

From Integration to Inclusive Education in England: Illuminating the Issues through a Life History Account

Dr Jonathan Glazzard
University of Huddersfield
Huddersfield, England

Abstract. This paper provides a life history account of one teacher's determination to make inclusion work. The account reflects on the policy discourses of integration and inclusion and demonstrates ways in which these were translated into practice within the remit of the informant's experience. The account illustrates how inclusion can result in exclusive practices which categorise and marginalise learners on account of their impairments. The account also demonstrates how inclusion operates within a medical model of disability rather than a social model. Insights into the policy discourse of integration demonstrate how the informant was better able to meet pupils' holistic needs at that time.

Keywords: Disability, Inclusion, Inclusive Education, Integration, Special Educational Needs

Introduction

The Green Paper for special educational needs (DFE, 2011) and the Code of Practice for Special Educational needs (DFE, 2014) in England signpost the direction of travel in relation to special needs policy in England. Throughout the documents emphasis is placed on raising levels of achievement for pupils identified as having special educational needs and ending the culture of low expectations which the government argue has disadvantaged some of the most vulnerable learners.

Current special needs policy in England has been shaped by the Warnock report (DES, 1978) which advocated a policy of integrating pupils with special educational needs into mainstream schools. This was largely a 'dump and hope' model which placed responsibility on the child to adapt to the policies, rules and routines of mainstream settings. However, following the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) the New Labour government radically advanced a policy of inclusion. Although the term has been criticised for its lack of clarity (Avramidis

et al, 2002; Benjamin, 2002; Sikes et al, 2007), it is generally agreed that inclusion necessitates proactive response so that schools transform themselves to meet the diverse needs of learners (Mittler, 2000). The policy was contentious because it was advanced under the overarching policy agenda of raising standards and it has been argued that the agendas were polarised and incompatible (Warnock, 1996; Barton, 1998; Armstrong, 1998). Additionally, evidence from the academic literature suggests that attempts by schools to become more inclusive resulted in a decline in academic standards. Given that school effectiveness in England is currently evaluated on the basis of narrow performance indicators schools which embrace diversity face numerous challenges. For these schools it may be more difficult to maintain high positions in the league tables whilst schools with less diverse student populations are allowed to flourish. Additionally, schools with diverse student populations may face other challenges in relation to facilitating parental partnerships. This may mean that such schools do not receive full parental support in supporting them to raise standards.

Teachers' own accounts of their experiences of integration and inclusion illuminate some of the issues in relation to how policy was translated into practice. This paper presents an account from a teacher whose career has spanned five decades. Whilst I acknowledge that it is not possible to make generalisations from a single account, the account does raise some fundamental issues in relation to inclusion that are worthy of consideration.

Literature and theoretical framework

Azzopardi (2009, 2010) has argued that the term 'inclusive education' is little more than a cliché: 'a politically correct term that is used for speeches and policy-makers to silence all woes' (2009: 21). The main problem is that there is no shared understanding of the term. It means different things to different people and interpretations of inclusion are shaped by vested interests and cultural values.

It has been argued that inclusion necessitates a deep, cultural change in schools (Graham and Harwood, 2011). Inclusion places an onus upon schools to examine the curricular, pedagogical and environmental factors which limit achievement (Erten and Savage 2012) rather than blaming impairments within the child for educational failure. However, inclusion as a policy discourse has been infiltrated by neoliberal values and consequently it has focused on notions of presence, assimilation and normalisation rather than the development of socially just pedagogies (Dunne, 2009; Slee, 2011). The marketization of education has provided little incentive for schools to become more inclusive (Hodkinson, 2012). Within a discourse of performativity schools which become increasingly responsive to diversity jeopardise their positions in the market league tables. This can cause tensions for those educators whose educational practices are driven by a sense of moral purpose and social justice. Whilst it is unquestionable that educators should demonstrate the highest expectations of all learners, it is the case that some learners with special educational needs and/or disabilities will be unable to demonstrate educational achievement of the kind that is valued by government officials, school inspectors and other stakeholders. However,

schools which demonstrate a genuine commitment to inclusion risk their reputations if narrow performance indicators are the basis for evaluating overall school effectiveness.

Dunne (2009) provides a fascinating analysis of contemporary discourses of inclusion. Through her own research she demonstrates how 'inclusion was heavily characterised by a process of othering' (p.49) through the use of divisive language which separates a minority of pupils from an unnamed majority. Additionally, drawing on the work of Foucault (1978) she demonstrates how regimes of observation and surveillance are employed to eradicate difference, thus strengthening the socially constructed norm. Similarly, Armstrong (2005) argued that inclusion acts as a disciplinary force which serves as a mechanism for assimilation and conformity. These mechanisms result in the growth of surveillance and the management of 'troublesome' student populations who threaten overall school performance indicators.

Foucault's concepts of hierarchical observation, normalising judgements and the examination (Foucault, 1977) have been applied to special educational needs (Allan, 1996) to illustrate ways in which pupils with special needs become objects of surveillance and power in schools. Under the imperative to raise standards schools and teachers will do all that they can to maximise student performance (Ball, 2003). This results in schools providing additional intervention programmes for learners who are falling behind. These serve the purpose of closing the achievement gap under the banner of equality of opportunity. However, such divisionary practices marginalise learners who are singled out and reinforce amongst them a sense of failure (Lloyd, 2008).

Giroux (2003) reminds educators to reject forms of schooling that marginalise learners. However, under the banner of inclusion normative practices result in the marginalisation of those with special educational needs and disabilities through their construction as an 'othered' group (Goodley, 2007). Whilst inclusion was presented within policy scripts as 'a fundamental good and worthwhile endeavour' (Dunne, 2009: 42) educators' personal accounts of inclusion illuminate some of the disciplinary effects of inclusion. The account which follows problematises inclusion and raises questions about social justice.

Methodology

This study uses a life history approach to explore one teacher's (*Mary*) experiences of inclusion. Dhunpath (2000) has argued that 'the life history approach is probably the only authentic means of understanding how motives and practices reflect the intimate intersection of institutional and individual experience in the postmodern world' (p.544). Life stories are 'lives interpreted and made textual. Stories represent a partial, selective commentary on lived experience' (Goodson, 2001: 138) and Lewis argues that:

Quite possibly, it is the principal way of understanding the lived world. Story is central to human understanding- it makes live livable, because without a story, there is no identity, no self, no other.

(Lewis, 2011: 505)

Mary documented her own account which has been presented in its entirety below. Although a systematic approach was not adopted for data analysis the subsequent discussion draws out pertinent points from the narrative which contextualises the story by locating it within the broader political contexts which shape education.

Mary's account

Over the last 36 years I have enjoyed the rewards and challenges of teaching hundreds of children in all age groups of the primary phase of education. Some have, of course, proved to be more challenging than others. As a newly qualified teacher I taught several children who had previously been initially educated in special schools. The role of integrating them into a mainstream classroom was a responsibility that was placed on my shoulders alone. These children did not have statements of special educational needs and were simply deemed to be ready to return to mainstream education. Transition was ill considered and most of them arrived with no preparation either for themselves or for the receiving school. The child was expected, with support, to adapt to the policies and systems of the school. Memories of such an abrupt introduction to life in a new school now fill me with horror. Somehow we coped as did most of the children who joined us. There was no alternative, merely a sense of acceptance that this was current policy and practice. During this period of my early teaching career I was extremely fortunate to be working in a school where the Head Teacher realised that if we were to be successful in reintegrating these children we too would need to make adaptations to our practices to meet the diverse needs of those in our care. There were, unsurprisingly, some children who struggled to access some aspects of their education and in the absence of focused individual education plans and support staff their individual needs were frequently not as effectively supported as they are today. However it was considered to be of paramount importance to support the whole child. Some differentiation was in evidence although I do not recall grouping children with similar learning needs. Class sizes were frequently in excess of 35 children and I recall teaching some cohorts in excess of 40 children. I was required to educate these classes with no additional support.

In the early 1980s I was the class teacher with children in the early years. There were almost forty children in the class. Within 2 weeks of the autumn term beginning a new child joined my class. This was not unusual but it was to be one of the most challenging times in my teaching career. Rory was just 5 years old when he joined us. He had recently been placed with foster carers in the local area. Rory and his elder brother Adam had been living with their teenage mother who also had 2 year old twin girls. She had been unable to cope and concerns had apparently been raised by neighbours. Two years earlier Rory and Adam were discovered in the attic of their home amongst heavily soiled blankets and scraps of food. Social services had acted immediately and both boys had been placed with foster carers. Two years later they were now beginning a new life with their fourth set of foster carers. This was the depth of the information I received only hours before Rory joined my class. He had already begun full time education in another primary school. I received no information about him and the only way for me to learn more about Rory was through first-hand experience. He could only be described as wild and free. He had no understanding of boundaries and he was unable to socialise appropriately with other children. When Rory wanted or needed something he was intent on getting it. He would growl menacingly at his peers who would quickly hand over whatever Rory wanted. He threw items around and would run out of the classroom to menace the rest of the school. One week of responsibility for Rory and I was exhausted.

The head teacher seemed to be oblivious to the disruption that Rory was causing. I was on my own and whenever Rory left the classroom I could not follow to ensure his safety without jeopardising the safety of his peers. I decided that I must act and went to discuss this with the head teacher. His advice was to 'make' Rory do as he was told. With a class of terrified 5 year olds and one very unpredictable child I was at a loss as to where to start. I knew that without support I could not help Rory and that the education of the other children was already suffering. The challenges were too great. In sheer desperation I suggested that maybe I lacked experience and that perhaps the head teacher could model the ways in which this could be achieved....in the classroom with Rory! The head teacher never actually modelled his expectations however he did contact the local authority and it was suggested that an additional adult be employed to work alongside me. It was actually another month before help finally arrived in the form of Nancy. Nancy was my salvation. Before she officially took up her post we met to discuss Rory's needs and the challenges we faced educating him in a mainstream classroom. It was immediately decided that Rory needed to initially understand and then conform to the rules and routines of the setting. We picked our arguments carefully. It was important that our interactions with Rory were not all negative and without careful consideration that could so easily have been the case. Rory loved to run out of the classroom, he got a reaction. It was decided that when he left the classroom we would follow him at a distance, to ensure his safety. He was however not automatically allowed to return. He was expected to calm down and tell us when he was ready to do so. For several weeks this was a long battle. We discovered, very quickly, that once we knew he was safe he was best ignored. Rory could not abide being ignored.

He would shout, bang doors, swear and spit. No reaction was given. Eventually he gave up. Once calm he was asked if he would like to return to the classroom. These escapades could last for well over an hour and on his return the whole scenario would often begin again. We persevered and several weeks later we began to notice that Rory was responding to our expectations much more quickly. Sometimes he would head for the classroom door and then decide not to make his exit. He seemed to prefer to be in the classroom. With this in mind we next decided to challenge aspects of his unacceptable behaviour towards his peers. Again we picked our arguments and decided that any actions that upset or hurt other children would be addressed. Knowing that Rory was beginning to enjoy his time in the classroom we would lead him out of it whenever he hurt or upset his peers. His response was amazing. He would pull back explaining that he would 'stop it' or 'I won't do it anymore'. We insisted that he left, accompanied by Nancy. Once calm again he was invited to return. Addressing these behaviours took at least a term and in that time I confess that Rory probably made little academic progress. He began to enjoy school, he understood our expectations and to some extent he was developing an understanding of the needs of others.

It was only at this point that we could carefully concentrate on Rory's learning needs but he was now ready to learn. From time to time Rory would have an outburst but when he did he would take himself out of the classroom and sit quietly in the reception area of the school. It was Rory who would tell us when he was calm and ready to return. He was learning to control and deal with his own emotions. Looking back on the time I spent with Rory I obviously consider how I might have done things differently. With greater experience I realise that I did make some mistakes. Thirty years later I often wonder how I would be able to support Rory now. Would the term we spent introducing him to boundaries and expectations be considered wasted time? How would I justify his

poor attainment for over a term? Why was Rory not making progress in maths, reading and writing? I am grateful that thirty years ago I genuinely had time to devote to his most immediate needs. Rory now works in the construction industry. On meeting Rory and his mother a few years ago she explained 'He's done so well. I'm so proud of him. He's kept out of trouble. I've never had the police at my door. You really helped him.' Rory stood silently beside his mother. As they walked away he uttered 'Who's that?'

The agenda for inclusion, initially, had little impact on my practices. I do not remember being made explicitly aware of it. In the early 1990s I continued to make every effort to meet the needs of all children and swiftly identified the reasons for children being unable to access my systems and practices as well as identifying areas in which I considered they needed additional focus and support. With no training to support me in identifying specific social, emotional or learning needs I made these diagnoses in isolation. I was unaware of professional agencies that could support me.

My views were never challenged. I coped, without complaint, and that was deemed to be successful inclusion. Teachers eventually began to enjoy the support of additional human resources to aid them in meeting the needs of children who had a statement of special educational needs. In theory, this would enable teachers to more effectively meet the diverse needs of these children. I recall that at this time I began to have grave concerns about the ways in which such human resources were deployed. It was not unusual to witness many children with a statement of special educational needs who, in my view were excluded rather than included in mainstream education. A Velcro model developed where individual children spent entire days with the member of staff deployed to support them. These children were frequently denied access to a teacher and were educated totally by a learning assistant. Such practices clearly created barriers between the children with statements and their peers as well as their teacher. These were of course only my own experiences of the early days of inclusion, however to this day, I continue to witness learning assistants whose roles appear to be to ensure that challenging children are kept 'out of the teacher's hair.' I have grave concerns that children who find aspects of life as well as aspects of their learning challenging are frequently only taught by teaching assistants. Every child had the need and the right to be taught by a qualified teacher. Today children are usually grouped according to meet their immediate learning needs but some are rarely educated by a teacher. Teachers are dumping these children. A dump and hope model is not inclusion.

In my current role I encounter children who have a statement of special educational needs or a 'status' of school action plus to meet their very diverse needs. Such needs are usually clearly identified and outside agencies offer additional advice and support to teachers working with these children. Children with a status of school action however are usually identified by the school because they find mathematics, reading or writing difficult. They are rarely identified as needing support for alternative reasons. School tracking systems currently have a very narrow focus and it is through these systems that children needing additional support are identified. I work in an area of social and economic deprivation. The needs and challenges faced by some of the children are vast and go way beyond those of mathematics and English. Many of their parents see little value in education. Some seem to have few aspirations for either themselves or their children. Education is not placed highly on their agenda for life. Some children witness the volatility of adult relationships and for others their home lives are touched by drugs or alcohol. These are their daily experiences of the world and my prime concerns for these children go beyond mathematics and English. I work in the current system and am

completely accountable, endeavouring to raise standards. I continue, however, to have my own agenda, an agenda that attempts to support the diverse needs of the whole child.

Discussion

Inclusion as a policy agenda was intended to transform the policies and practices of mainstream schools in order to make education more responsive to the differing needs of pupils. However, Mary's account of her practices under the discourse of integration illustrate how she was able to devote the time to meeting Rory's social and emotional needs without having to explain or account for his lack of progress in the taught curriculum. Mary's commitment to supporting children's holistic needs seems to have remained consistent throughout her career and this has formed part of her inclusive teacher identity. Her account of Rory provides some powerful insights into the discourses of integration and inclusion. Under the policy of integration she succeeded with Rory largely because of her own determination to make his integration into her classroom a success. She persevered through 'good faith and effort' (Cole, 2005) and with the support of her teaching assistant she was able to cater for Rory's social and emotional needs before concentrating on his academic needs. However, the attitude of her Head Teacher, that Rory should be forced to conform to the rules and routines of the classroom, illustrates how integration as a policy discourse placed the onus on the child rather than placing the onus on the school to demonstrate a proactive response in relation to meeting Rory's needs. There was clearly an expectation that Rory would 'fit in' to the school and this demonstrates how integration largely operated under a medical model. The Head Teacher and Mary expected Rory to 'correct' his behaviour rather than considering the changes to policies and practices that might be implemented to address Rory's needs. Rory eventually conformed to the expectations by modifying his behaviour but there is no indication in the account that policies, systems, rules and routines were adapted to facilitate Rory's successful inclusion.

Mary acknowledges in the account that she made mistakes and this is a theme identified by Cole (2005) in her research with mother teachers. However, the critical questions which she raises at the end of Rory's account illuminate the wider issues around inclusion:

Thirty years later I often wonder how I would be able to support Rory now. Would the term we spent introducing him to boundaries and expectations be considered wasted time? How would I justify his poor attainment for over a term? Why was Rory not making progress in maths, reading and writing?

Ironically Mary's account illustrates ways in which Mary was able to implement more inclusive practices under the discourse of integration than she is able to do currently under the discourse of inclusion. Although Mary remains committed to supporting children's holistic needs her questions indicate that the current focus on maximising children's progress and attainment in academic subjects results in limited time to focus on children's social and emotional needs. Until inclusion is disentangled from neoliberal forms of governance educators are restricted in the extent to which they are able to develop socially just pedagogies

(Slee, 2011). Policy, under neoliberal forms of governance, has exploited inclusion through marketing it as a strategy to raise academic achievement for all. Inclusion has not been introduced to promote genuine inclusive values (tolerance, respect, democracy). Instead it has been subverted to serve the economic needs of various governments by limiting its purpose to closing the achievement gap between learners with and without special educational needs. Thus, inclusion as a policy discourse has been implemented to serve a normalising and perfecting function (Dunne, 2009) rather than a struggle for equality and social justice (Hodkinson, 2012). This subversion of inclusion is promoted under the banner of equality of opportunity for all and inclusion is therefore advanced as a tool for promoting equity and eradicating discrimination.

Mary's account demonstrates how inclusion has insidious and pathologising effects. Her description of inclusion illustrates powerfully how practices which at surface level are deemed to promote inclusion (one-to-one support and differentiation through grouping) ironically promote exclusion (Dunne, 2009). Such dividing practices under the discourse of inclusion serve to instil amongst learners with special educational needs a sense of failure and exclusion. Ironically Mary continues to support the holistic needs of her learners within the current climate of performativity which pervades education. This is a risk because current mechanisms of accountability focus on pupils' progress in a very limited range of academic subjects. However, Mary recognises that pupils are unlikely to make progress in these areas unless their social and emotional needs have been effectively met. Consequently, to enact inclusion, Mary has to transgress the performativity discourse in order to meet children's holistic needs. This is a risk for her because in choosing to follow this path, she remains accountable for her pupils' academic achievements every term.

Mary's account illustrates how inclusion has not resulted in a radical change to educational policies and practices. Thus, teachers continue to operate practices in which children who transgress the limits of normality are effectively isolated from their peers (Dunne, 2009; Slee, 2011). Through additional intervention and support these learners are expected to correct their behaviour and make progress and the needs of the school to maintain order and demonstrate high standards and transferred onto the child (Thomas and Loxley, 2007). Inclusion should operate within a social model of disability because it is now generally accepted that disability is a product of social, cultural, environmental and economic influences which result in people with impairments being restricted from accessing goods and services. Practices such as one-to-one support, exclusion from classrooms or differentiation effectively bar some pupils from accessing the educational opportunities that their peers are fortunate to be able to enjoy. Through Mary's account it is possible to see how inclusion can instrumentally fail to achieve its core principles by creating overt forms of segregation which marginalise and categorise learners (Dunne, 2009). Her account also makes it possible to see how inclusion has led to the increased surveillance of pupils with special educational needs through the deployment of teaching assistants and multi-agency support.

Conclusion

Personal accounts are necessary because they illuminate the issues that pertain when policy is translated into practice. Whilst current government policy in England has abandoned the bias on inclusion, inevitably mainstream schools with diverse student populations will continue to exist. These schools will inevitably need to develop inclusive practices to meet the needs of their learners. Inclusion will not simply disappear despite attempts by the government to expand segregated and alternative provision. The teachers who work in these schools face significant challenges given that they are accountable for raising academic standards whilst at the same time responding to diverse needs. Mary's account illustrates how powerful forms of segregation accompany inclusion. Learners who fail to operate within prescribed limits may be marginalised and segregated from their peers to enable teachers to focus on raising standards for the majority. There is a danger that inclusive schools might choose to implement divisionary practices to allow them to respond to the imperative of the standards agenda. There is also a danger that pupils' holistic needs will not be effectively met as teachers focus their energies on closing the achievement gap between learners with and without special educational needs. Those teachers who choose to focus on the whole child, teachers like Mary, are vulnerable within the performative regime which pervades education. If they choose to do this at the expense of raising standards then they risk being identified as failing teachers through accountability mechanisms that only take into account narrow measures of teacher and school effectiveness. However, it is clear that for some pupils a focus on their social and emotional development is critical and a pre-requisite to any future academic success. Inclusive teachers often demonstrate a strong commitment to the principles of social justice and equality. These teachers demonstrate ethical practices based on care and dignity. They recognise the uniqueness of every child and understand that children develop at different rates and have strengths in different areas of the curriculum. They demonstrate a firm commitment to personalised learning and child-centred education and they make a difference to the lives of many vulnerable children. They actively embrace diversity amongst learners and they view diversity as a positive and energising and enriching force. They should not be penalised by an education system that is based on neoliberal values. Inclusion still necessitates a commitment to the whole child and teachers must not be made to pay the price for choosing to make this a priority.

References

- Allan, J. (1996), 'Foucault and special educational needs: a 'box of tools' for analysing children's experiences of mainstreaming', *Disability and Society*, 11, (2), 219-233.
- Armstrong, D. (1998), 'Changing faces, changing places; policy routes to inclusion' in P. Clough and L. Barton (Eds), *Managing Inclusive Education: from policy to experience*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Armstrong, D., (2005), 'Reinventing 'inclusion': New Labour and the cultural politics of special education', *Oxford Review of Education*, 31, (1), 135-151.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P. and Burden, R. (2002), 'Inclusion in action: an in-depth case study of an effective inclusive secondary school in the south-west of England', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6, (2), 143-163.

- Azzopardi, A. (2009), *Reading Stories of Inclusion: engaging with different perspectives towards an agenda for inclusion*, Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Azzopardi, A. (2010), *Making Sense of inclusive Education: Where everyone belongs*, Saarbrücken, VDM.
- Ball, S.J. (2003), 'The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity', *Journal of Education Policy*, 18, (2), 215-28.
- Barton, L. (1998), 'Markets, managerialism and inclusive education', in P. Clough and L. Barton (Eds), *Managing Inclusive Education: from policy to experience*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Benjamin, S. (2002), 'Valuing diversity: a cliché for the 21st century?' *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6, (4), 309-323.
- Cole, B., (2005), 'Good Faith and Effort? Perspectives on Educational Inclusion' *Disability and Society*, 20, (3), 331-344.
- Department for Education (2011), *Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability: a consultation*, DFE.
- DFE, (2014), *Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years: Statutory guidance for organisations who work with and support children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities*, DFE.
- Department for Education and Science (DES) (1978), *Special educational needs: report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people* (The Warnock Report), London: HMSO.
- Dhunpath, R. (2000), 'Life history methodology: 'narradigm' regained', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13, (5), 543-551.
- Dunne, L. (2009), 'Discourses of inclusion: a critique', *Power and Education*, 1, (1), 42-56.
- Erten, O., and Savage, R.S. (2012), 'Moving forward in inclusive education research', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16, (2), 221-233.
- Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish*, London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1978), *The History of Sexuality: an introduction*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Giroux, H.A. (2003), 'Public pedagogy and the politics of resistance: notes on a critical theory of educational struggle', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35, (1), 5-16.
- Goodson, I. (2001), 'The Story of Life History: origins of the life history method in sociology', *Identity*, 1, (2), 129-142.
- Graham, L.J. and Harwood, V. (2011), 'Developing capabilities for social inclusion: engaging diversity through inclusive school communities', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15, (1), 135-152.
- Hodkinson, A. (2012), "'All present and correct?' Exclusionary inclusion within the English Education System', *Disability and Society*, 27, (5), 675-688.
- Lewis, P.J. (2011), 'Storytelling as Research/ Research as Storytelling', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17, (6), 505-10.
- Lloyd, C. (2008), 'Removing barriers to achievement: a strategy for inclusion or exclusion?' *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12, (2), 221-236.
- Mittler, P. (2000), *Working Towards Inclusive Education: social contexts*, London: David Fulton.
- Sikes, P., Lawson, H. and Parker, M. (2007), 'Voices on: teachers and teaching assistants talk about inclusion', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11, (3), 355-370.
- Slee, R. (2011), *The Irregular School: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*, London: Routledge.
- Thomas, G., and Loxley, A., (2007), *Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion*, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- UNESCO (1994), *Final Report: World Conference on special needs education: access and quality*, Paris: UNESCO
- Warnock, M. (1996), 'The work of the Warnock Committee', in P. Mittler and V. Sinason (Eds), *Changing Policy and Practice for People with Learning Difficulties*, London: Cassell.