1981 Education Act. His submissions were not apparently supported by anything other than personal opinion. Bookbinder also pointed out the social and emotional disadvantages of segregated special school placements. As with all his comments he did not single out specific groups of children, such as

those with physical disabilities, to show how they might suffer if placed in special schools. Nevertheless Bookbinder raised the possibility that teachers are preoccupied with the placements of children with physical and other disabilities, rather than concentrating on making appropriate provision for pupils' individual needs.

2.11 Further evidence of the inappropriate use of assessment based on categories of handicap as described so far in this chapter, is provided by Booth (1983). He claimed that there is a need for national policy on developing a range of special educational provision. This opinion is important in relation to the development of features of organisation such as 'integration', a topic which is also considered in chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. This chapter has shown that the range of provision available to pupils with a variety of disabilities has been a significant influence on their placement. Despite the risks of conflicts, Booth suggested there should not be "mere passive evolution" because the special education system in England is "the province of the professionals" and therefore continues to be self-perpetuating. Booth noted that despite the 1981 Education Act the 'official documents' mask the continued advocacy among some professionals of a segregated system of special educational provision. As a result Booth did not expect the 1981 Education Act to affect the existence or role of special schools.

2.12 This chapter has shown that in the period before the 1981 Education Act, special educational provision for children with a range and variety of disability was organised according to rigid categories of handicap. This method of organisation had the legitimacy of official D.E.S. categories as noted by Hurst (1984). This chapter found the literature describes serious doubts about the appropriateness of provision in special schools organised according to categories of handicap. These doubts existed because the categories were used as a series of pigeon holes into which children were fitted, with little apparent consideration for individual degrees of disability or its effects. This chapter suggests that special educational provision made on the basis of categories of handicap, involved little consideration of the relationships between individual childrens' disabilities and their homes or learning environment. This raises the issue of how perceptions of the nature of childrens' physical disabilities affect the special educational provision made for the pupils involved. This topic is investigated in chapter 3.

2.13 It was shown in paragraphs 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 that the apparent limits to placement set by categories of existing special schools before 1981, encouraged continued stereotyping of handicap. Barton and Tomlinson (op cit.) noted the perceptions of the latter among the professionals involved thus became socially legitimate and therefore a definite influence on educational provision.

It has been argued that the system of provision based almost entirely on special schools was self perpetuating. Furthermore it was seen by some teachers in ordinary schools as a way of segregating children with handicaps. Different types of special schools developed their own specialist staff and resources. These reflected attempts to provide for the needs of what were seen as distinct groups of children identified according to the ten categories of handicap. As the schools became more specialised they became harder to change as noted in paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10. The need for change in special schools and their future role is examined in chapter 10.

2.14. This chapter has argued that the existence of segregated special schools, based on categories of handicap, hindered the development of alternative provision for children with physical disability. The organisation of special education up to 1983 reflected use of existing labels rather than the nature of physical or other disabilities. This chapter has suggested that one purpose in using such labels was to segregate children with physical and other disabilities from ordinary schools. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 examine the development of a range of special educational provision for such pupils in more detail. If children are assessed in order that the most appropriate educational provision can be made for them their placements may be different. Thus another significant issue raised by this chapter, for consideration in chapters 3 and 4, is the identification

of valid criteria for the assessment of the likely effects of childrens' physical disabilities. Chapter 4 examines the concept of special educational needs as the basis of an alternative strategy, on which to base special educational provision for individual children with physical and other disabilities.

Chapter 3

The definition of Physical Disabilities and the development and use of the term Physically Handicapped.

3.1 In the previous chapter it was shown that categories such as 'physically handicapped' were not clearly defined despite their significance as influences on educational placements and provision for children so labelled. This chapter examines criteria which lead to children being perceived as physically handicapped. There is discussion of the literature reporting various opinions on the nature of physical disability and physical handicap. The definitions of terms such as physical disability and physical handicap, which are to form the basis of discussion in the rest of the thesis are outlined. The implications of the terms 'disabled and 'physically handicapped' for childrens' educational placement and provision are investigated. The significance of possible distinctions between such terms is an important issue to be examined. Appropriate consideration is given to the relevance of the identification of any medical conditions which affect childrens' physical function. The significance of parents' and teachers' perceptions of physical disability and physical handicap, are also considered, along with the influences from which

they result. The thesis examines the validity and reliability of those perceptions as a basis for making educational provision for children with physical disabilities. The extent of the effects of physical disability on childrens' education is discussed in the context of assessment procedures under the 1981 Education Act. The final issue to be considered is whether schools should focus on childrens' physical disabilities rather than their own possible failure to meet these.

3.2 Fish (1985) suggested that the term 'physical disability' refers to the criterion of an individual having some loss of physical function. Using the term in this way implies comparisons with the physical abilities of children in general. Chazan et al. (1980) suggested that comparisons can be made between children who have physical disabilities and the majority who reach certain norm-referenced milestones of physical, intellectual, social and emotional development through childhood and adolescence. Brennan (1987) noted that all human beings are unique, though teachers working with groups organised according to ages, often assume that children within them are at similar stages of development. If children are perceived to have physical deficits in relation to patterns of norm-referenced physical development, teachers may not adequately consider criteria on which to judge the appropriateness of learning situations for individual pupils. Nevertheless Brennan did point out that children usually become bigger, heavier, stronger and have more

understanding as they grow older. Patterns of physical development through childhood and adolescence are evident to parents and teachers. Whatever their environmental or cultural background children generally learn to walk, talk, have bladder and bowel control for instance within certain age ranges. Both parents and professionals certainly have concern if these 'milestones' are not reached. Such concern and the likely origin of any apparent disability however, is not a sudden event, with the exception of a child who suffers loss of physical function as a result of an accident.

3.3 Brennan noted the importance of teachers recognising individual children's disabilities. He suggested this recognition is significant to the making of adequate educational provision for such pupils. It is difficult to define 'normal' development in the context of Brennan's views on the uniqueness of individual children. Nor would it be helpful for teachers to do so. It is more important for them to identify any ways in which educational provision is inappropriate for individual children with physical or other disabilities. Kneedler et al. (1984) did point out the importance of recognising physical and other disabilities, which were significant to the degree that the usual educational programmes of schools were not appropriate for children suffering from them. In Kneedler's view physical disability is of significance to education if it puts the child at a disadvantage at school. Section 1 of the 1981 Education

Act is based on a norm-referenced view of disabilities. It states that the criterion for making special educational provision should be whether children can benefit from the educational provision generally made for the majority of pupils in any age group. This criterion suggests failure is resident in the child, rather than being brought about by the failure of those implementing special educational provision to make learning possible for children with physical and other disabilities. A norm-referenced view of physical disability also implies that provision for certain pupils should be different. This could involve alternative aims, methods, organisation or location of special educational provision for children perceived as being different to the majority. Chapter 2 has already shown the weaknesses of such labelling.

3.4 Despite the broad agreement on the patterns of physical development mentioned above, parents, teachers and other professionals may not share the same perceptions on the nature and effects of childrens' physical disabilities. This may cause these individuals to lobby for different types of educational provision for individuals or groups of children. Thomas (1977) commented that teachers' and parents' perceptions of children with physical disabilities were too frequently expressed in terms of the handicap by which children were known to them. Thomas suggested too much stress was thus put on what children couldn't do. In chapter 2 it was shown that particular perceptions of the characteristics of

children with a variety of disabilities of function have had definite influences on educational provision made for them. It was also argued that before and even after the Warnock Report was published existing patterns of provision and categories of handicap reinforced perceptions of handicap and allowed what was considered appropriate provision for some children to be self-perpetuating. Thomas similarly claimed that special educational treatment for children with physical disabilities may depend not only on the assessment of their needs, on policy and organisation, but also on what he described as the human qualities of teachers. This view was also supported by the later observations of Croll and Moses (1985) and Barton and Tomlinson (1981) which are described in chapter 4. Thomas did not support his opinions by quoting research of his own. He did however report a study by Conine T.A. (1969), in which a sample of teachers showed a similar level of acceptance of the physically disabled as the general public. While that research is now dated and was conducted in the U.S.A., it is relevant to this thesis in that it is another pointer to the significance of teachers' perceptions of the difficulties of children with physical disabilities, whether these are norm or criterion referenced.

3.5 In suggesting a link between attitudes and organisation of special educational provision Thomas noted that successful attitude changes are related to positive experiences, ie. of the disabled. He therefore suggested

that positive contacts should be made between student teachers and disabled pupils during training. He considered that it was certainly not adequate for mere facts such as 'one spastic child is born every eight hours' to be handed out. In the period since Thomas wrote, there have been significant developments in special education such as the Warnock Report (1978) and the presence of increasing numbers of disabled pupils in ordinary schools following the 1981 Education Act.

3.6 Chazan (op cit.), like Brennan as noted in paragraph 3.2, suggested that most of what they termed 'handicaps' do not appear suddenly. They noted that assessments by professionals such as doctors or educational psychologists may diagnose certain conditions such as paraplegia, cerebral palsy, spina bifida or heart defects for example soon after a child is born. Other medical conditions involving loss of physical function, such as muscular dystrophy, may not be evident even to professionals until later in the child's life. The lack of physical development and/or loss of physical function associated with any of these medical conditions may not have significant consequences for childrens' performance in schools unless it affects co-ordination, motor control, strength and/or mobility for example. Lack of development or loss of physical function in any of these areas may affect classroom activities such as play, practical assignments or writing. Perceptual difficulties associated with conditions such as cerebral palsy and hydrocephalus

can also affect the acquisition of number and reading skills and will be considered under the headings of delayed physical or intellectual development as appropriate. In this thesis physical disability is defined as loss of physical function or lack of physical development significant enough to affect a child's ability to perform tasks central to learning. Examples of such tasks are given above.

3.7 Kneedler (op cit.) suggested that physical disabilities could put a child at a significant disadvantage at school if appropriate provision is not made for them. Section 1 of the 1981 Education Act terms such disadvantages 'learning difficulties' and points out the children involved may require special educational provision compared to that generally made for children in each age group. This suggests adequate special educational provision can only be made for children with physical disabilities if parents or professionals identify the possible learning difficulties faced by some pupils. Pocklington (1980) noted the main obstacles to learning in physically disabled children were their difficulties in input, processing and output. He described the significance of poor sensory information, lack of speed on task, difficulties in reaching, pointing, gross and fine motor control which he argued are part of the feedback which results in learning.

3.8 If the significance of physical disability as

defined in paragraph 3.6 is unrecognised or if childrens' physical and therefore educational difficulties are not adequately provided for, then physical handicaps to educational progress exist. This definition of physical handicap is of major importance to the thesis. It is based on the criterion that educational tasks should be appropriate for individual pupils, not that those with physical disabilities will best be served by special provision which distinguishes them from other children. Madge and Fassam (1982) distinguished between 'impairment' defined as a physical defect, 'disability' as a loss of functional ability and 'handicap' as the inability to perform an activity. Such a view does not adequately acknowledge the significance of activities being appropriate. It is clear from these definitions that handicap can result from impairment or disabilities, but need not do so if they are recognised and adequate provision made to circumvent concomitant physical difficulties in educational assignments.

3.9 Chazan et al. (op cit.) noted that professionals may predict loss of limb function or perceptual difficulties will eventually become a handicap to childrens' performance in school activities. Such expectations are quite negative and imply children with physical disabilities are likely to fail at school. If assessing professionals or teachers have such perceptions children are faced with a self-fulfilling prophecy of physical handicap as defined above, arising automatically

from physical disability. Chazan et al. recognised this risk and claimed that the extent of childrens' physical handicaps would depend on the context of the school situation. The 1981 Education Act distinguishes the assessment of special educational needs from the making of appropriate special educational provision. It does allow recognition of features of the learning situation which may influence possible physical handicaps. Clearly only the successful prediction of the possible physical handicaps, which may result from physical disabilities, can allow adequate educational provision to be developed in special or ordinary schools.

3.10 It is clear that successful identification of any individual pupil's physical disabilities and physical handicaps as defined above is essential, if adequate special educational provision is to be made for them. Chazan et al. claimed that liaison between assessing professionals, parents and teachers is important if adequate educational provision is to be made for the special needs of children with physical disabilities. The Warnock Report (1978) and Brennan (1987), have pointed out the importance of teachers supported by multidisciplinary teams recognising the distinction between physical disability and physical handicap. Chazan et al. also noted that parents and teachers may miss important details if they do not have the guidance of colleagues such as therapists as to how children may be prevented from becoming 'physically handicapped'. Fish J. (1985),

suggested that the successful identification of physical disability can directly influence the degree of childrens' physical handicaps. He claimed the latter would vary according to features of special educational provision such as therapy, access, resources and staffing. Not only teachers but welfare staff/classroom assistants must be aware of the significance of childrens' physical disabilities if these are not to become physical handicaps to the educational progress of such pupils. Assessment and monitoring of children with physical disabilities is therefore crucial to the success of their educational placements in either special or ordinary schools.

3.11 The opinions of Chazan et al. (op cit.), were based on their research in two LEAS into the identification of 'handicapped children' by teachers and health visitors. The staff involved were asked to pick out children with specific difficulties which could lead to physical handicap likely to affect performance at school. This is consistent with the definition of physical handicap (PH) outlined above. Chazan et al. found the physical disabilities considered to be possible handicaps to childrens' educational progress were difficulties in locomotion, muscular control, co-ordination, vision, hearing, mental ability, speech and language.

3.12 In a second level of screening Chazan et al. (op cit.) invited only teachers to rate children identified on

the first screening, on a five point scale of development in five areas: sensori-motor, self-help, language, modes of activity and behaviour. The first screening was heavily dependent on perceptions of anything seen as a significant developmental problem. Chazan et al. found that teachers and playgroup leaders were more likely to see potential educational problems than the health visitors who were also interviewed in the first screening, perhaps because of their different viewpoints and expectations. 22% of the difficulties noted in assessments in the first screening were not identified in the second.

3.13 The research of Chazan et al. included children with physical disabilities affecting mobility, co-ordination and strength. It also included those who the sample revealed had any of a range of additional difficulties such as speech, language, intellectual, visual or hearing problems. It was found these problems, which varied in severity, added to pupils' physical handicaps and therefore affected their educational progress. Chazan et al. claimed that it was a mistake to consider physical disabilities in isolation from pupils' other difficulties when making special educational provision. This view is compatible with the opinions supporting the definitions of physical disability and physical handicap outlined earlier in this chapter. In chapter 2 it was shown that a system of special schools based on trying to isolate children according to categories, including that of 'physical handicap', was

unsatisfactory. Chazan et al. commented that the significance of childrens' physical, sensori or learning difficulties varies according to individual cases. They suggested it would not be satisfactory merely to assume that placements in any particular type of school would guarantee appropriate special educational provision.

3.14 The distinction between disability and handicap outlined earlier in this chapter, is an important one for the purposes of this thesis. Fish (1985) suggested the effects of physical disability are modified according to personality, family, socio economic factors and the educational provision made. Thus all children with apparently similar disability in terms of loss of physical function may not suffer from the same degree of handicap. Indeed some parents may recognise more easily than others the physical difficulties their children face when playing with toys such as building bricks, in counting games or when given objects to hold and feel. Some children may thus have the benefit of greater involvement of parents trying to compensate for physical disability by offering greater involment than is felt necessary by parents of other disabled pupils. Similarly some parents, if they have cars, may be able to offer more experiences in the way of outings, which can stimulate learning, than parents of other disabled children. Fish did not support his opinions by objective research, but chapters 5,6,7 and 8 consider specific examples of schools limiting or exacerbating the effects of physical disabilities to the

extent that these may or may not become handicaps. Fish noted that varying perceptions of disability are revealed by parents', teachers' and other professionals' use of different terms such as 'disabled' and 'physically handicapped'.

3.15 The 1981 Education Act requires LEAs to show on Section II of a child's Statement of Special Educational Needs details of any such need. The draft Circular issued in December 1988 to eventually revise D.E.S. Circular 1/83 on implementing the 1981 Education Act points out that "The 1981 Act, while it abolished "categories of handicap", does not rule out the use of such terms.....the Statement should nevertheless go on to amplify the nature of the child's educational needs" (page 24). The draft circular also includes a reminder that Section II of Statements should include "a description of the child's functioning - what the child can do as well as what he or she cannot do", (page 24). A suggested checklist for those involved in writing advice was appended to Circular 1/83 and has not been revised in the 1988 draft circular. It notes possible headings for description such as "physical state and functioning (physical health, developmental function, mobility, hearing, vision and continence)," (page 39). This official guidance does nothing to clarify the possible confusion between terms such as 'physical disability' and 'physical handicap' on which comment has been made in this chapter. Thus the danger of one leading to the other as described

in the previous paragraph, still exists. It is left to professionals involved in writing advice and the Statements based thereon to include details of "all SEN's identified, whether or not the LEA feel able to make provision for those needs in Section III" (page 24). Chapters 5, 6 and 7 of the thesis, which examine provision for children with physical disabilities, consider the issue of how far any mismatch between needs and provision is tackled by LEAS and schools.

3.16 This chapter has shown that it is important to recognise a difference between the terms 'physical disability' and 'physical handicap'. The former is defined in this thesis according to the criteria of loss of physical function, examples of which have been given. These examples show that loss of function can limit access to the learning situation because of factors such as loss of power, co-ordination, mobility or control. It has been argued that if teachers' demands in these areas are inappropriate, childrens' educational progress may be restricted. Their performance depends not only on the severity of any loss of physical function, but also on its recognition by teachers and their efforts to avoid consequential physical handicap. This relationship is explored in chapters 4 and 5, which consider the special educational needs of children with physical disabilities.

3.17 All apparently able-bodied pupils are not equally adept at skills such as handwriting or practical tasks

which require certain levels of co-ordination. There is thus no definite boundary between those children who can be considered physically disabled and those who are not. Of greater significance are the demands and responses of schools which determine the degree of physical handicap. While the definition of physical disability in this thesis is child centred and possibly norm-referenced, the definition of physical handicap is focussed on features of the learning situation and is criterion based. It has been argued that varying perceptions of physical disability held by parents, teachers and other professionals influence the effectiveness of special educational provision for the children involved.

3.18 It has been suggested that medical diagnoses such as those mentioned in paragraph 3.6 are of limited value as a basis for making educational provision for children with physical disabilities. Medical conditions vary in severity, details of which form an important background to any educational provision made. Receiving such information however will not guarantee that schools take appropriate account of such medical influences when making their responses to physical disabilities. Use of medical labels may lead teachers to have inappropriate expectations of the children to whom they are applied. Teachers may perceive medical labels as a pointer to disability being resident in the child, rather than considering that educational failure may be a reflection of handicaps which exist in the learning situation.

3.19 In this chapter it was shown that the degree of childrens' physical handicap is influenced by the provision made by teachers and professionals. It was argued that the special educational provision made for children with physical disabilities depends on recognition of their individual educational needs. Teachers' or parents' acceptance of physical disability may lead to some children being less involved in sport or practical craft and science for example. In fact these activities could be the source of independence and fulfillment. The Warnock Report suggested that there is a link between individual children's disabilities and the degree to which they are handicapped according to attempts made to provide for them in schools. "Whether a disability or significant difficulty constitutes an educational handicap for an individual child and to what extent, will depend on a number of factors. Schools often differ widely in outlook expertise resources, accommodation, organisation, physical and social surroundings" (paragraph 3.5).

3.20 The literature considered in this chapter underlines the dissatisfaction expressed in chapter 2 about placement of children in special schools organised according to categories of handicap. The literature reviewed in this chapter has led to the conclusion that whilst there is a continuum of physical disability the recognition by teachers of a child's concomitant learning difficulties and therefore of physical handicap, may vary.

Thus the extent to which the child's physical disability becomes a significant handicap to educational progress is a function of teachers' perceptions of physical disability, the child's loss of function and the appropriateness of the learning situation itself. The role of parents and other professionals involved in the assessment of childrens' special educational needs and their pre-school support is also significant to the degree of physical handicap which exists. Thus accurate assessments of these needs can only be made in relation to individual children.

3.21 The examination of definitions of physical disability and physical handicap in this chapter has clearly identified a significant difference between them. This has raised a most important issue for the thesis in highlighting that while adequate information about physical disability including delayed physical development or loss of function is important, recognition of factors in the home and school which may lead to physical handicap as defined are also significant to making adequate special educational provision in special or ordinary schools. This chapter found no clear justification for considering the needs of children with physical disability as distinct from those of other children in general or those labelled as having other difficulties. In this context it is important to examine alternative ways of assessing the influence of physical disabilities on childrens' educational progress. The next chapter considers the

concept of 'special educational needs' as a means of coping with what has so far been revealed as a continuum of possible physical disability which can not necessarily be separated from other disabilities which may affect childrens' educational progress.

Chapter 4

The Origin and Use of the Concept of Special Educational Needs.

4.1 The previous chapters have suggested there are difficulties in finding valid and reliable methods of assessment of all the possible factors which could be physical handicaps to pupils' educational progress. As an alternative this chapter examines the concept of special educational needs (SEN) suggested by the Warnock Report (1978). The related mechanisms of assessment established by the 1981 Education Act are also examined. This chapter investigates definitions of SEN and perceptions of their relevance in the assessment of children with physical disabilities. Chapter 3 argued that perceptions of physical disability are likely to influence the adequacy of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. A major issue for this chapter is the clarity and relevance of the definition and use of the term SEN in attempting to make special educational provision for such pupils in special or ordinary schools. A search of the literature is used to evaluate perceptions of SEN held by those charged with making assessments and/or implementing special educational provision. The success of assessment and provision for the SEN of physically disabled children is considered in relation to the recommendations of the Warnock Report. The influences

of criteria used in making assessments and special educational provision before the 1981 Education Act are also investigated.

4.2 The Warnock Report (1978) commented on educational provision for children with physical disabilities. It quoted the Ministry of Education from 1946 thus: "All those requiring special educational treatment because of a physical handicap should be sent to special schools. Those however not requiring medical or surgical treatment or where disabilities did not interfere with progress in ordinary schools should not be regarded as physically handicapped". This was noted by the Warnock Committee as an indication of what they considered undesirable in assessments referring to certain categories of provision. The latter were considered too arbitrary in not recognising a continuum of special educational needs including children suffering from a range of physical and/or learning difficulties. The Committee also suggested that the medical influence on assessment was too great because it implied that disabilities could be clearly defined and distinguished. In this its recommendations were similar to the opinions of Swann, and Barton and Tomlinson described in chapter 2.

4.3 The Warnock Report (1978) suggested that the degree of any physical handicaps to childrens' educational progress is linked to the efforts made to provide for their individual disabilities. It therefore recommended

that assessments of the special educational needs of individual pupils should in future be used as the basis of special educational provision for them. The Warnock Report suggested that up to 20% of pupils may have special educational needs at some time during their school life. Paragraph 3.18 of the Report states that such needs may be "one or more of: special access to the curriculum; provision of special or modified curriculum; attention to the social structure or emotional climate (of schools)". This is significant to the thesis in that it suggests lack of educational progress may not be due to the child's disabilities but to failure of the provision to match special educational needs (SEN). Brennan (1987) noted that changes in the incidence of handicaps, recognition of new handicaps and the increased incidence of multiple handicaps showed up the inadequacies of assessments in terms of rigid categories.

4.4 The Warnock Report (1978) suggested that special educational provision in special or ordinary schools or units should be based on Statements of individual children's Special Educational Needs. Section 1 of the 1981 Education Act defined children with special educational needs as those who have a learning difficulty, which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. This learning difficulty is to be considered in relation to the abilities of the majority of pupils of that age or may be significant if pupils have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of

educational facilities generally provided. This use of the term 'disability' is consistent with that defined for this thesis in chapter 2 emphasising that appropriate provision for physical disability must be made if physical handicap is to be prevented. D.E.S. Circular 1/83 and the draft revision of it outline parameters for the Statementing process. This involves Head Teachers, Educational Psychologists, Doctors, Therapists, Social Service etc. as appropriate, in making assessments and recording advice. This is used by LEA Officers as the basis for written Statements which specify childrens' special educational needs and set out the special educational provision pupils require. Parents have the right to be present during assessments, to see copies of the advice and appeal against the Statements of SEN.

4.5 Lewis and Vulliamy (1981) suggested that the assessment procedure under Section 5 of the 1981 Education Act encourages professionals to see children only in terms of subjective perceptions of what special educational provision is possible. Lewis and Vulliamy argued that if appropriate special provision is to be made, childrens' real SEN must be identified. They claimed that there was no guarantee that consideration would be given under the suggested assessment procedure to factors "endemic to the organisation and expectation of schools". They said the 1981 Act thus continued to give credence to attempts to diagnose failure in the child rather than failure in the provision made for them. O'Hagan and Swanson (1984)

also claimed that the weakness of the 1981 Act is that it stresses the recording of deficits, not how results could be obtained. Lewis and Vulliamy suggested the assessment procedure still relied too much on categories of medical and / or psychological explanations of handicap rather than considering difficulties requiring social solutions. They suggested the checklist which was annexed to D.E.S. Circular 1/83 as a guideline to assessment could allow the child's functioning to be described in terms of disability alone. If childrens' physical disabilities are not assessed in the context of their access to the learning situation adequate special provision may not be made for them. Thus physical handicap as defined in this thesis may not be prevented. D.E.S. guidelines merely suggest assessing professionals may comment on "Factors in the child's environment which lessen or contribute to his needs". Even before the Warnock Report was published Gulliford (1971) pointed out that "special educational needs may arise from personal disabilities or environmental circumstances or a combination of the two, the degree of need is always relative to the contribution of both factors", (page 3). He added that special educational needs should not be defined in terms of particular disabilities but should be viewed in terms of handicaps to learning.

4.6 While Lewis and Vulliamy tried to argue the weakness of assessment under the 1981 Act, their views were not supported by interviews or questionnaires to

those involved with such procedures and the provision which results. It is significant to this thesis that Lewis and Vulliamy observed that professionals' failure to recognise the SEN of physically disabled pupils will influence the appropriateness of educational provision for such pupils. Chapter 3 noted that Fish (1985) argued that physical handicap is a reflection of unsatisfactory provision for children with loss of physical function, impaired or delayed physical development. In chapter 2 it was noted that Barton and Tomlinson (1981) found a medical model of categories of handicap inappropriate. Lewis and Vulliamys' opinion also suggests that formal assessments of SEN recorded on Statements under the 1981 Education Act may only offer special educational provision for children with physical disabilities, based on categories such as physical handicap, rather than on the basis of individual SEN as the Warnock Report intended. Lewis and Vulliamy thus suggested assessment under the 1981 Education Act is open to the subjective interpretation of the professionals involved. This could account for some of the inertia to retain pre 1981 Provision organised according to categories of handicap which Chapter 2 showed to be self-perpetuating.

4.7 The evolution of the concept of 'Special Educational Needs' by the Warnock Committee has been examined by Barton and Tomlinson (1981). Their major concern was whether reference to SEN in making special educational provision would lead to increased stigma among

those who are labelled as having special needs. Barton and Tomlinson suggested that the various professionals involved in assessing and recording SEN, by means of Statements, may have other hidden criteria in making their assessments, such as a wish to see children placed elsewhere. These could be significant influences in addition to the simple wish to make special provision for the sake of the child. Barton and Tomlinson also claimed the professionals may wish to prevent, or alternatively bring about, structural change in the various special or ordinary schools concerned or within the range of special educational provision. This view concurs with that of Bookbinder (1983) discussed in chapter 2. Such change can be influenced, it is argued, by the relative demand for various types of provision reflecting competition for scarce resources. Tomlinson (1982) argues strongly that the allocation of the latter may depend upon professionals' social, moral and political judgements as well as the their assessments of childrens' physical and intellectual abilities. Such judgements could influence the way advice appended to Statements of SEN is written.

4.8 In ordinary schools assessment of SEN is usually carried out initially by classroom teachers reported Croll and Moses (1985). They based their conclusions on interviews with 428 teachers in 61 schools, their Head Teachers and members of the School Psychological Services. Teachers' perceptions of the special educational needs of children in 34 Junior classes were studied and related to

pupil performances. Croll and Moses found that different teachers had a variety of perceptions of what they really meant by 'special needs'. These were identified by the teachers according to the support available in the school or from sources such as an LEA remedial or support service. In their analysis Croll and Moses considered the Warnock Report's premise that there are no distinct categories or degrees of handicap to which children can be assigned. They pointed out that neither the Warnock Report nor the 1981 Education Act gave a clear functional description of what should be considered by teachers as the SEN of groups of pupils such as those termed 'disabled'. Thus Croll and Moses, like Lewis and Vulliamy (op cit.) and Barton and Tomlinson (1981), indicated some possible unreliability in subjective assessments of SEN under the 1981 Education Act procedure. This was because the criteria on which assessments are based are not clearly defined and contained insufficient guidance on possible failure in existing provision.

4.9 Croll and Moses expected teachers' assessments of SEN would be affected not only by their perceptions of need, but also by LEA policies, levels of class ability, their own knowledge and attitudes. They also suggested that teachers' perceptions of the provision previously available to the child whose SEN were being assessed, could influence the advice written as part of assessments. Considering existing provision may be helpful in allowing teachers to suggest changes in provision according to how

they see childrens' SEN. It may also mean that teachers who cannot see failings in existing provision, may try to structure assessments towards provision elsewhere. Reliable assessments may remove the need for changes in placement, if they reveal that physical handicap has been exacerbated by lack of special provision. The 1981 Act defined SEN in relation to the special educational provision which is additional to or different from that which is "made generally" for pupils in ordinary schools. This definition confirmed the findings of Croll and Moses that the concept of SEN as outlined would allow special educational provision for individual children to be possibly influenced by provision previously made in special or ordinary schools. This is one explanation for the continued existence of features of provision such as segregated special schools for 'PH' pupils.

4.10 The position of Lewis and Vulliamy as noted in the paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 is similar to that of Croll and Moses, both sets of writers noting the serious possibility that teachers' perceptions can influence their assessments of pupils' SEN. These views are not what was apparently intended by the 1981 Act which was designed with the purpose of obtaining appropriate special educational provision for individual children, though it involves assessment in the context of their current placements. Croll and Moses (op cit.) claimed that if the special educational needs of individual children are to be considered in the way intended by the 1981 Education Act,

all professionals involved must agree on the use of the term SEN. They pointed out that while many forms of assessment, such as attainment testing are clearly norm-referenced, Warnock's reference to "significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of his age" is also norm referencing. The definition of physical disability outlined in the previous chapter is also norm-referenced, but it is of most significance when considered in relation to the definition of physical handicap which was shown to be based on the criteria of individual pupil's access to learning. If it is decided for example, on making an assessment of a group of children, that "they can all read" then Croll and Moses suggested that the poorest reader may not have any special educational needs. Thus they submit SEN must be judged in terms of what a child can and cannot do, rather than his place in class. Such criterion referencing is possible within the guidelines of the 1981 Education Act, though the latter does not guarantee that individual children's needs will be assessed in this way. A child considered by one teacher for example to have SEN may not be regarded as such by another. Croll and Moses suggested it is difficult for teachers to make assessments of SEN without considering existing or potential support for pupils. The social implications for teachers wanting to begin, maintain, change or increase such support, as recognised by Barton and Tomlinson and noted in paragraph 4.7, were also noted by Croll and Moses. They doubt however that teachers would knowingly use assessment procedures to

achieve these objectives.

4.11 Croll and Moses' considered three criteria in their research of teachers' assessments of the SEN of pupils in ordinary schools. They asked teachers to identify pupils with SEN according to learning, behaviour or health problems. Out of the total described by teachers as having SEN, which was 18.8% of all children in the classes studied, 23% were said to have health problems. This category included those children referred to as having physical handicaps and those with sensory handicaps. 4.5% of all the children studied were found to have SEN related to health problems, 60% of this group also had specific learning difficulties. 40% of children identified as having SEN apparently did so for more than one reason. This again shows the difficulty of isolating groups of children with particular characteristics such as physical disabilities, as already noted in chapter 2. Croll and Moses found that teachers often felt unsure about the significance of health related difficulties because they were poorly informed by medical colleagues. This lack of medical information contrasted with the opinion that medical staff had too much influence on placement as noted by Fish (1985), Lewis and Vulliamy (1981), Barton and Tomlinson (1981). Teachers' resentment at lack of information possibly occurred because they felt uninformed yet wished to make appropriate special provision for the pupils concerned. Lack of information about physical disabilities could possibly lead teachers

to think that they could not meet the needs of children with such problems in ordinary classes when in fact a little additional knowledge could ensure appropriate provision.

4.12 Some 20% of the children said by teachers to have SEN were not receiving "any extra help", nor did their teachers want it, reported Croll and Moses (op cit.). This implied that the teachers considered they were making adequate special educational provision for the children concerned. Croll and Moses suggested the term SEN was being used by teachers as a label implying some form of disability in the child rather than a deficiency in the learning situation. Teachers may use the term SEN in this way to describe children previously labelled 'physically handicapped'. Croll and Moses found by means of their interviews and questionnaires that teachers perceived that SEN were related to children's disabilities, the influence of their parents, home and school environments. Teachers mentioned the latter as causes of SEN in only 3% of cases. Head Teachers' opinions on the causes of SEN revealed a similar pattern. Croll and Moses did suggest that teachers and Head Teachers may recognise factors in schools which contributed to the SEN of their pupils but might be reluctant to admit these to researchers. Nevertheless Croll and Moses provided evidence that teachers may not realise that SEN can occur as a result of inappropriate provision. This supports the argument that failure to provide for SEN linked to physical

disabilities, may result in physical handicap as defined in chapter 3. There is nothing in the 1981 Education Act to ensure assessments will reveal physical handicap caused by inappropriate provision.

4.13 Fish (1985) argued that identifying childrens' SEN according to categories such as 'physical handicap' would not ensure awareness of failings in existing educational provision. Using the term 'physically handicapped' as defined in chapter 3 is however a useful way of assessing the success of attempts to meet the SEN of pupils with physical disabilities. This view allows the concept of special educational needs to encompass the continuum of physical disability described in chapter 3, rather than merely reflecting broad categories of handicap with the weaknesses explained in chapter 2. Fish noted that in the U.S.A., assessment of what he described as the unique special educational needs of each child, including those with physical disabilities, must ensure educational provision is made in "the least restrictive environment". This suggests it is possible to make special educational provision based to some degree on assessments of individual SEN. The use of the word environment is particularly relevant to the need for pupils with physical disabilities to have appropriate access to learning.

4.14 Croll and Moses (op cit.), found that teachers referred to the SEN of individual children, for whom they felt it appropriate to distinguish special educational

provision. Fish (op cit.) stressed that children described as having SEN also have many needs in common with other children of their age. These views are both compatible with the hopes of the Warnock Report. It intended that two groups of children classified as handicapped or non - handicapped would no longer be distinguished, merely by labelling children according to categories. This view was supported by the recommendation that within school assessment of special educational needs is important and should ensure provision for a continuum which includes those children whose SEN may not in fact be recorded on a Statement. This showed that teachers should be aware that childrens' SEN can be varied in severity and can embrace a variety of disabilities requiring a variety of adjustments to methods and objectives of teaching. Assessment procedures under the 1981 Education Act offer a means of specifying provision which differs significantly from that generally made for the majority of pupils. Fish noted significant features of special educational provision are access to specially trained teachers, support staff, a suitable educational environment with specific aids, resources and curricula. The importance of such possible features of special educational provision and the role of assessments in obtaining them for children with physical disabilities are examined in later chapters in relation to specific examples.

4.15 It is not only teachers who are involved in writing advice on childrens' SEN as part of the assessment

procedure under the 1981 Education Act. Although advice should be limited to describing SEN, any of the professionals involved may recognise their assessments have implications for the future educational provision and placement of individual children. Potts (1983) noted that doctors and educational psychologists for instance may write their advice in such a way as to leave no doubt that they feel a particular form of educational provision, eg. integration into an ordinary school, is required for an individual child. Potts suggested the Statementing procedure may not give adequate consideration to the views of teachers who he claimed have the most experience of the children. Thompson (1984) noted that the school should be the source of the most up to date information on any child and therefore the source of the most relevant opinions on individual children's SEN. Thompson, like Potts, claimed that the various professionals involved in assessment may have their own sectional interests. Barton and Tomlinson (1981) also claimed educational psychologists and doctors may have particular opinions on special educational provision revealed in the way their advice was written. They noted that the Head Teacher should be in a position to organise and manage the multidisciplinary assessment process and play a leading role in it. These opinions disagree with views of Croll and Moses noted in paragraph 4.11. They found that teachers' assessments of SEN were unreliable in not acknowledging the significance of access to the learning situation on the degree of possible handicap to children with physical disabilities. If the

other professionals involved in assessment are similarly unaware of the limitations of present provision they might not make appropriate assessments or write appropriate advice. In view of those contrasting opinions about the reliability of the advice written as part of the assessment process, there are clear weaknesses in the concept of special educational needs and its reliability as a means of making adequate special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. The role of LEA officers using it as a basis for the writing of Statements is crucial. They are the final arbiters of advice and do have an opportunity to recognise the possible handicaps faced by children with physical disabilities.

4.16 Galloway (1985) claimed that there are patterns of referral by certain ordinary schools which reveal the special educational needs of their teachers as well as those of their pupils. It was suggested that children may be reported as having SEN if their teachers see them as disruptive for instance. This point was not made with particular reference to children with physical disabilities. Nevertheless like the findings of Croll and Moses noted in paragraph 4.11, it shows the significance of teachers' perceptions of handicap on their opinions of the provision which should be made for individual pupil's SEN. Galloway claimed that even assessment by means of measures such as behaviour rating scales could be used by teachers as a way of obtaining

specific forms of special educational provision. Galloway claimed therefore that the precise percentages of children having SEN, which the Warnock Report suggested, are in fact open to doubt given that assessment is unreliable in the ways he suggested. Galloway, like Fish as noted in paragraph 4.13, also suggested that all children with apparently similar disabilities may not therefore have the same degree of handicap, the latter being a reflection of teachers' efforts to meet SEN.

4.17 It has been established in this chapter that the Warnock Report suggested special educational provision should be based on assessments of individual childrens' special educational needs, (SEN). It has been difficult to isolate a clear definition of the concept of SEN. Evidence was found of different perceptions of the term among those involved in assessments or making special educational provision. It has been argued that the SEN of individual children with physical disabilities depends not only on any loss of physical function they may have, but also on the appropriateness of the educational provision made for them. This chapter confirmed that if special educational provision is to be adequate for pupils with physical disabilities it may involve the provision of special access to the curriculum.

4.18 It has been suggested that the definition of special educational needs in Section 1 of the 1981 Education Act is norm-referenced according to the

criterion of whether individual children have learning difficulties. It was noted that these are said to exist if pupils are unable to gain full benefit from the educational provision generally made for pupils in their age groups. Clearly not all children will gain the same from any learning situation. This suggests that there is a continuum of special educational needs, ranging from those children who reach some but not all of the teacher's planned objectives, to those who may not reach any because the objectives are inappropriate or unattainable. This chapter has expressed some doubt that percentages of children having SEN may be quite as precise as those suggested by the Warnock Report. The latter implied that in any age group a significant percentage of pupils are so far from the norm as to have SEN. This may lead some of those making assessments to attempt to identify an appropriate number of such pupils. Clearly this would be at odds with the criterion referenced definitions of physical disability and physical handicap outlined in this thesis.

4.19 In chapter 3 it was established that children with physical disabilities can be considered physically handicapped if they are unable to participate fully in their educational assignments. This chapter has confirmed that special educational needs as defined by the 1981 Act can be created or exacerbated by inadequate educational provision. Some pupils' physical disabilities may be such for instance that they cannot gain access to some

practical learning situations or record their responses to assignments adequately, even if they have the intellectual ability to do so. They could then be said to have SEN according to the criteria of the 1981 Act. This line of argument suggests that children with physical disabilities and associated sensory, emotional or specific learning difficulties should be considered to have SEN. These interpretations of the concept of SEN underline the significance of the definition of physical handicap made in chapter 3. Nevertheless this chapter has showed that consideration of SEN does not guarantee the recognition of physical handicaps.

4.20 Procedures for the assessment and Statementing of SEN, which were introduced by the 1981 Education Act, were examined in this chapter. They were designed to lead to the making of appropriate special educational provision for individual pupils. It has been argued that the assessment process under the 1981 Education Act offers an opportunity, but does not ensure that Statements of SEN will identify pupils' physical handicaps as defined in this thesis. Evidence has been found that the Statements may merely identify SEN in terms of loss of physical function or failure in the child, without noting failures in existing educational provision which cause physical handicaps.

4.21 This chapter has suggested that there are weaknesses in the assessment of SEN under the 1981

Education Act. As the concept of SEN is norm-referenced some professionals may for instance attempt to use assessments to influence the outcomes in terms of the provision to be made for individual children. It has been argued that assessments can be influenced by professionals' perceptions of existing provision or what they think should be the future educational provision for an individual child. It has been suggested that these perceptions may include seeing SEN as resident in the child, rather than in failures in the existing provision which may be unrecognised by those involved in making contributions to assessments. Nevertheless it has been shown that awareness of possible handicaps to learning may be raised by consideration of the concept of SEN. The concept may be helpful to distinguish and obtain appropriate provision.

4.22 The concept of SEN could perhaps be a more useful means of obtaining appropriate special educational provision for individual pupils if it was reinforced by changes in the assessment procedures under the 1981 Act. The opportunity to make changes doesn't seem to have been taken, judging by the D.E.S. draft circular on SEN which followed the 1988 Education Act. This issue is considered in more detail in chapter 11. The possibility remains that those contributing towards assessments will not recognise when physically disabled children are failing in school because teachers have not considered whether curricula access and objectives are appropriate

for such pupils. Those writing advice as part of the statementing process under the 1981 Education Act may continue, consciously or not, to be influenced by their perceptions of failure in the child, rather than failure in existing provision. LEA Officers charged with writing Statements will continue to have a very significant role in the interpretation of the advice they receive about childrens' SEN.

4.23 This chapter has not attempted to identify particular SEN of children with physical disabilities. The next chapter will investigate patterns of physical disability and physical handicaps which may result from them. Recognition of any patterns of physical disability would clearly be helpful to avoiding physical handicaps to learning.

Planning and Implementing Effective Special Educational Provision to meet the Special Educational Needs of Children with Physical Disabilities.

5.1 This chapter examines attempts to identify the special educational needs of children with physical disabilities, to investigate whether they have contributed to the making of adequate special educational provision for such pupils. The perceptions of the SEN of children with physical disabilities, held by those involved in assessment and educational provision, are evaluated. Previous chapters have shown the significance of distinguishing between physical disability and physical handicap. Examples of special educational provision are considered inadequate if, as suggested in chapter 4, those involved blame childrens' failure to learn on their disabilities, rather than handicaps caused by inappropriate educational provision. It has been argued that there are difficulties in identifying the SEN of individual children with physical and other disabilities, despite the assessment and statementing procedures of the 1981 Education Act. This chapter therefore examines examples of methods of classifying and identifying the SEN of children with physical disabilities to see if there are any which offer a reliable strategy on which to base the

recognition of possible physical handicap as defined in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.8. There is investigation of examples of organisation, staffing and resources, which have been provided in both special and ordinary schools where there are children with physical disabilities. Another issue to be addressed in this chapter is whether there are particular features of special educational provision which have been found to contribute to its success in meeting the SEN of individual children with physical disabilities.

5.2 In her detailed research into the success of provision for children with physical disabilities in ordinary primary schools, Anderson (1973), asked teachers to distinguish such pupils according to the severity of their loss of physical function. She reported teachers' perceptions of the most significant physical handicaps caused by impairment of function to be in the areas of mobility 40.5%, hand control 36.4%, incontinence 16.2% and temporary immobility 5.4%, though it was felt many childrens' performances were affected in more than one area. Anderson claimed that the severity of childrens' needs could be distinguished according to the aids they used eg. wheel chairs, walking aids or the need for assistance with tasks such as feeding, dressing, mobility or the toilet. Thus Anderson's analysis merely reflected teachers' perceptions of the effects of childrens' physical disabilities. She found no clear evidence that teachers recognised shortcomings in the special

educational provision available in the ordinary schools concerned. This suggests that they considered physical handicaps could be overcome by focussing on aids for disabled children without examining the appropriateness of the demands of learning situations or pupils' access to them. This confirms the suggestion made in chapter 4 that teachers' perceptions of physical disabilities may in fact be an unreliable basis for ensuring that SEN have in fact been met. Nevertheless physical disabilities do have important implications for features of special provision in special or ordinary schools for the children concerned. The features of provision necessary to meet loss of physical function in the areas of physical independence mentioned by Anderson would involve provision of special resources, special access to buildings and welfare assistants. Anderson noted that if physical function is limited, as shown by the need for the aids mentioned, childrens' comfort and therefore attainments in school could be affected. Their physical needs may require special educational provision such as physiotherapy and training for physical independence. It is therefore crucial that teachers are aware of any lack of physical development or physical function as such rather than merely the aids which may or may not be adequate to limit physical handicap.

5.3 Anderson suggested that in addition to the physical needs discussed above other significant criteria to be considered if disabled children were to be

satisfactorily educated in ordinary schools were their intellectual, social and emotional needs. Anderson did not refer to these as 'special needs'. In 1973, when she was writing, such terminology had not taken on its post Warnock Report significance. In fact all children have educational needs in these areas but Anderson suggested features of what would now be termed 'special educational provision' were needed to meet particular characteristics of ph children in these areas. She suggested adequate educational provision for them must include teaching related to academic subjects any specific learning difficulties, appropriate teacher expectations of attainments, confidence building and security. The detailed curricular implications of Anderson's findings are examined in chapter 6.

5.4 Anderson reproduced a table (figure 5), which showed that there was a significant overlap between placements of children suffering from various medical conditions and physical disabilities in either special or ordinary schools. Anderson noted that those pupils with the more severe physical disabilities, for example cerebral palsy manifest as athetosis or quadraplegia, were generally but not exclusively, placed in special schools. Figure 5 confirms that in 1972, despite the then existing ten D.E.S. categories of handicap described in chapter 2, 56.4% of children with physical disabilities were placed in ordinary schools. Such figures do not of course indicate that such placements and the provision made there

FIGURE 5

(Reproduced from ANDERSON, (1973)

Comparison of the types of physical disabilities found in ordinary and special schools at January 1971.

(Figures taken from HEALTH OF THE SCHOOL CHILD, D.E.S. 1972)

NATURE OF DISABILITY	Total Number of Children	Children in	
		Special Schools % of total	Ordinary Schools % of total
Cerebral Palsy	4294	66.00	34.00
Spina Bifida	2256	65.00	35.00
Heart Disease	2805	24.70	75.30
Muscular Dystrophy	797	66.90	33.10
Congenital Deformities of Limbs	2848	16.20	83.80
Post Polimyelitis	844	37.00	63.00
Haemophilia	433	43.60	56.40
Perthe's Disease	601	24.10	75.90
Miscellaneous Physical Handicaps	4721	65.00	59.50
Total Number of children.	19599		
Total Percentage of children with each type of disability found in special or ordinary school.		43.59	56.41

was adequate. This evidence does nevertheless suggest the existence of a continuum of physical disability reflected in a continuum of associated special educational needs rather than the existence of a distinct category of children with physical handicaps as such. If this is the case the range of possible special educational provision for children with physical disabilities must include both ordinary and special schools, if it is to be adequate.

5.5 Despite the above evidence that there should be a range of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities, LEAs charged with providing expensive resources may still attempt to categorise the special needs of such pupils. This they may justify by a declared wish to make what the 1981 Education Act refers to as "efficient use of resources". The previous paragraph showed that there is a need for special schools for children with physical disabilities as part of a range of provision for them. It could reasonably be expected that LEAs would ensure such schools would have adequate accommodation, resources and staffing for such pupils. In contrast LEAs may consider it impossible for all their ordinary schools to be provided with such facilities.

5.6 An HMI Report (1989) noted that many LEAs were reviewing their provision for pupils with physical disabilities. 35 special schools, 20 ordinary primary and secondary schools and 11 units attached to the latter were visited. It was found that LEAs had not always examined

the true costs of adapting buildings, providing necessary resources or support staff, for physically disabled pupils in ordinary schools. Nevertheless in general it was said that most ordinary schools visited had "succeeded to some extent in making adaptations to solve pupils' mobility problems" (para. 8). The level of resources in special schools varied enormously, often being a reflection of their reliance on charitable donations as much as of LEA support. Resources in ordinary schools and units more directly reflected LEA support but were generally found to be "adequate" (paras 46 and 47). The accommodation in special schools was reported as good in only a minority of cases. This appeared to be because of the buildings generally being older, reflecting the historical development of such provision described in chapter 2. It is significant that HMI generally found the more recently developed provision in units to be "adequate" (para 42), though in some cases accommodation problems limited the possibility of full integration for pupils with physical disabilities. In ordinary primary schools HMI noted "there was little need for adaptation" (para.44) however in secondary schools few buildings had been fully accessible to such pupils. As a result there were limitations particularly in the practical subjects available for them and in "a few cases" (para 43) there was physical danger to pupils because of poor access.

5.7 HMI (op cit.) also found that where access to ordinary schools is not adequate for children with

physical disabilities, there may be a mismatch between the provision available and the wishes of parents and disabled pupils. Similarly poor accommodation, staffing, therapy support and resources in either special or ordinary schools, as found in some cases by HMI, may effectively set limits as to what can be regarded as adequate provision. Any restrictions of this kind on possible placements show the importance of considering the individual special needs of children with physical disabilities. Chapter 2 has already shown the weaknesses of the use of broad categories such as 'PH' as a basis for making special educational provision. Chapter 4 showed that the 1981 Education Act required LEAs to record two categories of special educational need on children's Statements, those which are educational and those which are non-educational. Anderson's evidence on the needs of children with physical disabilities and HMI's findings show that both categories may be significant to the making of adequate provision for such pupils. The relative significance of needs in each area may however vary between individuals.

5.8 HMI pointed out that "Statements for pupils with a physical disability, written in response to the 1981 Education Act, were generally not very useful" (para 10). This implies that the Statements were not a reliable basis on which to make special educational provision. This appears to be a weakness of assessments and recording rather than a failing in the basic strategy of making

provision based on Statements of special educational needs as such. The evidence of HMI (1989) does demonstrate that as chapter 4 suggested, even if Statements are precise in their specification of SEN, as long as LEAs can argue that provision and therefore placements should be related to the most efficient use of resources, there is no guarantee that the special educational provision will be adequate.

5.9 Cope and Anderson (1977) conducted research into the placement of children with physical disabilities in special units attached to ordinary schools. Their aim was to examine the quality of such special educational provision and find how many LEAs had such 'integration' schemes. The pattern of organisation of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities was also examined and the influence of historical inertia investigated. Cope and Anderson described three areas of needs they claimed were common to disabled children and significant to adequate educational provision for them. This research was significant in being conducted before the Warnock Report had suggested analysing special educational needs. Indeed it may have been a deliberate attempt to further the 'integration' of children with physical disabilities. Cope and Anderson suggested the needs could be classified as follows :

- a) Medical / Physical including therapy, help with toilet; adapted furniture, buildings and access; special transport and extra supervision.

- b) The need for specialised teaching perhaps because of specific learning difficulties, frequent absence or a combination of these factors.
- c) Social and emotional needs requiring contact with able-bodied pupils.

This description appears to be an attempt to isolate the special educational needs of a group of children who can be defined as having physical disabilities. In fact the evidence of Cope and Anderson shows such isolation of needs is impossible. Those listed under a) for example reflect needs expressed in terms of provision rather than individual children's characteristics. While those listed as b) reveal needs which are common to other pupils without physical disabilities who are also placed in ordinary schools. The needs mentioned in c) may largely be a result of previous provision being made in a segregated setting.

5.10 Cope and Anderson's research revealed a continuum of physical disability accompanied by varying degrees of associated learning difficulties among the pupils involved. Cope and Anderson observed a pattern of placement which distinguished between children, who being mobile and continent, with no specific learning difficulties, could attend ordinary school and those "needing special medical or physical help" who could only be successfully placed in special units or schools. This conclusion suggests that despite their analysis of needs

noted above, Cope and Anderson were making judgements on the appropriateness of what they considered to be an essential range of provision. They actually listed recommendations the principle one of which was to suggest that more units for physically disabled children attached to ordinary schools should be opened. Clearly they considered this was a feature of the range of provision which had been lacking. Cope and Anderson reported that those children who had specific learning difficulties as well as physical disability could best be provided for in special schools or units attached to ordinary schools. Thus Cope and Anderson provided evidence of attempts to make placement on the basis of available provision and the identification of a distinct group of children, ie. those with certain characteristics including a range of physical disabilities. Cope and Anderson concluded that many children with mild physical disabilities and no learning difficulties could be educated in ordinary schools. Thus their recognition of a continuum of need was qualified in relation to differences in the special educational provision available at that time ie. that ranging from ordinary schools to special units for disabled pupils attached to the latter and special schools.

5.11 Swann (1983) suggested that only those aspects of physical disability which require special resources such as the use of Bliss Symbolics or a Possum switch to eliminate handicap can be classed as special educational needs. This was also explicit in the definition of SEN

used by the Warnock Report, though such specific examples were not given. Swann claimed that teachers in special schools underestimated the ability of colleagues in ordinary schools to meet the SEN of pupils with disabilities, though he did not quote specific research on such attitudes. Certainly there is no reason why the particular resources mentioned could not be provided in ordinary schools. Swann's opinion complements that of Potts, in Booth and Potts (1983), that neither special nor ordinary schools are ideal in being able to meet all the SEN of children with disabilities. Potts therefore suggested that placement should be made with reference to a concept of "least disadvantage" to the individual child. This opinion is similar to that of Fish (1985), who suggested that placement should be made where there was provision for children with physical disabilities in the "least restrictive environment". The origins of this concept lie in the U.S.A. where Public Law 94-142 guarantees children access to the educational placement offering the least disadvantage, considering their special educational needs. The suggestion that both special and ordinary schools' may be able to meet SEN is also shared by Dessent (1984).

5.12 Without naming specific disabilities, Mittler (1978) suggested that teachers should be aware of the significance of the physical demands they make on children he termed 'handicapped'. This implied the need for particular strategies or special provision for SEN related

to teachers' recognition of individual pupils' physical disabilities. The distinction between 'physical handicap' and 'physical disability' explained in chapter 3 remains an important one for this thesis. Mittler pointed out that teachers should be aware of possible handicaps to pupils' learning. He noted these were related to pupils' opportunities for access to activities, to make responses, or to record their work. The appropriateness of such demands is strongly influenced by teachers' perceptions and knowledge of childrens' physical disabilities. Mittler thus suggested that adequate provision for children with physical disabilities depends on two factors a) the successful identification of physical loss of function and b) careful planning of special educational provision for their individual needs.

5.13 Morgenstern (1987) appeared to recognise the difference between physical disability and physical handicap as defined in chapter 3. He pointed out that childrens' educational progress is influenced by their physical ability to access learning situations. He claimed that such access may for instance be affected by any limitation in childrens' mobility hindering exploration and therefore the development of peer group relationships. Morgenstern noted that pupils with physical disabilities are as a result more often observers than participants. He distinguished between "primary handicaps", ie. loss of physical function or lack of its development and the resulting fragmented or missed

experiences, which he termed "secondary handicaps". The latter he claimed affected general intellectual and social development which in turn influenced learning both at home and in school. Thus he suggested that children with physical disabilities may have SEN related to their lack of ability to manipulate small articles. The latter could be significant for instance in affecting counting and therefore pre-number activities. Drawing and colouring may also be affected. Similarly restricted mobility could affect childrens' gross motor development and therefore spatial awareness, with implications for problem solving activities.

5.14 Morgenstern (op cit.) stressed the importance of teachers' awareness of childrens' disabilities. He suggested that such pupils should nevertheless be allowed to correct their own errors. Clearly this had implications for careful monitoring of childrens' physical development. Morgenstern suggested difficulties in access to the learning situation are best assessed on an individual basis. This view is compatible with the provisions of the 1981 Education Act which requires individual assessment as noted in chapter 4. Morgenstern claimed children can only have an adequate basis for learning if teachers pay due regard to developing the sensori-motor experiences of pupils who have what he termed 'primary handicaps'. This suggests that special consideration is needed to successfully teach the children who are the concern of this thesis. This special

consideration is an essential feature of special educational provision which will depend on teachers' perceptions of physical disability in general and their recognition of it individual children in particular.

5.15 In this chapter the significance of the distinction between physical disability and physical handicap first made in chapter 3 has been confirmed. Anderson's evidence in paragraph 5.2 showed that children with physical disabilities were perceived by their teachers to have broad categories of special educational needs relating directly to lack of physical function. It has been argued that teachers' perceptions of the severity of such needs may not be accurate however if they are simply based on the aids children use. While use of a wheel chair clearly suggests a child has mobility problems it does not show that he or she may also have the spatial awareness difficulties noted by Morgenstern in paragraph 5.14. Thus if special educational provision for children with physical disabilities is to be successful teachers must have accurate knowledge of any loss of physical function, insight into its possible effects and an accurate perception of the adequacy of provision to limit possible physical handicap.

5.16 This chapter has shown that if the SEN of children with physical disabilities are to be successfully identified educational objectives and learning situations must be examined according to the criteria of the

individual child's access and ability to respond to them. Such consideration is relevant to the successful teaching of all children but is particularly significant to meeting the special educational needs of children with physical disabilities. The significance of the four areas of particular special educational needs of children with physical disabilities identified by Anderson and noted in paragraph 5.2 is clear. They are criteria which are directly relevant to the making of effective special educational provision for such pupils. Chapter 4 noted that individual assessments of SEN under the 1981 Education Act offer a method of assessing the likely effects of physical disability. This chapter has confirmed that Statements of SEN will only be helpful if the advice of assessing professionals is based on accurate perceptions of disability and possible handicap. It is to be regretted that HMI (1989) found that whilst reports from physiotherapists for example were clear, only a few of the educational and psychological reports clearly specified pupils' learning needs or conveyed broad profiles of pupils' strengths and weaknesses. This chapter has argued that teachers' perceptions of SEN do not always recognise the risk of children with physical disabilities being physically handicapped in school learning situations.

5.17 The evidence of Anderson (1973) showed special educational provision for children with physical disabilities, existed in both special and ordinary schools

with varying success, even before the 1981 Education Act. No evidence was found in this chapter that the broad pattern of the needs of such children identified by Anderson has changed. Special access to buildings, resources to remove the possible handicaps of loss of physical function, staff awareness and support from therapists have all been mentioned as significant to the success of individual children's placements. The HMI Report (1989) expressed disquiet at the adequacy of accommodation and resources in special schools for children with physical disabilities. Their main concerns were that curricular, rather than physical needs were not being met. This was also found to be true in comprehensive schools where children with physical disabilities were placed. The issue of whether there are particular curricular needs for children with physical disabilities and how they can be provided for is considered in the next chapter.

5.18 This chapter has not found evidence that educational provision for children with physical disabilities can best be made by distinguishing their needs according to a rigid category of physical handicap. Indeed this chapter confirms that it is essential that assessments of the SEN of children with physical disabilities reflect their individual access to learning situations. The only common characteristics of such children are that by definition they have some significant loss of physical function. It has been argued that the

effects of physical disabilities on educational attainment vary in relation to the degree of loss of function and according to the way teachers perceive this. This raises the issue of the merits of continuing to include segregated special schools within the range of provision for children with physical disabilities. This issue is examined in the next chapter to see if there is any justification on curriculum grounds for this type of provision. It is clear from the HMI Report (1989) and the evidence of Swann (1983) noted above that many of the physical needs of pupils with physical disabilities, summarised by Cope and Anderson, could be met in ordinary schools or units attached to such establishments. This chapter confirms that, despite the difficulties of obtaining reliable assessments, provision for children with physical disabilities should be made on the basis of their individual special educational needs, rather than placement within existing provision. Use of Statements however will not guarantee that there will be any change in the availability of for example the 'units' suggested by Cope and Anderson. HMI's findings (op cit.), confirm that such provision is only likely to be established in response to clear policy initiatives by LEAs, rather than individual childrens' Statements. Influences on the range of special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities are further examined in chapter 7.

Chapter 6

Identifying and meeting the curricular needs of pupils with physical disabilities.

6.1 The previous chapter showed that teachers' success in making special educational provision for children with physical disabilities depends on their perceptions of the likely effects of pupils' loss of physical function or lack of physical development. Even if teachers have an accurate perception of pupils' abilities to perform tasks however, a major issue to be considered is whether the demands being made on pupils are relevant to their educational needs. This chapter therefore discusses such needs by examining the aims of education for pupils with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools.

6.2 The first issue to be examined in this chapter is whether the aims of education for children with physical disabilities should be different to those relevant to children in general. Whether they are different or not a second issue to be clarified is whether implementing the aims of education for children with physical disabilities requires alternative or additional educational objectives, learning situations or methods. A third issue to be examined is whether any mismatch between

childrens' physical ability and tasks relevant to the overall aims of their education, can be tackled merely by improving access to learning situations. An alternative to improving such access may be the modification of objectives. Even if the overall aims of education are relevant to the special educational needs of children with physical disabilities, if the immediate objectives are not suitable, such children will not attain them. It is in the context of these issues that examples of curricular provision, based on attempts to meet the SEN of children with physical disabilities are evaluated.

6.3 The Warnock Report (D.E.S. 1978) noted that while concern was often shown for individual pupils with SEN their curriculum was sometimes limited in scope and challenge. This implied that the aims of education for such pupils were inadequate and that they should not be different to those for all children. The Warnock Report suggested that one starting point for curriculum development should be each child's attributes and needs. Another consideration was said to be the different problems faced by children with different disabilities. This suggests that the aims of education for children with SEN could be different to those of other pupils. In fact as already shown in chapters 3, 4 and 5 pupils with physical disabilities do not form a distinct group. The consideration of individual SEN suggested by the Warnock Report would help the provision of a broad, balanced and relevant education for all children, including those with

physical disabilities, whether or not they are labelled as having SEN. HMI also express such an opinion in their advice on curriculum development contained in Curriculum 5 - 16 (D.E.S. 1985). The Warnock Report suggested that four interrelated elements contribute to a curriculum for pupils with SEN. They are the setting of appropriate objectives, choice of materials, choice of teaching and learning methods and appraisal of objectives and means of achieving them. Here again these considerations would help ensure successful education for all children.

6.4 The Warnock Committee also pointed out that whilst many children with SEN learn incidentally from their surroundings some of them "may need to be taught as part of the school's curriculum many things which other children learn naturally", (paragraph 11.4). This view is still compatible with the earlier conclusion that children with SEN, including those with physical disabilities do not form a distinct group. Warnock is merely noting the added significance of certain factors for such pupils. It was noted for example that secondary schools especially should modify the materials to be used by pupils with physical disabilities in responding to the curriculum. For those with learning difficulties it was suggested that teaching objectives should also be modified, for example by devising Modern Language courses for such pupils which include more oral work with less written work or grammar. It is significant that the Warnock Report did not suggest that pupils with learning

or physical disabilities should have an alternative curriculum to that offered to children in general. This principle has been confirmed by the 1988 Education Act, and is described thus in paragraph 8.1 of 'From Policy to Practice': "All pupils share the same statutory entitlement to a broad and balanced curriculum, including access to the National Curriculum", (D.E.S. 1989). The curricular implications of the 1988 Education Reform Act for pupils with physical disabilities are examined in chapter 11.

6.5 The Warnock Report was quite clear in saying that pupils with SEN "need access to the whole range of the curriculum, not just a limited part of it" (paragraph 11.10). Indeed it was noted that "many special schools under-estimate their pupils' capabilities" (paragraph 11.12). Special school curricula were often found to be too narrow in concentrating on reading and number to the exclusion of science and environmental studies. The Warnock Report claimed that the most successful special schools were those with both overall curriculum guidelines and programmes for individual children in response to those guidelines. It was particularly noted that special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities should include individual programmes produced in collaboration with physiotherapists and occupational therapists. With suitable individual programmes it was claimed that "many children with physical disabilities may be educated in

ordinary schools if adequately supported" (paragraph 11.39). On the other hand it was noted that the need for therapy may be so intense as to require placement of the child concerned in a special school where such input may be concentrated at the required level.

6.6 Hegarty et al. (1982) examined the needs of children with physical disabilities who were candidates to be placed in ordinary schools. The latter they noted, must make special provision for care, therapy and access as well as for the education of children with physical disabilities. Hegarty et al. did not suggest that there should be any specific aims for children with physical disabilities, unless they had additional learning problems caused for example by neurological abnormalities. Hegarty noted that specific expertise may be necessary to teach children who suffer from Cerebral Palsy, Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus for instance. Chapter 3 showed that medical labels are an unreliable basis on which to base assessments of special educational needs because varying conditions do not always cause the same degree of disability. Nevertheless spatial and perceptual difficulties which may be associated with the conditions named above are likely to affect childrens' educational attainments. Teachers may therefore need to modify educational objectives for the children concerned. Hegarty et al. reported that some teachers interviewed were uncertain about what were appropriate curricular demands for pupils about whose physical and intellectual

abilities they admitted ignorance.

6.7 Hegarty et al. (op cit.), found that a significant number of primary school teachers in their study claimed to have "little difficulty in exposing pupils (with physical disabilities) to the normal school curriculum." (page 108). This choice of words is very significant for it implied that such a curriculum is rigid and that teachers did not consider that educational aims should be altered for such pupils. In one ordinary primary school however Hegarty et al. found that the curriculum was 'narrowed' as pupils with physical disabilities were excluded from P.E.. Evidence that children with physical disabilities can in fact be involved in P.E. is provided by the Kielder Challenge Competition as reported by Newman and Sharples (1987).. This competition has been organised nationally, every year since 1986. It involves combined teams of disabled and able-bodied youngsters training and eventually competing in outdoor problem solving. The challenge requires fitness training and use of initiative appropriate to the physical and intellectual abilities of both disabled and able-bodied participants.

6.8 In examining curriculum provision for pupils with physical disabilities placed in a comprehensive school with a special unit to support them, Hegarty et al. (1982) found that those children who also had significant learning difficulties were rarely integrated into the

main school. It was noted that "the more academically able pupils, pursue individual subjects just like any other pupil of the school," (page 122). Such pupils were integrated into ordinary classes anything up to full time. Those who remained in the special unit for the disabled followed a 'custom built' course, suggesting it had different aims. The course consisted of English, Maths, Science, Craft, Home Economics, Typing and P.E.. The latter subject was said to have been adapted to the needs of children Hegarty et al. termed PH, though these needs and any special educational objectives for them in the other subjects mentioned were not explained. This 'custom-built' course presumably differed from the curriculum available to the majority of pupils in the school by not only having objectives suited to the children with learning and physical disabilities following it but also in excluding them from subjects such as foreign languages and humanities which were not mentioned. Certainly Hegarty et al. found no justification as to why children with physical disabilities should not have the opportunity of following such subjects. A 'Design for Living Programme' was being developed for disabled sixth formers at the same school. This involved personal hygiene, relationships, household management, entertainment and the community. Again it is not made clear if or how this programme was related to any perceived special educational needs of children with physical disabilities. It is not clear why such a programme should be considered any more appropriate for

them rather than for able-bodied children.

6.9 Hegarty et al. (op cit.) noted that in another comprehensive school into which pupils with physical disabilities from a special school on campus were integrated part time, a leavers' course in 'Post School Living' "was considered not to be suited to the needs of physically handicapped pupils" (page 142). This was because its starting points were said to be too remote from their experience. Apparently no effort was made to alter the approach of the course yet its overall aim must have been relevant unless all the disabled pupils were terminally ill. Hopefully this was not the case. Chapter 3 did show however that pupils with physical disabilities may have special educational needs which in fact require special or additional curricular objectives. These can compensate for limited experiences and therefore assist aims to be realised. Hegarty et al. also reported that staff at the comprehensive said that they could not always find the time to attend to difficulties faced by children with physical disabilities integrated for academic subjects. These pupils were perceived to be used to working at a slower pace. This may have resulted from lack of teacher expectation in the special school or inadequate differentiation of objectives in the comprehensive school. It is clear that with better differentiation of objectives curricular integration may have been more successful. It is clear that provision of appropriate curricula and objectives depend on teachers'

perceptions of childrens' SEN.

6.10 There are no clear criteria on the basis of the evidence of Hegarty et al. in terms of curricula, which suggest that the SEN of children with physical disabilities can only be met in segregated special schools. This view is supported by the evidence of Swann (1983) and Brennan (1982) noted in chapter 2. Brennan, like the Warnock Report specifically warned against seeing special schools as the only form of adequate special educational provision. They noted that special schools had the disadvantage of limited subject availability, supporting the evidence noted in paragraph 6.5. Brennan suggested that special schools may have the advantage of small classes. Though Hegarty et al. did not comment on this the point it may have been subsumed in some of the perceptions of teachers they interviewed who indicated that they thought children with physical disabilities may have been better placed in special schools. They summarised their findings by saying that children with physical disabilities should pursue educational aims that are broadly similar to those of their peers in the main school, but with individual needs being fully recognised and fully met.

6.11 Swann (1983) commented on the curriculum principles for the integration of children from special schools into mainstream. He suggested that some features of the 'hidden curriculum' in special schools were unique

to that type of educational provision yet may be of value to children with special educational needs placed in ordinary schools. Swann suggested that if individual children are placed in their neighbourhood schools they may not be aware that there are others with apparently similar physical disabilities. Such awareness may offer them some security. This argument suggests provision for children with special needs in ordinary schools should be based on designated establishments where there may be several children with physical disabilities rather than individual placements in neighbourhood schools.

6.12 Individual teaching plans noted Swann (op cit.), may be of doubtful value in ordinary schools where there are pupils with special educational needs. He claimed that many curricular activities expressed in such plans in special schools differed little from those in ordinary schools, though checklists and names for them reflect jargon used by teachers. Swann thus implied that the existence of such jargon may not in fact be a successful way of relating objectives more clearly to the special educational needs of individual children. In contrast the evidence of Hegarty et al. above showed curricula aims for children with physical disabilities in special or ordinary schools can not be adequately implemented without individual consideration of teaching objectives.

6.13 Swann confirmed that provision for children with physical disabilities could be adequately made in

ordinary schools but the thesis has already argued that SEN of such pupils may not be recognised. He suggested there was little in special schools for the PH which was "educationally special". He noted that behaviourism in special schools is an attempt to create a 'special curriculum'. Swann suggested that goal-setting based on such approaches denies the potential of even 'mentally handicapped' pupils for incidental learning. Whilst this may be so, it is clear from the evidence of Hegarty et al. in paragraph 6.9 that objectives for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools are not always appropriate. On the other hand Swann did point out that ordinary schools by definition can offer a broader curriculum than that which may be available in special schools. He felt that if all objectives in an ordinary school were totally individualised to meet the perceived SEN of children with physical disabilities their isolation may be perpetuated. Swann therefore suggested children with special needs in ordinary schools should be taught from the same syllabus as other pupils to prevent stigma. He did acknowledge the importance of suitable learning and teaching methods in making adequate special educational provision for children with SEN in ordinary schools. Swann stressed however that such individual consideration should be helpful to all pupils and therefore applied to all rather than increasing the stigma of pupils with disabilities because methods for them appear different.

6.14 This chapter has argued that curricula objectives for pupils with SEN should be as near in scope and reality to those of other children of the same age as practically possible. Fish (1985) noted that children with SEN have many educational needs common to all children. Fish also noted that schools themselves could create or exacerbate SEN if the curricula they offer do not have flexible objectives as suggested above. This opinion is consistent with the definitions of physical disability and physical handicap in chapter 3.

6.15 Mittler (1981) claimed that "handicapped children must be taught what others learn" (Foreword to Morgenstern 1981). He claimed it is essential they have individual programmes with clear objectives. Mittler noted the significance of considering the physical demands faced by pupils with physical and other disabilities including their opportunities to make responses to the demands. This view is consistent with the argument in this thesis that children with physical disabilities may fail to learn because they are handicapped by inadequate access to the learning situation. Mittler implied that such difficulties could be overcome by appropriate teaching programmes. Mittler's use of the term 'handicapped' suggests he considered these pupils to be different to other children. He implied that their curricular needs could be entirely met by individual teaching plans and unlike Swann (op cit.) did not acknowledge the importance of giving them

opportunities for incidental learning.

6.16 In writing about 'Teaching Plans for Handicapped Children' Morgenstern (1981) stated "the aims of special education do not coincide with those of normal education". This appears to be in direct contrast to the opinions of Warnock, Potts, Swann and HMI mentioned above. Morgenstern does agree with these other writers however that access to the learning situation for a disabled child will influence the degree of physical handicap as defined in chapter 3. Thus it seems that his comment about the aims of education is based on the view that it requires different methods, though not necessarily different content. Detailed discussion in chapter 5 showed that Morgenstern believes helping 'handicapped' pupils to overcome what he described as obstacles to learning, is of greater significance than curricula content. In contrast Potts (1983) noted that lists of objectives alone were not a 'Curriculum'. They should be supported by the overall aims mentioned with reference to Warnock and Swann above.

6.17 HMI (1989) reported on attempts to provide for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. They noted that the increased integration of such pupils into ordinary schools raised important curricular issues such as the revision of timetables to allow access to all classes and the optimum size of groups for mixed ability teaching. Only a

minority of special schools for pupils with physical disabilities were found to be "providing a comprehensive, coherent and balanced curriculum for all their pupils" (paragraph 12). Some subjects such as science and CDT were "poorly covered or omitted altogether". Fish (op cit.) also pointed out that small special schools were at a disadvantage in attempting to provide a broad curriculum. This was also acknowledged by HMI who blamed falling rolls and declining numbers of staff in the special schools for children with physical disabilities. In some special schools the needs of the minority for examination courses were found to overshadow the provision of an appropriate curriculum for pupils with significant learning as well as physical disabilities. HMI also regretted that in many PH schools it was no longer possible to sustain appropriate activities such as wheelchair dancing or sport as more of the pupils currently placed there are said to be too severely handicapped. This implies they should now be available in ordinary schools where there are disabled pupils.

6.18 In ordinary schools with units for children with physical disabilities HMI claimed that few modifications to the curriculum were needed. It was noted that pupils with physical disabilities "fare better in those schools where the provision is suitably differentiated for all the pupils with special needs" (paragraph 16). There were frequently interruptions to disabled pupils' studies caused by their needs for therapy. These were rarely

adequately catered for by flexibility in the timetable. Some ordinary schools also had difficulty in providing access to some subjects such as Home Economics, Science, CDT and P.E.. It was found that sometimes the number of subjects taken by pupils with physical disabilities was limited because it was felt that working at a slower pace they could not cope with all that could be offered in ordinary schools. This is in direct contrast to the evidence above which suggests that all pupils with physical disabilities should follow a curriculum as broad as that followed by all other pupils. It was suggested above that it is the curricular objectives which should be altered where pupils have additional learning difficulties, not the overall aims. The 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA) has made it quite clear that all pupils have a statutory right to a broad and balanced curriculum. The implications of this for pupils with physical disabilities are examined in chapter 11. Certainly the ERA does not distinguish the need for different curricula for pupils with any type of disability, or in any type of educational placement. No distinction is made for instance between curricula which should be provided in special or ordinary schools.

6.19 HMI claimed it was not possible to say that the overall quality of education for children with physical disabilities was better in special schools, units or ordinary classrooms. Examples of good practice were seen in all three types of provision. It was noted that

pupils attending ordinary schools, whether based in units or not, "usually miss out on the social and recreational activities and training which almost invariably form part of the total curriculum offered in special schools" ie. for children with physical disabilities (paragraph 19). It is unfortunate that no examples of such curricular features were provided by HMI. The implication of their comment is that there are in fact additional specific curricular needs for children with physical disabilities which are not being met in ordinary schools. Perhaps these would be activities such as those mentioned in paragraph 6.17 above, previously available in special schools. If children with physical disabilities were integrated into ordinary schools on an individual basis there are unlikely to be the numbers to sustain these activities. In a unit at a designated school with a wider catchment area however they could be a possibility.

6.20 Poor expectations were noted among some teachers in special schools and some unstimulating activities were observed by HMI in both special and ordinary schools. In some cases however examples had little to do with the physical disabilities of the children being taught. The teachers concerned would almost certainly have faced similar criticism for lack of preparation and poor differentiation with any class. HMI noted that in a class where a child with physical disabilities was unable to collect materials for the task independently his disability was especially significant because of lack of

teacher awareness. This reinforces the conclusion in chapters 4 and 5 that SEN are as much a reflection of teachers' perceptions as of disability in the pupil. In general it was noted that staff in special schools while providing loving, caring environments offered only moderate, mediocre or poor educational experiences. There was generally adequate academic expectation of the more intellectually able in units attached to ordinary schools but those with learning difficulty were less well catered for. This finding is disturbing given the weight of evidence in this and the previous chapter that while the aims of education for children with physical disabilities should not be distinguished from those of education in general, the importance of modifying objectives was stressed.

6.21 Fish (1984) suggested that special schools "need to be more precise about their curriculum". He suggested that staff in all special schools may have low expectations of all pupils, whatever their disabilities. He claimed the small groups there were not educationally viable because of insufficient peer pressure for success. Fish suggested special schools should be judged on the "educational programme offered".

6.22 None of the literature reviewed in this chapter actually prescribed a specific curriculum for groups of pupils with physical disabilities. This illustrates the difficulties in judging the appropriateness of placements



for such children is complex. Nevertheless Ainscow (1984) claimed that successful schools of all types share certain attributes eg. well defined guidelines for each curriculum area, links with other professionals and programmes for individual children. He claimed that there is no reason why these features could not be organised in special schools, though staff may need to change their attitude to curricula development. This implied previous inadequacies in such schools. Ainscow claimed schools should be judged by how far curricula priorities, methods and evaluation were related to individual pupils' disabilities. Procedures for monitoring curricular development for pupils with physical disabilities under the National Curriculum are discussed in chapter 11.

6.23 Howarth (1987) stressed the importance of an appropriate curriculum for children with S.E.N., who are placed in ordinary schools. Like Ainscow, as noted in the previous paragraph, she suggested that an objectives approach can minimise the affects of learning disabilities : "a prime consideration must be the provision of a structured teaching programme, designed to ensure mastery of the basics of numeracy and literacy and the acquiring of essential social skills." This implied that these were particular needs of the children involved but more important that such provision could in fact be made in ordinary schools. Howarth also found provision of what she termed an individualised curriculum was important for children with physical disabilities in

ordinary schools, as was the grouping of pupils, school organisation and other factors in the 'hidden curriculum'. No precise information was given by Howarth as to the existence of any specific programmes or schemes of work seen as appropriate for pupils with physical disabilities though she noted that one school found selection of materials, methods and experiences had implications for curriculum effectiveness for the children concerned. This is surely true for all pupils in all schools and if therefore the aims of education for children with physical disabilities are the same as for able bodied children, as suggested above then the possibility of making adequate provision for them in ordinary schools is confirmed. Howarth suggested that there should be a balance between systematic skills teaching and varied activities for disabled pupils, implying they do need specific curricula features. These are not described in detail. Howarth noted the importance attached to humanities involving development of personal adequacy and social competence in two schools, again implying specific curricula planning for pupils with physical disabilities. Howarth thus concluded that ordinary schools can provide the required curricula, judged on the basis of individual SEN of pupils with physical disabilities. Nevertheless she found examples of schools which were said to be too academic and of others which had appropriate practical curricula for the children with physical disabilities. In this context there appears no more or less likelihood

from Howarth's research that ordinary primary schools are meeting the needs of any of their pupils, whether they are disabled or not.

6.24 The Warnock Report noted that "available premises, resources and staffing will set limits to what is possible" (paragraph 11.6), in terms of curricula provision for pupils with SEN. The evidence of HMI above indicates that apart from a slight increase in provision of units for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools there has been little increase in the range of curricular opportunities for them. Fish (1985) suggested that special school provision for pupils with SEN could in future only be justified if it could be shown to be superior in terms of the curricula and additional non-educational provision offered. The evidence of Warnock and Swann suggests that special schools have serious weaknesses in the curricula they offer. HMI (op cit.) also found examples of unsatisfactory breadth, balance and relevance in the curricula of special schools for children with physical disabilities. Like Hegarty et al. (1982), they also recognised the all too common failure of ordinary schools to meet the curricular needs of such pupils. This chapter has thus raised the issue of how to ensure that curricula for children with physical disabilities are broad, relevant to their needs and with appropriate objectives. Strategies reportedly used to tackle this issue will be examined in the next chapter, with

particular reference to the range of educational provision available and its effects on placement.

6.25 This chapter has shown that it is not possible or appropriate to clearly define a distinct curriculum to meet the needs of children with physical disabilities. This is hardly surprising since chapter 5 showed that it is difficult to clearly define the special educational needs of such pupils. Evidence has been found that whilst the aims of education for children with physical disabilities, including those with associated learning difficulties should be the same as for children in general, objectives must be carefully considered. These must be judged on criteria of maximising the opportunities for children with physical disabilities to participate and respond to the curricular experiences offered. Chapter 11 will consider the implications of the 1988 ERA in this context. It has been noted in this chapter that modifying objectives should not lead to a less broad curriculum, though evidence of this was found by HMI in both special and ordinary schools. This chapter, like chapters 3, 4 and 5 found much evidence that the perceptions of teachers in both special and ordinary schools significantly affects the breadth of curricula available and the degree to which objectives are appropriate for children with physical disabilities. Having found evidence in this chapter that neither special nor ordinary schools may be ideal educational placements for children with physical disabilities the

next chapter further examines factors governing the availability of particular features of special educational provision which have been found to be significant to the success of such placements.

Chapter 7

Features of a range of special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities and their significance for the placement of such children.

7.1 This chapter examines significant features of examples which illustrate a range of special educational provision available for children with physical disabilities. There is discussion of the issue of whether the range is adequate to meet the SEN of children with any degree of physical disability. A further issue discussed is how an adequate range of special educational provision can be identified, planned and implemented. This chapter investigates criteria on which judgements can be made as to the effectiveness of educational placements for children with physical disabilities, within a range of educational provision. This raises the issue of 'integration' and 're-integration' which are defined and discussed in this chapter.

7.2 Cope and Anderson (1977) described a range of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities as follows :

- 1 Individuals placed in ordinary classes.
- 2 Individuals placed in ordinary classes with welfare support.

3. Individuals placed in ordinary class base but with some teaching in specialist rooms.
4. Groups based in special classes with some time spent in ordinary classes.
5. Groups placed full time in special classes in ordinary schools.
6. Groups in day special schools on campus with ordinary schools.
7. Groups in day special schools having no links with ordinary schools.
8. Groups placed in Residential Special Schools

Cope and Anderson studied special provision for disabled children in types 3 to 5 of the above list. The list is a useful background on which to compare availability of significant features of provision such as welfare support, special resources and residential facilities for children with physical disabilities. It was noted in chapter 3 that some children with physical disabilities may also have significant learning, sensory or behaviour difficulties. Cope and Anderson made it clear that pupils with such additional difficulties could be provided for in the range of provision outlined above. They did not comment on whether their references to 'integration' covered initial placements or those where pupils once placed in a special school or unit were later admitted at least part time to ordinary schools. Such transfers are referred to as 're-integration' in this thesis.

7.3 In chapter 3 comment was made on the difficulty of

making precise definitions and assessments of physical disability, physically handicapped etc.. Chapters 4 and 5 indicated the difficulties of identifying the particular SEN of children with physical disabilities. It is not surprising therefore that though figures from the D.E.S. (1972), reproduced by Anderson (figure 5), showed that in general children with more severe physical disabilities were at that time placed in special schools she also found that there was some overlap, children with varying degrees of disability being placed in either special or ordinary schools. This suggested that though influences such as the effectiveness of provision or LEA policies may have helped determine placements there was not a consistent strategy across LEAS. Anderson set out to investigate the quality of provision for disabled pupils placed in ordinary schools to see if in fact there was a possibility that larger numbers of children with physical disabilities could successfully be placed there.

7.4 Anderson (op cit.) reported the main differences in provision for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools was in the wider social environment and greater social and academic expectations of teachers in the ordinary schools. More welfare support and special transport to offset what were perceived to be the limited environmental experiences of pupils, were features of provision in special schools for the ph. Anderson did not quantify these factors in her study, merely raising them as issues on which to compare

special educational provision.

7.5 Anderson evaluated the placements of 99 children with physical disabilities who were placed in ordinary primary schools. No significant difference was found between the academic and social attainments of those for whom special school was originally suggested when compared with those for whom it was never considered. Many of the disabled children placed in the ordinary schools had the conspicuous support of parents who had resisted attempts to place their children in special schools. This may have been an influence on their performances. Anderson claimed it would have been too difficult to have compared the disabled children in ordinary schools with a group of children, matched in terms of physical disability as well as age, who were placed in special schools. This would however have been a more valid basis for comparison of academic and social attainment and therefore of the success of placements. Carr et al. (1983) did match, according to sex, age and intellectual ability, pairs of children with spina bifida who were attending special or ordinary schools. They found that the reading attainments of the two groups did not differ significantly between schools, though the children of both sexes at special schools were significantly behind their ordinary school counterparts in numeracy skills. This was a very small sample of only twenty-two pairs of children.

7.6 Cope and Anderson (1977) studied the integration

of children with physical disabilities into ordinary schools. They noted the social and educational expectations of placement within appropriate peer groups within an ordinary school are particular features of such establishments. Cope and Anderson claimed the main criteria on which to judge the success of type 3, 4 and 5 provision were said to be the opportunity to take a reasonable part in the life of the main school. Cope and Anderson suggested that this would depend on proper staffing, access and resources. The evidence of HMI (1989) noted in chapters 5 and 6 was not reassuring in these areas, though they confirmed the significance of such features of provision.

7.7 There is evidence that certain features of accommodation and resources contribute to the effectiveness of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. Cope and Anderson (op cit.) for example found Special Unit accommodation was purpose - built in only two of the six such establishments attached to ordinary schools which were examined. Only one had a separate treatment room and toilets for the disabled were unsatisfactory in three units. In one unit the doors were too difficult for the disabled pupils to open and in all the buildings studied there were some restrictions on the use of wheelchairs. Four of the units had separate allowances for equipment, though there was no detail of the items obtained. Staff thought only three of the units were adequately equipped.

This evidence suggested that integration developed because it was perceived to offer educational and social advantages, not because of superior facilities compared to those available in special schools for the PH. Despite the difficulties most of the integration schemes were regarded as a success when judged according to the part disabled pupils played in the life of the school.

7.8 Cope and Anderson (op cit.), found all but one of the units had adequate teaching and welfare staffing. In five of the units there were staff with experience of teaching in special schools. In all the units therapists worked closely with teaching and welfare staff, the latter sometimes supervising childrens' exercises etc. on days when therapists were not available. Children from one unit attended hospital for physiotherapy twice weekly and speech therapy was in general the least adequate of the therapies. Children from two of the units made use of hydrotherapy pools at local special schools another used that at their local hospital. This suggested that the placements of some pupils with physical disabilities were not ideal because all their needs were not met in units attached to ordinary schools. Although the criteria of assessing pupils' SEN does not guarantee adequate special educational provision as shown in chapter 4, Cope and Andersons' findings show it is nevertheless a valid means of judging the success of educational placements.

7.9 Cope and Anderson also noted the following

deficiencies in provision for disabled pupils in special schools, (ie. types 6, 7 and 8 in paragraph 7.2.) There was a need for more physiotherapy (3 schools); for more speech therapy (4 schools); for more swimming (1 school); for better toilets and changing facilities (1 school). Cope and Andersons' research is evidence that no particular type of special educational provision such as units attached to ordinary schools, or special schools for the PH, was totally adequate for children with physical disabilities. HMI (1989) clearly expressed the same view in chapter 6. The features of special provision mentioned by Cope and Anderson are nevertheless suitable criteria on which the adequacy of childrens' placements can be assessed. It is now clear that the infinite range of facilities required to cope with the physical disabilities of a relatively small number of pupils is so great as to render it almost impossible to meet all their needs adequately just because a school or unit has been designated as a placement for such children.

7.10 Frost (1977) reported on the integration of individual 'handicapped' pupils into ordinary schools or alternatively into units in ordinary schools. 547 children with physical disabilities placed full time in ordinary schools were known to Frost in his role as an education officer. These placements were, he noted, often the result of individual arrangements between parents and Head Teachers. Few if any extra resources were requested or provided. Frost claimed that the large number of such

placements did not mean integration was necessarily the best form of provision for the children involved. He claimed it can only be considered adequate if it is at least as good as that in a special school. Parents had made decisions on the basis of what provision was available ie. the opportunity to follow exam courses in ordinary schools. Such courses were not available in special schools. Frost's observations show that there was consideration of individual SEN prior to the 1981 Act. This is not evidence that the provision for the children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools was adequate, merely that it had certain advantages. This is an example of Fish's concept of placement according to least disadvantage which was described in chapter 4. Frost suggested suitable criteria on which to judge placements were accommodation, furniture and teachers' knowledge of disability. The importance of having welfare staff with realistic expectations of disabled pupils was stressed if even part time placements in ordinary schools were to be successful.

7.11 An amenities index was used by Chazan et al. (1980) to compare features of provision for the PH and the sensory impaired in special and ordinary schools. They found that observation classes attached to ordinary primary schools or nurseries had better facilities for the children they termed 'handicapped' than ordinary reception classes. The best facilities of those seen as significant for these children, ie. for washing, toilets, and access,

were in special schools. This was to be expected, though as chapter 6 showed HMI found evidence that access and curricula in special schools may also be inadequate. Chazan et al. noted that not all PH schools had therapists on the staff and they found evidence of dissatisfaction with the level of speech therapy in particular. It was found that more advice was available from paramedical staff in special rather than in ordinary schools and units. Chazan et al. found nothing to suggest that the staffing and facilities they deemed important for these children could not be provided in ordinary schools or units attached to them. Like Cope and Anderson (op cit.) they offered no evidence to suggest that any of the features of provision could not be provided for individual pupils who needed them in any neighbourhood school. Though they were writing before the 1981 Education Act the use of an amenities index by Chazan et al. may still be useful for LEAS. Judging placements according to an amenities index has not been subsumed into the Statementing Procedure as the latter is based on the needs of individuals. Whilst the dangers of labelling groups of children with physical disabilities have been acknowledged, LEAS need broad strategies on which to provide adequate buildings and other expensive resources.

7.12 Davies (1980) found that it was possible to successfully provide physiotherapy support for disabled pupils in ordinary schools. The peripatetic service he described was set up to overcome lack of knowledge among

staff in schools which had hindered childrens' progression in wheel chair independence skills, exercises and positioning. Some of the 110 pupils involved in 33 schools had recently been transferred from special schools where this kind of support was available.

7.13 Research by Madge and Fassam (1982) compared the self concepts and adjustment of children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools in a single London Borough. There was no pattern in the range of handicap evident among the 46 pupils from special schools, 26 from comprehensive and 16 from primary schools who were included in the study. Most integration schemes had begun on an ad hoc basis rather than because of definite LEA policy. Madge and Fassam reported that teachers found pupils' social and physical maturity were just as important as academic attainments in selecting those likely to benefit from integration. The only causes of failure in such placements were pupils' emotional problems. Madge and Fassam found that those children with physical disabilities who had been re-integrated into ordinary schools and could themselves therefore compare their placements with special schools, were unlikely to want to change schools. Those pupils from special schools who were interviewed were more likely to want to change school. Madge and Fassam found that the needs of disabled pupils for wheel chair access, medical and welfare support in ordinary schools were adequately met. Their evidence thus confirms the conclusion reached in chapter 5 that

such facilities can be made available in ordinary schools.

7.14 The sample of pupils interviewed by Madge and Fassam was small. Many of them did have clear reasons why they wanted to attend ordinary schools and were supported in these by their parents. The opinions of Frost noted in paragraph 7.10, the findings of Chazan et al. in paragraph 7.11 and Madge and Fassam op cit. show that parents' views are likely to be significant to the educational placements of children with physical disabilities. Parents are only likely to agree to educational placements of any kind if they perceive that the provision is adequate. Madge and Fassam found Junior PH pupils in ordinary schools and Seniors in special, were most likely to favour special school placement for themselves. The latter may have reflected lack of self confidence to move out of sheltered special schools. Seniors in ordinary schools were most likely to favour being integrated because of what they saw as the opportunity for what they perceived to be a 'proper education', with real work and the chance to take exams. Thus the curricula available in special and ordinary schools are significant criteria in the placement of pupils with physical disabilities.

7.15 Evidence in chapter 6 showed that children with physical disabilities share the need for access to certain features of curricula which it was suggested are only available in ordinary schools. An alternative to the previous isolation of special schools for the PH mentioned

in chapter 2, is the siting of such establishments on the same campus as ordinary schools. This is type 6 from the classification of Cope and Anderson noted in paragraph 7.2. Hegarty et al. (1982) described a scheme where 31 pupils from a special school were actually spending varying amounts of time in the adjacent comprehensive school. The special school was purpose-built on the site of the latter in 1976. The staff of the comprehensive school was increased to take account of the physical disabilities of the pupils who were integrated into it. This increase in staff was on the basis of one extra teacher for each eight of the special school pupils who attended the comprehensive for at least 80% of their timetable. A further teacher was provided specifically to organise and monitor the integration programme. Support staff in the special school consisted of two full time physiotherapists, a full time occupational therapist, two part-time speech therapists, two nurses and a health visitor. All these staff were employed by the Area Health Authority but Hegarty et al. reported that they did not work closely with teaching staff in the special school. It is therefore assumed that they had very little liaison with the staff in the ordinary school, this indicates that therapy provision there was inadequate.

7.16 The two schools were connected by a short enclosed corridor. Parts of the comprehensive are two storey and though a lift was installed this has not allowed access to all parts of the building for those in wheel chairs.

Practical rooms and equipment for craft and home economics were also modified. Narrow corridors were a problem for the disabled pupils in the comprehensive school but this was overcome by introducing a 'one-way traffic' system, or even allowing them to leave lessons early. Limitations to the movement of wheelchairs because of fire regulations were also reported. The close proximity of the special school was said to be a particular advantage in the interchange of special equipment such as typewriters between the two establishments as required by individual pupils. At the time problems were encountered in transporting heavy electric typewriters. Hopefully these have now been overcome either by use of portable models or a microcomputer network. The significance of special educational provision for the children with physical disabilities in same campus schools is clearly evaluated by Hegarty et al.. They noted that despite the problems the staff of the special school observed the creation of more educational opportunities for their pupils and more mature social behaviour. This is similar to the conclusions of Anderson (paragraph 7.4), Frost (paragraph 7.10) and Madge and Fassam in (paragraph 7.13).

7.17 Other types of special educational provision for physically disabled children were the 'Special Centres' described by Hegarty (1982, a). The term reflected a desire not to use the term 'unit' which Hegarty feared implied a segregated school within a school. Such provision included types 3, 4 and 5 of the range of

provision described in paragraph 7.2. Hegarty noted that there was a significant growth in such placements during the period 1973 to 1980. This he suggested represented an ideological shift towards integration but was not always supported by appropriate access for disabled pupils to the ordinary school as a whole. Hegarty noted that some special centres only provided a base for children with disabilities from which they could dip into the available curriculum when possible but did not necessarily involve any real attempts by schools to do anything other than concentrate resources in certain areas of their buildings. Hegarty reported this was sometimes justified as an opportunity for the children involved "to associate with others who were handicapped". Hegarty's findings suggest that special centres were not always providing satisfactory integration or re-integration when judged according to the criteria of social and educational opportunities for disabled pupils discussed in paragraphs 7.6, 7.8 and 7.10. These findings were supported by Adey (1983) though he considered units in ordinary schools for children with sensory impairments.

7.18 Hegarty (1982, b) studied the success of the individual placements of 42 disabled children who were integrated into ordinary schools in 14 LEAs. These were examples of types 1 and 2 of the range of provision listed in paragraph 7.2. Hegarty concluded that both teaching and non-teaching staff played a significant part in the success of such placements depending on the the training

they had received and their attitudes to the children involved. This was more significant than the adaptation of buildings to provide access for disabled pupils. Hegarty pointed out that integration was considered to be a success by parents and teachers who reported gains in pupils' self confidence, independence and social maturity.

7.19 The re-integration of physically disabled pupils from a special school to both primary and comprehensive schools as appropriate, was described by Jones and Southgate (1983). They stressed the importance of the children involved in what were initially part-time individual placements in the ordinary schools remaining on the role of the special school. This was a means of its staff retaining contact and being able to perform the important role of supporting the placements of their children in ordinary classes as necessary. This liaison allowed staff from the special school to broaden their experience and help pupils of the ordinary school who had SEN. The aim of support was to provide advice to the teachers in the ordinary school on the implications of childrens' medical and physical conditions, to help pupils with practical activities and provide them with appropriate follow up to lessons. The definition and significance of support teaching for pupils with physical disabilities is further explored in chapter 9.

7.20 This chapter has so far described examples of provision for physically disabled children which have been

made as a result of local demands for integration or re-integration. These demands frequently led to special educational provision being established on an ad hoc basis. In contrast Pocklington (1980) suggested lessons could be learned from America, where Public Law 94-142 requires that children with any form of disability should be integrated in ordinary schools. Placements of disabled children are to be made in 'the least restrictive environment' with integration to the 'maximum extent appropriate'. Individualised education programmes (IEP), must be provided for each child with short term goals and annual objectives agreed by parents, teachers and other professionals. In contrast to the 1981 Education Act, the American legislation makes no mention of placements depending on whether they involve efficient use of resources or may have a detrimental effect on non-handicapped peers. Children are only segregated from ordinary schools if the nature and severity of their handicaps is such that education in regular classes, even with supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily. That does still leave an opportunity for segregation but it is in contrast to the situation in England where it is children's integration or re-integration which has to rely on opportunity. Pocklington (op cit.) reported that though IEPs should be used to ensure necessary support for childrens' special needs, in practice these have sometimes remained unmet because teachers had insufficient time to review objectives or provide the specified physical attention.

7.21 Gibb and Flavahan (1987) examined the criteria used in making the school placements of physically disabled pupils. Children were assigned to groups matched for age and sex, 12 pupils in special schools, 6 integrated in ordinary schools and 6 re-integrated there. The severity of childrens' physical disabilities was not considered, they were selected merely because they were labelled 'physically disabled' in their child guidance files. Eight factors were hypothesised as possibly distinguishing children in special and ordinary schools. Parents, children, and professionals were asked to rank their preferences for placements in special or ordinary schools, their actions in seeking placements were also ranked. Childrens' attainments, severity of disability, amount of therapy and family circumstances were also ranked. Gibb and Flavahan found significant differences between the disabled children in special and ordinary schools in the areas of parents' preferences, childrens' preferences, psychologists' preferences (only to the 5% level) and educational attainments. there were no significant differences in the eight factors according to whether placements in ordinary schools were integration or re-integration. Though there was correlation between parents' and childrens' preferences and parents preferences and actions in agreeing to placements, the latter did not distinguish the two groups of children. Gibb and Flavahan (op cit.) suggested that the implied satisfaction with placements may have resulted from their existence, rather than because parents had sought a

particular type of provision for the children involved. There were also correlations between the amounts of therapy given in special and ordinary schools and the severity of pupils' disabilities. Whilst this suggested that where children had more severe disabilities they received more therapy, it does not necessarily mean they received all that was required. Gibb and Flavahan argued that two types of placements for physically disabled children exist because of inertia rather than because either offers particular features of special educational provision. They noted that severity of disability and amounts of therapy did not distinguish segregated provision. That underlines the findings of this chapter that there are no rigid patterns of placement and features of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities in either special or ordinary schools.

7.22 The Warnock Committee (1978) noted "It would be impossible for the many different combinations of individual need that occur to be matched exactly by a corresponding number of organisations", (paragraph 6.8). This led the Warnock Committee to recommend that individual children's SEN should be assessed as a means of establishing what special educational provision should be made for them. Whilst they recognised that the organisation of the educational system, as well as resources available would impose limitations on what is possible, they pointed the way to making appropriate

provision within a range of organisations. Though the Committee recommended that there should be "as great a variety of organisational arrangements as is practicable", (paragraph 6.8), they noted that the majority of those likely to require special educational provision would need help within the ordinary school. Chapter 4 argued that recognition of individual children's SEN was essential to the success of special educational provision, wherever they are placed. The evidence in chapters 5, 6 and 7 has shown that the SEN of children with physical disabilities may require special educational provision involving particular resources, curricular considerations and appropriate attitudes among staff in special and ordinary schools. The significance of the latter will be explored in the following chapter.

7.23 The Warnock Report also made it clear that special schools would continue to be needed for "those with severe or complex physical, sensory or intellectual disabilities who require special facilities, teaching methods or expertise that it would be impracticable to provide in ordinary schools," (paragraph 6.10). The Committee produced a list said to be an "indication of the range" (paragraph 6.11) which they felt was needed. Their analysis of the required range of special educational provision corresponds almost exactly with the earlier suggestions of Cope and Anderson, as described in paragraph 7.2. The Warnock Report particularly stressed that there should be the "closest possible relationships

between ordinary and special classes or units and between ordinary and special schools", (paragraph 6.12). Clearly this reflected the Committee's findings that as the range of possible SEN was infinite and given that they noted organisational limits to provision of different types, there should at least be an overlap in what was available. It was also suggested that LEAS ensure details of the range "in any area" should be widely available.

7.24 Figure 6 shows that children are indeed receiving 'Special Education' in all the types of special educational provision suggested by the Warnock Committee. This does not of course mean that all the pupils who require particular placements have them. Nor does it show that the range of special educational provision is adequate for the SEN of all children with physical disabilities to be met. Whilst this chapter has found evidence that a range of the types of organisation suggested by Cope and Anderson and Warnock could offer a means within which appropriate individual provision could be made, there is no guarantee that this will be done. All LEAS for instance may not actually implement all the types of provision suggested. Evidence discussed in this chapter shows that it is not the breadth of the range that is the main issue to be tackled in ensuring the SEN of children with physical and other disabilities are met, rather the effectiveness of the provision made wherever it is located. The next chapter further explores the influences which determine the adequacy of special

educational provision for children with physical disabilities.

7.25 Examples discussed in this chapter confirm that the effectiveness of special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities is related to the provision of access, staff and resources. Such features of provision are the only criteria on which satisfactory placements can be made. It is to be regretted that, the evidence of HMI (1989) and other examples noted in chapters 5, 6 and 7, shows that provision for children with physical disabilities in both special and ordinary schools is not always adequate. It has been shown that given adequate staff and resources adequate special educational provision can be made in different situations, for children with similar disabilities. It is certainly not possible to identify, plan and implement provision based solely upon subdivisions of categories of apparent SEN, such as severity of physical disability.

7.26 It is clear from the evidence in this chapter that the range of special educational provision required for children physical disabilities must reflect the range of their special educational needs. It has been established that children who have more severe physical disabilities as defined in chapter 3 will have SEN which involve more specialised educational provision. Nevertheless it cannot be argued that children with any particular degree or form of physical or other disability can only be

successfully placed in a particular type of school. Thus it is important for LEAS making special educational provision for children with physical disabilities to be aware of any potential shortcomings in the range of such provision which is available. The greater the range of special educational provision available, the more chance that the needs of all pupils with SEN will be met. While chapters 5, 6 and 7 have shown that there are some advantages for some children with physical disabilities in some broad types of educational provision, the features which influence the success of any child's educational placement are complex.

7.27 The term 'integration' has been found to be misleading. If children with SEN are attending an ordinary school but following different programmes and therefore not mixing as equals with their peers then such placements can only be considered in terms of location. Integration can be considered functional only if the children take a reasonable part in the life of the school as mentioned in paragraph 7.6. The next chapter considers whether the success of integration schemes for children with physical disabilities is influenced by the attitudes of staff involved in arranging and implementing them.

7.28 The thesis has already considered the influences of curriculum and resources on the success of placements. It has been shown in chapters 5, 6 and 7 that if SEN are not successfully identified then the complex issues of

resources, curricula and placement will not be properly addressed. It is also clear from chapters 5, 6 and 7 that even if assessments of SEN are accurate, they will not guarantee that suitable resources or curricula are in fact provided for pupils with physical disabilities. The implementing of special educational provision depends on the teachers involved, wherever children with SEN are placed. Chapters 8 and 9 therefore examine teachers' attitudes towards provision for the SEN of children with physical disabilities.

Chapter 8

The influences of teachers' attitudes to pupils with physical disabilities on the special educational provision made for them.

8.1 Chapter 7 showed the importance of making available a range of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities within which their individual SEN could be met. The main issue to be considered in this chapter is whether perceptions of the SEN of children with physical disabilities held by teachers and other professionals influence the breadth of the range of special provision available to such pupils. Particular consideration is given to attitudes influencing integration and re-integration as these are an essential part of the range of provision suggested in the previous chapter. Chapters 4 and 5 showed that accurate assessment of childrens' SEN is influenced by teachers' perceptions. This chapter explores how such perceptions influence features of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. In chapter 6 there was evidence that a strong disadvantage of segregated special schools for the PH was their inability to provide appropriate social and educational peer group experiences. In this chapter reasons for this are further examined to assess staff awareness of such inadequacies. Another

issue to be considered is whether ordinary schools merely respond to the demands for re-integration and as a result make ad hoc provision for such children or whether they offer planned provision and therefore the opportunity for initial integration. The implications of initial segregation of children with physical disabilities in special schools can then be discussed.

8.2 Foster (1977) reported attempts to make provision for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. He highlighted the importance of examining such provision in the context of individual schools by commenting that there is no such thing as an ordinary school. Foster described this type of provision, for children he labelled as PH, as 'integration'. In fact his observations as a Head Teacher of a special school for the PH, involved in arranging placements for his pupils in ordinary schools, revealed he was referring to strategies involved in what paragraph 7.2 defined as re-integration. The purposes behind such schemes were not reported. The types of loss of physical function among the children to whom Foster was referring were unclear. Nevertheless he noted that the most important feature of provision for the children to whom he referred was the need for positive attitudes from the Head Teacher and staff of ordinary schools.

8.3 In commenting on the essentials for successful re-integration Foster stressed the importance of adequate

buildings, staffing ratios and resources. His evidence is based on recorded observations of a specific re-integration programme. It revealed that the initial problems of such schemes were expected to be: the sympathy, fear and curiosity of able-bodied children; the possible resentment of their parents; neglect of the able-bodied pupils by teachers; the upset caused to the physically handicapped children by being left out of activities. In fact, because positive attitudes in the form of appropriate expectations in all these areas had been fostered among teachers and pupils in ordinary schools, no such problems were recorded. This clearly showed that appropriate attitudes can be created to expedite re-integration of children with physical disabilities into ordinary schools. Foster reported clear evidence of the success of the re-integration programme. He claimed the PH children themselves brought organising ability, humour, and knowledge of a range of sport and hobbies to the ordinary school. Thus Foster felt that the able-bodied children benefitted from the presence of the PH and the concerns of their parents and teachers were thus removed. This evidence shows that attitudes supportive to the re-integration of pupils with physical disabilities can be developed in ordinary schools. This complements the findings of chapters 5 and 6 that features of access, staffing and resources for children with physical disabilities can be provided in ordinary schools. Foster's findings are also significant here because they referred to the unsupported re-integration of children

with physical disabilities into ordinary schools ie. type 1 of the range of provision noted with reference to Cope and Anderson's analysis quoted in paragraph 7.2.

8.4 Jones and Southgate (1983) reported that attitudes of staff in ordinary schools were crucial to the success of the re-integration of physically disabled pupils on a part-time basis. Hegarty (1982, b) also noted that the enthusiasm of the Head and staff is more important than suitable buildings in choosing ordinary schools for the integration of physically disabled pupils. He suggested that positive attitudes to disabled pupils were likely to be found in ordinary schools which are already responding to the SEN of their existing pupils.

8.5 Lack of close contact between teachers in a special school and an ordinary school into which some of their pupils were re-integrated was reported by Hegarty et al. 1982. Indeed an In-Service course organised by the Head Teacher of the Special School to advise staff of the comprehensive school on the needs of the disabled children was not well attended by colleagues from the latter, despite the Head Teacher of the comprehensive school being in favour that the special school should be built on campus with his existing school. Thus it seems that the provision of extra staff and support staff available in the special school were not used to the best advantage of the pupils with physical disabilities in either school. This finding supports the earlier evidence that staff

attitudes to the placement and provision for these children are crucial. Merely to provide the necessary access, curricula and paramedical support for them is not enough. The attitudes of staff in ordinary schools to physically disabled pupils, from whole school approaches to pupils with SEN. Chapter 9 considers this topic in more detail.

8.6 Cope and Anderson found staff attitudes involving appropriate "vigilance, effort, sympathy and understanding" were significant influences on the success of placements in units for the disabled attached to ordinary schools. It was suggested that these influences should be monitored carefully in types 3, 4 and 5 provision, whereas they are taken as read in special school provision.

8.7 Spencer (1980) reported on the placement of 22 PH children at a primary school with appropriate welfare assistance, ie. type 2 of the provision described in paragraph 7.2. It is not clear if these were initial placements, ie. integration, or re-integration. No reasons were given for the placement of the individual children concerned in an ordinary school rather than in a special school or unit. Spencer reported that Bell Wood School was chosen for the children concerned because it was a single storey building. It had no steps, and ramps were easily constructed to overcome ridges in doorways. Although the children concerned were referred to as ph it

is clear that significant attempts were thus made to prevent physical handicap as defined in chapter 3. This choice of building was seen as an influence on the availability of adequate provision for pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. Another distinction used in deciding to make provision for the ph at Bell Wood was the fact that the Head Teacher had taught in a special school for the PH. Thus there was recognition of the importance of relevant staff knowledge and experience of PH children. It is not clear if the appointment of the Head Teacher had been made with integration or re-integration in mind in a school already seen as suitable in terms of potential access to children with physical disabilities.

8.8 Spencer emphasised that the attitudes of staff were more important to the success of placements for the PH than features of buildings. There was he claimed a need for both teachers and welfare assistants to guard against the overprotection of children with physical disabilities. Their role was seen as a significant influence on the success of integration though it was not described in detail. Presumably welfare staff could be appointed in any ordinary school where their support was needed for the PH. Spencer reported that an initial feature of provision for the PH which was not satisfactory at Bell Wood was the provision of physiotherapy. This was originally only offered to pupils at the local hospital. After considerable lobbying by the school therapy was made

available there three times per week. This suggests that the attitude of the school towards integration was indeed very positive. Spencer's observations thus confirm that the availability of features of successful provision for pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools depends as much on a positive desire for its success by all involved as it does on buildings etc.. Spencer's findings indicated fewer difficulties in making such successful provision than those observed by Hegarty et al. described in paragraphs 7.15 and 7.16. The difference may be because their findings were concerned with a secondary school rather than primary where it may be easier to develop appropriate attitudes, because of the smaller numbers of staff involved. The standing and conviction of the Head Teachers in relation to integration may have been other significant variables in its success. The buildings described by Hegarty et al. were so specialised as to make LEA planning obvious. Nevertheless there were significant problems in the re-integration scheme because of lack of conviction among some of those involved.

8.9 Various influences on demand for integration may receive different responses in terms of attitudes among staff involved in ordinary schools. Parents' wishes for their child to be admitted to his or her neighbourhood school, irrespective of physical disability, may be considered by the school in relation to any LEA policy on integration or re-integration. The existence of such policies may determine whether Head Teachers and Staff of

ordinary schools are willing to make suggestions such as alterations to buildings or whether they make time for liaison with staff from Special Schools if attempts are made to re-integrate their pupils. This raises the issue of how the the formality of arrangements for integration has affected the special educational provision available. If there is a written LEA Policy either to integrate disabled pupils into their neighbourhood schools, or into ordinary schools designated and resourced by the LEA, staff there may recognise a legitimacy in the demands for such placements. If, alternatively, integration is the result of ad hoc requests of parents, staff from special schools or other professionals, provision made for the disabled pupils may be less adequate as attitudes to it may not be so favourable. Much will depend on how much consultation there was in establishing integration or re-integration schemes, noted Hegarty (1982, b).

8.10 Howarth (1987) noted the importance of positive attitudes among staff of ordinary schools receiving disabled pupils who are re-integrated. She commented that Hegarty et al. (1982) noted "S.E.N. can be met in ordinary schoolsgiven the necessary commitment". After direct experience of integration of disabled pupils Howarth found that 52 out of 58 teachers involved were in favour of the schemes. There is unfortunately no account of the LEA policies or other factors which could have lead to the demand for it. Howarth found childrens' personalities, social adaptability, attainment and

behaviour influenced teachers' acceptance of them rather than pupils' physical handicaps as such. This may have been so but in fact there could also have been links between these characteristics and childrens' disabilities if lack of special provision did not remove physical handicap as defined in chapter 3. Thus the possibility of a vicious circle exists, if appropriate special provision is not made physical handicap may occur leading to lack of acceptance of the children concerned. Six teachers were still apprehensive about the integration of disabled children even after being involved but Howarth did not find such pupils unwelcome among those teachers. They wanted reassurance that they were doing the best for the children concerned. In two schools Howarth found evidence of attitudes leading to overprotection of disabled pupils who were integrated. In one school staff were only involved with integration for one year but then wanted special school allowances and extra welfare assistance. The reasons for their poor perception were not reported but reveal a less positive attitude to the children with physical disabilities. This reinforces the argument put forward in chapters 2 and 3 that teachers' perceptions of children with physical disabilities may be influenced by labels applied to them.

8.11 The Warnock Report suggested that 18% of pupils in ordinary schools will have SEN at some point in their school life. Croll and Moses (1985) found that in seven out of ten of the schools studied between 10% and 30% of

pupils were perceived by their teachers as having SEN. No school had more than 49% so labelled, one out of five schools had fewer than 10%. This is further evidence that the latter are unreliable. If teacher perception of pupils' SEN was consistent then Croll and Moses suggested all would have nominated about one in six pupils though the nature of the difficulties would be varied. Yet this proportion was not found to be constant. In fact the range across classes was found to be greater than the range across schools. This suggested that teachers' criteria for the assessment of SEN including the effects of physical disability, were unreliable. For instance 60% of teachers regarded 10% to 30% of their pupils as having SEN, 3.5% of teachers asked said there were no children with SEN in their classes. Six teachers said 50%+ of their classes had SEN. Although these figures reflect research from a relatively small number of schools and cover a range of SEN they point to the possibility that some teachers may recognise childrens' physical disabilities and make allowances for them to access learning situations accordingly. Others may allow physical handicap to remain or develop because of childrens' physical loss of function.

8.12 The importance of initial preparation for re-integration was emphasised by Howarth. There should be close co-operation between staff in special schools and ordinary schools receiving their pupils. Howarth found sympathy, but with high expectations, was crucial to

successful re-integration of disabled children. Intolerance was said to be rare but there is a need for appropriate preparation or need for background knowledge about disability to be made available to teachers in ordinary schools. Another prerequisite for successful re-integration was said to be dissemination of positive experience of handicap to other staff. It is not clear if this comment really meant 'handicap' as distinct from 'disability' in the way noted in chapter 3. Such a distinction is important to this thesis in that if 'handicap' is seen as such at the outset it may follow from disability. This shows the need for appropriate guidance from those with experience of disability so this difficulty could be avoided. At the start of the re-integration schemes Howarth reported that the 58 teachers involved had little existing knowledge of the S.E.N. of disabled pupils. In a year an increase in useful knowledge was noted though 70% of staff in ordinary schools felt inadequately informed especially by support staff such as therapists. Seven out of nine schools claimed there was insufficient liaison with medical officers. This reflected the desire for background information, as a means of promoting realistic expectations rather than the wish to make a broad type of provision based on medical diagnoses.

8.13 From their interviews with children and parents Madge and Fassam (1982) claimed integration offered opportunities to study more subjects to a higher standard,

for more social interaction with less interruptions for physiotherapy. Thus the latter was not viewed as a significant advantage of special school provision. Evidence in chapter 6 showed that special schools may not be able to provide a broad, balanced and relevant curriculum which is available but also that access to such a curriculum may not be available in ordinary schools. Access depends on objectives as shown by chapter 6. Objectives depend on perceptions and attitudes. The main disadvantages of ordinary school placement mentioned by the pupils concerned were difficulties of making friends and some teasing. Neither of these problems can be directly related to features of provision, though they could be related to the attitudes of staff in the ordinary schools or the preparation and support for re-integration provided by staff in the special schools from which the pupils had transferred. The availability of individual attention in a special school was the most important advantage mentioned by pupils in special and ordinary schools as being helpful to placements there. So far there is no evidence to suggest that this too cannot be made available in an ordinary school.

8.14 This chapter has confirmed that while resources, access and pupil-teacher ratios are all influences on the success of the integration and re-integration of children with physical disabilities, teachers' perceptions of physical disability are particularly significant to such placements. The success of the provision varies according

to teachers' demands for resources. These demands reflect their perceptions of childrens' physical handicaps as defined in chapter 3. This chapter found evidence of such influences from different researchers in different types of organisation of ordinary primary and secondary schools as well as special units for children with physical disabilities attached to the latter. It is clear from the evidence in this chapter that favourable attitudes among teachers are significant to successful special educational provision for children with physical disabilities across a range of educational placements. Thus teachers' attitudes do influence the range of available provision for such children, because its breadth is a function of the success of the various types of organisation available.

8.15 In this chapter the development of positive attitudes to integration and re-integration have been linked to favourable LEA Policies and Head Teachers' views. It has been suggested that on an ad hoc basis such provision for children with physical disabilities has less chance of success. The evidence of of HMI (1989) noted in chapters 5, 6 and 7 also confirms this. It has been argued that teachers' acceptance of children with physical disabilities depends more on their perceptions of pupils' social maturity than on their physical disabilities. Howarth (1987) pointed out that difficulties in integration schemes are usually because of children involved being seen as outsiders, not because of their physical disabilities.

8.16 This chapter suggests that ordinary schools which consider the individual needs of their existing pupils are more likely to be successful in integrating or re-integrating children with physical or other disabilities. It has been argued that the adequacy of special educational provision made for such pupils in ordinary schools is likely to reflect the affective combination of their teachers' attitudes to the children concerned. These will determine the whole school approach to pupils with SEN. In chapter 9 there is discussion of examples of strategies involved in planning and monitoring such approaches. This chapter has suggested that the perceptions of teachers are one important factor in such strategies. If staff in all ordinary as well as special schools have positive attitudes and realistic perceptions of the SEN of pupils with physical disabilities, the range of special educational provision for such children would include the possibility of their being placed in their neighbourhood school. If suitable attitudes for the integration of physically disabled pupils only exist in special or designated ordinary schools then clearly the range of educational provision for such pupils would be restricted. It has been shown that where children have initially been segregated in special schools their re-integration has possibly been hindered in that they have been perceived as outsiders. Nevertheless examples of strategies to improve attitudes to pupils with physical and other disabilities were found.

Chapter 9

The development of successful whole school approaches to meeting the Special Educational Needs of pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools.

9.1 Chapter 8 found evidence that teachers' attitudes to pupils with physical disabilities significantly affect the success of their placements in ordinary schools. This chapter further examines the nature of links between teachers' attitudes and the provision of appropriate access, resources, staffing and curricula for pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. It examines how teachers' attitudes contribute to the development of what are termed 'whole school approaches' to pupils with SEN, including those with physical disabilities. The main issue to be considered in this chapter is how ordinary schools may develop strategies to increase teachers' awareness of the significance of such approaches, if they are to offer successful placements for pupils with physical disabilities. This chapter also considers examples of LEA policies for supporting ordinary schools in their attempts to make special educational provision for children with physical disabilities. There is discussion of the issue of how ordinary schools can play a successful part in the range of special educational provision, which chapter 7 found was significant to the educational placements of physically disabled pupils.

9.2 Dessent (1987), claimed that by becoming special ordinary schools can meet the SEN of any individual child. He noted that teachers' distinctions between 'ordinary' and 'special' children are arbitrary. Dessent pointed out that the continued use of such terminology reveals teachers' attitudes which result in some children being removed from ordinary schools, which could in fact meet their needs. This view supports the evidence of Barton and Tomlinson (1981) in chapter 4, that schools may wish to see children labelled as having SEN so that they will be placed elsewhere. Dessent expressed the opinion that the continued existence of special schools is evidence of the wish for the continued segregation of some children for whatever reason. The mere existence of the term 'integration' is significant to Dessent. He claimed that this implies 'special' children exist as a distinct group unlike others who are apparently 'normal'. Evidence presented in chapters 2, 3 and 4 has already shown that this is not the case as it is not possible to reliably identify groups of 'ph' children.

9.3 Dessent suggested that ordinary schools should ensure policies of non-segregation by examining factors within the school which fail to meet the SEN of pupils, rather than looking for causes of failure within the child. This view is consistent with the definition of SEN outlined in chapter 4. Dessent argued that to some

teachers the label SEN implies that a different kind of provision or placement is necessary for a child within or outside an ordinary school. To others the label itself is representation of an awareness of childrens' SEN and a wish to obtain appropriate resources for them to maintain placement in an ordinary class or school. Dessent did not comment on the difficulties of providing resources for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. He did however note the critical influence of staffing and resources as influences on successful provision for them in ordinary schools. It has already been shown in Chapter 6 that much of what is required in the curriculum for all children, is also needed by those who are disabled and indeed may be more readily available to them in ordinary schools.

9.4 Chapters 3 and 4 revealed that there is a continuum of childrens' SEN varying in severity and that disabilities may involve loss of function in more than one area. Dessent claimed this is another reason why some disabilities may be recognised by some teachers but not by others. He claimed that making provision for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools is straightforward. This is misleading since chapter 8 found no evidence that favourable attitudes alone will guarantee adequate special educational provision for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. Dessent admitted such pupils may also have specific learning

difficulties, which are less obvious than their physical loss of function. He did not comment on whether reliable assessment is a significant part of what he called 'making ordinary schools special'. Dessent nevertheless argued that schools should have policies of non-segregation. He did not offer any clear evidence as to how ordinary schools should develop and implement whole school policies to meet SEN. He merely suggested schools should not be preoccupied with childrens' apparently special needs when these can sometimes be symptoms of failure of the 'diet' available in the school. Such a view is consistent with the conclusions of chapter 4.

9.5 Dessent noted that ordinary schools should not use existing inadequacies in resources as a justification for the segregation of a child with physical disabilities. He claimed it is wrong for ordinary schools to presuppose that they cannot cater for certain children when they could lobby for the necessary resources. Though he offered no examples, Dessent claimed that positive discrimination for the most able pupils in ordinary schools and the fact that children are judged by their successes, has worked against the development of successful provision for pupils within a continuum of SEN. To support his view Dessent quotes Booth (1983) thus: "Discrimination against the handicapped is a consequence of a system which rewards people with talents and certain physique". He noted that having a separate system of

special schools has been a means of resolving the ethical problem of suitable provision. Dessent claimed the statomenting of pupils SEN under the 1981 Education Act has helped to legitimise this segregation. He noted statements have become the weapons used by schools and parents in battles with LEAS over resources. Dessent claimed that the 1981 Education Act has done little to end the segregation of pupils with physical and other disabilities from ordinary schools, merely because of inadequacies in provision there.

9.6 Dessent suggested that making ordinary schools special would give help to all those pupils with S.E.N. who have not been placed in special schools but who are presently failed by their ordinary schools. Though he preferred not to refer to such placements as integration, what he suggested is consistent with its definition in this thesis. He recognised that to be successful integration depended on overcoming the difficulties of staff in ordinary schools who may need special training to cope with children formerly placed in special schools. These opinions were clues to strategies, which Dessent saw as essential for ordinary schools, if they were to provide successfully for children with physical and other disabilities.

9.7 Dessent stressed staff in ordinary schools need help from colleagues such as support teachers, therapists

and educational psychologists if they are to provide adequately for pupils with SEN. If ordinary schools involve the support staff mentioned by Dessent they may more easily recognise inadequacies of provision for children with physical disabilities. Specialist staff being suitably trained and experienced, may have knowledge of additional special resources or be able to offer help as Dessent suggested, in modifying curricula and teaching methods for pupils with SEN. Dessent also noted however that the danger in strategies involving this kind of support is that teachers in ordinary schools may take the attitude that they can leave any concern with childrens' SEN to visiting support staff. In the worst case he suggested they may seek withdrawal of pupils with SEN. Another danger noted by Dessent is that what he described as a well organised LEA support service may increase assessment of pupils thought to have SEN. This he claimed may result in an increased chance that they may be referred to any form of segregated special provision.

9.8 Hockley (1985) described her work as a support teacher working in two comprehensive schools and their ten feeder primary schools. She perceived her role as including three major functions: classroom work with pupils; liaison and advice for classroom teachers and in-service training. Although she was involved with children who had emotional and behaviour problems these aspects of support teaching could be equally applicable to

support for physically disabled pupils. Hockley's observation of pupils' attitudes to self, peers and environmental conditions would certainly be relevant to children with physical rather than behaviour difficulties. Careful observation could help class teachers in ordinary schools to recognise possible physical handicap as defined in chapter 3, especially if it is discussed with support teachers. In-service training carried out by Hockley involved discussion of curricular objectives, record keeping and setting up a reference library. These again are activities which would contribute to the successful integration of pupils with physical disabilities in ordinary schools. Hockley noted the importance of support teachers being aware of the perceptions of their role held by class teachers and head teachers who may resent the involvement of outsiders with their pupils. Her long term aim was to extend the skills and expertise of teachers in the ordinary school.

9.9 Dessent (op cit.) also noted that a clear distinction can be made between the roles of support staff working with children who have SEN compared to those who work on INSET programmes for their teachers in ordinary schools. Dessent claimed INSET is not simply a matter of passing on 'magic' training. Like Howarth as noted in chapter 8, he emphasised the importance of particular attitudes among teachers of pupils with S.E.N.. Examples are tolerance for diversity, concern for disadvantage and

acceptance of the rights of the handicapped. Dessent stated that the skills for dealing with S.E.N. are the skills he claimed are needed to deal with all teaching situations i.e. awareness of all pupils' needs and difficulties, goal planning, selection of appropriate methods and intervention. Above all he said ordinary schools should have appropriate expectations of their pupils with SEN. Dessent noted LEA support staff can have a significant role in helping ordinary schools to develop all the above strategies. These views support the opinions of Howarth (1987) in chapter 8 that teachers in ordinary schools can be helped to develop attitudes which will contribute to effective special educational provision for children with physical disabilities.

9.10 Edwards (1985) studied children with learning difficulties, who would previously have been withdrawn from subjects such as science in her comprehensive school. She noted they made as much progress as the children with whom their attainments were matched and who had been withdrawn. Support teachers reviewed approaches and materials for those who remained in ordinary classes by discussion with class teachers. Edwards emphasised that the Head Teacher's agreement was essential to such a whole school approach to tackling SEN. The aims of such support teaching were agreed in advance by the class teachers and support teachers involved. Edwards found it was helpful if support teachers produced some suitable materials for

children with learning difficulties as examples for class teachers, but it was found to be counterproductive to use all their time to do this. She noted it was important for strategies in class management to be worked out so that pupils and staff knew the implicit role of support teachers including the nature and extent of the help they would receive. Edwards pointed out it was not found satisfactory for support teachers to work on an ad hoc basis if whole school approaches to SEN were to be effective. If children with physical disabilities are to be placed in ordinary classes, types 1, 2 and 3 of the range suggested in paragraph 7.2, then all the findings of Edwards are likely to be significant to the success of the special educational provision made for them.

9.11 An alternative to support teachers based in a special needs department, whose advice may be spread thinly around a comprehensive school, is for each subject department to nominate a co-ordinator to seek help and disseminate knowledge on SEN to colleagues. In suggesting such a strategy for a whole school approach to pupils with SEN, Edwards (op cit.) noted that the advisory role for support teachers required particular skills. He or she needs to be able to listen to problems, explain strategies and approaches which are being recommended and support these in written form. Edwards stressed it is important for support teachers to use diplomacy and have confidential discussion on the possible failings of class

teachers to provide for pupils with SEN. Chapters 5 and 6 described the importance of appropriate access and curricula for physically disabled pupils. Clearly Edwards' suggestions could contribute to whole school approaches to these issues.

9.12 Hodgson (1985) noted the importance of practical materials which were suitable for children with physical and other disabilities placed in ordinary classes. They may need to be easily handled and to provide concrete representation of abstract problems. She argued that awareness of the need for some pupils to have such materials is an essential part of successful whole school approaches. Hodgson suggested support teaching can contribute to the success of disabled childrens' placements in ordinary schools by raising teachers' awareness of their SEN.

9.13 In addition to the significance of teachers' attitudes to the successful placement of children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools, Dessent (op cit.) did acknowledge the importance of other features of special provision in successful whole school approaches to their difficulties. Examples he gave were additional non-teaching support, paramedical input where necessary and specialist teaching methods for physically disabled pupils. He noted that whole school approaches to childrens' SEN are particularly relevant to developments

such as the siting of units where groups of pupils with physical disabilities may be brought together in ordinary schools. Dessent suggested that there are particular dangers to be avoided if children are grouped in this way, such as the possible stigma attached to their placements. He claimed stigma could be overcome if schools with specialist support units attached placed all children with SEN in ordinary pastoral groups.

9.14 Gipps, Gross and Goldstein (1987) examined the special educational provision for what they termed 'Warnock's 18%' ie. children in ordinary primary schools, but who were without Statements of SEN under the 1981 Education Act. Gipps et al. pointed out that ordinary schools should develop their special educational provision from that previously called 'remedial' according to pupils' individual SEN. Like Dessent as noted above Gipps et al. suggested that schools must recognise it may be the curriculum rather than the child which needs help if SEN are to be met. The thesis has shown that recognition of physical disability and identification of possible physical handicap, as defined in chapter 3, among pupils integrated into ordinary schools, should thus involve their class teachers in a well organised system of assessment, goal setting and monitoring. Gipps et al suggested that schools could be helped to develop such important strategies by support from LEA specialist staff.

9.15 Wedell et al. (1987) noted the significance of LEA policies in the effectiveness of special educational provision made in ordinary schools. They found that falling rolls, financial factors and local initiatives such as integration policies have changed the patterns of such provision. Wedell et al. studied the responses of 5 LEAs to the 1981 Education Act. They found a 31% increase in support teaching in ordinary schools by staff from special schools, 37% more support teachers appointed directly to ordinary schools and a 76% increase in non-teaching assistants there. Interviews with teachers, LEA officers, other professionals and parents led to the conclusion that increased resources did not necessarily increase the effectiveness of special educational provision. This is consistent with the earlier points in this chapter that teachers' perceptions of SEN and their attitudes to the placement of pupils with physical and other disabilities in ordinary schools are significant to the success of whole school approaches to childrens' SEN.

9.16 Using responses to questionnaires sent to all LEAs, Moses et al. (1987) confirmed the trend of support teaching in ordinary schools away from 'remedial reading' towards work with teachers as well as pupils across the curriculum. 63% of the LEA support services claimed to spend over half their time teaching pupils, though 20% of the services couldn't give a detailed account of how time was spent. Only 3 services out of 71 who replied to Moses

et al. totally rejected withdrawal from ordinary classes as an option for pupils with SEN. 25 of the services ran one term courses in 'SEN' for teachers in ordinary schools. Common elements were a taught component on SEN, visits to other schools, roles of advisory and support services and a project involving teachers in developing special educational provision in their own schools. These components are consistent with the critical areas of whole school policies for children with SEN described earlier in this chapter. Such In-Service training would help schools to tackle the issues of perception of the SEN of children with physical and other disabilities, examine approaches to SEN in other schools, encourage effective use of support services and develop specific policies for ordinary schools to meet SEN.

9.17 Gipps et al. (op cit.) examined patterns of support for children with SEN available to ordinary primary schools in a range of LEAS contrasting in environment and socio-economic make up. They found that there was a huge variation in the assessment and support offered by LEAS to teachers faced with meeting the SEN of pupils in ordinary primary schools. There were for instance 35 different names for the 90 services offered with great variations in what and how much support was offered. 12 LEAS had no adviser for SEN at all. Various features of support provided for ordinary schools included staff to work with individual children having a range of

learning difficulties. There was no specific mention of special support being available for teachers attempting to meet the SEN of pupils with physical disabilities. They found support services provided guidance and support for class teachers including materials for them to use with children, as well as relevant INSET programmes. Gipps et al. made no comment as to the value of such support for pupils with any particular loss of function such as those with physical disabilities. Chapter 3 clearly showed the difficulties of trying to isolate groups of children with any particular SEN such as those linked to physical disability. This chapter found no examples of specific attempts to distinguish support teaching for children with physical disabilities from that available for any pupils with SEN. Chapter 2 showed that such distinctions are not likely to contribute to the success of special educational provision.

9.18 Gipps et al. also investigated teachers' opinions of the support services available to pupils with SEN. They found many examples of dissatisfaction with what was on offer. Teachers considered that smaller classes, rather than in-class support teaching from an additional teacher, was the best means of helping children with any form of SEN. Withdrawal was still seen by a significant number of teachers as a useful form of special provision. Lack of advice from support services and lack of suitable INSET was also noted by many teachers. In one LEA it was

a declared aim that all teachers in ordinary schools should become a teacher of pupils with SEN, though how they would perform this role was not specified. This policy is similar to that proposed by Dessent and discussed earlier in this chapter.

9.19 Gipps et al. noted that in one LEA, INSET to help schools develop approaches to pupils with SEN, was initially directed at one member of staff from each school. The two LEAS whose support services were rated with the most satisfaction among class teachers were those with materials produced for individual children and emphasis on an objectives approach. The significance of such an approach was noted in chapter 6. Gipps et al. found evidence of teachers' difficulties in matching programmes for children with SEN to the ordinary classwork of their peers. That implied that all children without SEN worked on assignments which were not differentiated. If that was the case it is unlikely that effective special educational provision would be made for individual pupil's SEN. Gipps et al. also found that children for whom LEA support staff planned individual programmes, had little more contact with teachers than other pupils. Some of the withdrawal and support approaches were found to be better than others in terms of continuity.

9.20 This chapter has argued that teachers' attitudes

to pupils with SEN determine ordinary schools' approaches to special educational provision. It was noted that Dessent (1987) suggested that some teachers assume children with physical or other disabilities are different and therefore outsiders who may be integrated into the curriculum on offer or alternatively placed in a special school. Dessent argued that it is the segregation of pupils with SEN which should be questioned, despite the legitimacy of the Statementing process under the 1981 Education Act which may suggest it. Dessent claimed ordinary schools should 'become special'. This could be done if staff examine the appropriateness of the curriculum, follow advice from support staff and lobby for appropriate resources. He suggested that they could then improve provision for all their pupils with SEN, including those with physical disabilities. Dessent did not report detailed strategies in action to bring this about, though his comments on raising teacher awareness of SEN are relevant to the definition of physical handicap in chapter 3. The findings of Hockley (1985), Edwards (1985) and Hodgson (1985) do support the argument that there are particular strategies, which are significant in making adequate provision for SEN and which can follow from the whole school approaches suggested by Dessent.

9.21 Dessent (op cit) suggested designating certain ordinary schools as accessible for children with physical disabilities because it may not be possible to make all

ordinary schools special enough for such pupils. Designated schools should be part of clusters of ordinary schools which share resources as a means of extending the range of special educational provision available. Dessent did not describe what these shared resources might be. He suggested that LEAs should look at what resources schools have and whether they were likely to be able to meet the SEN of individual pupils. Thus he assumes that LEAs have a significant role to play in making appropriate special educational provision for pupils with physical disabilities.

9.22 This chapter has argued that LEAs can assist schools to develop successful whole school approaches to SEN by arranging appropriate In-Service Training and providing support teachers. Dessent (op cit.) claimed that all ordinary schools could provide for a range of SEN but their success will depend on teachers' awareness of the support available and their recognition of their own needs for support. Although Gipps et al. (op cit.) were concerned with ordinary primary schools in a limited number of LEAs, their findings suggest support teaching has a significant part to play in helping all primary and comprehensive schools to provide for SEN, including those of physically disabled pupils. This chapter has argued that whatever support is given to individual children with physical and other disabilities in ordinary schools, successful special educational provision for them will

depend on the extent to which class teachers dovetail it into their teaching and curricula. In this chapter it was shown that if teachers in ordinary schools do not have an appropriate perception of their role in this, input from the support services is wasted. If class teachers do not see their own role in providing for SEN as significant, they are unlikely to respond to INSET arranged to raise their awareness of the possibility that physically disabled pupils may not have full access to the curriculum on offer.

9.23 This chapter has argued that support teaching which includes In-Service Training, can raise teachers' awareness of the nature of pupils' SEN and improve their expectations of children with physical and other difficulties. Improving teachers' attitudes in this way can contribute to whole school approaches to meeting SEN if indeed all staff in the ordinary schools become involved. Such developments are complementary to improving provision for physically disabled pupils by lobbying for special resources for them. It is likely that teachers' demands for resources will be more appropriate if they have a realistic perception of the SEN of physically disabled pupils, as suggested in chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 10

The future role of Special Schools for the 'Physically Handicapped'.

10.1 Previous chapters have suggested changes are taking place in the demand for various types of provision for children with physical disabilities within the range available across special and ordinary schools. In this chapter the possible future role of special schools which have provided for children, who were known as 'physically handicapped', is examined in the context of the demand for integration and re-integration discussed in chapter 7. The possible influence of falling rolls identified by HMI (1989), on the provision available in such schools, is also examined. The purpose of this examination is to see how special schools for the PH can play their part in the range of provision described in chapter 7. There is also discussion of criteria which may be used to decide on placement of children at such schools and therefore analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of such special educational provision for children with physical disabilities.

10.2 Jowett et al. (1988) suggested that despite its disadvantages, a system of special schools cannot be dismantled overnight. Indeed they pointed out that from

1972 to 1988 the number of pupils in special schools in England and Wales was constant at about 13 per 1000. Their research was concerned with an evaluation of links, defined as any sharing of staff or resources, between special and ordinary schools. Twenty one of the schools selected by Jowett et al. were described as being for the physically handicapped. 67% (14 of them) had links with ordinary schools. This was a smaller percentage than that of other types of special schools though not significantly so. Two thirds of all the schools sampled had contact between their staffs and those of special schools, weekly or less. The work undertaken by special school teachers in ordinary schools was found to be as follows :

teaching pupils from special school	18%
teaching pupils from ordinary school	5%
teaching combined groups	42%
advising colleagues in ordinary school	29%
liaising re. placements in ordinary sch.	6%

10.3 Jowett et al. noted that a total of sixteen teachers from schools for the PH were involved in links between special and ordinary schools. The most substantial involvement by a teacher from such a school was to work twenty five hours per week in an ordinary school. Twenty pupils from that special school were spending between three and five hours per week in the ordinary school. There was also some movement of staff from the ordinary school to the school for the PH to assist with teaching there. Two teachers from another

school for the PH spent fifteen hours per week advising colleagues in an ordinary school about the integration of twenty three of their pupils. In fact a total of one hundred and three special schools reported that staff from ordinary schools visited them even if it was just to attend occasional open days. Half the approaches were for staff from ordinary schools to benefit from special resources held by the special school, 25% of the contacts were on a regular weekly basis. Thus Jowett et al. showed that there have been significant developments in the role of special schools, including those for the PH. These are now being used as resource centres for staff from ordinary schools as originally suggested in the Warnock Report.

10.4 Jowett et al. (op cit.) reported support and exchanges of staff between special and ordinary schools offers advantages to both types of school. The importance of support from suitably experienced teachers, for pupils being integrated or re-integrated, was noted in chapter 7. Jowett et al. suggested that special school staff accompanying their pupils part-time into ordinary schools could smooth the progress of childrens' re-integration by passing on their expertise in meeting S.E.N. to teachers in ordinary schools. In contrast, the findings of Hegarty et al. (1982 a,b) noted in chapter 7 suggested that such support from special schools may not always be positive. Contact with special schools may be an advantage to the staff of ordinary schools, who with less formal categories

of provision are now more likely to have to teach children with physical disabilities either part-time or full time. On the other hand if small special schools for the PH continue to exist, HMI (1989) found their chances of providing the full National Curriculum may be enhanced by support from subject specialist teachers from ordinary schools.

10.5 Oliver (1985) argued that special schools would continue to exist because they can be politically justified by those responsible for their existence as offering provision for 'the handicapped' to be self sufficient. He claimed special schools reflect the powers of professionals such as educational psychologists and administrators in exercising social control by removing potentially disruptive pupils from ordinary schools.

Given the difficulties in integrating physically disabled pupils described in chapters 7 and 8, it is likely that some teachers will co-operate with moves to segregate such children in special schools. Oliver argued that in view of special schools' limited curricula and poor expectations for the PH described by Anderson (1973), it is segregation which should be considered the exception in the placement of children with SEN, rather than their integration. He claimed the ideological commitments to integration in the 1944 and 1981 Education Acts were not followed by action to bring them to fruition.

10.6 Jowett et al. noted that links between special and

ordinary schools have accelerated since the abolition of the formal D.E.S. categories of handicap. They suggested staff in special schools providing for pupils with physical disability can also benefit from links with ordinary schools because their expectations of pupils are more realistic if they have contact with colleagues from ordinary schools. The subject specialism of staff from ordinary comprehensive schools may be helpful to staff from special schools in overcoming the difficulty, common in a small school, of perhaps having to teach more than one subject. Jowett also noted however that this process had already begun in many areas before the 1981 Education Act. The research of Anderson (1973) described in chapters 3 and 5 also indicated that links were developing with specific reference to improving the range of special educational provision available for pupils with a range of physical disabilities.

10.7 In examining integration, Jowett et al. distinguished between pupils from all the special schools sampled, who attended ordinary schools on an individual basis (from 122 schools) and those who attended ordinary schools in groups (from 68 schools). 75% of the schools involved had fewer than 5 pupils going out to ordinary schools. More than half of all those pupils on individual placements spent at least one day per week in the ordinary school. The different figures of pupils going from special to ordinary schools either in groups or individually were found by Jowett et al. to reflect the different purposes

involved. These were classified as being predominantly either to stimulate pupils' social or alternatively their educational development. Generally it was found that individual re-integration was arranged to make appropriate educational provision and links for groups of pupils were for social reasons.

10.8 Freelands School was an establishment catering for 60 pupils described as 'PH' between the ages of 2 and 19. Jowett et al. reported that it was sited on a campus with first and middle schools. The close proximity between the special and ordinary schools was said to have helped in integration of staff and pupils. The reasons for this 'help' are not made clear but it may well have been because of the lack of time travelling between sites and ease of staff liaison. 29 out of 32 pupils in the secondary age range were spending some time within the ordinary schools. Support from welfare staff was available in practical lessons and for assistance with the toilet and physical care in the ordinary schools if needed. All the junior pupils visit the ordinary school as a group for half a day per week. They were accompanied by a welfare assistant and a teacher. There were said to be no problems with PH pupils receiving physiotherapy support because juniors were spending enough time in the special school to receive such special provision there. Seniors who generally spent more time in the comprehensive than the special school, could return for physiotherapy "when the curriculum" permitted. This has important

implications for full time re-integration as Jowett et al. implied that there may be a danger that therapy support could be lost if the children with physical disabilities did not spend some time in the special school where paramedical support was apparently concentrated. They did not comment directly on the issue of whether the PH pupils should have to return at all to the segregated special school for physiotherapy rather than receive it in the ordinary school.

10.9 Some significant questions about the links between Freeland's and the ordinary school remain unanswered by Jowett et al.. No explanation was given for example as to whether all the pupils at Freeland's would normally have attended the adjacent primary and middle schools as their neighbourhood school. If not, then they may not have gained from the social advantage of schooling alongside their neighbourhood peer group. No explanation is given as to the criteria on which children were selected as candidates for integration. No comment was passed by Jowett et al. on any difficulties involved in setting up such a scheme, for example, possible problems of inter school liaison or access to the ordinary school premises. These however are very real potential problems as revealed by chapter 7.

10.10 Another school studied by Jowett et al. was Standlake School for children with physical disabilities. There were 100 pupils on roll, 17 teachers and 4

non-teaching assistants. Standlake, like Freelands, shares a campus with a comprehensive school. 13 pupils were attending fourth year and fifth year classes, 6 followed sixth form courses. No explanation was given as to why some pupils attended these courses, perhaps it was because they were following courses which could not otherwise be provided at the special school. It would have been more helpful if information had been included by Jowett et al. as to the criteria, for example social or educational, on which staff at Standlake arranged part time re-integration into the comprehensive school. It is significant that as a percentage of total numbers on roll there was much less integration occurring from Standlake than from Freelands, despite similar buildings and location of both special schools on campus. The reasons for this could have been different attitudes in the two special schools setting up the schemes, different perceptions of what the ordinary schools could offer, or different influences such as LEA policies. It was noted that staff at Standlake said they did not envisage any more links developing.

10.11 Most of the gains from the integration of pupils from Standlake into the comprehensive were said by the Head Teacher of the special school, to be social rather than educational. Although the distance between the schools is reported as being quite long, it was noted that ramps, lifts and special toilets were provided for disabled pupils in the comprehensive. This suggested that

there was not an access problem which might otherwise have been a criterion for decisions on which children were to be re-integrated. It also suggests as with Freolands school, that some quite detailed planning was done by the LEA to help integration of the disabled pupils. This implies that some definite purpose was seen in their part time re-integration.

10.12 Jowett et al. also described re-integration from Ashdown PH School. It was situated on campus with a comprehensive school. There was formerly a primary school there too, but this had closed. 24 out of 45 senior pupils were spending up to 75% of their time in the comprehensive school. Several more having returned there full time. Difficulties were reported in balancing the timetable between the two schools. It was noted that three extra teachers had been provided at the comprehensive school to improve overall pupil teacher ratio thereby to assist integration. Jowett et al. implied that it was considered one would automatically follow from the other. Chapter 8 noted the importance of attitudes of staff in ordinary schools to pupils with S.E.N., if they are to be successfully integrated. Thus it is not necessarily the case that merely increasing resources would alone facilitate integration. It was nevertheless reported that Ashdown staff were available to advise the staff in the ordinary school about the S.E.N. of the disabled pupils. This suggested that attitudes there were receptive to the re-integration programme. Indeed Jowett et al. reported

long term plans have been made for a new department of special needs to be set up in the comprehensive with a senior teacher as head. Some of the staff from Ashdown will transfer to it full time along with all the senior pupils. Ashdown will then become a primary assessment unit for children with physical disabilities. Such a significant change could presumably only have come about as a result of definite LEA policy and with the approval of HMI. The apparent success of the Ashdown development reported by Jowett et al. shows the importance of such policies rather than mere ad hoc evolution. This is clear evidence of a change in the role of a special school for the PH and also of an alteration in the range of special educational provision available in that area.

10.13 The wish to form links between special and ordinary schools may originate from a number of sources such as Head Teachers of the schools to be involved, LEA policies, or as a result of demands from other professionals or from parents for the integration of children with physical disabilities. HMI (1989) found some evidence that in the light of falling rolls Head teachers of Special Schools for example may offer their staff as support teachers in ordinary schools where children with physical disabilities have been integrated or re-integrated. Some have also made their schools resource centres available to staff in ordinary schools as suggested by the Warnock Report. Parents and professionals may be opposed to the labelling of children

as ph, for the reasons explained in chapter 2. HMI suggested this is one reason for the falling rolls of special schools. Such views may now be evident at Annual Review discussions. These views could then be incorporated into childrens' Statements of S.E.N. and are another possible influence on the range of special educational provision available. The influence of the latter in determining special educational provision is discussed again in the conclusion.

10.14 Jowett et al. (op cit.) reported staff in special and ordinary have varying perceptions of the need for links. For some facing a falling roll situation or expectations of parents and professionals for the integration of individual pupils it was almost a matter of inevitability. Other schools were said to have wished positively to demonstrate their expertise. During the research three special schools were absorbed into ordinary schools as planned for Ashdown School and described in paragraph 10.10. Jowett et al did point out that special schools, in the absence of guidance from LEAS, had influence over integration in the choice of ordinary schools with which they attempted to form links. The reported criteria for selection of such schools were factors such as adequacy of buildings for the disabled, receptiveness of staff in ordinary school and their teaching strengths. Jowett et al. found that pupils to be integrated were selected on criteria such as educational ability, attainments and social maturity. They noted

possible criteria for special schools for physically disabled pupils to consider, in selecting ordinary schools to receive their pupils. Significant features of ordinary schools were whether adequate access was available, whether the school with the most suitable buildings had staff with receptive attitudes. Jowett et al. noted possible LEA influence on the success of re-integration could go further than the tacit approval noted in paragraph 10.15. While they could not change attitudes in ordinary schools overnight LEAs could begin the process of doing so through appointment of appropriate staff. Altering buildings also takes time and the necessary resources may only be available from LEAs. The availability of such resources may in future be affected by the implementing of Local Management of Schools, though initially LEAs will retain an element of central funding reserved to meet SEN. This point is considered again in chapter 11, which deals with the significance of the 1988 Education Act.

10.15 Jowett et al. found that links between special and ordinary schools could indeed be the result of formal LEA policies on provision or placement based on the desire to integrate or re-integrate pupils with S.E.N.. LEAs are usually aware of such schemes and do give their tacit approval. LEAs may need to be more directly involved if integration schemes or links between special and ordinary schools require extra resources, alterations to buildings, transport between schools or extra staff to meet the needs

of children with SEN in ordinary schools. Reference by those involved to formal LEA policies on the principle of links could be significant noted Jowett et al. if there was disagreement about provision, between schools professionals or parents. Jowett et al did not give specific examples of such disagreements but their acknowledgement of the possible difficulties is relevant to this thesis.

10.16 Jowett et al. gave an example of the making of LEA policies aimed at bringing about re-integration of pupils with SEN who were previously placed in special schools. They described how an LEA Advisory Team which requested special schools to draw up a plan describing how they could promote contact with ordinary schools. All the latter were published within the LEA and for its part it stated that a long term aim of all special schools should be the re-integration of as many pupils as possible. While formal LEA policies may be relevant, less tangible but nonetheless important are considerations such as attitudes of Head Teachers of special and ordinary schools to integration schemes. Such variables may have been one of the influences in the different amount of integration described in paragraphs 10.8, 10.9 and 10.10. Jowett et al. noted that LEA officers may wish to be mindful of this point in making Head Teacher appointments.

10.17 Jowett et al. (1987), reported that special and ordinary schools must work out important issues in the

organisation of any links. These issues are choice of curriculum area, the amount of support from special school staff, appropriateness of teaching styles in receiving schools and counselling of their pupils and staff about SEN. Jowett et al. found problems experienced by various link schemes related to transport not arriving on time, liaison with reference to absence, or changed arrangements especially where receiving schools were some distance from the special schools. As a result of these difficulties sometimes integration had to be for periods of half or full days to minimise inconvenience. This sometimes led to artificial adjustments to pupils' timetables. Had there been provision for children with physical disabilities in units attached to ordinary schools as described with reference to the research of Cope and Anderson in chapter 7, many of these problems could have been avoided. Jowett et al. noted that some staff in ordinary schools felt that colleagues in special schools did not understand the complexities of some courses requested. Certainly the evidence of Gipps et al. in chapter 9, with reference to whole school approaches, indicated that many ordinary schools may not be providing adequately for those pupils with S.E.N. already placed there. The need for changes in special schools was also recognised by Jowett et al. thus "it may well happen that only by a major re-think of its own curriculum and academic purposes can the special school bring its timetable into line with that of the ordinary school". this statement is even more significant in the context of

the entitlement of pupils in special schools to the National Curriculum.

10.18 It is clear from the comments of Jowett et al. noted in the previous paragraph that whatever the policies of LEAs with regard to integration or parental wishes, its success depends very much on the teachers involved. Jowett et al. found that in the links studied teachers in ordinary schools did welcome the assistance they received from teachers accompanying their pupils from special schools. They found that the support teachers' roles were largely determined by the teaching styles of the teachers with whom they were working. A common view of aims was needed but some teachers in ordinary schools initially had poor perceptions of how they thought teachers from special schools could help them by passing on specialist techniques and experience. Jowett et al. reported some teachers in ordinary school relied upon the staff from special schools to cope with pupils who had SEN. This casts doubts on whether the integration was functional or not as defined chapter 8. The support may have encouraged pupils of the ordinary school to continue to regard those in special school as different. Support in terms of materials and concrete proposals for individual pupils was generally welcomed. Some special school teachers were consciously trying to introduce into the ordinary school the "caring and supportive qualities" of their special schools. In this they agreed that the most important prerequisite for success was to be approachable and

competent in working with colleagues in ordinary schools. Jowett et al. considered the role of the support teacher was "a very difficult boundary to negotiate". There was apprehension among teachers in ordinary schools asked to accommodate another colleague in their classroom. Support teachers needed to know when to observe and when to help. These issues though not applied directly to children with physical disability were no less likely to be relevant to their integration.

10.19 Jowett et al. found many special school teachers enjoyed the autonomy of being away from their usual school base but many had concerns about how their support was received. Some special school teachers did not see themselves as experts. The expectations of ordinary school staff may have been inappropriate in this context possibly causing difficulties. Jowett et al. noted some teachers in ordinary schools declared themselves apprehensive about accepting children with physical disabilities. Their success in meeting the S.E.N. of children with physical disabilities, was likely to turn on whether they were prepared to alter their methods or allow support such as special communication aids to be used by pupils with physical disabilities. Some of the demands made by teachers in ordinary classes such as that for note taking or drawing may need to be altered for children with physical disabilities. It would be wrong for example for such pupils to miss out on receiving or recording information which could in fact be prepared for them

earlier. That would mean they were physically handicapped unnecessarily. Such a risk was explained in chapter 3. Thus Jowett et al. found evidence of frustrations among teachers of special and ordinary schools involved in links. Successful integration therefore depended on the goodwill of both.

10.20 This chapter has shown that while special schools are changing their roles and developing their links with ordinary schools there are many problems to be overcome if these new roles are to offer advantages to pupils with physical disabilities. Examples of special schools and ordinary schools involved show that there are variations in the extent of staff and pupil involvement in those links. There is evidence in this chapter that the presence of special schools for physically disabled pupils on campus with ordinary primary or comprehensive schools does make integration easier. Appropriate ordinary school buildings with full access for those with problems of mobility are also essential if pupils with physical disabilities are to be integrated. More significant are the attitudes and preparations made by staff both from ordinary and special schools. Clear purposes behind the integration of pupils with physical disabilities are also an important consideration as are strategies for implementing these. Jowett et al. noted that the sources of plans for the integration of pupils with S.E.N. vary. The role of LEAS was found to be significant given the need for expensive adaptations to buildings, provision of

support staff and resources for children with physical disabilities if they are to have full access to ordinary schools. The influence of special schools on the success of integration for groups or individual disabled pupils cannot be underestimated. Finally comment has been made on the difficulties and advantages of links between teachers in special and ordinary schools. Their biggest influence on the success of the integration of disabled pupils into ordinary schools is the strategies they use to overcome difficulties of in-class support for the children concerned. Difficulties in this area were considered in chapter 9.

Chapter 11

The implications of the 1988 Education Reform Act and its likely influence on Special Educational Provision for children with physical disabilities.

11.1 The legislation contained in the 1988 Education Reform Act applies to all pupils in maintained schools. This is in contrast to the 1981 Education Act which was concerned with children with special educational needs. The first issue to be considered in this chapter is how the 1988 Act will affect the identification, assessment and statementing of pupils with physical disabilities. A major feature of the Education Reform Act is the introduction of a National Curriculum for all pupils in England and Wales. The second issue to be examined in this chapter is how far it will be possible to implement the National Curriculum for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. This chapter thus examines the possible influence of the Education Reform Act on the placements of pupils with physical disabilities within the range of special educational provision referred to in earlier chapters.

11.2 The implementing of the 1981 Education Act was begun following D.E.S. Circular 1/83. Following the 1988 Education Act a draft circular revising the latter was

issued in December 1988. Whilst the substantive circular has yet to be published the contents of the draft circular are relevant to this thesis. The purpose of the new circular is to review the implementation of the 1981 Education Act, in the light of experience since 1981.

11.3 The draft circular reiterates the definition of 'special educational needs' used in Circular 1/83. As noted in chapter 4, SEN are said to exist if children have a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. The draft circular confirms learning difficulties may be the result of a disability. In Paragraph 17 (D.E.S. 1988), headed "Focus on the Child", the draft circular emphasises that special educational provision should be made in relation to childrens' needs rather than their disabilities. This confirms that categories of handicap should not be the basis of special educational provision. The Draft Circular continues : "The extent to which a learning difficulty hinders a child's development does not depend solely on the nature and severity of that difficulty. Other significant factors include the personal resources and attributes of the child as well as the help and support provided at home, and the provision made by the school and the LEA and other statutory and voluntary agencies". These comments appear to reflect a move away from the mere labelling of children as having SEN, under the 1981 Education Act. Chapter 4 showed the label SEN is sometimes used to refer to childrens' disabilities.

without other factors which may cause them learning difficulty being acknowledged. The draft circular (op cit.) does claim to have regard to research, experience and reports such as that of the House of Commons Education, Science and Arts select Committee on the 'Implementation of the Education Act 1981'.

11.4 The draft circular (op cit.) emphasises that statutory procedures for the making of Statements of SEN under the 1981 Education Act have drawn attention away from a larger group of children for whom schools and LEAS have also made special educational provision. Although Section 5 of the 1981 Education Act dealing with monitoring and assessment remains in force, guidelines for the procedures involved have been clarified. Paragraph 18 of the draft circular clearly states "The assessment of SEN's is not an end in itself; it is the first step towards a better understanding of the child's learning difficulties". The draft circular stresses the importance of early identification of possible learning difficulty, defined as in paragraph 11.3 above. This clearly includes those children with physical disabilities as defined in chapter 3 of this thesis. The importance of non statutory assessments within schools and the designation of teachers with responsibility for children with SEN is also stressed. Of particular significance to the findings in chapter 9 of this thesis is the comment that "It is the classroom teacher who is in the key position to observe responses in the classroom, to recognise the child who is

experiencing difficulties in learning, and to try out different approaches to help meet the child's needs" (paragraph 24). These guidelines confirm that the D.E.S. recognise that learning difficulty may arise because of childrens' interaction with their learning environment rather than merely because of their disabilities.

11.5 Arrangements for the assessment of SEN are largely unchanged by the 1988 Education Act. Professional involvement from class teacher, through head teacher, specialist teachers, educational psychologists and medical staff remains unchanged. Parents continue to be seen as partners in the process. The need for them to be given information in simple terms rather than educational jargon is confirmed in the draft circular (op cit.). The process of gathering advice from the professionals involved in assessments and its collation by an LEA officer leading to the writing of a Statement has not been altered. In view of experience, the need to complete the assessment process in 6 months is stressed. Similarly the suggested checklist annexed to the draft circular (op cit.), against which professionals can frame their advice, reveals a change of emphasis from that which accompanied D.E.S. Circular 1/83. Whilst the headings for the "Description of the Child's Functioning" are the same it is suggested under Aims of Provision that "Reference should be made to the relevant attainment targets of the National Curriculum wherever possible". Categories of physical and motor development appear particularly relevant to children with physical

disabilities but there is nothing to say entries must be made under all headings or that there could not be entries under others which are not listed. Similarly under "Facilities and Resources" there are suggestions relevant to the SEN of children with physical disabilities. Thus resources such as those possibly required for the teaching of children with physical disabilities and other specialist provision such as therapy and appropriate physical environment, including access for non-ambulant pupils, can be specified.

11.6 Paragraph 29 of the draft circular (op cit.) notes that "it is not possible to describe precise limits for this smaller group", ie. those for whom statements are to be made. Paragraph 30 states that "As a general rule, LEAs are expected to afford the protection of a statement to all children who have severe or complex learning difficulties which require the provision of extra resources in ordinary schools and in all cases where the child is expected to spend most of the day in a special unit of an ordinary school or a special school". In speaking of "protection of a statement" the draft circular implies that without such a document, special educational provision for pupils with SEN in ordinary schools ought to be adequate. Yet if additional resources are not requested by a school, even though they may be necessary, a statement will not be made. In paragraph 30 the draft circular clearly places the responsibility of making adequate provision on ordinary schools by noting that

"Statements are not required where ordinary schools themselves determine and make special educational provision from their own resources. Such provision might commonly include additional support or equipment". Chapters 5, 6 and 7 of the thesis showed that in fact special educational provision for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools is sometimes inadequate. It is now clear that this could be a result of failure of staff in ordinary schools to identify children's SEN.

11.7 Another feature of the 1988 Education Reform Act is the introduction of the Local Management of Schools, (LMS). Under schemes to be set up by the LEAs and approved by the D.E.S. LEAs will have discretion as to whether or not they delegate provision for statemented pupils in ordinary schools and special units organised as part of ordinary schools. Special educational provision for non-statemented pupils must be funded from the formula based on pupil numbers. Ordinary schools may identify the need for extra resources, for example a disabled pupil may require an alternative means of communication such as a word processor. Under the guidance in the draft circular noted above, schools would be obliged to fund this equipment, unless the child concerned had a statement. Thus there may be disputes between schools and LEA Officers as to what constitutes adequate special educational provision for pupils with physical or other disabilities. It has so far been the situation that the

responsibility for any shortfall in funding for resources to meet special educational needs lay with LEA officers. They ultimately write statements identifying SEN and the special educational provision to be made. If an LEA gains approval for an LMS scheme involving the delegation of funding for statemented pupils, it is hard to see how schools could all be given an appropriate share of an LEA-wide formula, which would be flexible enough to allow for developments such as provision of access for pupils with wheel chairs. Examples of the difficulties of making such provision were noted in previous chapters. Hopefully the safety clause contained in the draft circular will guarantee that no child will be without appropriate special educational provision under LMS. It states in paragraph 12 that "The LEA retains its statutory duty to ensure that the special educational provision specified in the statement is made for statemented pupils."

11.8 Guidance in the draft circular (op cit.) on the "Form and Content of the Statement" varies little from that originally issued in D.E.S. Circular 1/83. It notes for instance that "the 1981 Act, while it abolished 'categories of handicap', does not rule out the use of such terms." It adds that whilst reference may be made to specific disabilities "such as autism" the full nature of the child's educational difficulties should be amplified. The draft circular reiterates that "special educational provision should be specified in terms of the facilities and equipment, staffing arrangements, methods and

approaches. Where relevant, educational environment, access and transport provision should be specified". These requirements offer a clear opportunity for very specific provision to be planned by LEAs but they do not offer guidance to parents as to what action can be taken if this is not made, merely offering the chance to appeal if the parents do not consider appropriate provision has been specified. In the area of "Additional Non-educational Provision" the draft circular does make it clear that whilst LEAs may provide services such as speech and physiotherapies, the responsibility for District Health Authorities to do so remains.

11.9 The thesis has shown that no clear pattern of special educational provision for children with physical or other disabilities has developed following the 1981 Education Act. There is nothing in the 1988 Education Act which directly requires LEAs to provide particular types of organisation, staffing, resources or placements for pupils with SEN. There is thus nothing to ensure they make the range of provision, which evidence in chapter 7 suggested was necessary, to provide adequately for pupils with physical disabilities. The duty of LEAs to as far as possible educate children with statements in ordinary schools is reiterated in the draft circular (op cit.). Under the heading of 'Integration', special needs support services, resourced provision in ordinary schools and extensive links with special schools are merely said to be "valuable developments" in the education of children with

SEN. These views are consistent with the findings of the thesis but the 1988 ERA does not ensure that such examples of good practice will be more widely adopted. Wedell (1988) noted the 1988 Act's failure to outline a range of special educational provision in recognition of a continuum of SEN.

11.10 The draft circular confirms that the requirements of the National Curriculum apply to all pupils with special educational needs. Under the heading of 'Integration' it notes that "the 1988 Act aims to raise expectations of all pupils, including those with statements", (paragraph 22). It adds "the curriculum is expected to be balanced and broadly based, and relevant to the full range of pupils' needs", (paragraph 9).

11.11 Whilst also stating that "levels of attainment defined within the National Curriculum will cover a wide spread of achievement and will enable pupils of very different abilities to demonstrate progress", the draft circular adds that "in some cases it may nevertheless be necessary to modify or disapply the statutory provision to meet the child's needs". The draft circular notes that attainment targets, programmes of study and assessment arrangements could be modified. It clearly states "if it is considered essential" a subject or subjects could be excluded from the curriculum of the individual child with SEN. This could only be done if details are given as to the alternatives for whatever is modified or disappplied.

Indeed the draft circular suggests that under the heading of Special Educational Provision statements may specify, in accordance with section 18 of the 1988 Act, "any provision excluding the application of the provisions of any part of the National Curriculum.....any alternative programmes of study outside the National Curriculum framework designed to meet the child's needs". It is merely said to be "desirable to record" such detail in statements. The draft circular clearly states that if no exemptions are shown on the statement "then a maintained school is obliged to offer all the subjects of the National Curriculum without modification for that pupil at a level appropriate to the pupil's ability", (paragraph 62).

11.12 The draft circular (op cit.) offers no guidance on criteria which can be used to justify the exclusion "of a subject or subjects", (paragraph 9) from those which are part of the National Curriculum. Guidelines to be followed are outlined in paragraph 10(i) of the draft circular. The first of these is "where the National Curriculum requirements would involve certain kinds of physical or practical work, alternative arrangements might be prescribed for those whose physical disabilities could put at risk their own safety or that of others". Secondly it is noted that only by means of a statement can there be any modification or disapplication of the demands of the National Curriculum. In order to allow time to determine any necessary modifications and disapplications for pupils

with statements they are not required to follow the National Curriculum until September 1990, rather than 1989 as in the case of other pupils. Finally under regulations in section 19 of the 1988 Education Act a Head Teacher can temporarily make such modification or disapplication as necessary to allow assessment of SEN or to cater for a pupil who develops "temporary problems which it would not be appropriate to reflect in the statement". This temporary exclusion is to be restricted to a maximum of six months.

11.13 Evidence in chapter 6 of this thesis found it unsatisfactory to distinguish particular aims for the education of children with physical disabilities, though it was suggested some individual adjustment of objectives, methods and resources may be appropriate in individual cases. The guidance in the draft circular noted above in fact suggests that the 1988 Education Act recognised the importance of giving the opportunity to distinguish such aims in terms of National Curriculum subjects. The possible disapplication of certain subjects because of pupils' physical disabilities, makes this clear. This opportunity may be seen by some schools and LEAs as a means of avoiding the difficulties of having to provide the necessary access, staffing and resources needed for children with physical disabilities to participate in the National Curriculum. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 gave examples of existing difficulties in providing what was previously termed a 'Mainstream Curriculum'. The 1988 Education Act

only affords curricular protection to those with physical and other disabilities in so much as it does require those making assessments to specify alternatives to the National Curriculum.

11.14 The disapplication and modification of Programmes of Study and Attainment Targets were further explained in 'Policy to Practice', (D.E.S. 1989). It noted that as objectives for attainment are based on 10 levels covering the period of compulsory schooling they allow "virtually all pupils to record some progress", (paragraph 8.2). Though reference is made to the adapting of the National Curriculum to "groups of pupils defined in terms of particular cases and circumstances", (paragraph 8.4), these are not actually specified. This comment reflects powers under the 1988 Education Act which allow the Secretary of State to make orders for instance modifying the publishing of results of assessments. It is not clear how such 'groups' of pupils are to be defined other than in terms of those with statements. This thesis has shown it would be most unhelpful to return to making curricular provision for children with SEN on the basis of labelling their disabilities. Of particular significance to this thesis is the confirmation in the draft circular that "no pupil should be deprived of access to the National Curriculum attainment targets in mathematics or science on the grounds of disability", (paragraph 8.6). This implies that the necessary resources and special equipment in these subjects should be made available for all children

with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. This still leaves unanswered the problems of whether such provision will actually be made for children without the protection of a statement, this being of greater significance should their school be involved in an LMS scheme. Despite these concerns the D.E.S. clearly confirms the entitlement of "as many pupils as possible to the full National Curriculum -all foundation subjects, attainment targets, and programmes of study", (Policy to Practice, paragraph 8.5).

11.15 The National Curriculum Council, (NCC), was set up by the D.E.S. under the 1988 Education Act to carry out statutory consultation on proposals of the Secretary of State for programmes of study and attainment targets. It also offers non-statutory guidance on implementing the National Curriculum and its Circular number 5, (May 1989), covered the participation by pupils with special educational needs. NCC stated its support for the principle of maximum participation by all such pupils and "minimal use of the exceptional arrangements", (paragraph 1). The circular highlights the entitlement in law of all pupils to a broad and balanced curriculum, relevant to their individual needs and says that "this entitlement represents an opportunity to improve standards further", (paragraph 2). NCC reported that "the great majority of respondents strongly supported participation and were opposed to exemption", (paragraph 3). Such support led them to continue "NCC wishes to reaffirm this principle of

active participation by the complete range of pupils with SEN (including those with profound and multiple learning difficulties), whether they are in special, primary, middle or secondary schools, with or without statements". Thus NCC Circular Number 5 changed the emphasis of the original D.E.S. view on exemptions which was outlined in the Draft Circular examined above. The NCC view on the implementing of the National Curriculum complements the findings of this thesis that the aims of education for physically disabled pupils should not be distinguished from those for children in general. NCC have removed the difficulty of finding legitimate criteria on which to exclude children with physical and other disabilities from the National Curriculum. Wedell (1988) noted that modification and disapplication are inconsistent with the view that the National Curriculum is a right for all children, irrespective of any physical or other difficulties they may have.

11.16 In common with the conclusions reached in chapter 9, NCC in Circular Number 5 (op cit.), argues that "special educational needs are not just a reflection of pupils' inherent difficulties or disabilities; they are often related to factors within schools which can prevent or exacerbate some problems", (paragraph 5). Schools with agreed policies on teaching and learning approaches for a range of SEN are expected to be most successful in meeting them. The importance of links between special and ordinary schools and the assistance of LEA support services are

noted by NCC as effective means of successfully providing the National curriculum for pupils having a range of disabilities. Chapter 10 showed that such features of special educational provision for children with physical and other disabilities are already in existence and can therefore support participation by pupils with SEN in the National Curriculum.

11.17 NCC has issued guidance on approaches to be used to allow pupils with SEN maximum participation in the National Curriculum. They suggest that access to the curriculum should be facilitated by whatever means necessary to ensure that success is achieved. Examples given are use of alternative means of communication, specific support and carefully structured teaching programmes. The significance of such provision for physically disabled pupils has been considered in earlier chapters. The significance of NCC's guidance is their recognition that such provision can bring about the effective participation of children with SEN in the National Curriculum. It was noted above that the D.E.S. draft circular (op cit.) defined special educational needs in terms of childrens' learning difficulties, which may or may not result from physical or other disabilities. NCC (1989 a) suggest that "the majority of pupils with learning difficulty simply require work to be suitably presented and differentiated to match their need", (paragraph 6). This confirms the findings of the thesis in chapter 6 that such pupils need individual objectives.

11.18 Wedell (1988) noted the importance of providing adequate access to the National Curriculum for all pupils, whatever their physical or other disabilities. He argued that though the aims of education may be the same for all pupils, teachers must consider which skills are to be developed as priorities when planning schemes of work. Wedell suggested that the latter should also consider the significance of objectives to the motivation of pupils with SEN. In seeking to follow the National Curriculum he noted schools must ensure that all pupils are really "engaged" in activities appropriate to their individual needs and interests. Wedell suggested the National Curriculum challenges both special and ordinary schools to provide all pupils with experiences leading to success, continuity and progression. He noted pressure for LEAs to arrange appropriate programmes for those individual pupils with severe physical and learning difficulties will highlight problems in accommodating a range of progress rates. Wedell suggested this may lead to a reversion to the segregation of children with SEN in special schools and of streaming in ordinary schools. This would be most regrettable given that as chapters 6, 7 and 10 showed the curricula provided by special schools for physically disabled pupils are often lacking in breadth and balance. These are exactly the qualities the National Curriculum seeks to promote.

11.19 Norwich (1989) confirmed that the entitlement of all pupils to participate in the National Curriculum

requires "good practice" in special and ordinary schools, which must have whole school policies for the inclusion of pupils with SEN. He noted that DES Circular 6/89 does allow pupils to be taught at levels which are outside their age-related key stages. Such 'informal modification' could be used to counter the argument in the previous paragraph that the National Curriculum may result in demands for the segregation of pupils with SEN. Chapter 8 noted the significance of whole school policies if physically disabled pupils are to have access to the curricula available in ordinary schools.

11.20 Norwich suggested that "given the time constraints, some subjects may be a low priority for pupils with SEN", (page 95). He suggested disapplication may be appropriate if pupils' levels of attainment are consistently below level 1. This would go against the advice of NCC Circular 5 as explained in paragraph 11.15. Norwich does add that "it is notable that the system of defining 10 Levels of progression with AT's provides for more Attainment Levels above the average for 16 year olds than below the average for 7 year olds", (page 96). He argues there should be a locally or nationally defined 'developmental curriculum' to lead into Level 1. The thesis has found no justification for such a curriculum for physically disabled pupils. An argument for an apparently distinct 'developmental curriculum' may be seen by some teachers as a means of continuing to segregate some children in special schools. Oliver (1985) claimed

separate special schools have failed to provide adequate curricular and their existence cannot be justified as the best means of providing for what are perceived to be distinct groups of pupils. The thesis has clearly shown that there are no valid criteria on which to identify groups of physically disabled pupils and that it is not helpful to do so.

11.21 NCC confirm that some wording in original proposals for Attainment Targets (AT) and Programmes of study in the core subjects was altered so that tasks previously impossible for children with physical or communication disabilities have been made possible without compromising the AT. As noted in chapter 6, HMI (1989) found evidence of inadequate curricular provision for children with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. NCC confirm that it should be possible for all pupils with SEN to demonstrate progress in relation to AT's, even though this may be small and within one level, though the latter should not be directly related to age groups.

11.22 In 'From Policy to Practice', (D.E.S. 1989), it is explained that Attainment Targets (AT's) should "cover the range of knowledge, skills and understanding which pupils should be helped and expected to master as they progress through school", (paragraph 3.11). Programmes of Study (PoS) "will set out the essential matters, skills and processes which need to be covered by pupils at each stage

of their education" (paragraph 3.12). It is noted that the targets offer general objectives, setting out areas within which pupils will need to develop their attainments. Thus there is flexibility to meet the SEN of pupils with physical or other disabilities. NCC (1989 a) comment "there is no set allocation of time to the AT's, and teachers may feel that certain AT's are appropriate vehicles for meeting particular aspects of special educational need, and could with advantage be given more time. Provided all AT'S are covered, this kind of flexibility can be used when planning pupils' work", (paragraph 9). This confirms Wedell's suggested strategy described in paragraph 11.18 above. The D.E.S. have confirmed that pupils at Key Stages of assessment at ages 7, 11, 14 and 16 might show attainments over a range of levels. D.E.S. National Curriculum Orders and non-Statutory Guidance for Maths and Science confirm that most attainment levels will be relevant to more than one key stage, as are the PoS.

11.23 Simmons and Thomas (1988) were concerned that originally the Education Reform Bill made no mention of special arrangements for the assessment of pupils with SEN. They feared that it would lead to a "stilted test-led or exam-led curriculum". Simmons and Thomas found that staff in ordinary schools were in favour of all their pupils participating in the National Curriculum but that they wanted to be able to carry out assessment related to their own schools and pupils. While he

acknowledges the significance of appropriate AT's for pupils with physical and other disabilities Norwich (1989) expressed the hope that the School Examination and Assessment Council (SEAC) would similarly allow Standard Assessment Tasks (SAT's) to be appropriate and accessible to pupils with SEN. The SEAC Recorder No. 2 (1989) confirms that "the mode of presentation, the mode of operation, or the mode of response may need to be adapted" for some pupils, if they would otherwise be at a disadvantage in attempting the tasks. Clearly this offers the opportunity for teachers in special and ordinary schools to use SAT's appropriately for physically disabled pupils.

11.24 This chapter has shown that the assessment and writing of statements for pupils with physical and other disabilities will not be significantly altered by the 1988 Education Reform Act. There is also unlikely to be any immediate change in the range of provision available in special or ordinary schools for children with physical disabilities. There may be changes in the patterns of placement of such children based on specific LEA policies influenced by the pattern of resourcing which results from LMS.

11.25 It has been argued that the demands of the National Curriculum may result in attempts to make specific curricular provision for physically disabled pupils in special schools justified as part of a range of

provision for such pupils. This is not what the 1988 Education Act intended and chapter 10 showed that such placements can only be justified if there are links between special and ordinary schools. The thesis has shown that it is not just the range of provision which is significant to physically disabled children but the opportunity to move between the various types of organisation. This chapter has shown that the possible financial complications of LMS may limit the part-time or permanent transfer of children between schools. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 showed that a range of special educational provision for physically disabled pupils will not be of full benefit unless their placements within it are flexible. Patterns of placements as with the numbers of statements actually written and the provision of resources for physically disabled pupils, are likely to continue to vary between LEAs.

11.26 It has been shown in this chapter that the National Curriculum need not be the whole curriculum for pupils with physical disabilities in special and ordinary schools. There is no reason why schools should not continue to provide activities such as riding for the disabled or wheel chair dancing for example, if it can be shown these contribute towards breadth, balance and relevance for the children concerned. The demands of the National Curriculum will clearly put pressure on some special schools to broaden their curricula to include subject areas chapters 6 and 10 found were not previously

covered. The National Curriculum positively encourages the differentiation of objectives to meet the SEN of individual pupils, including those with physical and other disabilities. Chapter 6 showed this is of benefit to physically disabled pupils.

Chapter 12

General Discussion and Conclusions

12.1 This concluding chapter comments on the current significance of the arguments discussed in the thesis about the nature of physical disability and causes of possible physical handicaps to childrens' educational progress. The thesis has shown that during the period since the Warnock Report (D.E.S. 1978), significant changes have occurred in the strategies used to make special educational provision for physically disabled children. This chapter evaluates these strategies. The thesis argues that they are influenced by the identification of physical handicap, the interpretation of the concept of special educational needs, the availability of resources to prevent it, opinions on appropriate curricular objectives, attitudes and approaches to physically disabled pupils in ordinary schools, the changing role of special schools and the 1988 Education Act. This chapter summarises the influence of these factors on features of educational provision for children with physical disabilities and considers whether these factors justify the use of the term special to describe such provision.

12.2 Chapter 2 showed that during the 1970's some

professionals involved in the assessment and implementing of special educational provision began to feel that the label 'physically handicapped' was an inappropriate basis for special educational provision as it stressed deficits in the child. Gulliford (1971) defined 'disability' as "the kind or degree of impairment which results in some loss of physical capacity or function". He added that "the extent of childrens' physical handicaps depends on the demands made of them and the ease with which disability can be circumvented or compensated for", (page 4). The search of more recent literature found many examples of educational provision, some appropriate for physically disabled pupils, some not, which supported Gulliford's views. The thesis concludes that the definitions of 'physical disability' and 'physical handicap' made in chapter 3 of the thesis in order to highlight the importance of pupils' access to learning, will always be significant to their educational progress. HMI (1989) recognised the importance of distinguishing the terms in the title of their Report on 'Educating Physically Disabled Pupils', as have NCC in their documentation (1989 a, b).

12.3 Gulliford (op cit.) argued that "disability may have restricted the opportunities for learning through incidental experiences, for acquiring and trying out new mental and physical skills, for exploring the immediate environment and for becoming aware of the social one", (page 170). This supports the conclusions in chapters 3,

4 and 5 that teachers' perceptions of pupils' physical disabilities, of pupils' special educational needs (SEN) and of features of educational provision, significantly affect its success. The thesis has clearly shown that if teachers are aware of the possibility that less obvious physical disabilities can lead to physical handicaps, the latter need not affect educational progress. The thesis has shown that this awareness must be translated into appropriate special educational provision involving adequate access to the curriculum, necessary educational and non-educational support and appropriate placements. Almost twenty years ago Gulliford (op cit.) wrote "Some physical disabilities need be little of a handicap if the environment is organised appropriately", (page 5). It is regrettable that HMI (1989) still found many examples of physical handicaps to childrens' educational progress in both special and ordinary schools.

12.4 Brennan (1985) distinguished between two pupils, both physically disabled, to illustrate that "there is no simple relationship between the severity of the disability and its effect on learning," (page 35). One boy was severely physically disabled being totally dependent on a wheel chair. He was nevertheless able to study at 'A' Level given the necessary assistance in mobility and recording. In contrast Brennan described another pupil, who although able to move around school independently, had poor co-ordination, difficulties in grasping and lifting objects and in concentrating on tasks such as reading and

numeracy, which require sequencing skills. The contrast between these pupils confirms learning difficulties cannot be directly linked to physical disabilities, but may also reflect pupils' perceptual, intellectual, social and emotional development. This confirms that it is not appropriate to make a distinction between special educational provision for physically disabled children with statements of SEN and others without statements, who may also have learning difficulties related to possible physical handicaps.

12.5 The thesis has argued that the 1981 and 1988 Education Acts still allow those making assessments to continue to explain some childrens' difficulties in terms of physical disabilities, rather than necessarily considering the failure of learning situations to provide for them. Whilst the concept of SEN has been shown to be a more valid basis for making special educational provision than categories of handicap, the thesis has argued that the writing of Statements under the 1981 Education Act merely provides the opportunity to record difficulties and specify special educational provision. Clearly this position has not changed since Wedell (1982) noted that Statements cannot guarantee good practice, but that they only represent the accumulated, relevant information. Goacher et al. (1988) showed that in most LEAs Statements did not provide a full description of childrens' needs. The thesis concludes that Peter (1982) was correct in her assumption that Statements were not

intended to describe detailed educational programmes.

12.6 Pumfrey and Mittler (1989), have argued that the term 'special educational need' has outlived its usefulness as a means of consciousness raising in an attempt to obtain resources for some children. They suggest that the term SEN "is subjective, ambiguous, relative and context bound". Its vagueness is shown by their evidence that one LEA has provided Statements of SEN for 0.04% of its school population, yet another has done so for 4.2% of its pupils. They confirm that Statements of SEN have implied that there is a distinction between ordinary children and those who have SEN, reinforced by labels such as SEN Advisers and SEN departments. Pumfrey and Mittler (op cit.) suggest use of the term SEN is counterproductive because it leads to the perception that the children so labelled are someone else's responsibility. Their opinions are consistent with the arguments in chapters 3 and 4 that assessments under the 1981 Education Act may fail to identify and record the physical handicaps of some pupils in what the thesis has shown to be a continuum of physical disability.

12.7 Pumfrey and Mittler (op cit.) suggest that assessment procedures should reflect criterion as well as norm-referenced tests and observations. Chapters 3 and 4 noted the significance of such measures in identifying childrens' physical disabilities. The thesis concludes that teachers in both special and ordinary schools should

not only be aware of any pupils' physical disabilities but should also record the strategies they intend to use to ensure access for all pupils to the curriculum. The National Curriculum Council (NCC), (1989 b) confirm that National Curriculum Plans should ensure that "all staff know which pupils have special educational needs, the nature of their needs and how best to meet these needs", (page 5). Whilst NCC use the term SEN, clearly they are not suggesting that it should only be used to refer to those pupils who have statements written under the 1981 Education Act.

12.8 Wedell (1988) defined SEN as the outcome of interaction between resources and deficiencies within the child and resources and deficiencies within the environment. This suggests that Statements may be misleading in implying SEN are static. Clearly childrens' physical disabilities may be lessened for example as they develop physically or following medical treatment. Certainly there may be changes in their environments, hopefully, but not necessarily for the better. Changes in SEN can be recorded in the Annual Review Procedure under the 1981 Education Act, though there is no guarantee that they will be identified.

12.9 Pumfrey and Mittler (op cit.) claim that making explicit assessments of childrens' individual differences by use of "agreed instruments and procedures" is an adequate basis for the allocation of additional resources.

They do not outline such procedures in detail. Pumfrey and Mittler argue that as every child has "different and varying personal and educational attributes and needs", the word special is redundant and divisive in this context. While these opinions are consistent with the findings of the thesis that childrens' physical disabilities should be individually defined, it does not acknowledge possible physical handicaps present in the learning situation, rather than the child. Chapter 11 showed the 1988 Education Act will not remove the difficulties of making reliable assessments of SEN which were described in chapter 4. The thesis concludes that where Statements of SEN are written under the 1981 Education Act they would be more helpful if they made explicit references to the physical handicaps to pupils' progress which would exist if particular features of provision are not made. The thesis has referred to special educational provision for physically disabled pupils but concludes that a continuum of provision is more likely to result if the emphasis is on making appropriate educational provision for all children.

12.10 The thesis has found no evidence that use of the term SEN has been directly detrimental to the educational provision made for physically disabled pupils. In Pumfrey and Mittler's view (op cit.) use of the term 'special' can only be justified to qualify educational needs or provision, as a means of obtaining particular resources. The thesis recognises there can be advantages in the use

of the term SEN to identify and obtain adequate furniture, access to buildings, resources to assist in practical assignments, communication aids, provision of therapy and non-teaching assistance which chapter 5 showed are significant in preventing individual physical handicaps. Clearly the term special educational provision is not appropriate if it is to be used to make arbitrary distinctions in educational provision or placement, the dangers of which were explained in chapter 2.

12.11 Chapter 6 argued that the aims of education for physically disabled pupils should not be distinguished from those for the education of other pupils. DES guidelines issued following the 1981 Education Act required special schools and units to provide 'mainstream', 'modified' or developmental curricula according to their pupils' individual SEN. They reflected the additional support necessary to provide access to a mainstream curriculum or the modification of objectives needed to make it appropriate for childrens' learning or physical difficulties. Clearly the 1988 Education Act has changed the emphasis by demanding the curricular breadth, balance and relevance which HMI (1989) found lacking for physically disabled pupils in some ordinary and special schools and units. Chapter 6 noted that the advantages of smaller classes, specialist teaching and resources which special schools claimed, did not compensate for such curricular inadequacies. It also found that some physically disabled pupils in ordinary schools were

excluded from the curricula provided for other pupils there. Sometimes they were excluded because schools felt aims for their education should be different, sometimes it was because the schools claimed they did not have suitable buildings, resources or experienced staff to provide for the SEN of physically disabled pupils.

12.12 Chapter 11 noted the clear entitlement of all pupils to the National Curriculum. This is likely to highlight problems of resourcing. NCC (1989 b), emphasise that adaptations to furniture, computers with adapted keyboards, word processors and other I.T. aids are necessary for some physically disabled pupils to have adequate access to the National Curriculum. NCC do not suggest how the necessary finance to provide these items could be obtained. Pumfrey and Mittler (op cit.) see the 1988 Education Act's requirement that an individual curriculum plan should be drawn up for all pupils and shared with their parents as the key to resources. Lefevre (1988) could not have been aware of the full National Curriculum implications for resources when he wrote of "fishing for funds". Nevertheless he confirmed fears described in chapter 11 that LMS may make it difficult for ordinary schools to provide adequately for pupils with physical disabilities. Lefevre suggested this would be because of those who he termed "cost cutting administrators".

12.13 NCC (1989 b) ask both special and ordinary

schools to carry out a curriculum audit which examines their aims, objectives and available resources. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 showed that provision of resources, the planning of schemes of work and in-service training for teachers are significant features of special educational provision for physically disabled pupils. NCC guidelines ask that National Curriculum Plans to be written by schools should mention methods and intermediate objectives to render Attainment Targets appropriate to the SEN of individual pupils. This is consistent with the conclusions in chapter 6 that physically disabled pupils may need individual curricular objectives wherever they are placed. The thesis therefore concludes that the National Curriculum plans which all schools must produce do offer a means of improving educational provision for physically disabled children. The breadth demanded by the National Curriculum has removed the danger of the narrowing of the curriculum which chapter 6 showed was a danger of the 'objectives' approach. The thesis concludes that strategies advocated by NCC (1989 b) can improve educational provision for physically disabled pupils by removing deficiencies in previous curricula provision which were noted in chapters 5, 6 and 7.

12.14 NCC (1989 b) provide examples of activities which can be part of schemes of work leading to particular attainment targets. They suggest that "pupils in wheelchairs" may benefit from collaborative work in maths and science gaining the benefit of other pupils'

experiences. Thomas (1988) implied Programmes of Study should be relevant to children with SEN, for example "history is what happened this morning", (page 9). NCC (1989 b) confirm the same attainment targets are set for all pupils in any key stage, with only those children with severe learning difficulties having exceptions recorded on their Statements of SEN, if for instance they are always working at levels below their key stage. NCC note that "The Secretary of State does not expect most statements to have references to modification or exemptions from the new curriculum", (page 2).

12.15 Chapter 6 found that some special and ordinary schools have organised particular courses designed to cater specifically for what they perceived to be the SEN of physically disabled pupils. Galletley (1985) claimed that vocational courses leading to what he termed 'employability' for special school pupils were more important than the "liberal tradition in education". He argued that such strategies need not produce a narrow curriculum and that children involved could experience "wonder, joy and delight", in curricula which aimed for independence. Whilst the thesis has shown such aims are relevant to physically disabled pupils, it concludes they are not an adequate basis to ensure the breadth now demanded by the National Curriculum. In contrast to Galletley, Dyson (1985) claimed that 'vocationalism' is not 'education' and therefore irrelevant to children with SEN. In his view special schools should be "widening and

deepening the understanding of even those children with profound and multiple physical and learning difficulties". This is consistent with the findings of this thesis and NCC Guidelines that physically disabled pupils should have a broad and balanced curriculum.

12.16 The thesis has found no evidence to support Dyson's claim (op cit.) that "many children with SEN will never master technological skills". Even if this were true in practice, the thesis argued in chapter 8 that such negative perceptions would limit teachers' expectations of physically disabled pupils. Though pupils with statements of SEN are not to have results of attainment testing published, the 1988 Education Act makes it clear special and ordinary schools should be able to demonstrate that such pupils are making progress on the National Curriculum programmes of study. This demand should raise teachers' expectations of pupils with physical and other disabilities. Chapters 6 and 8 showed that these were sometimes inappropriate in the past.

12.17 NCC have offered guidance (1989 b) on implementing the National Curriculum attainment targets for children with SEN. This suggests teachers should reduce physically disabled pupils' reliance on written materials and stresses the benefits of classroom assistants helping with practical activities. The thesis concludes that it is more important to plan appropriate curricular objectives for physically disabled pupils than to disapply the

National Curriculum for them. NCC also highlight the importance of whole school approaches to the recording of progress by all pupils, whatever their levels of attainment. Chapter 9 noted the importance of adequate record keeping in monitoring the progress of physically disabled pupils in special and ordinary schools.

12.18 The clear requirement in the 1988 Education Act that all pupils participate in the National Curriculum signals a significant change from the 1981 Education Act, which as the thesis has shown effectively led to a division between pupils with Statements of SEN and those who are not so labelled. This chapter has argued that if children with physical disabilities are to successfully participate in the National Curriculum they must have appropriate access, the necessary staffing and resources to do so. Clearly while these features of provision could be specified on Statements of SEN as a means of providing essential access to National Curriculum programmes of study, the absence of Statements for some physically disabled pupils shows the importance of other strategies to ensure adequate provision for all pupils.

12.19 This chapter has shown that the adequacy of educational provision for physically disabled pupils in special and ordinary schools will continue to vary despite the demands of the National Curriculum. NCC (1989 c) have made it clear that "the ten core and other foundation subjects of the National Curriculum plus religious

education - is not intended to be the whole curriculum", (page 1). Chapters 6 and 11 suggested activities and subjects which may be particular appropriate for many physically disabled pupils. Brennan (1985) offered appropriate guidelines for curriculum evaluation for pupils with SEN, including those who are physically disabled. He suggested their curricula should be judged on whether they are real, relevant, realistic and rational. The thesis has found however that the most helpful criteria for evaluating curricula for physically disabled pupils are those of HMI (1985) which do not distinguish between groups of pupils. HMI suggested that curricula for all pupils should be broad, balanced and relevant to their needs, with adequate continuity and progression.

12.20 O'Grady (1988) pointed out that the implementing of LMS may increase demands for the statementing of children with physical and other disabilities. Schools may see this as a way of making LEAs fund adequate provision for such children in ordinary schools, rather than having to rely on their delegated budgets to do so. O'Grady also noted that increased pressures to write Statements of SEN for pupils with physical and other disabilities may lead to their segregation in special schools. This would effectively result in a narrowing of the range of educational provision for such children. The thesis concludes that such unintended consequences of the 1988 Education Act can only be avoided if LEAs have

explicit policies of making appropriate provision for all pupils, whether or not they have Statements of SEN. Indeed as Pumfrey and Mittler (1989) feared, continuing use of such terminology could result in some physically disabled pupils being inappropriately placed.

12.21 O'Grady (op cit.) also suggested demands for statementing could also result from schools' desire to remove such children from the local and national comparisons of attainment testing. These are now required by law for all pupils except those with Statements of SEN. Clearly there is a danger, as O'Grady suggested, that ordinary schools may seek the Statementing of those pupils whose attainments are weak. Further guidance from DES is needed to prevent inappropriate use of Statements of SEN.

12.22 The thesis has shown that the existence of varying types of educational organisation is less significant to the successful placement of children with physical disabilities, than the appropriateness of provision wherever it is made. The thesis concludes that decisions on placements must include careful consideration of whether the provision suggested can really offer the physically disabled full access to the National Curriculum. Another consideration is whether there is any justification for segregating any pupils from their neighbourhood schools. The thesis concludes that ideally every ordinary school should be adequately staffed and resourced to provide access to the curriculum for pupils

with any degree of physical disability.

12.23 Pumfrey and Mittler (op cit.) argued that if teachers are committed to the education of all children none would be excluded from any area of the curriculum. Chapters 8 and 9 found that teachers' attitudes are a significant influence on the success of physically disabled pupils' educational placements. Bennett et al. (op cit.) reported integration may be hindered by negative "teacher attitudes, inappropriate organisation and curriculum", page 104. NCC (1989 b) agrees that some physically disabled pupils "will meet attitudes and practices in schools which do not actively encourage full participation", (page 1), ie. in the National Curriculum. Its guidance on making the latter accessible to pupils with SEN contains an implicit assumption that teachers will be influenced by the suggestions made. Chapters 8 and 9 showed that ordinary schools varied in their acceptance of input from LEA support services including In-service training. Given the clear guidance by NCC (1989 a and b) to provide the National Curriculum for all pupils they may be more ready to do so.

12.24 The thesis has found that in order to cater for what it has found to be a continuum of physical disability the range of provision suggested by Anderson (1973) and outlined in paragraph 7.2 should be established and available in every LEA. Figure 6 shows that many children with SEN who do not have statements written under the 1981

TABLE A25/87
EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (1, 2)

January 1987

Assessment and placement during 1986	Number of Children
Children for whom statements of special educational need were made under the Education Act 1981 Children newly placed in special schools or independent schools Children whose special educational needs were reassessed in accordance with Regulation 9 of the Education (Special Educational Needs) Regulations, 1983: Statement retained (with or without amendments) Statement discontinued	22,256 13,748 7,105 213
Children with special educational needs in January 1987	Children with statements under the 1981 Education Act
Attending special schools (3): Maintained Non-maintained Attending maintained and non-maintained hospital special schools Attending independent schools under arrangements made by authorities Attending ordinary classes in ordinary schools Attending special classes and units in ordinary schools Receiving education otherwise than at school (4) Awaiting admission to special schools: Aged 5 and over Under 5	90,923 5,383 945 6,040 15,425 13,612 1,362 1,039 179
ALL PUPILS	134,908

(1) These figures are not directly comparable with those in previous years, because of changes in the way statistics are collected as a result of the Education Act, 1981.
 (2) The figures in this table are not comparable with those shown in tables A21 to A23 as they are derived from a different source.
 (3) Excluding hospital special schools.

Act are placed in ordinary schools. Whilst the thesis found examples of varying types of educational provision for physically disabled pupils it found no evidence of clear strategies to ensure a national or local continuum of provision. Although HMI (1989) drew attention to the particular advantages of certain features of special educational provision for children with physical disabilities they felt unable to advocate rigid policies of placement for such pupils in special or ordinary schools.

12.25 Bennett et al. (1989) in their case studies found that "there was a wide variety of LEA approaches to the issue of integration", (page 103) and that few of them had definite policies for it. They suggested that the availability of special schools was a significant factor in the placements of children with SEN. The thesis has argued that physically disabled children should be placed in the most appropriate provision, not in whatever limited part of the range happens to be available in their LEA. O'Grady (op cit.) emphasises that if it is unacceptable to distinguish curricular needs for physically disabled pupils, it can not be acceptable to distinguish placements for them by their being segregated from their peers.

12.26 Chapter 10 suggests it may be difficult for small special schools to provide the breadth of curricula required by the 1988 Education Act, in view of their limited staffing and resources. NCC (1989 b) stress that

curricula breadth can be extended by links with nearby ordinary schools. Chapter 10 established that such links are helpful in improving special educational provision for children with physical disabilities in both types of provision. NCC offer no detail on how such links should be set up, implemented or monitored. The thesis has shown that a variety of ad hoc integration and re-integration schemes for physically disabled pupils exist, some more successful than others. It concludes that such developments are more likely to play a useful part in a range of educational provision for physically disabled pupils if LEAs have clear policies on provision for them and if the DES, HMI or NCC produce national guidelines as to how links can be established.

12.27 The thesis suggests that special schools staffed and equipped to provide for physically disabled pupils are still needed as part of the range of provision discussed. Chapter 10 showed that contact between colleagues from special and ordinary schools had helped teachers in the latter to gain insight into the SEN of their disabled pupils. The thesis concludes that the National Curriculum is likely to result in special schools asking for help in subject areas for which as HMI (1989) showed they have no specialist teachers. It is clear that as the demand for places in special schools falls, then they must change their role so that they can still be a viable part of the range of educational provision for children with physical disabilities.

12.28 The thesis has shown that if ordinary schools provide appropriate curricular objectives, resources for access to the curriculum and are adequately staffed, many more physically disabled pupils could be permanently placed there. Oliver (1985) argued that given the political will to do so, such features of provision could be made available. Pétér (1984) argued that "there are embedded attitudes and structures which limit access to the curriculum" for pupils with SEN. The thesis has found that this is true of some examples of provision for physically disabled children.

12.29 Ainscow and Tweddle (1988) argued that the labelling of pupils' disabilities has led to the development of a separate branch of the education service based on the premise that a proportion of pupils "have something wrong with them". NCC (1989 b) have stated that "some pupils will have physical and sensory impairments which make access into a challenge," (page 1). This acknowledges the reality that some children may still be excluded from the National Curriculum because of inadequate resources and inappropriate teachers' attitudes. The thesis concludes that the unjustified segregation of physically disabled pupils in special schools may therefore continue, as Oliver (1985) predicted.

12.30 The thesis has shown that the challenge to some

physically disabled children results not from the nature of their physical disabilities but from the appropriateness of the educational provision made for them. NCC (1989 b) observe that the entitlement of all pupils with SEN to a curriculum which includes the National Curriculum is based on the notion of equal opportunities. There have been national guidelines in recent years on this subject, but mainly related to gender and racial issues. The thesis concludes that physically disabled pupils should be given equal opportunities to receive the broad and balanced education to which they are now legally entitled. The thesis concludes that the existence of such opportunities depends on the attitudes of LEAs, teachers and other professionals involved in making appropriate provision for physically disabled pupils. As neither the DES or NCC are directly involved in resourcing schools for the needs of physically disabled pupils, the thesis concludes that they could be in conflict with LEAs who have this responsibility.

12.31 The thesis finds that Ainscow and Tweddle (1988) offered the most helpful summary of influences on educational provision for children with SEN, including those with physical disabilities. They argued educational provision can only be appropriate if politicians, administrators, teachers and parents consider the individual needs of all pupils, entitlement rather than exclusion, flexibility rather than rigidity and support for all teachers rather than expert attention for some

children in separate provision. Ainscow and Tweddle warned that the label SEN is unhelpful to the making of appropriate special educational provision and is merely a "more polite way of referring to pupils who are seen as inadequate". This thesis has argued that the label SEN may not necessarily be helpful to the making of appropriate educational provision for physically disabled children. The concepts of entitlement and equal opportunities offer more hope for the provision of adequate curricula and resources for such pupils, providing there are clear guidelines as to what is considered appropriate. NCC have provided such guidelines (1989 a,b,c). It is for HMI, LEAs, teachers and parents to ensure these are properly implemented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADEY S. (1983) 'A Strategy for Integration', SPECIAL EDUCATION, 10,(2), pages 27-28.
- AINSCOW M. (1984), 'Curriculum Development in Special Schools', in BOWERS T. (ed.), Management and the Special School. London: Croom Helm
- AINSCOM M. & TWEDDLE D. (1988) 'Lets lose the labels: time to stop talking about Special Needs and start making teaching effective for all.' TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT, 3756, 24.6.88, page 25.
- ANDERSON E.M. (1973), The Disabled School Child: A Study of Integration in the Primary School. London: Methuen.
- BARTON L. & TOMLINSON S. (1981) Policy, Practices and Social Issues. London: Harper and Row.
- BENNETT N. & CASS A. (1989), From Special to Ordinary Schools, Case Studies in Integration. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- BOOKBINDER G. (1983) 'New Deal or Dashed Hopes', SPECIAL EDUCATION, 10,(1), pages 6-7.
- BOOTH T. & POTTS P. (1983), Integrating Special Education London: Basil Blackwell.
- BOWERS T. (ed.) (1984) Management and the Special School. London: Croom Helm.
- BRENNAN W.K. (1982), Changing Special Education. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- BRENNAN W.K. (1985), Curriculum for Special Needs. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- BRENNAN W.K. (1987), Changing Special Education Now. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- CARR J., HALLIWELL M.D. & PEARSON A.M. (1983) 'Educational Attainments of Spina Bifida Children attending Special and Ordinary Schools'. SPECIAL EDUCATION, 10,(3), pages 22-24.
- CHAZAN M., LAING A., BAILEY M.S., & JONES G., (1980) Some of our Children. London: Open Books.
- COPE C. and ANDERSON E.M. (1977) Special Units in Ordinary Schools, Windsor: N.F.E.R...

- CROLL P. and MOSES D. (1985) One in Five, The Assessment and Incidence of Special Educational Needs. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- DAVIES J. (1980) 'Physiotherapy in Ordinary Schools' SPECIAL EDUCATION, 7.(1), page 29.
- D.E.S. (1978) Special Educational Needs (The Warnock Report). London: H.M.S.O.
- D.E.S. (1983) Circular 1/83. London: H.M.S.O.
- D.E.S. (December 1988) Revision of D.E.S. Circular 1/83: Assessments and Statements of Special Educational Needs: Procedures within the Education, Health and Social Services. Draft Circular. London: H.M.S.O.
- D.E.S. (1989) National Curriculum From Policy to Practice. Stanmore: H.M.S.O.
- DESSENT T. (1987) Making Ordinary Schools Special. London: The Falmer Press.
- DYSON A. (1985) 'A Curriculum for the Educated Man', BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 12.4, pages 138-139.
- EDWARDS C. (1985) 'On Launching a Support Service', BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 12.2, pages 53-54.
- FISH J. (1984) 'The Future of the Special School', in BOWERS T. (ed.), Management and the Special School, London: Croom Helm.
- FISH J. (1985) Special Education: The Way Ahead. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- GALLETLEY I. (1985) 'Vocationalism must come first' BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 12.4, pages 140-141.
- GALLOWAY D. (1985) Schools, Pupils and Special Educational Needs. London: Croom Helm.
- GIBB C.Mc.D. and FLAVAHAN R.P. (1987) 'What Distinguishes Integrated and Segregated Physically Disabled Pupils?' EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH 29.(1), pages 3-11.
- GIPPS C., GROSS H. and GOLDSTEIN H. (1987) Warnock's 18% - Children with Special Needs in Ordinary Schools. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

- GOACHER R., EVANS J., WELTON J., & WEDELL K., (1988), Policy and Provision for Special Educational Needs. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- GULLIFORD R. (1971) Special Educational Needs. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- HALLIWELL M. and SPAIN B. (1977), 'Integrating Pupils with Spina Bifida' SPECIAL EDUCATION/FORWARD TRENDS 4,(4), page 15.
- HALLMARK N. and DESSENT T. (1982) 'A Special Education Service Centre' SPECIAL EDUCATION 9(1).
- HEGARTY S. (1980) 'Integration : Some Questions to Ask' SPECIAL EDUCATION/FORWARD TRENDS 7(1)
- HEGARTY S. (1982 a) 'The Growth Of Special Centres' SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS 9.(1) pages 27-29.
- HEGARTY S. (1982 b) 'Meeting Special Needs in the Ordinary School' N.F.E.R. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH 24,(3) pages 174-181.
- HEGARTY S., POCKLINGTON K. & BRADLEY (1982 c) Recent Curriculum Development in Special Education. London: Schools Council.
- HEGARTY S. POCKLINGTON K. & LUCAS S. (1982 d) Integration in Action. Windsor: N.F.E.R.
-
- H.M.I. (1985) Curriculum Matters: the Curriculum from 5 to 16, London: H.M.S.O.
- H.M.I. (1989) Report on Educating Physically Disabled Pupils, Stanmore: D.E.S.
- HOCKLEY L. (1985) 'On being a support teacher' BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 12,1, pages 27-29.
- HODGSON A. (1984) 'Integrating Physically Handicapped Pupils' SPECIAL EDUCATION/FORWARD TRENDS 11(1).
- HOWARTH S.B. (1987) Effective Integration Windsor: N.F.E.R. / NELSON .
- HURST A. (1984) 'Legislating for Special Education' SPECIAL EDUCATION 11,(1) pages 6-9
- HUGHES D. (1984) 'The Role of a Visual Handicap Department in an Integrated Secondary School' BRITISH JOURNAL OF VISUAL IMPAIRMENT 11(1)
- JONES N. and SOUTHGATE T. (1983) 'Integrating the Ormerod Children' SPECIAL EDUCATION 10,(2), pages 14-16.

- JOWETT S., HEGARTY S., & MOSES (1988) *Joining Forces, Links between Special and Ordinary Schools.* Windsor: N.F.E.R. / Nelson.
- KNEEDLER R.D. (1984) *Special Education for Today.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall .
- LEACH G. (1982) 'Making Science More Accessible' *SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS* 9(1)
- LEFEVRE P. (1989) 'Fishing for Funds' , *TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT*, 2.6.89
- LEWIS V. (1987) *Development and Handicap.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- LEWIS I. & VULLIAMY G. (1981) 'The Case of Special Education' in BARTON L. & TOMLINSON S. *Special Education, Policy, Practices and Social Issues.* London: Harper and Row.
- LORING J. and BURN G. (eds.) (1977) *Integration of Handicapped Children in Society.*
- LOWDEN G. (1985) 'The Unit's Approach to Integration', *BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION*, 12.1, pages 10-12.
- MADGE M. and FASSAM F. (1982) *Ask the Children .* London: Batsford.
- MITTLER P. (1987) 'Foreword' in MORGENSTERN F. *Teaching Plans for Handicapped Children.* London: Methuen.
- MORGAN G. (1977) 'Integration v Segregation in Ontario' *SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS* 4,(1), pages 18-21.
- MORGENSTERN F. (1987) *Teaching Plans for handicapped Children* London: Methuen.
- MOSES D., HEGARTY S. and JOWETT S. (1987) 'Support for the ordinary school'. *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH* 29,(2) pages 108-115.
- NATIONAL CURRICULUM COUNCIL (1989 a) *Circular No. 5 Implementing the National Curriculum - Participation by Pupils with Special Educational Needs.* York: NCC.
- NATIONAL CURRICULUM COUNCIL (1989 b) *Curriculum Guidance Number Two - A Curriculum for All.* York: NCC.

- NATIONAL CURRICULUM COUNCIL (1989 c) Circular No. 6. The National Curriculum and Whole Curriculum Planning: Preliminary Guidance. York: NCC.
- NEWMAN I. & SHARPLES R. (1987) 'The Kielder Challenge' BRITISH JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, 18,5, pages 218-220.
- NORWICH B. (1989) 'How should we define exceptions?' BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 16,3, pages 94-97.
- OLIVER M. (1985) 'The Integration - Segregation Debate: Some Sociological Considerations' BRITISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION, 6,7, pages 75-93.
- O'GRADY C. (1988) 'Exclusive Effects' TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT, 23.9.88 page 36
- O'HAGAN F. & SWANSON I. 'Special Education - Which Way Forward?' SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS 11, (2), pages 2-6.
- PETER M. (1982) Editorial SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS 9, (2), page 5.
- PETER M. (1984) 'On with the Act', BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 11, (1), page 5.
- POCKLINGTON K. (1980) 'Integration a lesson from America?' SPECIAL EDUCATION/FORWARD TRENDS, 7,3, page 22.
-
- POTTS P. (1983) in BOOTH T. and POTTS P. Integrating Special Education. London: Basil Blackwell.
- PUMFREY P. & MITTLER P. (1989) 'Peeling off the Label' TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT, 13.10.89
- RAYMOND J. (1984) Teaching the Child with Special Needs . London: Ward Lock
- RAYNER P. (1983) 'A Science Link with Tulse Hill' SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS 10, (1), pages 29-30.
- SIMMONS K. & THOMAS G (1988) 'Assessment, Special Needs and the Education Reform Bill'. SUPPORT FOR LEARNING, 3, (3), pages 144-148.
- SOUTHGATE T. (1988) 'Roll Play' T.E.S. 23.9.88
- SPENCER M. (1980) 'Wheel Chairs in a Primary School' SPECIAL EDUCATION 7, (1) page 18.
- SWANN W. (1981) The Practice of Special Education . London: Blackwell.

- SWANN W. (1983) 'Curriculum Principles for Integration' in BOOTH T. & POTTS P. Integrating Special Education. London: Basil Blackwell.
- THOMAS D.N. (1977), in LORING J. & BURN G. (Eds.), Integration of Handicapped Children in Society.
- THOMAS N. (1988) 'The National Curriculum: Primary Issues' BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, 15,(1), pages 8-10.
- TOMLINSON S. (1982) A Sociology of Special Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- WEBB L. (1967) Children with Special Needs in the Infant School. Glasgow: Fontana.
- WEDELL K. (1982) 'Challenge in the 1981 Education Act', SPECIAL EDUCATION / FORWARD TRENDS, 9,2.
- WEDELL K. (1988) 'Special Educational Needs and the Education Reform Act' FORUM 31, (1), pages 19-21.
- WILSON J. & COWELL B. (1984) 'How should we define handicap?' SPECIAL EDUCATION/FORWARD TRENDS, 11,(2), page 33-35.
- WILSON M.D. (1981) The Curriculum in Special Schools London: Schools Council.

