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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate meanings of inclusion at different levels of the education system in relation to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000 policies. My specific focus is to make connections between policy and practice in relation to the inclusion of students with disabilities in a secondary school setting.

Through using an ethnographic qualitative methodology I am able to gain an in-depth understanding of the perspectives of participants at all levels within the state education system, (students, school staff, parents, support agencies and state representatives), particularly those directly involved within the school. Data was collected by way of participant observation, semi-structured interviews and document analysis. Data analysis was ongoing throughout the study, through a method of modified analytic induction.

My analysis draws on the theoretical perspectives of interpretivism and radical humanism, both of which are underpinned by a social construction epistemology. This provides the necessary theoretical link for understanding the connections between macro- and micro-level social action in terms of policy intentions and classroom practices.

My findings serve to highlight the inconsistencies, contradictions and points of congruence between the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000, the intentions of the policy makers and classroom implementation. Six themes emerge from the findings. These are Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability; Privileged Knowledge; Blurring The Edges; Power Struggles; Maintaining Normality; and Excluding The Included. These themes demonstrate that a shift by the state to utilitarianism diverged from principles of inclusion that were simultaneously being promoted in the curriculum documents. The conflicting messages at a state level were being replicated within the school, and thus the status quo was maintained because the only inclusion models the school had available to them were those based on traditional special educational ideologies. The result was a context of continued exclusion, which continued to permeate through to daily classroom practices.
If we are to move beyond a culture of uniformity, of selective ‘normality’, to a politics of difference, what we need is a culture which values and celebrates difference, a culture which responds energetically to diversity. In such a culture what would be valued would be the richness and diversity of human experience and the creative capacity of each individual person. Such a culture can only emerge where there exists a profound respect for each person, no matter how individual their being, and a profound commitment to enabling each person to realize his/her unique self within social conditions of cohesiveness, nurture, justice and inclusiveness (Isaacs, 1996, pp. 43-44).

BACKGROUND

As a qualitative researcher, I believe it necessary to provide the reader with an understanding of what I, as the researcher, bring to this thesis in terms of my perspective. In this way throughout the thesis, I will hopefully provide a clear understanding of the premises on which my interpretations and understandings have been based.

As a way of beginning this process I will introduce this chapter with my own personal story. This story will help to explain not only why I support the values underpinning inclusion but also provide insight into why I believe in it passionately.

My story dates back to my childhood, where as the youngest of four children, I grew up in a working class household in Wellington. My family had moved from a rural area when I was nearly five, so my older brothers and sister had to be relocated into new schools when we arrived. Not long after we shifted, I was also enrolled in the same local state primary school that my two older brothers were attending.

I remember being told by my mother that our new school had labelled my brother (who was five years my senior) with a learning disability. I understood this was because unlike his classmates of the same age, he was unable to read or write.

My memory of the way his disability was dealt with both at home and at school was one of acceptance. The way I remember it, nobody ever talked
about him being excluded or removed to a segregated setting because of his learning difficulties. In fact he was just like "other kids" at their neighbourhood school and his exclusion was not something I would ever have considered.

We grew up in an area where all the neighbourhood children caught the local school bus to school and spent many hours playing together in the streets. It would not be unusual for up to 15 children to play games together outside after school until dusk. Age was never a barrier; nor was difference or disability. I remember a number of children in our street, whom I realise now looking back could have been categorised as having a disability. However they were never excluded on that basis by us or our local school.

As I grew older and I learned to read and write, of course I noticed that my brother still couldn't. I remember us both learning our times tables and in the end me trying to teach them to him instead of vice versa. None of this seemed especially out of the ordinary to me at the time - it was just the way it was. It became very usual for me to read magazines and novels to him because he could not, and as we grew older and although he had left school, to write letters and complete forms for him when required.

I cannot imagine now how different things would have turned out for my brother if he had been excluded and placed into a special unit or school. He was lucky that he left school during the years of social democracy and at a time when apprenticeships were still available. At 14 he gained special dispensation to leave school. He started an apprenticeship and has continued in his chosen field ever since.

In our family his disability and inclusion were never really something that we ever focused on very much as both things were just taken for granted. It has only been as an adult when confronted with such different scenarios for people who do not academically "fit" the education system that I have reflected on my past.

I realise now that my childhood reality of living with a family member who did not "fit" the schooling system has instilled in me a sense of social justice for those who are different. When undertaking my undergraduate/post
graduate courses I was drawn to papers about disability. With ease I utilised a rights discourse when learning about issues that involved people with disabilities. I found it difficult to understand why others did not do the same. My commonsense view was that everyone had a right to be included, just as I would expect for my own children. I never made any conscious connections to my childhood experiences at this time.

It was not until I was asked by the Williams family to be a support person for them when surveying prospective high schools for their disabled son, Jamie, that I started to reflect on my childhood experiences and the efficacy of these in my advocacy for inclusion. I had taken for granted my brother's inclusion in our local school and in our family just as I now do with my own children. I did not have to fight for their placement because of others' perceptions. But here I was, experiencing first hand a different scenario for a family with a disabled son. Whilst he did not have the same disability as my brother, nevertheless like him it seemed he did not "fit" the normal schooling system. I sat in disbelief as we were told by the representative of the local high school into which this family was zoned, that the school could not say whether their son would be accepted into the school until they had seen his previous academic records. These parents were not made to feel as though they had the right to choose which high school they could send their son to.

I was and continue to be struck by the resilience of these parents. They did not wait to be rejected by the staff of the school, but rejected them first. They did not want their son to go to a school where he was not welcomed (not many of us would I suspect). They had already experienced that in the past, so we continued the search for a school that would welcome Jamie as a regular student. We talked with other parents, including Lee's who were in a similar situation and through this were introduced to Westside High School. We met with management staff who welcomed both Jamie and Lee as regular students. On this basis the parents made the decision to enrol their children at the school.

By this time I had enrolled to do a doctoral thesis and had made the decision to explore inclusion in relation to policy and practice. I was interested in how policy filtered through into practice but I also wanted to experience
inclusion firsthand through my research. As a proponent of inclusion myself I wanted to be part of a positive experience where students with disabilities were welcomed and accepted as regular students. In terms of my own perspective I felt it would have been unethical of me to go to a setting that did not support inclusion. Having said this I was aware that there may be aspects within the school that would hinder inclusion and I was interested in documenting them as well. I therefore made the decision to focus on the secondary school level and set about negotiating access to Westside High School.

Focus of study

The study focused on meanings of inclusion at different levels of the education system and how these related to the policies of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000. I was interested in gaining the perspectives of participants at all levels of the state education system in relation to their understandings of inclusion and the subsequent connections that these had to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework policy.

Purpose of study

*Most qualitative studies are directed toward developing or verifying sociological theory. The purpose of theoretical studies is to understand or explain features of social life beyond the particular people and settings studied (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 125).*

The purpose of this study was to investigate inclusion with a specific focus on students with disabilities in a secondary school setting, in order to document the way inclusion occurred in practice for them, the teachers and the school itself. I also wanted to reveal the constraints that hindered inclusion for the school and those within it by understanding the way educational policy impacted on practice. I utilised the New Zealand Curriculum Framework policy as a vehicle to do this, by focusing on the rhetoric of the claims made in the Framework and exploring the way they were then reconstructed in practice. This required an in-depth investigation of participants' perspectives over time and I chose to do this by observing and interviewing a large number of people pertaining to one site rather than a few people across many sites. I needed to be able to understand how
they defined situations and the meanings they gave to their constructions. Consequently, a qualitative methodology served best for this purpose.

Research Questions

The research sought to answer two broad questions:

1. What do stakeholders understand about inclusion as it applies to students with disabilities and to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework?
2. What are the implications of a policy of inclusion for practice?

Definitions

According to Booth (1995) the use of terms like inclusion are often problematic due to the underlying assumption that everyone shares the same meaning when using such concepts. This was also the case for other key generic terms utilised in this study such as policy, curriculum, and mainstreaming. In the following section I will therefore explicitly reflect on each of the key concepts outlined and define the meanings attached to each one in the context of this particular study.

Policy

My involvement with policy in this thesis was twofold. Firstly, I was interested in educational state policy and the impact it had on a school at a grassroots level. Secondly, I also aimed to understand school-level policy as an indicator of the values and direction held by the school. My understanding of policy extended beyond the written word on an official document. This was not to undermine the stated version as such, but to explain that I saw policy as a process rather than only an outcome that had occurred as a result of compromises between competing groups. According to a social democratic viewpoint and one which I argue for in this thesis, educational policies emerge as a result of the:

dominant interests of capitalism on the one hand and the oppositional interests of various social movements on the other. … Recent educational policy initiatives may thus be viewed as responses to the struggle over particular constructions of social, political, economic and cultural changes" (Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard & Henry, 1997, pp. 4-5).
in addition, policies are reflective of the philosophy posited by the state at any given time. Like Taylor et al., I argue that over recent years policy has increasingly replaced educational theory as "a source of guidance for practitioners" and that education is "no longer discussed in terms of broad visions and ideals but in terms of what governments believe to be possible and often expedient, and what interests groups feel they can persuade governments to do" (Taylor et al., 1997, p.3). This means that policy development is a political activity and linked very much to ideology. Policies, according to Cocks (1998), are therefore shaped and influenced by "the prevailing vision we have about the kind of society in which we want to live and by the dominant values in our culture" (p. 12). It is from this viewpoint that I approached the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000 policies in this thesis.

Curriculum

The way the curriculum has been defined varies considerably and has changed over time (McGee, 1997). In the past it has often been defined only in relation to materials and plans for teaching, separate from policy and implementation (Taba, 1962; Walker, 1990 cited in McGee, 1997). Cornbleth, on the other hand, defines it as follows:

The curriculum is not a tangible product but the actual, day to day interactions of students, teachers, knowledge and milieu (Cornbleth, 1990, cited in McGee, 1997, p. 11).

This definition of the curriculum is much broader than that of Taba or Walker and means that curriculum plans, like syllabuses, are just one aspect of the whole context that shapes and influences curriculum practices. This contextualised view of the curriculum takes account of both the hidden curriculum and what teachers do not teach, or what McGee (1997) calls the null curriculum. As a qualitative researcher interested in not only what is stated but also in what is intended and assumed, this definition of curriculum assisted the aims of my research. A definition of curriculum that encapsulated the context beyond the text book and classroom allowed me to understand how meanings of inclusion as they are interpreted within a school intersected with the curriculum. This extended from the day to day interactions at the school to a systems level beyond the school. In this way
an understanding could be gained of how the curriculum aided or hindered inclusion.

Models of Inclusion

I will begin this section with what inclusion is not. This will serve to clarify the differences between the term inclusion and mainstreaming that are often used synonymously. I will then explore shared understandings held internationally of what inclusion and inclusive education mean and simultaneously highlight the diversity between them. This will then provide the necessary framework in which to introduce and provide a rationale for the working definitions of inclusion I used for this study.

Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming is a term that has been used to explain the assimilation of students with special needs into regular classes usually on a part-time basis. Students are enrolled into special units or other segregated settings and placed into regular or mainstream classes for some subjects. Within this concept various types of mainstreaming have been identified. In 1988, the New Zealand Ministry of Education released the following definitions of locational, social and functional mainstreaming:

Mainstreaming is education in a regular school setting, but not necessarily in a regular classroom. Mainstreaming has three interrelated components. These are:
(a) locational mainstreaming - where a student is educated in a separate unit or in a separate class located within a regular school.
(b) social mainstreaming - where a student who is locationally mainstreamed can enjoy social interaction with the peer group in a variety of ways within a school setting; and
(c) functional mainstreaming - where a student spends some or all of the time in a regular classroom on the same programme as the class or on an adaptation of that programme. (Ministry of Education, New Zealand Education Gazette, 1988, supplement).

This approach to special needs students had been utilised by those in the special education field and indicated a starting point of non-membership from the regular classroom. From this premise, students were then integrated into the mainstream for some subjects but remained the responsibility of the unit and special educators. This model has been criticised not only for its positivist approach that is underpinned by a
medical discourse, but also because such an approach fails to question the assumptions, theories, and metatheories in which the model and its practices and tools are grounded (Skrtic, 1995a). Moreover, students have remained excluded despite their partial assimilation, and the good intentions of those proponents of mainstreaming. This is because temporary membership into classes failed to provide the student with a sense of belonging (Schnorr, 1990). Furthermore by relegating some students to the fringes of schools by placement in segregated settings, the school lacked a sense of community for all its students (Stainback, Stainback & Ayres, 1996).

Inclusion Debate

For these reasons it was recognised by some that the starting point of integration had to be changed so that students were members of the regular classroom as of right like their peers on a full-time basis, and only removed if absolutely necessary. This difference in premise has called into question the role of special education as a separate entity from the mainstream and asks whether special education has any place at all. In response the field of special education has resisted inclusion by attempting to assimilate the language of mainstreaming and inclusion into a special education discourse (Ballard, 1995).

To add to the complexity, more recently it was recognised that inclusion required a much broader worldview than only being about access into classrooms for students with disabilities. This meaning of inclusion opposed all forms of discrimination and oppression for those of difference, not just the disabled. Furthermore it recognised that inclusion was not just about classrooms and schools but encapsulated the attitudes and practices of a whole society (Ballard, 1999).

Ideal Type

The other issue requiring investigation about the term "inclusion" is the nature of the concept as an ideal type. Inclusion is not a fixed entity that can be defined as an outcome but rather it is a process over time. It is a goal or vision to be worked towards rather than an assertion that one can make such as "we are now an inclusive school". Rather inclusion or inclusive
education requires ongoing reflexivity. This is not to suggest that examples of inclusive practices are not apparent in many schools but such practices still require ongoing reflection at all times. Inclusive practices must become inherent in all everyday life situations at both an individual and societal level. With these tenets in mind I will now explore the different approaches and definitions of inclusion that have evolved over the last decade as a response to the mainstreaming debate.

Definitions of Inclusion

There are a number of well known international proponents in the field of inclusive education (Ainscow; Ballard; Barton; Biklen; Clark, Millward & Dyson; Forest & Pearpoint; Lipsky & Gartner; Oliver; Porter & Richler; Schnorr; Sapon-Shevin; Sleé; Stainback & Stainback, to name a few). They all share a common philosophical understanding of inclusion that defines it in terms of social democratic principles underpinned by an egalitarian rights discourse and one that rejects traditional positivist approaches to special education (this will be expanded on in the next chapter).

Where these leading academics appear to differ is in how students are included and whether special education as a separate entity should be retained. Furthermore differences are apparent in the breadth of their definitions and whether inclusion incorporates not only individual practices but also organisational and societal systems.

Leading educators from the United States, Stainback, Stainback and Ayres, for example define inclusion in relation to schooling:

An inclusive school or classroom educates all students in the mainstream. This means that all students, including students with learning and physical disabilities, and those who are at risk, homeless, and gifted are included in integrated, general education classes. It also means providing all students within the mainstream with (1) appropriate education experiences that are challenging yet geared to their capabilities and needs; and (2) any support and assistance they or their teachers require (1996, p. 35).

Their position embraces a broad definition of inclusion in terms of including a wide range of groups. Stainback, et al. have a rationale for
inclusion that is clearly underpinned by a social justice discourse of rights. They state that

... the most important reason for including all students in the mainstream is that it is the fair, ethical and equitable thing to do. ... All children should be a part of the educational and community mainstream. It is discriminatory that some students, such as those labeled disabled, must earn the right or be gotten ready to be in the general mainstream or have to wait for educational researchers to prove that they can profit from the mainstream, whereas other students are allowed unrestricted access simply because they have no label. No one should have to pass anyone's test or prove anything in a research study to live and learn in the mainstream of school and community life. It is a basic right, not something one has to earn (1996, p. 33).

In another example, Ainscow (1999) from the United Kingdom, also defines inclusion in relation to schooling but places more emphasis on the need for the restructuring of general schooling:

Inclusion is not assimilation, it is not an act of integrating or subsuming difference within the dominant culture of schooling. Inclusive schooling is a profoundly subversive and transformational undertaking. The aspiration is an overhaul of 'traditional forms of schooling no longer adequate for the task' of educating all children. It accepts as given Tom Skrtic's (1991) observation that 'special educational needs' as an [sic] 'artefact of the traditional curriculum'. To be sure, schooling never was, nor was it the intention, adequate for the task of educating the majority of students. ... Preferred is a 'language of practice' that personalizes schooling rather than individualizes differences as indices of defect (p.xi, Series Editor's preface).

Isaacs focuses only on disability but extends this definition further to incorporate the wider society:

Given the pervasiveness of traditional disempowering social notions of disability, what is required is an educative strategy which encompasses not only those working within the field of special education, or even those working within education, but extends to the total community and seeks to critique all areas of culture where negative connotations of disability still prevail (1996, p. 43).
In contrast other proponents define inclusion only as a strategy rather than as a philosophy. They seek to preserve a continuum of services that maintain separate special education facilities. Lieberman, for example advocates the preservation of special education facilities for students with severe disabilities. He adopts a utilitarian theoretical approach and rationalises his position on the basis of a market discourse of choice:

The resolution is choice. It is the ability to choose full inclusion in a regular classroom as a viable and appropriate placement for some students with disabilities, even some with severe disabilities. The continuum of services must be preserved. A range of service options is needed because of the range of people with a wide range of needs, many of which cannot possibly be met in the regular classroom. Full inclusionists seek to destroy this range. Their position is that everyone is in - no decision making, no choice. Everyone is in. This fundamental denial of reality plays well with some budget-cutting bureaucrats and some fanatical parents (1996, p. 25).

Ferguson on the other hand, rejects the notion of inclusion being about continua of services or placements. Instead she sees inclusion as being about systemic reform and one that

merges the reform and restructuring efforts of general education with special education inclusion. ... A more systemic inclusion will replace old practices (which presumed a relationship between ability, service and place of delivery) with new kinds of practice (in which groups of teachers work together to provide learning supports for all students) (1995, p. 285).

The diversity of established meanings of inclusion even within the same theoretical discourses meant that I needed a working definition as an ideal type to use in my own study. This was important for understanding my participants’ experiences and perspectives of inclusion. It needed to be one I personally supported and was relevant to the New Zealand context.

In terms of my own social justice stance, my first criterion centred on my belief in the right of all students to an education alongside their peers regardless of difference. Ballard’s definition of inclusion supported a rights approach because it not only incorporated the rights of every child to inclusion but also focused on the curriculum in the school setting:
Inclusive education in New Zealand means that every student has the right to access the curriculum as a full-time member of an ordinary classroom alongside other students of similar chronological age. This position is non-exclusionary, emphasising a belief that 'the education of each student is equally important' (Biklen, 1987, p.i) and that no student should experience segregation on the basis of disability (Ballard, 1996, p. 34).

The second part to my criterion went further than access, and required not only presence but also participation and acceptance by peers. Moreover this acceptance had to shift beyond the classroom into the community and wider society. For this I drew on the work of Ryba who has provided the following definition of an inclusive education:

The aim of inclusive education is to create learning environments in which students naturally interact with one another through talking, sharing, and working together. Within these environments, differences are acknowledged and there is a sense of acceptance and valuing of people. The role of the teacher is to reinforce the community spirit within the classroom and to assist class members to become more co-operative and understanding of each other's individual characteristics. The school is part of the wider community, and it is through being a member of this community that skills can be acquired and friendships can emerge (1995, p. 54).

Diversity Issues

I also recognised that issues of diversity confront the complexity of notions and meanings of inclusion. Inclusion is not just about one group of students - in this case only those with disabilities being included. One cannot include this group and ignore other marginalised groups within the school or beyond. Inclusive education is about the recognition and inclusion of all of those who are marginalised as different in our society. This includes addressing issues of ethnicity, gender, social class, sexual orientation, cultural and religious differences. For me the vision for inclusive education under a rights discourse is that all students have the right to be included, free from discrimination and/or oppression. Whilst my focus in this study is on one specific group, that is, those labelled as special needs or disabled in a school setting, it is imperative that the reader
understands that inclusion as I am defining the term, encapsulates all those who are perceived as different. Moreover many of the exclusionary practices that hindered students with disabilities in my study were also applicable to others of difference within the school but are beyond the scope of this thesis.

In conclusion this chapter has provided the introduction to the study and my position as the researcher in terms of the perspective I bring to this research. It has also outlined the purpose of the study and definitions of key concepts under investigation. These include policy, curriculum and inclusion. Additionally, it presents the working definitions of inclusion that will be used for the study.

Chapter two outlines the theoretical framework utilised for the analysis in this thesis in relation to understandings of disability and special education. A critique of traditional dominant discourses is undertaken, providing the necessary framework in which to offer an alternative.

In chapter three, firstly an alternative theoretical framework is presented that underlies the approach taken in the study. A social constructionist epistemology is offered. The two theoretical frameworks of interpretivism and radical humanism are argued for as a way of drawing linkages between micro- and macro-social action in terms of the state and classroom levels in relation to meanings of inclusion. Secondly, in terms of methodology this chapter describes the theoretical framework of qualitative research and the rationale for using it in this study. As a study that investigates people’s perspectives and meanings, this study draws on symbolic interactionism for its theory of method.

Chapter four discusses the methodological procedures I have utilised in the study. This explains the contextual settings, who my participants were, methods of data collection used, data analysis procedures and ethical issues accounted for.

Chapters five to nine present my research findings and are organised in relation to my research questions.

Chapter five is divided into parts A and B. Part A explores contextual factors in relation to the state and policy changes over the previous decade. This
sets the scene for understanding meanings of inclusion used at the state level and the ideology that underpinned their understandings. The chapter asks questions about the shift to utilitarianism by the state on the one hand and the promotion of principles of inclusion on the other. It asks what is the result of philosophical confusion in this context? Part B investigates the understandings of all other stakeholders in relation to inclusion and an inclusive curriculum. Are there layers of shared meanings and in what ways are understandings divergent at the macro- and micro-levels?

Chapter six investigates the way policy is implemented in practice and how the conflicting messages from the state are being replicated in the school. This is a school undergoing a shift to managerialism within a constrained context. This chapter demonstrates that as the school tries to hold on to the democratic egalitarian values of the past, it has to simultaneously compete in the marketplace of education. In relation to inclusion, the school attempts to implement the rhetoric from the state but has only traditional special education models to draw on.

Chapter seven undertakes a review of the curriculum and the role it plays in how inclusion is constructed and interpreted in practice. This demonstrates that the policy itself conflicts with different theoretical concepts underpinning the framework. An analysis of the curriculum documents themselves is undertaken on the basis of the degree of rhetoric of inclusive practices for different groups. In practice, the chapter shows that the shift to utilitarianism by the state, (in relation to teaching to the majority rather than the most disadvantaged), is again reflected in practice within the school.

In Chapter eight the barriers to inclusion for Westside High School in relation to constraints within the school are presented. What impact has the shift to the marketisation of education had on the school? How does this relate to inclusive practices within the school? What strategies has the school adopted in response?

Chapter nine extends beyond the school to constraints and barriers that impact on Westside High School. This makes connections firstly to the community and then to the state at the macro-level. It takes account of the contextual factors that impinge on inclusive practices for the school.
Chapter ten, the discussion chapter, provides a summary of the common themes that emerged across the previous findings chapters. The discussion highlights the interconnectedness of them all in relation to understandings of inclusion and the curriculum. Moreover the contradictions that are apparent at both the macro- and micro-levels and the importance of a holistic approach for understanding inclusion are shown. Finally, the chapter presents the methodological themes that emerged during the research process and my reflections from undertaking the thesis. It highlights the importance of such an undertaking when doing research.

The final chapter, the conclusion, begins by demonstrating my reflexivity as the researcher by standing back from my study and explaining the way the study has contributed to the field of education. The chapter then discusses my findings in relation to their implications. I make some suggestions for the changes required as I see them for inclusive practices to become more than an "appearance" but a "reality". I then finish the thesis by exploring a way forward for the future so that all students can be included in our schools.
Theorising of special education and disability can be best understood through a sociological analysis. This is because it is through a sociological imagination that one is able to

understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meanings for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals. It enables him [sic] to take into account how individuals, in the welter of their daily experience, often become falsely conscious of their social positions. Within that welter, the framework of modern society is sought, and within that framework the psychologies of a variety of men and women are formulated. By such means the personal uneasiness of individuals is focussed upon explicit troubles and the indifference of publics is transformed into involvement with public issues.

(Wright Mills, 1959, p. 5).

This chapter investigates and critiques the dominant theoretical framework that has underpinned special education in philosophy and practice since its inception. It is necessary to expose these discourses in order to understand the relationship that has evolved between special education and general education over time. Challenges to the dominant theoretical framework will be presented and alternatives explored as a way to contextualise the empirical findings from my study. Firstly, I will challenge the traditional discourses of disability that have been prevalent under a functionalist paradigm. This will provide the necessary context within which to understand the social theory of disability and the rights discourse that I am using for this study. An exploration of both of these will provide the framework for theorising and critiquing special education and the shift to inclusive education. This will reveal that for inclusive education to be possible, not only are practical changes required but an alternative theoretical and philosophical framework is also necessary.

**FUNCTIONALIST PARADIGM**

This first section explores and critiques the traditional ways that disability has been constructed under a functionalist paradigm. It investigates the way disability has been defined in terms of the individual. It explores the traditional discourses of disability, that is medical, lay and charity and
critiques them using a sociological approach. This provides the framework for understanding the ways schools have constructed the disabled. It shifts the focus from a deficit view of the individual, to viewing disability as a social construct of society (i.e. social model). I will begin by explaining my use of the term paradigm.

Paradigm

Kuhn defined a paradigm in terms of knowledge that incorporated "some accepted examples of actual scientific practice - examples which include law, theory, application, and instrumentation together - [they] provide models from which spring particular coherent traditions of scientific research (1962, p. 10). This can be likened to the Skrtic diagram of a paradigm, (reproduced on page 26 of this chapter) that I will using in this thesis.

Defining Disability

Traditionally disability in our society has been defined in a pathological sense: that is as pertaining to the individual and being constructed as a "problem". This has occurred largely as a result of the way people have been categorised under a medical discourse. A discussion of the medical discourse is required because it not only provides an understanding of the way special education has been traditionally constructed in our schools under a functionalist paradigm, but it also reveals the way categorisation of disability has become taken for granted in our society. Additionally, a discussion of the terminology used in this discourse will act as a necessary prerequisite for understanding my own usage of terms such as mainstreaming, inclusion and disability and hence provide greater transparency for my own analysis.

Defining Functionalism

Functionalism, traditionally linked to sociologists of the nineteenth century and to the work of Durkheim, has been defined as "the way in which the various elements of a society were interdependent, and they often explained this interdependence in terms of evolutionary theory ... or the organic analogy" (Abercrombie, Hill, and Turner, 1984, p. 101). All social functions and institutions are seen as functional and as one of the parts that makes up
the whole. Social activity is defined in terms of the way its consequences impact on other parts. This means that the focus is on the way that social activity can contribute to the maintenance of the stability of the social system. This paradigm has been criticised for being unable to account for conflict or change. Furthermore, because it focuses on the consequences of actions, it fails to account for meanings that individuals confer on action (Abercrombie, et al., 1984).

The education system is one such example of an institution integral to our society. Furthermore the functionalist paradigm underpinning it has been evident in the ways our schools have traditionally been structured and the role they have played. Much focus in schooling has centred on conformity and maintaining the status quo in the wider society. For the area of disability and the disabled a functionalist approach has shifted the focus away from being a societal issue to that of an individualised problem. This has manifested through a number of dominant discourses (medical, lay, charity) that will be outlined in the section that follows.

TRADITIONAL DISCOURSES OF DISABILITY

The Medical Discourse

Mainstream sociology of education has tended to ignore disability because of the way it has been regarded as a medical issue and an individual problem (Oliver, 1996). It has therefore become part of the discipline of educational psychology, which traditionally (especially in the special education area) has tended to focus at a micro level in relation to understanding disability in terms of the individual rather than at a macro level as a societal issue.

As schools have also operated under the same functionalist paradigm, disability has been defined in this setting in a similar medicalised way. Under functionalism disability has traditionally been connected with "sickness". Parsons' influential model proposed that those who are impaired, such as sick people, are relieved of normal responsibilities and are not capable of fixing their own problems and must seek the help of medical or professional experts (Oliver, 1996). This has primarily been the way
society has perceived the "disabled" and the model of special education (which I shall discuss shortly), has been premised on a medicalised interventionist approach.

Fulcher (1989) explains the terminology surrounding "disability" and the way "impairment" has become connected with it by subsequently becoming the taken for granted meaning of the term. She utilises Marles' (1986) definitions of the terms to show the way this has been constructed:

Impairment is a medical term for anatomical loss or a loss of bodily function. Disability is the measurable, functional loss resulting from an impairment. Handicap is the social consequence caused by environmental and social conditions which prevent a person achieving the maximum potential a person seeks. Disabilities are what people cannot do... (1986: A:2) (Fulcher, 1989, p.22).

Fulcher, like many others in recent years, (Barnes, 1998; Brisenden, 1998; Christensen, 1996; Finkelstein, 1998; Oliver, 1996) critiques the use of a medical discourse to explain disability in this way, because whilst a distinction is made between impairment and disability, the connection between the two implies a "cause-consequence logic to the terms" (p.22) which suggests one follows the other. Furthermore the usage of the term "loss" implies a deficit in the individual. A view of disability that is attributed to the individual and has a deficit connotation, encourages a discourse of "person blame" (Fulcher, 1989).

There has been strong opposition against categorisation and labelling from sociologists who align themselves with other paradigms and critique the medical discourse. Moreover concerns have been raised by disabled people themselves in regard to the way they have been depicted by categories. Brisenden (1998) for example asserts it is important not to be categorised under one "metaphysical category", such as "the disabled" because "the effect of this is a depersonalized, a sweeping dismissal of our individuality, and a denial of our right to be seen as people with our own uniqueness, rather than as the anonymous constituents of a category or group" (p. 21).

Brisenden, as do many other disabled groups, sees such medicalised labelling as a form of exclusion and oppression:
We are the outcasts in a society that demands conformity to a mythologized physical norm, the pursuit of which leads to neurosis and is the cause of much guilt and suffering. The impossible demands made on us by these norms, against which we are measured and found to be inadequate, are at the root of our oppression (1998, p. 23).

To understand the disabled body, Davis (1995) argues it is necessary to focus on the concept of the ‘norm’ and the ‘normal body’. Underpinning the medicalisation of the person with disabilities as ‘the problem’, is the way normalcy is constructed to create the ‘problem’ of the disabled person” (p. 24). The construction of normal therefore, is integral to the construction of the disabled. In our society privilege is bestowed on the "able-bodied" which then becomes the dominant construction or taken for granted way of viewing the world. Thus those with "like physical and cognitive abilities" are rewarded at the expense of those who are different. This has developed historically in part as a result of the dominance of statistics in science and the development of bell curves based on the average person. This focus on the average has meant that extremities away from the "norm" have subsequently been constructed as deviant, which in the case of social science has meant particularly those with impairments or disabilities. As Davis states:

> When we think of bodies, in a society where the concept of the norm is operative, then people with disabilities will be thought of as deviants. This, as we have seen, is in contrast to societies with the concept of an ideal, in which all people have non-ideal status (Davis, 1995, p. 29).

Furthermore, the way people define normalcy is tied closely to the concept of disability, in that the concept of disability is a function of a concept of normalcy. So “normalcy and disability are part of the same system” (Davis, 1995, p. 2). The work of Foucault in relation to the medical profession is useful to draw on to explain this further:

> From the Foucauldian perspective, power as it operates in the medical encounter is a disciplinary power that provides guidelines about how patients should understand, regulate and experience their bodies. The central strategies of disciplinary power are
observation, examination, measurement and the comparison of individuals against an established norm... (Lupton, 1998, p. 95).

In the same way this can be related to disability in relation to the concept of normality. According to Davis, disability is a social process and the concept of disability regulates the bodies of those who are “normal” (Davis, 1995, p. 2). In other words constructions of what it means to be normal, or to behave in ways that are considered normal, are governed by constructions and behaviours of what it means to be disabled. Thus seen in this way, the concept of disability actually regulates the construction of normality. Conversely, those who are unable to self-regulate or have bodies that are unable to be regulated in the same way as those perceived to be normal, face discrimination as they are labelled deviant.

In addition, the adoption of a medical discourse in the field of disability, at a societal level has historically ensured a depoliticisation of disability. By personalising disability at the individual level rather than viewing disability as a societal issue in terms of disabling factors within it, disabled people have traditionally lacked agency and legitimation as an oppressed group. Furthermore by being underpinned by a functionalistic paradigm premised on notions of scientific rationality and objectivity, disability has become professionalised and has subsequently been defined only in terms of being a technical issue (Fulcher, 1989, p. 27). This has served to remove agency from individuals by placing the power into the hands of professionals. Focus has consequently shifted away from viewing individuals holistically in a particular context, often to trying to implement quick fix-it solutions to perceived individualised problems.

To summarise thus far, the medicalisation of disability has not only influenced the way society views the 'disabled' but it has also influenced the way people with disabilities have been categorised and labelled. A system based on the 'average' in relation to normality and deviancy has resulted in students with disabilities being constructed as the 'problem' by way of a deficit-based approach.
Charity and Lay Discourses

Two other traditional discourses that relate to the individual and which have connections with a medical discourse are charity or personal tragedy and lay discourses. These discourses share similar themes with a medical discourse and are also grounded in functionalism. Under a charity or personal tragedy discourse disabled people are defined as in need of help and unable to think for themselves. Not only do they require others to think for them but it is perceived that they are to be pitied (Fulcher, 1989; Oliver, 1990). A lay or commonsense discourse informed by the medical model and a charity ethic, often manifests itself in forms of ignorance, fear and prejudice. People with disabilities are treated as child-like or without agency. From a Foucauldian perspective (as discussed previously) for those whose bodies are deemed less regulated and therefore seen as "abnormal", expectations about personal responsibility are lessened and practices of maternalism and paternalism become normalised under this discourse, thus resulting in disempowerment and oppression for those concerned (Fulcher, 1989; Lupton, 1998). These three discourses are all important for my analysis because these were the discourses most commonly used by my participants.

In summary, the medical, lay and charity discourses have become the taken-for-granted way of understanding disability in our society. Underpinned by a functionalist paradigm these approaches have all attached disability to the individual in a pathological sense whereby the disabled are perceived as the "problem". This concept has failed to understand disability as a societal construct, and as a result the disabled have been subject not only to categorisation, but also to discrimination and oppression.

RESISTING THE DOMINANT DISCOURSE

In this section I continue a critique of the functionalist paradigm by offering alternative frameworks. This will make a shift from constructing disability as an individual trait to a societal barrier that serves to discriminate and oppress. In accord with this, I will investigate rights discourses and provide a case for a liberal-egalitarian model in my thesis.
The Social Model/Theory of Disability

The theorising of disability based on the concept of oppression and underpinned by a rights discourse led Abberley in the 1980s to start the development of a social model or theory of disability (Fulcher, 1989). This was taken further in the nineteen-nineties especially by disabled people themselves (Barnes, 1998; Brisenden, 1998; Oliver, 1996) as a way of critiquing the traditional discourses surrounding disability. The central tenet of the social theory or model of disability proposes that it is the social practices in our society that are the most disabling barriers for people rather than something that is inherent in the individual and hence a personal trouble. According to Fulcher (1989) this is because disability is a social construction relative to social practice.

Disability under this model is also seen as a political construct whether an impairment is present or not. Indeed the separation of impairment from disability is seen as crucial for the development of the theory. Fulcher states: “whether or not an impairment is present, certain procedural practices occur in relation to disability and it is these that a social theory of disability needs to focus on, while simultaneously suspending judgement about the link it sometimes has with impairment” (1989, p. 22).

Taking it a step further, Brisenden (1998) argues that it is the organization of society itself, and the attitudes of individuals within it that results in people being 'disabled'. The implications of this for those who are labelled 'disabled' are extensive. Connolly writes about the irony of policy makers and reformers in relation to the way they constitute disability:

This connection between standards and disability complicates the politics of reform; for reformers who visibly defend people with recognised disabilities invisibly and uncritically defend the social priorities and standards which constitute those disabilities. There is thus some basis to the radical charge that reformers help to perpetuate the class of people they intend to protect (Connolly, 1981, p. 8).

This contradiction occurs because the aforementioned who are advocating for the disabled are continuing to construct disability in the individual rather than as a barrier of society. In contrast, under the social model of
disability theory, in relation to, in this case schooling, the focus would shift away from a deficit in the individual (as in the medical model) to converge on pedagogical and school practices (Fulcher, 1989).

The social model of disability, therefore provides a critique of a medicalised construction of disability and shifts the disabling barriers to a societal level. It opposes and challenges the charity, lay and medical discourses and is underpinned by a liberal-egalitarian rights discourse. Such a rights discourse advocates for equity\(^1\) which includes equality of citizenship and social justice for all. A formal shift to the concept of rights for people with disabilities largely emerged from the Civil Rights movement in the United States (Bickenbach, 1996). This discourse is openly political and critiques society for discriminatory practices towards disabled people that result in their exclusion and oppression at all levels (Fulcher, 1989). It is to discussions about rights discourses that I now turn.

**Discourses of Social Justice**

In this section I intend to explore the philosophical underpinnings of rights discourses. Liberal approaches to social justice and rights are divided mainly between liberal-egalitarian and liberal-utilitarian approaches. Liberal-egalitarianism has dominated liberal-political theory and is premised on the work of Rawls and a re-distributive model of social justice. In contrast, liberal-utilitarianism focuses on the notion of equality in terms of maximising individual autonomy to the greatest degree possible. Furthermore in relation to justice, this approach proposes intervening to the least degree possible in social and economic arrangements that individuals freely agree on (Howe, 1996). Both of these approaches will be

---

\(^1\) Debate has arisen about the use of the terminology ‘equality’ and ‘equity’. The term equality has been a cornerstone of Rawls’s social theory of justice. However it has been attacked by feminists who have associated ‘equality’ with treating women the same as men rather than valuing differences. Some have taken up the use of the term ‘equity’ instead but this has also been claimed by neo-liberals who define it in utilitarian way. Fraser advocates that “we reconceptualize gender equity as a complex, not a simple idea. This means breaking with the assumption that gender equity can be identified with any single value or norm, whether it be equality, difference, or something else. Instead, we should treat it as a complex notion comprising a plurality of distinct normative principles. The plurality will include some notions associated with the equality side of the debate, as well as some associated with the difference side” (Fraser: 1997, p.45). For the purposes of this thesis, my promotion of either term (equality or equity) is used in this light rather than in a liberal-utilitarian way, unless stated.
expounded to demonstrate my support of a liberal-egalitarian model that promotes a social justice rights discourse rather than the current liberal-utilitarian discourse of rights that is currently being advocated by the state. This exposé will also provide a way of theorising the marketisation of education, an important prerequisite for my data analysis especially at the policy level.

Once establishing my justification for using a Rawlsian liberal-egalitarian model of justice and rights, I will discuss the debate that has arisen in recent years within this framework, from those who advocate that this model fails to sufficiently account for difference or recognition of marginalised groups, such as those with disabilities. I will utilise the work of Nancy Fraser to explore her proposition that a combination of both models is the way to ensure people's rights are upheld. I will question this proposition and demonstrate that the Rawlsian redistributive model can account not only for economic-political rights but already provides the necessary theoretical framework to include the valuing of diversity and recognition of marginalised groups.

The Liberal-Egalitarian Framework

The seminal work of Rawls, A Theory of Justice, (1972) has been very influential in the development of the liberal-egalitarian re-distributive model of social justice. He established principles of justice by setting standards through drawing on a similar concept to Weber's "ideal type". He used the notion of an 'original position' whereby he constructed a hypothetical state called the "veil of ignorance" in which people would not know what their future would be. He argued that in this situation, based on people's self-interest they would select principles that they envisaged would do them the least amount of harm and give the greatest amount of happiness in the future (Stainton, 1994; Rizvi & Lingard, 1996). The original position was used to form the basis of the principles of social justice. From this 'original position' Rawls suggested the following principles would be agreed upon:

1. Each person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of basic liberties which is compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for all.
2. Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions. First they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; and second they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.

The two principles are to be understood in serial order of priority both between the principles and within the second principle. Thus equal liberties take priority over opportunity and fair equal opportunity takes priority over the difference principle, the second part of the second principle. (Rawls (1972) cited in Stainton, 1994, p. 54).

Furthermore according to Rawls himself the second principle applies

in the first approximation, to the distribution of income and wealth and to the design of organizations that make use of differences in authority and responsibility, or chains of command. While the distribution of wealth and income need not be equal, it must be to everyone's advantage, and at the same time, positions of authority and offices of command must be accessible to all (Rawls, 1972, p. 61).

According to Rizvi and Lingard, (1996) the first principle refers to individual freedom as the most important basic right and the second principle suggests that the state must redistribute where necessary to address social and economic inequalities to benefit the most disadvantaged in our society. In relation to the second principle, Stainton explains that:

Rawls states that "the role of fair equal opportunity is to ensure that the system of just cooperation is one of pure procedural justice". This is defined as a system where a correct result is obtained by following a fair procedure, regardless of the specific outcome. It is concerned with ensuring that opportunities and access to the social primary goods are equally shared by all and that this is established within the basic structure of society. (1994, p. 66).

For this principle to be relevant to education, it must be possible to construct education as a "primary good" and an area that values fairness in terms of equity. In relation to the first aspect, according to CoDD (1993) it is possible to establish education as a primary good because "primary social goods are things that all reasonable people would want because without them they cannot even choose the kind of life they would want" (p.165). He asserts that people require knowledge and skills to be able to participate in decisions that
affect their welfare or involvement in political and economic institutions of society. Thought of in this way, education becomes a basic human right because it is not something "we can simply choose to have from a position of not having it. Education is not something we simply acquire; it changes who we are" (Codd, 1993, p.165). Having established that education is a primary good what implications does Rawls' theory of justice have for education? Codd argues that it would mean that resources would be allocated to improve long term goals for the most disadvantaged, rather than "evening out existing inequalities or improving the economic efficiency of the system" (p.165) as proposed by the liberal utilitarianists.

In relation to the second aspect, valuing of fairness in terms of equity according to Codd:

Rawls argues that a just society is one in which primary goods are distributed fairly, according to people's needs. This implies that '... resources for education are not to be allotted solely or necessarily mainly according to their return as estimated in productive trained abilities, but also according to their worth in enriching the personal and social life of citizens, including here the less favoured' (Rawls, (1972), cited in Codd, 1993, p. 165).

Under this view social justice in education provides the theoretical framework for the state to create policies which ensure a fairer distribution of educational benefits. This would safeguard the welfare of all but if necessary could limit the choice of some if redistribution meant being 'fairer' by benefiting the most disadvantaged (Codd, 1993). Under this social justice discourse, equity is given priority over choice as a primary social good. According to Rawls' "General Conception", "all social primary goods - liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect - are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favoured (ibid.:303)" (Olssen, 1997, p. 399).

To summarise thus far, the liberal-egalitarian discourse of rights being used in my thesis, is underpinned by the following: an equal right to freedom; a redistribution by the state of primary goods in order to address social and economic inequalities to benefit the most disadvantaged in our society; justice based on a notion of fairness; and equity valued over individual
choice. The definition of "primary goods" is broad and includes not only economic and political aspects but also social dimensions such as education and individual self-respect.

The Liberal-Utilitarian Framework

In stark contrast, a liberal-utilitarian approach prioritises utility over natural rights (Olssen, 1997) and focuses on the satisfaction of individuals' wants. Utilitarianism, is the concept in which

... the greatest good was defined simply as the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. Its main impact on the social sciences has been via its model of social action in which individuals rationally pursue their own self-interests, and its conception of society as the aggregation of atomised individuals united by self interest" (Abercrombie et al, 1988, p. 261).

A leading proponent of this approach is Nozick (1975), who states that "individuals have rights and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights)" (cited in Snook, 1997, p. 362). These rights, in contrast to Rawls' approach, include the right to be free from any form of state intervention. Moreover this approach rejects welfare rights or rights of recipience or decent social conditions in favour of property rights. Accordingly, Snook suggests that under this model "only those with property can be said to have full rights. There would consequently be no point in allowing those without property to have a say in government policy, which almost by definition relates to the possession, retention or distribution of goods (owned by some, and not by others)" (1997, p.362). This stance which supports market-individualism, suggests a view of social justice based on desert (Rizvi & Lingard, 1996). According to Rizvi & Lingard (1996): "market-individualism ... favours those who are already advantaged. For people with disabilities, the market view of social justice can often mean no justice at all" (p. 20). Furthermore, Cocks asserts that such a way of viewing the world "creates a selfish world of 'haves', winners who jealously guard their territory against losers" (1998, p. 14).

The market liberal-utilitarian approach also has a quite different view of education from that of liberal-egalitarianism. Under this approach education is considered to be a preferred good and therefore something we choose or earn. It is viewed as being like any other commodity because it is
asserted that through education we are able to acquire skills which we can exchange in the marketplace. This means that education becomes a private rather than a public good (Codd, 1993). In contrast to Rawls’ liberal-egalitarian model that advocates redistribution to those who are the least advantaged "the distributive principle within a utilitarian framework is that of utility, which means that a preferred good such as education is distributed so as to gain optimal average benefit for all, even if the least advantaged become worse off" (Codd, 1993, p. 164). This has far reaching consequences especially for the most vulnerable and often the most disadvantaged in our society, such as those with disabilities. According to Rizvi & Lingard, "...social justice is no longer 'seen as linked to past group oppression and disadvantage' judged historically, but represented simply as a matter of guaranteeing individual choice under the conditions of a 'free market'" (1996), p. 15).

Dworkin, according to Codd:

argues that market liberal utilitarianism, which ‘attempts to justify irreversible losses to a minority in order to achieve gains for the large majority’ is contrary to the principle that people must be treated with equal concern. Thus the utilitarian ethic, which gives priority to the maximization of people’s opportunity to have what they happen to want, denies the principle of equity that is central to social justice as fairness” (Dworkin, 1985) cited in Codd, 1993, p. 166).

In summary, this section has shown that the liberal-utilitarian approach focuses only on self-interest and the promotion of individual choice over equity for all. Based on utility, education becomes a preferred good, rather than a primary one, which means that distribution is based on meeting the greatest average benefit for all even if that is at the expense of those who are the most disadvantaged, including those who are disabled. It therefore fails to be congruent with a discourse of inclusion and the liberal-egalitarian view which informs my research process. It is important however, because it provides an understanding of the political context and therefore presuppositions of the state policies on which I focus in my thesis.
The 'Recognition' Model

Within an accepted view of a liberal-egalitarian approach there has been much debate surrounding the inability of the model to go far enough to recognise and promote the differences of marginalised groups. In this section I will outline these criticisms in relation to disability, followed by an explanation of the alternative model of 'Recognition' that has been proposed in response to the distributive one. I will demonstrate the way this has been taken up by self-advocacy groups as a way of politically addressing discrimination. I will juxtapose the two positions and examine the compromise suggested by Fraser to combine the two approaches. This will provide me with the framework to return to the liberal-egalitarian model and contend that a re-evaluation of Rawls' theory of justice shows that it does have the capacity to address issues of injustice in relation to recognition and difference.

Some theorists in the disability field have criticised the liberal-egalitarian model of social justice on the basis that it fails to recognise or account for difference. Christensen and Rizvi (1996) argue that under the Rawlsian notion of equality of educational opportunity, fairer distribution has often been constructed in terms of access to "normal" environments which promotes assimilation rather than difference. According to them:

what is becoming increasingly clear is that the distributive notions underpinning many of the educational reforms in special education are insufficient to take account of the cultural economic and political relations that define people's lives in schools and society.... And they are limited because they focus attention on the individual child and not on the educational system that perpetuates and sometimes produces disadvantage (pp. 3-4).

They assert that a welfarist distributive model has failed because people with disabilities continue to be marginalised and oppressed and therefore the distributive solution has not worked. They propose instead a model which recognises the multiple voices of people with disabilities: "...we need a language of social justice that highlights notions of recognition, rights and empowerment of people with disabilities" (Christensen & Rizvi, 1996, p. 4).

Christensen & Rizvi's comments about the distributive model, fails to take several contextual aspects into account. Firstly, schools in Western society
no longer operate under a welfarist liberal-egalitarian model of social justice but rather a political climate of liberal-utilitarianism, which as stated by Rizvi and Lingard, serves to provide no justice to vulnerable groups (such as those with disabilities) at all (1996, p. 20). Furthermore the education system historically and currently continues to operate under a functionalist paradigm whereby medical, lay and charity discourses, override a social justice rights discourse. Arguably, the continuation of marginalisation and oppression for people with disabilities is a result of the nature of schooling under a liberal-utilitarianian ideology, rather than the distributive model of social justice.

Self-Advocacy

The evolvement of the social theory of disability has seen the increase of self-advocacy movements for disabled people. Some of these groups have focused on a model of recognition and a politics of difference. The rise of this approach can be aligned with "identity" politics that arose from the feminist movement. Identity politics reclaim disability and aim to give it value. Proponents have questioned the notion of disability as an always negative characteristic and something that should automatically be eliminated, and they have reclaimed it through movements such as disability pride and disability culture (Zola, 1994). Whilst social constructionists discourage all use of labelling and categorisation, social creationists embrace it. This is because, according to Oliver (1990), social constructionists view the perception - that disability is a problem - as being located in the minds and attitudes of able-bodied people, whereas social creationists sees the problem as located within the institutional practices of society. The latter group thinks that discouraging the use of labelling can lead to disadvantage for people by ignoring the special requirements they may need and portraying disability only as a negative thing rather than a difference to be celebrated (Allan, Brown & Riddell, 1998, p. 23).

Some disabled groups advocate "the notion that in order to understand disability one, in one measure or another, has to be disabled. That is to say the politics of disability is experiential - one has to live the life of a disabled individual to be provided with the insight of what it means" (Bickenbach,
1996, p. 37). This position has had ramifications in terms of politicisation of action by disabled people as a group, against discrimination and oppression.

There has also been a re/claiming of involvement and control in the field of research by disabled groups. This has resulted in a shift from research 'on' disabled people (which has occurred traditionally under a psychological model) to research 'by' disabled people and a resistance by some disabled researchers against non-disabled people researching their field2 (Oliver, 1990). As Ballard states "those who are disempowered, including women, Maori, and people with disabilities, no longer accept being researched, spoken for or about" (1993, p. 91).

This shift towards "the researched" having control over the research has also had ramifications in terms of the academy. For example, the formation of the "The Society of Disability Studies", in the United Kingdom was formed with the intention of trying to influence the way publicly-funded disability research was undertaken. According to Zola, the Society aims to promote a shift for people with disabilities "from being only the objects of research and policy to partners in policy setting and research. Furthermore, he states that "participatory action research" and "consumer-oriented research and dissemination" are early attempts to designate the desired research topics and methods that are heavily influenced by those who are subjects of investigation or beneficiaries of the findings" (1994, p. 60).

Whilst it is important to address research practices where disabled people are objectified and/or alienated from the process, the proposal that only disabled people can research other disabled people or that they must have control over the research process is susceptible to several aspects that are problematic. Firstly, there is an assumption that the disabled people in the research are interested and/or able to participate in the research process. Secondly, being disabled does not necessarily make one an empathetic, ethical researcher and thirdly, the diversity within disability means that there could be huge disparities between the researcher and the researched despite both having disabilities. Furthermore, to be researched only by

---

2 This self advocacy stance requires an explanation from me as an able-bodied person undertaking research with a focus on disabled students. I will address this issue in my methodology chapter.
another person with a disability has the potential to create more exclusion and stigmatization for the researched. Having raised these aspects I am not meaning to detract in any way from the importance of involving people with disabilities in the research process where possible, but rather to state that there should be no prescribed rules based on unchallenged presuppositions.

Recognition and Redistribution?

Nancy Fraser, (1997) in contrast to the thesis that redistribution and recognition are mutually exclusive concepts, proposes that we do not need to choose between one or the other but rather that they can be combined. The challenge according to Fraser is to "identify the emancipatory dimensions of both problematics and to integrate them into a single, comprehensive framework" (Fraser, 1997, p. 4).

Fraser (1997) distinguishes between socioeconomic and cultural injustices. She posits that socioeconomic injustice is addressed by Rawls' distribution of primary goods, and cultural injustice through recognition and representation. "Recognition for difference" according to Fraser, is overriding socioeconomic redistribution and becoming the main medium of political mobilisation for injustice in the late twentieth century. The two models appear contradictory in that recognition tends to promote group differentiation whereas redistribution often "call[s] for abolishing economic arrangements that underpin group specificity" (Fraser, 1997, p. 16). Fraser, however would argue that it is artificial to try to separate these types of injustices in a mutually exclusive way because:

When oppressed or subordinated, ... they suffer injustices that are traceable to both political economy and culture simultaneously. Bivalent collectivities, in sum may suffer both socioeconomic maldistribution and cultural misrecognition in forms where neither of these injustices is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are primary and co-original. In that case, neither redistributive remedies alone nor recognition remedies alone will suffice. Bivalent collectivities need both (p. 19).

For example in relation to disability, women with disabilities may encounter injustices that intersect across two bivalent collectivities - that of disability and gender.
Fraser rejects affirmative recognition and redistributive models in favour of transformative solutions to injustice and discrimination. By affirmative she means strategies that aim to only address inequitable outcomes (for example giving certain groups more resources) without challenging the broader underlying framework. Conversely, a transformative approach aims to reduce social inequality by deconstructing and restructuring the basic framework in both a redistributive and representative way. In other words this means addressing socio-economic and cultural injustices but in a way that reforms structural barriers but does not simultaneously stigmatise vulnerable groups of people. In summary, Fraser (1997) distinguishes between redistribution and recognition models of social justice but argues that by blending them together under a social reconstructionist transformative approach, injustice can be curtailed.

Liberal-Egalitarian – Revisited

In this section I will question Fraser’s assertion that a liberal egalitarian model relates only to socio-economic injustice. Whilst I would not take issue with her transformative approach and the need to address economic, social and cultural injustices, I will maintain that a re-assessment of Rawls’ theory of social justice will demonstrate that it already encapsulates all of these elements.

Rawls' liberal-egalitarian model of social justice has been criticised for being restrictive in its capacity to address injustice of a cultural or social nature. This allegation is open to critique, when reflecting on the basic principles of the theory and the way some theorists have interpreted them. Howe (1996) suggests that a rethinking of what the liberal principles can mean and how extensive they can apply is required. Much emphasis has been placed on Rawls' "General Conception" that all primary goods are to be redistributed to the most disadvantaged, but often this is assumed to be only in relation to economic injustices. Often what is omitted by critics is Rawls' inclusion of "self-respect" as a primary good (Olssen, 1997). In actuality Rawls states strongly that self-respect is a primary good:

On several occasions I have mentioned that perhaps the most important primary good is that of self-respect....Without it nothing may seem worth doing, or if some things have value for us, we lack the will to strive for them. ... the parties in the original
position would wish to avoid at almost any cost the social conditions that undermine self-respect. The fact that justice as fairness gives more support to self-esteem than other principles is a strong reason for them to adopt it (Rawls, 1972, p. 440).

Furthermore, for example Kymlicka (1991) contends Rawls's inclusion of 'self-respect' among the 'primary goods' that society must justly distribute opens the door to - indeed, requires - including a place for the effective expression and incorporation of diverse identities in the design of society's institutions. This is so because maintaining one's identity, and having what flows from it respected and taken seriously, is inextricably bound up with self-respect (cited in Howe, 1996, pp. 54-55).

Viewed in this way, redistribution means more than differential treatment or compensation for disadvantage, in that it requires accounting for equal respect of diversity and differences (Howe, 1996). If the 'representation of voice' is not adequately distributed in relation to the decision making and power relations in shaping an institution and these social structures are the key determinant of disadvantage, then under the egalitarian model this would constitute an injustice and would become the primary focus (Moore, 1998). Furthermore "if the best or the only way to shift patterns of identification, representation, belonging, and so on, and therefore disadvantage and injustice, is through the active participation and primary agency of the people concerned, then that is what egalitarian liberal commitment recommends" (Moore, 1998, p. 144). Within this theory, the way in which elements such as social justice, primary goods and redistribution are defined and interpreted becomes critical. Howe utilises a broader definition of social justice to demonstrate this. He suggests that social justice as part of a wider concept of democracy is required even when equality of opportunity cannot be attained. This means that:

In this vein, the democratic interpretation has as one of its requirements that all persons be afforded recognition and have their self-respect secured, a requirement that can be met here. Rather than being goals separate from social justice, or actually at odds with it, fostering care, community and a sense of belonging are its prerequisites. Thus an emphasis on caring, community and a sense of belonging should not be seen as alternative to an emphasis on social justice" (Howe, 1996, p. 58).
Defined in this way it becomes clear that a liberal-egalitarian account of justice is able to rebut its critics' claim that it proposes a narrow view of injustice. Furthermore it is possible to incorporate aspects of representation, recognition, diversity and community into its underlying principles (Moore, 1998). This means that not only is education an enabling good, but also it is required to recognise and value the diversity of its community. In relation to disability specifically, redistribution could mean

the inclusion of children with disabilities among their peers, and the reallocation of significant resources to these children from those who are educationally lucky. The redistribution can take many forms, from spending more than the population-average number of dollars on the education of children with disabilities; to the inclusion on grounds of their educational gain of children with quite severe disabilities in general classrooms, even when this generates some risk and disruption to other class members” (Moore, 1998, p. 143).

To summarise, this section provides a challenge to the dominant paradigm that has underpinned constructions of disability in our society. I have argued that a social theory of disability based on an egalitarian rights discourse is required to provide the necessary framework for my thesis. A re-evaluation of Rawls' social theory of justice shows that it is able to account for both socio-economic and cultural injustices. Based on democratic principles that seek to eliminate discrimination, this discourse is also consistent with a shift to inclusive education.

However in contrast to the liberal-egalitarian model of social justice, that centres on the rights of the most disadvantaged, the theorising of special education has been founded on a functionalist view of professional knowledge. This has had wide ramifications for the ways in which students with disabilities have been constructed, taught and included. I will now examine the theorising of special education.

THE THEORISING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

The aim of this section is to discuss Skrtic's claim that special education is in a state of crisis because a shift to a 'subjectivist' [or intersubjectivist] approach and therefore a challenge to a functionalist paradigm and notions of 'objectivity' also means a challenge to the underlying basis of knowledge
of the professional. If the theoretical framework and assumptions that the professional's knowledge is premised on is questionable then so too is their professional role. This has important implications for my study because the people with the power in the school in terms of what was happening for special needs students, were those who had been taught under the traditional professional special education model, particularly special education teachers and outside professional agencies. It followed that if their way of viewing the world was able to be questioned and critiqued, then so too were their practices and professional decisions.

General and Special Education

The medicalisation of disability under a functionalist paradigm has been reconstructed into all areas of societal life, including schooling. For the purposes of this study to theorise meanings of inclusion and enter the debates surrounding inclusive education requires a contextual step back into the field of special education. For it is only through deconstructing special education, particularly in relation to its historical connection with general education, that an understanding can be gained of its theoretical underpinnings. This will then provide the necessary context within which to theorise meanings of inclusion and the current advocacy of inclusive education.

The work of Skrtic makes an important contribution towards critiquing the links between general education and the traditional role of special education. He states that as an answer to school failure special education "...emerged as a means to remove and contain the most recalcitrant students, in the interest of maintaining order in the new rationalized school plant" (Skrtic, 1995a, p. 613).

Within a functionalist paradigm, schooling was founded on social regulation and control and has traditionally been and continues to be underpinned by a positivist epistemology. Skrtic explains it as follows:

... the functionalist or micro-objective paradigm is grounded in the sociology of regulation, takes a microscopic view of social reality, and approaches social science from an objectivist point of view. Given its realist ontology and deterministic view of human nature, functionalism assumes a single social reality to which
humans react mechanistically. Moreover, given its positivist epistemology and preference for nomothetic methodologies, it assumes that, by employing the methods of the natural sciences, social science can, over time, represent this reality objectively and thus predict and control the ways humans react to it. Together, then, the metatheoretical presuppositions of functionalism yield a view of social reality in which the current arrangement of society is assumed to be functional and thus indispensable, if not inherently correct (Skrtic, 1995, p. 67).

I will argue that the implications of a functionalist approach, have been pernicious especially for the area of special education, and particularly in relation to the way positivism has become privileged as legitimate professional knowledge for the field. Special education has embodied knowledge premised on behaviourist models of positivism and these underlie the methods used for teaching and learning in relation to the curriculum and instruction.

Although general education has been conceptualised in many different ways over the years the dominant discourse in which schooling has operated has been from a functionalist viewpoint. Skrtic argues that it is the functionalist dominance that has not only allowed the growth of special education but also seen it used as a way of addressing school failure in the 20th century (Skrtic, 1995; Tomlinson, 1985). Furthermore the adoption of a functionalist viewpoint has meant that public education has a number of inherent taken-for-granted assumptions in relation to pedagogy and what counts as knowledge. These are summarised as follows:

1. School failure is a (psychologically or sociologically) pathological condition that students have.
2. Differential diagnosis (i.e. homogeneous classification by ability, need, or interest) is an objective and useful practice.
3. Special programming (e.g., in-class ability grouping, curricular tracking, and segregated and pull-out special needs programs) is a rationally conceived and coordinated system of services that benefits diagnosed students.
4. Progress in education (i.e., greater academic achievement and efficiency) is a rational-technical process of incremental improvements in existing diagnostic and instructional practices (Skrtic, 1995a, p. 614).
The Pathological View of Disabled

By assuming that the cause of failure at school lies within the student, schools have adopted a deficit approach that sees the individual as 'the problem'. Not only has this meant that often educators have not been required to question their own practices, but it is also consistent with the medicalised approach that has defined those with a disability as previously discussed. These constructions are also reflected through a wider education system that promotes ideals of meritocracy based on individual success. By focusing on the individual other factors and societal influences are ignored. This is especially pertinent for those who are constructed as disabled. For disabled students the implications of the way schooling has been traditionally constructed, have resulted in them either being excluded altogether or segregated from other 'non-failing students'. For those segregated into special education classes, selection has been based on a medicalised pathological view within the individual.

Professionalism /Expertism and Knowledge

The problematic nature of special education is exacerbated by the positivist epistemology into which the professionals in the field have been inducted and the resulting consequences for those whom they serve. This has meant that the epistemology of professional knowledge of special educators has traditionally been linked to science and to a positivist paradigm that attempts to mirror natural science. The central tenet therefore of the professional role is one premised on "objectivity".

The notion of "objectivity" has been widely critiqued in recent years by many social scientists in favour of a subjective or intersubjective understanding of the ways in which meaning and knowledge are created or constructed (Crotty, 1998). Accordingly, this creates a dilemma for the legitimation of traditional views of professional knowledge (Skrtic, 1995, pp. 6-7). The reason for the dilemma is that unlike natural science which depends on challenges and critiques within the paradigm for revolutionary science to occur (Kuhn cited in Skrtic, 1995, p. 7), social scientists have failed to agree even on their view of science. The outcome of this, according to Skrtic, is that challenges have not resulted in revolutionary social science
but rather remained at a level of disagreement between those from different paradigms over science itself and the issue of "objectivism" (1995, p. 15).

The inter/subjectivist viewpoint describes how professional knowledge has traditionally been received from a professional body that constructs and privileges knowledge based on a positivist theoretical framework. Professional induction is undertaken through a transmission process whereby the would-be professional is always the novice awaiting to be told the knowledge required to be a professional. This process is deemed valid because it is assumed that the basis of all knowledge is 'objective' and therefore it only requires the knower to convey it to the learner.

Conversely, from an inter/subjectivist viewpoint the philosophical nature of knowledge underpinning science is never 'objective' and so this creates an epistemological crisis because of the contradiction it poses in terms of the so-called 'objectivist view' of professionals within an inter/subjectivist science (Skrtic, 1995, p. 20). This has much resonance for special education and my thesis because the rejection of a functionalist paradigm and notions of 'objectivity' also means a challenge to the underlying basis of knowledge of the professional. If the theoretical framework and assumptions on which the professional's knowledge is premised on, are questionable then so too is their professional role. This has important implications for my study because the people in the school with the power in terms of what was happening for special needs students were those who had been taught under this professional special education model: special education teachers and outside professional agencies.

Furthermore, whilst the construction of professional knowledge in special education transmits practical knowledge to its inductees, it has largely ignored theoretical knowledge and the underlying assumptions on which it is founded on. This has occurred because professional induction under a functionalist paradigm is usually in-house and centres on professional knowledge only as a technical issue rather than a philosophical one. I have reproduced Skrtic's useful diagram below to demonstrate the elements that constitute a paradigm. According to Skrtic, the professional knowledge of those involved in special education has focussed only on models, practices and tools to the exclusion of assumptions, theories and metaphysical suppositions. By way of critique I, like Skrtic, would argue that a familiarity
with all elements are intrinsic to understanding the paradigm within which one is operating (Skrtic, 1995, p. 13).

(Metaphysical suppositions)

Theories
Assumptions
Models
Practices
Tools

Source: (Skrtic, 1995, p. 13).

In practice this has resulted in psychologists and the medical profession in particular, controlling special education and those with disabilities over the last 30 years. This has enabled professionals to secure their positions even within integrated\(^3\) schools by enhancing their claims to professional expertise (Tomlinson, 1985). This control has been premised on notions of so-called professional judgement whereby the professional is constructed as "the expert". Troyna and Vincent (1996) refer to this as the "ideology of expertism" in which, despite educational reforms, political issues become technical ones and the power of decision-making remains in the hands of the 'experts'.

Under a positivist paradigm, not only does this disempower students with special needs but also their families, as the professional is deemed to be able to detach themselves from any emotional involvement and rely solely on the "facts" at hand when making professional judgements about the destiny of their client. In contrast the meanings and understandings of the families are always to be treated with scepticism by the professional because they lack the professionals' perceived 'objectivity'. (Ballard, 1994; Tomlinson, 1996).

The inculcation of this professional model into special education, one that continues to be underpinned by functionalism, has resulted in the same assumptions being unquestioned and followed as those proposed by Skrtic in relation to general education. This model relates to pathological views of disability, exclusion, special programming held up as preferred, and behavioural-based teaching and learning practices as fundamental.

\(^3\) This is the term used in the United Kingdom for inclusion
Such an approach, arguably fails to encourage ongoing personal development and growth of the professional or teacher, in the same way as other transformative approaches such as reflexivity. The focus for the professional rests with increasing their knowledge base, rather than being engaged in challenging existing practices and becoming an active social change agent. Reflexivity on the other hand, according to Schon (1983) would challenge the dominant technical rationality in professional education and encourage instead 'reflection in action' and 'reflection on action' amongst teachers and professionals. In the case of inclusion this would mean adopting a social reconstructionist model of reflexivity that "stresses reflection about the social and political context of schooling and the assessment of classroom actions for their ability to contribute toward greater equity, social justice and humane conditions in schooling and society (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1991, p. 3).

Curriculum And Functionalism

General Education

The way the curriculum has been developed in schools has also largely reflected functionalist principles. In terms of general education the influence of a positivist theoretical perspective has traditionally resulted in standardization in relation to curricular content, instructional procedures and personnel roles. Standards are maintained by way of competency testing of students, further specification of professional roles and student classifications to name a few. The removal of students into special education occurs because of the mismatch that is apparent between meeting a diversity of needs whilst simultaneously trying to fulfil goals of accountability and efficiency that centre on this standardization of services. When the latter takes priority a routinised system develops that is too rigid to accommodate student variability and so special programmes are devised for those who "do not fall within the scope of the organization's conventional instructional models, practices, and tools" (Skrtic, 1995, p. 73).

Special Education

The special programmes developed in special education have tended to incorporate the most extreme forms of functionalism by way of either a
Skinnerian form of behaviourism, (Skrnic, 1995), or a metacognitive model that has resulted in a medicalised diagnosis and intervention approach to special education. Both have relied on the reductionistic fallacy, according to Poplin, Wiest, & Thorson (1996), in which the belief is that the whole can be described merely by describing the parts.

The adoption of precision teaching techniques under the behaviourist model is a case in point. According to Poplin, Wiest, & Thorson:

Reductionist models *segment learning into parts*, either parts leading to an academic or social behavior, parts cognitive or learning strategies, or parts of mental processes. This breaking down of skills is done outside the student in a logistically ordered sequence, logical from the standpoint of adults without disabilities who designed the sequence based on their own experiences and knowledge (1996, p. 154).

The problem with this approach is that it fails to incorporate the context and thus loses any meaningfulness. It also has the potential to promote learned helplessness and low teacher expectations. According to Poplin, Wiest, & Thorson "instruction is viewed as unidirectional. The teacher is to deliver instruction, the teacher knows, the student receives. This is often referred to as the "banking system of education" (Friere, 1970)" (1996, p. 155).

**Mainstreaming to Inclusion**

It is within this context and as a direct response to overt criticism and challenges on moral, legal and political grounds that the model of mainstreaming occurred in public schooling in the Western world. This saw students in special classes starting from the same point as previously, in segregated classes but then being shifted into regular classes for selected subjects at certain times of the day or week. Whilst this addressed some of the practical criticisms that had been launched at the special education sector, in terms of the model, practices and tools, it still failed to challenge or change the theoretical assumptions and presuppositions on which the original model had been premised on. For this reason the mainstreaming model continued to operate under a functionalist paradigm (Skrnic, 1995). This resulted in little real change and many of the same problems
reoccurred (for example, instructional ineffectiveness, psychological and social damage) as the special class model continued.

In the 1980s the inclusion debate arose in response to the inadequacies of the mainstreaming movement. Inclusion proposed a shift in relation to student placement and presence. It began with a different starting point to that of mainstreaming, whereby all children belong in regular classes, thus the student with special needs was automatically "in" the classroom as of right, as were other regular classmates (Stainback & Stainback, 1996). This shift was premised on restructuring the separate special and general classes into a new “unitary system” where all would be educated in regular classes (Skrtic, 1995). Despite this Skrtic (1995) argues that whilst ‘inclusion’, unlike mainstreaming is able to critique and move away from functionalist theories, there is still a danger that its proponents will adopt a naïve pragmatism and fail to question it theoretically. Unless special education and special educators are challenged in terms of their taken-for-granted assumptions, their historical reliance on biological theories of deviance and their reductionist approaches to curriculum and instruction for students labelled as "special needs", inclusion like mainstreaming will fail (Skrtic, 1995). As Skrtic states:

Like the mainstreaming debate, the inclusion debate is important because it is empirical; it questions the legitimacy of special education’s models, practices, and tools in the language of the field and in terms of its own standards, which makes it comprehensible to the members of the special education community. However, because empirical data can be interpreted in a variety of ways, depending on the explicit or implicit theory of the interpreter (Harre’, 1981; Hesse, 1980), the field’s atheoretical (acritical) orientation means that special educators must default conceptually to their traditional theories and assumptions to interpret the meaning of the empirical evidence put forth in the inclusion debate, just as they did in the mainstreaming debate. This is naïve criticism; rather than resolving problems of special education practice, it reproduces them in a new form (Skrtic, 1995, p. 83).

The challenge is to not only critique and reject the empirical practices but also theoretical assumptions and presuppositions that have contextualised and dominated the area of special education for so long.
In summary it has been demonstrated that the way special education has been constructed under a functionalist paradigm has had huge implications for the education of students with disabilities. It has not only segregated and excluded students from general education but it has discriminated against them in terms of their rights as citizens in a democratic society. On a practical level the civil rights movement in the United States provided the catalyst for the emergence of the inclusion movement as a way of addressing this oppression. However for a shift to have any real impact, it requires an alternative theoretical framework. A framework is needed that questions the assumptions of objectivism and positivism that have encompassed and promoted the advent of special education as a separate entity from general education. To avoid replicating the failings of functionalism, the framework also requires an epistemology that challenges its own assumptions and presuppositions.

This chapter has provided a critique of the dominant theoretical framework that has underpinned special education in philosophy and practice in New Zealand over the last decade. This has meant challenging traditional discourses of disability in relation to a functionalist paradigm. Alternative theoretical understandings have been offered that shift concepts of disability away from the individual to societal barriers in our society. These are the social model of disability and social justice discourses of rights. I have argued that for theorising inclusive education a liberal-egalitarian discourse of rights is required that accounts not only for redistribution of resources but also recognition of marginalised groups. Finally this chapter critiques a functionalist approach to special education in relation to the discourses of professionalism and argues for an alternative framework that involves dismantling special education and restructuring general schooling in a bid towards an inclusive education for all.
This chapter outlines the theoretical approaches utilised in this study. The first section offers alternative theoretical frameworks (to that presented under functionalism in the previous chapter), for aiding the understanding of meanings of inclusion. Whilst no one theory or group of theories ever provide all the answers, I believe the frameworks presented are useful for gaining a holistic understanding of the way the participants in my study make sense of their lives as well as some of the contextual factors that impinge upon them. For my analysis I draw on two theoretical perspectives that are underpinned by the same epistemology, that of social constructionism. I utilise interpretivism at the micro-level and radical humanism at the macro-level. The second section of the chapter provides the rationale and explanations of the choices made in this study in regard to the techniques used in relation to method. Firstly, I describe a qualitative methodology and why it was chosen for the study. Then I will discuss the theoretical perspective that underpins my methodology, that of symbolic interactionism. Finally I reflect on methodological issues relevant to the study.

EPISTEMOLOGY AND THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

What follows is an explanation of the epistemological and theoretical perspectives that underlie this thesis. I will describe social constructionism and my intention to link the micro and macro level theories of interpretivism and radical humanism in my analysis. Social constructionism provides the necessary epistemology for understanding the way meanings of inclusion are constructed and interpreted from policy to practice. I will draw mainly on two paradigms that are consistent with a social construction epistemology and a rights discourse of inclusion for my analysis. I believe this is necessary because one theoretical perspective does not provide the necessary framework for trying to understand social action at all levels. As stated by Taylor and Bogdan: "Although most researchers align themselves with a specific theoretical framework, it is standard to borrow from diverse frameworks to make sense out of data" (1984, p. 136).

The paradigm that will provide the foundation for both my methodology and my analysis is Interpretivism; with specific employment of the Symbolic Interactionism theoretical perspective. I will also draw on Radical Humanism; or more specifically Critical Theory, for my analysis. In this way I believe that both of these paradigms will enable me to understand, explain
and provide a reflexivity to the research process that is missing in functionalist research.

Additionally these theoretical perspectives cross the boundaries between the micro- and macro-levels in society, a prerequisite in my thesis for understanding the links between the education system at the policy level and at the school level. This is not to say that I believe that these two paradigms provide all the answers or should not be open to critique. Like Radford (1994), however I believe: "Our goal, [then], should not be to devalue the contributions of formal science, but to open them up to critique and to use scientific methods within a pluralistic framework rather than in the pursuit of a supposed 'one best way'" (p. 23). The combination of micro- and macro-level paradigms, that have traditionally been framed as being diametrically opposed, requires discussion.

I will first explain the epistemology of social constructionism. This will be followed by a discussion of the micro-macro linkage and an explanation of the theoretical perspectives of interpretivism and radical humanism that I intend to use in this thesis.

Social Constructionism

Crotty (1998) defines social constructionism as the view that "all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context" (p. 42).

This epistemology suggests that the meaning of objects in themselves is undetermined (despite having potential meaning) until they are engaged with by the subject. Meaning therefore relies on the unification of the subject and the object, or what existentialists would call intentionality. According to Crotty intentionality is a radical interdependence of subject and world. Because of the essential relationship that human experience bears to its object, no object can be adequately described in isolation from the conscious being experiencing it, nor can any experience be adequately described in isolation from its object. Experiences do not constitute a sphere of subjective reality separate from, and
in contrast to, the objective realm of the external world... (1998, p. 45).

For this reason it has been proposed by a number of social constructionists (Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995; Crotty, 1998) that to separate the subjective and the objective, or to create a dichotomy between them is unsound. For it is in the interaction between the subject and the object as we engage with our world that meaning is made. Objects do not hold a separate entity nor are they "just found". Rather all meaningful reality is socially constructed without exception (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Crotty, 1998). It is this that distinguishes constructionism from objectivism. Crotty provides an explanation through the example of the chair whereby:

The chair may exist as a phenomenal object regardless of whether any consciousness is aware of its existence. It exists as a chair, however, only if conscious beings construe it as a chair. As a chair, it too 'is constructed, sustained and reproduced through social life' (1998, p. 55).

This is not to suggest that we as humans have to necessarily experience everything for ourselves firsthand. We are born into a world of meaning and a 'system of significant symbols' which we inherit as part of our culture. It is our culture that provides the lens through which we view the world. In this way objects are made, not found, by the social institutions in our society. Crotty explains the means by which this happens:

These means are institutions which 'precede us' and in which 'we are already embedded' and it is only by inhabiting them, or being inhabited by them, that we have access to the public and conventional senses they make (1998, p. 52).

In order for us to be able to disentangle ourselves from our cultural understandings and meanings we must be able to stand back and insist "that we take a critical glance towards our taken-for-granted ways of understanding the world (including ourselves)" (Burr, 1995, p.3). Social constructionism does this by focusing on the following three tenets: "knowledge is sustained by social processes", "knowledge and social action go together" and "the ways in which we commonly understand the world, the categories and concepts we use, are historically and culturally specific" (Burr, 1995, pp. 3-4).
Social constructionism also has a presupposition that there is no "true" or "valid" interpretation of social life. The sense we make of things, discretely from the way they actually are, depends on the different worlds we inhabit. Thus, there is no "objective truth" out there waiting to be discovered and different people will construct meaning differently, even in relation to the same phenomenon (Crotty, 1998).

Whilst other theoretical perspectives, such as postmodernism also critique an objectivist epistemology, social constructionism distinguishes itself from them. Crotty explains:

From the constructionist viewpoint, therefore, meaning (or truth) cannot be described simply as 'objective'. By the same token, it cannot be described simply as 'subjective'. Some researchers describing themselves as constructionist talk as if meanings are created out of whole cloth and simply imposed upon reality. This is to espouse an out-and-out subjectivism and to reject both the existentialist concept of humans as beings-in-the-world and the phenomenological concept of intentionality. There are strong threads within structuralist, post-structuralist and postmodernist thought espousing a subjectivist epistemology but constructionism is different. According to constructionism, we do not create meaning. We construct meaning (1998, pp. 43-44).

Because meaning is constructed through interaction rather than 'created' by the subject on to the object, social constructionism takes an intersubjective perspective rather than a purely subjective one. This means that as humans we are agents in the social interpretation of our world (Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995).

Accordingly, the job of the researcher is to re-interpret or reconstruct the everyday, common-sense meanings of our participants in a sociological way. Caution must be exhibited though so the researcher does not privilege their descriptions over their participants'. As Blaikie states:

In its epistemology, knowledge is seen to be derived from everyday concepts and meanings. The social researcher enters the everyday social world in order to grasp the socially constructed meanings, and then reconstructs these meanings in social scientific language. At one level, these latter accounts are regarded as redescriptions of everyday accounts; at another level they are developed into theories. The question of whether these accounts of social life are to be regarded as superior to everyday accounts is a matter of dispute (1993, p. 98).
Additionally, for this reason it is important to base the analysis not only at a macro-level and in the words of the researcher only, but also at a micro-level. This can be done by using the words of our participants in our findings to demonstrate the basis of our theoretical posings. An interpretivist paradigm provides the mechanism within which to do this. I will outline the importance of the interpretivism paradigm for my thesis but before I do this I will discuss the traditional dilemma of combining perceived macro- and micro-level theories.

Micro-Macro Integration

Traditionally theories at the micro- and macro-levels have been framed as incompatible and researchers have chosen either one approach or the other. The challenge of using them together as a way of gaining greater understanding of the social world is a goal not only of this research, but also of other researchers since the 1980s with similar aims. As Ritzer states:

While micro-macro extremism has characterized much of twentieth century sociological theory, it has been possible in the 1980s to discern a movement away from micro-macro extremism and toward a broad consensus that the focus instead should be on *the integration* (or linkage) of *micro and macro theories and/or levels of social analysis* (Ritzer, 1990, p. 350).

Arguably whilst there has been much diversity within both areas of what constitutes macro and micro, there has also been a large degree of overlap and one cannot be separated from the other. For "the micro-macro translation shows that everything macro is composed out of micro. Conversely, anything micro is part of the composition of macro; it exists in a macro context ... it is [therefore] possible to pursue the micro-macro connection fruitfully in either direction" (Collins, 1988 cited in Ritzer, 1990, p. 359).

To try to separate them and focus only on one level of social life, while ignoring the other, I would argue has been constraining for social research in the past. In contrast, a combination of both has the potential to provide a much fuller picture of social phenomena. Caution is required though when linking theories at different levels as it is important according to Ritzer for the development of an integrative theory to "give equal weight to micro and macro phenomena. Theories will be criticized, even if their intent is
integrative, if they overemphasize either end of the continuum" (Ritzer, 1990, p. 348).

It is also important to define in one's research what is meant by micro- and macro. I differentiate between them in terms of interaction patterns among individuals at the micro level and existing structures in relation to the macro-level. Respected sociologists, such as Giddens and Bourdieu have been attributed with describing micro-macro linkage "relationally and dialectically" rather than as dichotomous (Ritzer, 1990, p. 360).

In addition, Hassard (1993) also argues that you can cross paradigms and draws on the work of Pondy & Boje who "suggest that if we reject a truth-value function of theory, where only one theory can be mostly nearly true, and accept the explanatory power of multiple embedding paradigms, we find 'the function of theory shifts from that of truth providing to insight seeking' (p.84)" (cited in Hassard, 1993, p. 63).

Hassard argues that many theorists have based the assertion that research across paradigms is 'incommensurable', on Kuhn's original thesis but that in actuality Kuhn's later work

heralds an almost a volte face over this central question of incommensurability. Instead of arguing for exclusive paradigm determination of meaning, he advocates not only the seemingly progressive influence of nature, but more concretely, certain overlaps of paradigm meaning. [Furthermore] Kuhn talks of 'shared everyday vocabularies' ... (Hassard, 1993, p. 81).

In summary, this section has provided a case for the integration of two seemingly disparate theoretical perspectives in relation to traditional definitions, on which I will draw on for my analysis. I have argued that a linkage of micro- and macro-theories will provide greater insight into my data providing that it is based on the same epistemological understandings. In the next section I will outline the theory that informs both my methodology and my analysis - particularly at the micro-level, that of interpretivism.

**Interpretivism**

The interpretivist paradigm focuses on understanding the process through which humans construct their social worlds (Skrtic, 1995). This means that
the researcher is interested in understanding people's experiences and perspectives as perceived and intended. Interpretivism according to Ferguson & Ferguson (1995) is based on several tenets, all of which are consistent with social constructionism. These are: reality is socially constructed and intentional; it is not possible to split the subject and the object; and the context is imperative for understanding meaning (pp. 110-112).

Interpretivist research is undertaken in many different ways, (with much diversity within) and no prescribed standardization. The methods used to do this:

such as ethnography (Erickson, 1973), participant observation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982), and naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Skrtic, 1985; Skrtic, Guba, & Knowlton, 1985), generally use emergent protocols, nonstandardized instruments, and various forms of qualitative analysis. They are concerned with intersubjective truth, that is, with the way humans construct meaning as a guide to action in particular social contexts (Skrtic, 1995, p. 89).

Criticisms of this paradigm have centred on the interpretivists' focus towards understanding people's perspectives and experiences. Crotty, for example censures interpretivism for being "overwhelmingly oriented towards an uncritical exploration of cultural meaning" (1998, p. 60). Ferguson and Ferguson (1995) on the other hand would refute this on the basis that "from the interpretivist perspective, individuals are not 'cultural dopes' passively pushed along by social structures and collective determinism" (p. 107). Furthermore whilst this theoretical perspective focuses at the micro-level and on individual agency, according to Ferguson and Ferguson (1995), it is precisely this reliance on the individual that is the ultimate source of organisation and change in any social setting.

I would argue that the usefulness of this theoretical perspective for my analysis lies in its consistency with my methodology and the epistemology on which my research is based on. Moreover it is compatible with the social model of disability that I align myself with in my thesis for understanding disability. As does the social model, interpretivism constructs disability not as a fixed entity in the individual but as a series of experiences waiting to be described (Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995). Furthermore interpretivism supports my understandings of the way knowledge is constructed in an
intersubjective way rather than either a subjective or an objective way. Lastly, according to Ferguson and Ferguson, interpretivism has made an important contribution towards inclusive education:

Letting parents describe their experiences and perspectives about raising their children with severe disabilities in the community, in the local school, with other children, has been one of the primary forces towards integrated, inclusionary education. The very emphasis of interpretivism on micro-level description exalts the specific, the contextual, the local, the individual; in short, all that can be so easily flattened out in the more abstract structural analyses of world systems and ideologies (1995, p. 118).

These aspects are important for understanding meanings of inclusion but mostly at a micro level. Whilst these can be lost at a macro level analysis this does not mean that the effects of structure and ideologies on those at the individual level should be ignored. It is equally important for understanding the constraints that are placed on those at the micro level. As Connolly states:

An interpretive account begins with the self-understanding of the participants, but it must eventually explore implicit beliefs, unexpressed doubts, vaguely articulated hopes, and repressed anxieties which help to account for their conduct. Moreover, these discrepancies must be explained, and one promising route (though it does not exhaust the possibilities) is to explore institutional interdependencies which encourage some understandings and aspirations, while rendering others inconsistent with the wish of the participants to see themselves as responsible agents freely choosing to play the roles available to them (1981, p. 84).

A shortfall of interpretivism is the ability to do this well in relation to institutional structures. Major criticism of this paradigm centres on its lack of focus on power relations and divisions of interests particularly at structural levels. Giddens for example, says that social actors engage in conditions which produce and reproduce the social world of which they are at times unaware. He argues that interpretivists can be potentially misleading in that they imply that competent social actors engage in a continuous monitoring of their conduct and are thus aware of both their intentions and the reason for their actions....However, most of the
time action proceeds without reflective monitoring. 'Routine ... is the predominant form of day-to-day social activity' " (Giddens (1984) cited in Blaikie, 1993, p. 111).

The previous section has demonstrated the usefulness of an interpretivist approach for my thesis. Not only is it consistent with the social constructionist epistemology that I am using, but it allows research to be undertaken that explores the perspectives of one's participants. Taking an intersubjective stand, it focuses on interaction for understanding meaning and sees the context as integral. In the sub-section that follows I will shift from a theoretical framework that provides explanation mostly at a micro-level. Instead I will draw on the macro-level theoretical framework of radical humanism. Together these two paradigms help to provide understandings of the way meanings are socially constructed in all areas of our lives.

**Radical Humanism**

In this section, the radical humanism paradigm will be explained in relation to Interpretivism. I will introduce the notion of the 'immanent critique', followed by the critical theory perspective on which I will draw. This will serve to provide a critique of functionalism as related to special education. Like Skrtic (1995) and Hassard (1993), I will also draw on the work and model of Burrell and Morgan (1979) to explain the radical humanist paradigm.

According to Burrell and Morgan (1979) (as cited in Skrtic, 1995, p. 31) there exist four paradigms of modern social scientific thought, which are as follows: functionalism (micro-objective); radical structuralism (macro-objective); interpretivism (micro-subjective); and radical humanism (Macro-subjective). According to Hassard the radical humanist paradigm shares with the interpretive paradigm the assumption that everyday life is socially constructed. However, for the radical humanist, this social construction is tied to a 'pathology of consciousness', a situation in which actors find themselves the prisoners of the (social) world they create. The radical humanist critique highlights the alienating modes of thought which characterize life in modern industrial societies. Capitalism in particular is subject to attack in humanists' concerns to link thought and action as a means of transcending alienation (1993, p. 89).
I would maintain that this paradigm is useful not only for the analysis at the macro level but it also has the potential to explain and critique actors' social lives in ways that I have argued Interpretivism fails to do.

The basis of radical humanism, that of humanism, has as its central tenets ideas of "freedom, autonomy, equality, life and authentic self-realisation". These are not seen as merely rhetoric but are based on principles of civil rights and democracy (Johnson, 1994, pp. 14-15). This is not only consistent with principles of inclusion but also the rights discourse that has informed my thesis.

Moreover, radical humanism takes a critical stance and focuses on concepts such as culture, norms, and ideology (Skrtic, 1995). According to Kiel this paradigm views:

... from a social, rather than simply an individual (interpretivist) or mechanical (functionalist), perspective. ... However, social interpretivists, while approving of the macro-perspective of structuralists, disagree fundamentally with structuralists over the issue of objectivity of analyses. Humanists do not believe that social analysis can be objective. Rather, humanists assert that the world is not known objectively, but is interpreted (Kiel, 1995, p. 135).

Radical humanism therefore, like interpretivism is underpinned by a social constructionist epistemology and an intersubjective reality. This means that knowledge is still constructed through interaction but attention is paid to the macro-level (Kiel, 1995).

The importance of this paradigm for my analysis cannot be understated. It is consistent with other theoretical and epistemological frameworks I intend to draw on, and according to Kiel radical humanists are paradigm pluralists and "no single paradigm has a patent on knowledge, and each makes its contributions to human understanding" (Kiel, 1995, p. 135).

The radical humanist view is underpinned by four explicit beliefs. The first is that the development of consciousness (both individual and society) is a positive attribute and reflexivity is something to be fostered. It is stated that

---

1Kiel interchanges Social Interpretivist with the term Radical Humanist and so in this context they have the same meaning.
"... humanists seek environments where people can see more clearly the existing relations of power within society, the ideologies that mo[u]ld social choices, and the likely outcomes of the actions that people choose" (Kiel, 1995, p. 136).

The second belief is that as a society we need to increase human freedom and demand that organisations and governments especially, cultivate democratic values. This would suggest a social order that "is the reflective product of human participants" (Kiel, 1995, p. 136).

This is hindered somewhat, according to the third belief by dominant ideologies in society that serve to cause a gap between appearance and reality. This has resonance for my analysis in my thesis in relation to understanding the rhetoric of policies (the appearance) with implementation in practice (the reality).

The fourth belief refers to the Enlightenment as a "two edged sword". It replaced superstitious thought and monarchical tyranny, with democratic and republican forms of government which have served to increase human freedom and citizen participation. However it also constructed a science "severed from social life - [whereby] human knowledge (science) and human interests (social life) were separated." (Kiel, 1995, p. 138). Therefore humans became objects and units of production under an ideology of utilitarianism.

**Immanent Critique**

An important difference between interpretivism and radical humanism is reflexivity. Within a radical humanist perspective is the notion of the "immanent critique". Originating from G. W. F. Hegel, an "immanent critique" is about self-reflection which reveals the disjuncture between appearance and reality. This is not meant in an objectivist way but rather through self-reflection exposure is given as to how the claims of humans do not match up with their life conditions. As Kiel suggests,

the immanent critique allows for critical leverage without having to rest on an objective foundation. Humanists will still focus on their concerns for freedom, ethical reflection, and democracy, but they will try to promote those values through the use of the 'immanent critique" (Kiel, 1995, p. 140).
Chapter 3: Theoretical Tools

The implications of utilising this tool for my analysis are far-reaching. As a researcher I seek to explore the inconsistencies between the appearance and the reality for my participants and myself as the researcher. On one hand I ask my participants for their understandings of policies that relate to inclusion and curriculum, and on the other I observe them in their daily practice. This allows me to then ask them to reflect on these inconsistencies and the constraints that face them. Through exposing the contradictions between claims and conditions, the ideal and the real, an immanent critique "seeks to transform the real into the ideal by confronting us with the fact that we are not living up to our own standards; that is, by first describing what a social totality holds itself to be, and then confronting it with what it is in fact becoming" (Schroyer, 1973, cited in Skrtic, 1991, p. 31).

In my own role as researcher, I think it essential that I also engage in self-reflexivity. In this way I can learn from my experiences and become a better practitioner. As part of this process I present my conclusion chapter as a series of reflections in relation to the different aspects of this study.

Critical Theory

The theoretical perspective used by radical humanists that I also intend to use is that of critical theory. It has its roots in Hegelian philosophy and has been linked to Habermas, and Gramsci’s social theory (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1988; Blaikie, 1993; Hassard, 1993). According to Hassard a central notion of this perspective is that: "human consciousness is corrupted by tacit ideological influences. The common-sense accorded to hegemonic practices [such as management training] is felt to drive a wedge of false consciousness between the known self and the true self" (1993, p. 105). Hegemonic practices occur as the dominant groups in our society maintain their position by a combination of political and ideological means (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1988). Fraser defines the concept of 'hegemony' as the power to establish the "common sense" of "doxa" or a society, the fund of self-evident descriptions of social reality that normally go without saying. This includes the power to establish authoritative definitions of social situations and social needs, the power to define the universe of legitimate disagreement, and the power to shape the political agenda. Hegemony, then, expresses the advantaged position of dominant social groups with respect to discourse. It is a concept that allows us to recast the issues of social

Like interpretivism, this theoretical perspective attempts to understand social life but goes further in that it also explains and critiques it in the wider social context. According to Blaikie: "...while it is essential to ground our understanding of everyday life on the situations in which it occurs, it is important to recognize that there is considerable variability in the degree to which everyday knowledge is contextually determined" (Blaikie, 1993, p. 208).

Unless we take into account the contextual factors in which social action occurs we are in danger of failing to acknowledge the political and power relations within our culture. This is crucial for the exploration of the state and policy formation in my thesis. Finally critical theory, not surprisingly in view of its radical humanist paradigm, has an interest in emancipatory goals of freedom from domination (Blaikie, 1993).

A Critique of Functionalism

Radical humanists provide a critique of functionalism in several ways. They admonish schooling for failing to promote self reflection and challenge the way knowledge under a functionalist paradigm has become a one way process. This results in students being rewarded for docility. Furthermore under this paradigm, and counter to a humanist framework, private interests predominate over public interests (Kiel, 1995).

A humanist critique of functionalism in relation to special education centres on a number of specific aspects. It questions the consequences of the reliance on a diagnosis and intervention approach for students with disabilities in relation to labelling. It asks whether such labels empower or disempower students. It also questions the role of special education and how general education shapes the way disability is constructed. If students are removed from general education into special education for failing to meet disciplinary standards (or are not compliant), then a radical humanist would argue that the problem lies in the organisation rather than the individual. Radical humanism, in contrast to the functionalist view, is interested in culture and changes over time in society that shape the way disability is defined. According to Kiel this means that "...humanists
endorse a politics of inclusivity - a politics that includes citizens rather than categorizing them for the purpose of differentiation and disempowerment" (Kiel, 1995, p. 144).

This section has demonstrated that radical humanists promote a sociology of radical change and believe that structures inhibit human development and freedom. Whilst they support an interpretivist view of science their focus remains at critiquing structures and the way ideology and hegemony impinge on human thought and action. For it is only through self-reflection and understanding that changes can occur to the structures (Kiel in Skrtic, 1995).

In summary, this section has provided an outline of the theoretical frameworks of interpretivism and radical humanism, both of which will be utilised for the analysis of this thesis. It has shown that they share the same epistemology and therefore provide an important tool for understanding the perspectives of participants at both the macro and micro levels in relation to inclusion. Whilst theoretical understanding in relation to the analysis of this thesis has been outlined, it is also important to reflect on theoretical frameworks that underpin the method of this study. The next section explores the rationale for the choices made in this regard, presenting a qualitative methodology underpinned by symbolic interactionism.

THEORETICAL METHODOLOGY

In this section, firstly I will describe a qualitative methodology and why it was chosen for the study. I will then discuss the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism. This is an interpretivist approach based on a social constructionist epistemology. The method used is ethnographic and it is to this that I will next turn. I will then address research process issues including rigour in relation to credibility, trustworthiness and emotionality, representation of others and finally a section on facing my own assumptions. This will allow me to stand back as a qualitative researcher is required to do, in order to challenge the taken-for-granted views and reflect on my own research process.
Qualitative Methodology

"... qualitative methodology refers in the broadest sense to research that produces descriptive data—people's own written or spoken words and observable behavior" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 7).

A qualitative methodology was used for this study. This methodology provided the vehicle to answer the research questions I had posed and was compatible with the social constructionism epistemology that underpinned my research. According to Bishop, qualitative research can be distinguished from other research methodologies as it

will involve the researcher in considerations of disclosure, advocacy, subjectivity, consciousness, participation, identification, positionings, and agency, in contrast to research that operates within a framework of logical positivism, with its emphases on objectivity, reliability, replicability, hypothesis testing, controls and statistical analyses. Integral to this movement from the dominant positivist paradigm has been the realisation of the importance of meaning and interpretation of people's lives within their cultural contexts (1997, p. 30).

In my research, I was interested in understanding people's perspectives, and their interpretations of inclusion in education within their cultural context and as it related to the curriculum. I wanted to explore and experience with a school community (that is, students, teachers, parents and outside support agencies) meanings of inclusion as it occurred on a day to day basis. According to Taylor and Bogdan (1998) this methodology allows me to do this because qualitative researchers

are concerned with the meanings people attach to things in their lives. Central to the phenomenological perspective and hence qualitative research is understanding people from their own frames of reference and experiencing reality as they experience it. Qualitative researchers empathize and identify with the people they study in order to understand how those people see things (p. 7).

To enhance understanding the researcher usually spends extended periods of time in the field and takes the time to get to know their participants. In this way, the possibilities are opened up for the researcher to be able to "take the role of the other" and thus gain an understanding of what social life is
like for their participants (Blumer, 1969). This methodology also suited the ethnographic approach I had decided to undertake in my study.

One of the goals of qualitative research is to investigate how social life looks from different positions and points of view. Furthermore there is no hierarchy of credibility meaning that all perspectives (from the most powerful to the least) are as important as each other to the researcher (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). In my research the perspectives of the most vulnerable were an important element and therefore I needed a methodology that was not going to privilege the most powerful.

Unlike in a quantitative approach, one of the underlying assumptions of qualitative research is that there is no single fixed construct of reality, waiting to be observed and measured. Under the qualitative methodology therefore, importance is placed on participants’ perspectives and how they construct their realities and understand the world (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). In addition, this method allows the researcher to enter the lives of the people being studied and observe and analyse the process with them as it occurs. According to Emerson "although qualitative researchers cannot eliminate their effects on the people they study, they attempt to minimize or control those effects or at least understand them when interpreting data" (Emerson, 1983 cited in Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, pp. 8-9).

Taylor and Bogdan (1998) position the researcher as a tool and qualitative research as a craft. The methods followed are not prescriptive but guidelines only and must therefore serve the researcher rather than the reverse. The research design is flexible and specific questions are formulated after time has been spent in the field. This approach is founded on a premise of analytic induction whereby concepts and themes develop and emerge from the data rather than being collected on the basis of pre-set hypotheses or theories. This is not to suggest an objective process because all data collection and analysis occurs through the eyes of the researcher who then becomes the interpreter. The role of the qualitative researcher however, is to ensure that the emergent theory is grounded in the data. One way to keep check on this is for the researcher to reflect on his/her assumptions and process continuously throughout the research (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Details of this process are outlined in the Procedural Methodology chapter.
Methodological Theory

Whilst qualitative researchers share a similar phenomenological perspective there are many variations within the methodology in terms of theoretical perspectives. Much of this depends on the epistemological foundations that the researcher adheres to and their understanding of the relationship between the subject and the object. This can be understood in terms of a continuum from those who, at one extreme believe reality exists out there in an objective way, to those at the other end who believe that all knowledge is only ever subjective. Most researchers' stance falls somewhere between these two positions and this is why qualitative methodology has been linked to a range of theoretical perspectives such as symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, feminism and post modernism (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). I have drawn on a symbolic interactionist perspective for this research, an intersubjective approach that is consistent with the epistemology of social constructionism which underpins my study.

Symbolic Interactionism

"The symbolic interactionist places primary importance on the social meanings people attach to the world around them" (Taylor & Bogdan 1998, p. 11).

The world of the symbolic interactionist according to Crotty (1998) is one of "intersubjectivity, interaction, community and communication, in and out of which we come to be persons and to live as persons" (p. 62). Symbolic interactionism originated from the work of George Herbert Mead but arguably Herbert Blumer (1969) has been one of the most influential proponents of this theoretical perspective over time. Blumer proposed three central tenets on which symbolic interactionism was premised. In this section I will firstly explore each one in turn. I will then explain other elements of symbolic interactionism and then examine the usefulness and limitations of this perspective for the researcher.

Blumer's first premise related to the way people define the situation in social life. According to Taylor and Bogdan (1998) "people act toward things, including other people, on the basis of the meanings these things have for them. Thus people do not simply respond to stimuli or act out cultural scripts. It is the meaning that determines action" (p. 11). This means that
social reality is a process of constant negotiation, rather than being driven only by external or structural forces. Although people may act within a framework of an organization or culture, it is their definition of the situation that determines their action (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This occurs through people continually negotiating and redefining the actions of others. According to Woods:

Schemes of interpretation become established through use but require continued confirmation by the defining acts of others. For example, a pupil might challenge a teacher's symbolic warning to test the resolve behind the meaning. The teacher must then act to confirm the initial definition and to sustain the framework. But the interaction is open to redefinition (1996, p. 33).

Blumer's second premise is that "the meaning of a thing for a person grows out of the ways in which other persons act toward the person with regard to the thing" (1969, p. 4). This means that objects are not separate entities but are socially constructed. Through interaction with other people shared meanings of objects and people are developed (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This occurs as long as people assign the same meaning to the same act. The way this happens is through the ability of the actor to take the role of the other. In another words as Woods says the "construction of meaning in interaction occurs by means of the ability to take the role of the other, to put oneself in the position of the other, and to interpret from that position" (1996, pp. 32-33). This is contingent on all actors interpreting the situation in the same way. The definition of the situation sets the scene for how we interact with others but if definitions conflict then shared meaning does not occur and order breaks down (Woods, 1996, p. 33).

The reason that conflict occurs is because people have had different experiences and find themselves in different situations. Therefore they have learned different social meanings. Taylor and Bogdan (1998) provide the example of a student breaking a window in the school cafeteria to expound this premise. The student may not see it as an issue, the school caretaker defines it in terms of having to clean it up, whereas the Principal may define it as a behaviour problem. Previous experience and the situations in which people find themselves will dictate the ways in which they define what is currently happening.
According to Taylor and Bogdan (1998), Blumer's third fundamental premise of symbolic interactionism is that meaning is attached to situations, things and themselves by way of a process of interpretation. He explains further:

This process has two distinct steps. First, the actor indicates to himself the things toward which he is acting; he has to point out to himself the things that have meaning. Second, by virtue of this process of communicating with himself, interpretation becomes a matter of handling meanings. The actor selects, checks, suspends, regroups, and transforms the meanings in the light of the situation in which he is placed and the direction of his action (Blumer, 1969 cited in Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 11).

This process of interpretation is constant and involves interpreting, defining and redefining in different situations. It is an ongoing dynamic process based on the meanings an individual has available to them at the time and the sense they then make of it. An example would be the way actors attach meaning to objects (see page 49 of this chapter for a specific example).

In relation to society, Woods (1996) explains that symbolic interactionists believe that whilst structural features set conditions for action they do not determine them. Rather "social organization provides a framework inside which people construct their actions" (p. 34). Furthermore he argues that people do not act towards systems but rather to situations.

The symbolic interactionist perspective had resonance for my own research but is not without its limitatons. I was interested in how my participants defined the situation in terms of meanings of inclusion and the national curriculum policy in New Zealand. What were the opposing definitions of the situation? How were shared meanings constructed? This perspective allowed me as the researcher to understand how participants constructed meaning, how they interpreted the indications given to them by others, the meanings they assigned to it, and how they constructed their own action (Woods, 1996, p. 39).

This perspective had limitations. Firstly, the symbolic interactionist approach fails to take sufficient account of the power differentials that can occur between actors as they negotiate for meaning and shared understanding. Furthermore, whilst people have individual agency to
define the situation in a certain way and act upon it they are nevertheless still constrained, by structural concepts like ideology, hegemony and lack of self-consciousness (Ritzer, 1992). Whilst this theoretical perspective was useful for informing and guiding my methodological direction at an individual level, it fell short for analysing the constraints that impinge upon my participants at the societal level. For this reason I have drawn on more than one theoretical perspective for my analysis.

**Ethnography**

This study took an ethnographic approach in a secondary school. An aim of ethnography is to understand the way participants in the setting construct their world. Therefore even if the setting is familiar to the researcher one must treat the familiar as strange, and question their taken-for-granted views of the world. The researcher must try to view everything as though it is happening for the first time (Crotty, 1998, p. 76). In recent years ethnography has become more self-consciously recognised. Fine explains that "two changes have significant reverberations in contemporary ethnographies: a greater significance of theory in directing ethnographies and a greater self-consciousness of the role of the researcher as author and witness" (1990, p. 131). With this in mind, I will now stand back and reflect on my own research process in the next section.

**REFLECTIONS**

As a researcher who is committed to not only challenging my own assumptions but also mindful of my obligations throughout the process, I believe it is important that I reflect on my research process in the following ways. Firstly, I will address the issue of rigour in qualitative research particularly in relation to trustworthiness, credibility and emotionality. Secondly, I will discuss issues of representation by myself especially as an able-bodied researcher and the assumptions I had to face in my role as researcher.

**Rigour**

Dominant constructions of science have traditionally been prompted by the Enlightenment with the notion of "rational thought" being underpinned by an epistemology of objectivism. This has resulted in a social science that attempts to mirror natural science through purporting that reliable
knowledge can be obtained only: "through externalizing modes of knowing, through distancing, quantification, atomization, manipulation and experimentation" (Heshusius & Ballard, 1996, p. 7).

Subsequently, the verification of knowledge as empirically valid became a necessary component of social science research. This was perceived as achievable by following a prescribed regime of rigour that included remaining detached, unemotional and objective. In contrast, traditionally qualitative researchers defined rigour somewhat differently from those undertaking quantitative research but the focus remained on verification. Blumer (1969), for example defined it in terms of exploration and inspection. As stated in Wilson, Petelo, Hulston & Dunnachie-McNatty:

The concept of exploration requires confrontation of the premises on which the research is based and both the research problem and the data collected must be genuine in the "real world"(p. 41). In addition, aspects of inspection mean that the relationships between data must be checked and interpretations subjected to empirical testing. The concepts that then emerge are required to match empirically that to which they purport (1999, p. 3).

Whilst I do not disagree with the main components in Blumer's definition, I would argue that to think of rigour in his way is limiting and frames it in a positivist way that could be misconstrued as attempts at trying to find the "real truth". I think it is important as a researcher, to be answerable to the research process in terms of our participants and the academy. Therefore mechanisms such as rigour are essential in social research and qualitative research, but arguably, in light of its phenomenological epistemology it is more important to re-define rigour in terms of credibility and trustworthiness rather than verification.

Wilson et al. have argued previously that when focusing on the issues of rigour and emotionality in qualitative research,

what is required for the development of trustworthy and credible research methods is "self-reflexivity" (Lather, 1991, p. 66). Not only is it integral to qualitative research practice but the absence of such reflexivity fails to ensure rigour in one's research. Our challenge is to ensure that we reflect upon our processes and that these reflections are transparent in the re/presentation of our research (1999, p. 19).
By turning now to my own research, I hope to demonstrate that not only is my process credible and trustworthy, but also that it is simultaneously self-reflexive and thus rigorous.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

I have used various strategies to try to ensure credibility and trustworthiness in my research, in particular, that my findings were grounded in my data and thus believable. As outlined in greater depth in my Procedural Methodology chapter, by collecting the following multiple sources of data - document analysis of state level policies and official school documents; interviews with stakeholders from various groups both within-site and across-site in relation to the secondary school; and by spending intensive periods of time observing at the school, I have attempted to achieve an in-depth understanding of my research site and my participants. According to Guba and Lincoln (1995) cited in Maykut and Morehouse:

The combination of interviews and observations from the field, along with reviews of relevant documents increases the likelihood that the phenomenon of interest is being understood from various points of views and ways of knowing. Convergence of a major theme or pattern in the data from interviews, observations and documents lends strong credibility to the findings (1996, p. 146).

Participant observations at the school over an extended period of time allowed me to engage not only in formal interviews, but also to gain rapport with staff and students and to be involved in informal conversations with them at different stages during data collection. This served as a way of checking my preliminary analysis and findings to ensure my emerging themes were grounded in the data and were believable (Bradford et al, 1999). Glesne and Peshkin make the connections between time spent in the field and the trustworthiness of the data obtained by the researcher:

Time is a major factor in the acquisition of trustworthy data. Time at your research site, time spent interviewing, time to build sound relationships with respondents- all contribute to trustworthy data. When a large amount of time is spent with your others, they less readily feign behavior or feel the need to do so; moreover, they are more likely to be frank and comprehensive about what they tell you (1992, p. 146).
Another element of trustworthiness was my own as a researcher in terms of the academy. I discussed my emerging themes with my peers and supervisors so that my assumptions and perspectives could be challenged and I could take account of them. An example of this is that through self-reflection on my own world view of meanings of inclusion in relation to my data, I realised that my analysis and interpretation was always going to be imbued with these understandings. Moreover my bias towards a particular way of defining inclusive education would in turn impact on the way I had seen, described and interpreted inclusive practices at the school. For my research to have credibility I must therefore be transparent about such beliefs and biases, so that when I present my findings the reader can understand them in this light. By outlining my own personal experiences of disability and my positioning of it in my introduction chapter I believe I have met the requirement of self-reflexivity in this regard and thus given my research credibility.

Furthermore, as a way of cultivating trust from the academy, in my research process I have made my process as transparent as I can. I have provided detailed descriptions of my procedure and opened it up to scrutiny. Maykut and Morehouse believe that

a detailed description of the research process and outcomes provides readers with a basis for judging the credibility of a study. It allows them to look closely at the sample and the specific procedures for data collection and analysis and will contribute to (or lessen) their level of trust in the reported outcomes (1996, pp.145-146).

Emotionality

Heshusius and Ballard (1996) highlight that it is only since Western Science was introduced that emotional feelings and intuition have been devalued as ways of knowing, and that before this time attempting to separate mind from emotion was unheard of. They state:

The metaphors and worldview that emerged from the rise of Western science demand that we believe in the possibility of separating fact from value, mind from body, mind from emotion, and self from other. With its emphasis on scientific, methodological, and quantitative rationality, Western thought began to liquidate all other ways of knowing; not intuition; not
imagination; not feelings; not spiritual knowing; not knowing through connecting, participation, and identification; not qualitative subtleties; and surely not the information the body holds. Only the elegant, well controlled cleanliness of mathematical certainty could count as knowledge (pp. 4-5).

I found I was not able to detach myself from my feelings in the field as a 'scientific approach' would demand, especially because of the passion I had for my subject area and the occurrence of a critical incident when I witnessed blatant exclusion directed at the students with disabilities. I believe and have argued previously (see Wilson et al., 1999) that emotion in the field is not something that should be ignored but rather instead should be made transparent throughout the research process in order to demonstrate good rigorous research. In Wilson et al., (1999) I described my feelings in relation to the critical incident:

I experienced emotional hard work as a researcher, struggling between my intuitive feelings (of anger, sadness and distress) and my purported role of detached observer. In this role, I felt an expectation placed on me that I must stand aside, watch and only record what was happening before me. ... My stomach continued to ache, and I felt emotionally distressed when I saw the way that those same participants were now ostracised in subtle ways by their classmates. Data lay before me that escaped language - data that seemed uncodable and out-of-control (St Pierre, 1997). My academic training urged me to separate this somatic and emotional involvement from my research (Heshusius & Ballard, 1996). I questioned my feelings. Were they allowable? Had I stepped over the boundary as the researcher because I did not want to stand by and do nothing? (pp. 11-12).

By being explicit about my emotionality, not only were my emotional feelings and reactions privileged in my research process but they demonstrated reflexivity, a necessary component I believe in qualitative research. Furthermore my reflection on the emotionality of the process allowed me to explore my position as the researcher, my role in the research and the way I would re/present my participants. I came to realise that by being overt about the emotional hard work in my research, I was able to make my research more credible and trustworthy. For it was only by taking ownership for the way I was feeling that I came to understand "that although I felt positioned in certain ways by different people, I too was positioning others based on my own values, judgements and passion for my chosen field of study" (Wilson et al., 1999, p. 13).
In relation to the academy I also found myself reflecting on my position as a social scientist and questioning the traditional boundaries that were laid down before me. I wrote:

Had I stepped over the boundaries as a social scientist and allowed my emotional commitment and passion for my topic area to take over? ... My academic practice had taught me I was expected to be the unobtrusive observer (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Traditional notions of scientific research and rigour had told me that emotional involvement had to be suppressed at all costs. But I was unable to do this and over time I came to realise, nor should I. I could not ignore the feelings that I had and it occurred to me that maybe my feelings were not very different from those who were more directly involved. Maybe I was only experiencing what others were also. This being the case, then it was certainly not something to hide away, or extinguish but something that could give me a deeper understanding of how difficult the situation was for those at the centre of it (Wilson et al., 1999, p. 13).

By not dismissing my emotionality as irrelevant I was able to take the role of the other, but also gain a new self consciousness of my research process, and about myself as a qualitative researcher. Furthermore I believe my exposure of the emotionality entailed by my ethnographic research, serves only to increase the rigour of my research.

**Representation**

In my research I represent a diverse group of people including some students with disabilities. For me this raises the ethical issue of representation because some disabled people (see Oliver, 1990) have raised concerns about non-disabled researchers representing them and speaking with authority on their behalf. Furthermore they argue that this has objectified those with disabilities and has led to increased oppression. According to Cocks (1998) "those of us who work in human services need to be particularly conscious of the responsibility we assume when we speak on behalf of vulnerable people or in their name" (p. 17). In this regard Biklen has highlighted the role of the researcher as the privileged observer who acts as the signifier of the worth of the study (Biklen, 1999).

For me this means that I have a responsibility to represent my participants with respect and dignity. I am required to be aware that my findings are not
only my participants' perspectives but are also imbued with my interpretations and decisions on the way those perspectives are presented. In relation to disability, although I do not have a disability myself I think it is important that this research be done. I do not think that only those with a disability should undertake the research I have conducted. On a pragmatic level this would not only restrict the amount of research that was done in this area for purely logistical reasons, but also I think it is important that able-bodied people involve themselves in addressing the oppression that those with disabilities face in our society. I believe my study is one small way of doing this. Having said this, I do not pretend to understand what it is like for those with disabilities but I can try to be respectful of them, and not abuse the privilege that has been given to me to undertake research on their behalf.

According to Alcoff (1995) speaking for others is problematic, and so too then is speaking about others. She calls this a "crisis of representation" because "in both the practice of speaking for and the practice of speaking about others, I am engaging in the act of representing the others' needs, goals, situation, and in fact, who they are, based on my own situated interpretation" (p.100). I would challenge this use of the word crisis because, whilst I would never dispute that the researcher must always be careful of his/her own bias and interpretations, the very role of researcher means that I will always represent and speak about others. This is why ethical procedures are important and reflection on the process crucial. I would argue that once the researcher distributes an information sheet to a participant and a participant signs a consent form to participate in a study, they are handing over the right of representation to the researcher. This is not to suggest however, that the participant is then devoid of any control or comeback.

Facing My Own Assumptions

A qualitative approach requires the researcher to not only challenge their taken-for-granted understandings but also to reflect on their own perspectives and assumptions which they bring to the research and continue to draw on throughout the research process. Maykut & Morehouse draw on the work of Katz to introduce a process called "epoche" to address this issue. They state that according to Katz:
*Epocche* is a process that the researcher engages in to remove, or at least become aware of prejudices, viewpoints, or assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation. *Epocche* helps enable the researcher to investigate the phenomenon from a fresh and open view without pre-judgement or imposing meaning too soon. This suspension in judgement is critical in phenomenological investigation and requires the setting aside of the researcher’s personal viewpoint in order to experience for itself (Katz 1987 cited in Maykut & Morehouse, 1996, p. 123).

I would argue that it is not possible for one to put one's personal viewpoint aside because one's interpretations and the way one presents findings are always imbued with one's own perspectives and understandings. However, what I can do as a researcher is attempt to be as transparent as possible, to allow the reader to understand some of the assumptions and biases that inform my interpretations and representations of my participants. My introductory story of how I became involved and interested in the area of disability is one way of providing some insight into my position but does not go far enough. I am also required I believe to challenge my own assumptions continually throughout the research process and beyond. I need to be as explicit as possible for the reader, concerning the initial assumptions that I brought to my research, and the theoretical approach that underpinned my interpretations of what I saw and the way I wrote about it.

By attempting to do this however, I am placing myself as the researcher, in a somewhat paradoxical position. On the one hand I am required to try and understand the meanings constructed by others and on the other I need to be aware of how my own perspectives and understandings influenced the way I interacted with my participants and interpreted what I was witnessing (Maykut & Morehouse, 1996). Thus I am trying to be as honest as I can throughout my research process, yet also undermining myself by laying out my inadequacies in terms of the perspectives and assumptions I bring to this research. I believe this is necessary though in order to bring credibility to my research.

Before I entered the field, I drew on the approach Jones (1991, p. 23) had taken and I wrote myself a memo about my presuppositions at that point, so I could revisit them throughout the process. I will present it here now and discuss each area as a partial way of fulfilling my aim.
Memo: 23.10.96  pre-conceptions
(Comments in italics were written on 23.10.96)

**assumptions**

I need to be aware of my own assumptions about schools, like for example that they find it difficult to accept children with disabilities and that there are in fact barriers to inclusion at all secondary schools. Also I assume these barriers are not just at the classroom level but are on a much wider scale. I assume schools put up barriers by their organization, practices and general philosophies. Government policy and social structure in society generally also generate these barriers. These are my assumptions and they will affect how I interpret what I see.

My assumptions as stated above played out in practice. I have to acknowledge that maybe I was drawn more to looking for these barriers than I would have been, had my assumptions been different.

**flexibility**

I will need to be very flexible. What happens at the school may be quite unrelated to my project and I will have to accept this and go with it. This will not be easy.

During my data collection it became clear to me that inclusion was not just about the students with disabilities but required defining on a much broader basis. Whilst my focus remained with the students who had been labelled as disabled, my interest shifted to include everyone, especially all of the students who had been defined by the school as at-risk.

**agendas**

What is my agenda? I believe strongly in inclusion. I want to see it happen in all educational settings. This may hinder my research because of the intensity of my feelings. But then I recognise this up front and I will build this into my research question. So I will not be trying to pretend something different. However I must be careful that I do not lose sight of what is really happening in my search for the "answers". The participants will also be aware of this from the start. So will my agenda match that of the participants or the school? How will the school become involved and how will I handle this?

I believe I was always honest and open about my belief in inclusion to my participants. I remember being surprised when several of my key informants made the assumption that I had known Jamie and Lee and their families for a long period of time and in a capacity unrelated to my research. Reflecting on this, I think it in part demonstrates my openness about my own beliefs in relation to supporting Jamie's and Lee's parents stand on inclusion.
researcher know thyself:
I must be aware of my "power" and the possibility that I may be seen as the "expert". Hold my tongue, even when I want to voice my opinion. Be prepared to re-negotiate my position throughout. What do I do if I am asked for guidance, for say introducing co-operative learning strategies? Do I step in, refer them to literature or keep right out of it?

I was ever aware that I may be perceived as an expert by some, and strove not to put myself in this position. It was not something that I found I could be prescriptive about though. I did not volunteer my opinion but at times I was asked my advice about inclusive practices and I saw this as an opportunity for reciprocity on my part and so I got resources for staff and helped design an IEP form for the school to use. I took particular care to not place myself the position of expert with parents, and would explicitly say that I was learning and valued their knowledge. I became very adept with students at playing the 'naive' researcher especially on the basis that the students were at the school more frequently than me. I also tried not to assume that I knew what participants meant and queried taken-for-granted meanings. According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992) it is important that as a researcher, you set aside assumptions and pretensions that "you know what your respondents mean when they tell you something, rather than seek explanations about what they mean" (p. 80).

In summary this chapter has interwoven different theoretical perspectives that were utilised for this study. By drawing on a social constructionist epistemology I was able to combine macro- and micro-level theories for understanding the lives and perspectives of the people in this study. Firstly I have outlined interpretivism, a theory that has its strengths in understandings at the micro-level, followed by radical humanism which looks beyond day to day interaction to the macro-level. Both of these theoretical frameworks inform the analysis of the findings. The second section of the chapter addressed theoretical issues that related to my method. Firstly I explained my rationale for using a qualitative approach and symbolic interactionism that underpinned it. In the final section of the chapter I discussed rigour in relation to credibility, trustworthiness and emotionality, representation of others and lastly a section on facing my own assumptions. In this way I was able to reflect on issues that related to the research process.
OVERVIEW OF PROCEDURE

My thesis is an ethnographic study of a co-educational state secondary school and its support systems including state and charity funded organisations. As is consistent with qualitative research methodology, I have drawn on an interpretivist paradigm which is underpinned by a social constructionist epistemology. My theoretical perspectives draw mainly on symbolic interactionism (Crotty, 1998) and radical humanism (Skrtic, 1995). I used three data collecting techniques in my study: participant observations, semi-structured interviews and document analysis. This allowed for greater understanding of both my participants' perspectives and contextual factors (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). All data were analysed using the qualitative technique of modified analytic induction (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research took a two pronged approach in that there were several broad questions which were then underpinned by a number of more specific ones. The following outlines both sets of questions:

(i) **What do the stakeholders understand about inclusion as it applies to students with disabilities and to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework?**

1. What do all of the stakeholders understand by "inclusion" and "inclusive practices"?

2. What does the Ministry of Education mean in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework document by an "inclusive curriculum" and does it converge with the definition of "inclusive education" that will be utilised in this study?

3. What are the barriers to "inclusive practices" in relation to the Curriculum Framework?
4. What parts of the document support "inclusion" and what parts work against it?

5. What was the brief or terms of reference given to the Curriculum writers by the Ministry?

6. What are the legal requirements of schools in relation to implementing an "inclusive curriculum" as outlined in the Framework document for students with disabilities?

7. If the philosophy of the Curriculum Framework supports "inclusion" or "inclusive practices", is there a role for segregated special units/schools under this framework?

(ii) What are the implications of a policy of inclusion for practice?

1. What does inclusion mean for students with disabilities at a Christchurch secondary school?

2. What are the barriers to inclusion at a mainstreamed secondary school for the students, families and the school itself?

3. What part does the New Zealand Curriculum Framework play in all of this?

4. Do the claims of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework work in practice for students with disabilities?

PARTICIPANTS AND SETTING

This section focuses on my participants and the settings in which I conducted my research. My descriptions of participants and settings will be restricted due to issues of anonymity and confidentiality. I will describe people only through sub-groups of assigned roles, that is, student, management staff, state representative. I will not describe my perceptions of individuals' characteristics, unless it has particular meaning or relevance
for my findings. Even then I will attempt to do this with the utmost care and be as descriptive as is possible because it is extremely difficult to be non-evaluative or non-judgmental when describing people (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998).

Participants

My study involved participants from three different sectors of the community:
(a) members of a local school community which consisted of the following sub-groups:
   (i) students
   (ii) school staff
   (iii) parents
(b) representatives of the state;
(c) representatives of school support agencies.

(a) School Community

The school community included students, staff and parents. Whilst I had consent from specific people related to the school to participate in my study (School Board of Trustees (Governance), Principal (Management and acting loco parentis) and Staffing Committee), the qualitative nature of my investigation to undertake an ethnography in their school, meant that in effect all students, teachers, support staff, and parents with whom I interacted became participants in my study.

(i) Students
As stated I had the opportunity to observe and interact informally with most students in the school over the time spent in the school. The students at the school were graded into Years Nine (approximate ages 13/14) to Years Thirteen (approximate ages 17/18). My main participants were in the classes that I observed: one Year Nine class; an alternative Year Eleven class (meaning that the expectation was that these students would not sit the national exam, School Certificate in that subject at the end of the year) and two special unit classes. This meant a wide diversity of students in terms of
class, gender, race, disability, and other defining characteristics. The Year Nine class I was attached to, (3BR) started the year with 27 students.

The composition of the class in relation to students identified as "special needs" or "at-risk" are explained in the table that follows. The students categorised as at-risk had been done so by the At-risk Committee in the school. Their working definition of at-risk included "students who are struggling with classroom learning and students who have unacceptable behaviours in the classroom" (see Appendix Number 1) whereas the labelling of students as "special needs" had resulted from their categorisation under section nine of the Education Act and subsequent agreements with the Ministry of Education.

Table 1: Status of Special Needs and At-risk Students in 3BR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Categorised</th>
<th>Other Status</th>
<th>Time Spent in 3BR class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>at-risk</td>
<td>3BR only</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>at-risk</td>
<td>3BR only</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemi</td>
<td>at-risk</td>
<td>3BR only</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>at-risk &amp; special needs</td>
<td>3BR only</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>at-risk &amp; special needs</td>
<td>3BR only</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>special needs</td>
<td>PDU mainstreamed</td>
<td>one class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>special needs</td>
<td>PDU mainstreamed</td>
<td>two classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>special needs</td>
<td>IDU mainstreamed</td>
<td>most classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

PDU (*Physically Disabled Unit*)

IDU (*Intellectually Disabled Unit*)

This meant that Michael, Raymond and Laura were enrolled in the units attached to the school and mainstreamed into 3BR for some classes. Jamie and Lee, on the other hand were enrolled as regular students because their parents had forfeited the special unit option under the section nine agreement at secondary school level so as to ensure their children's inclusion.
The Year Eleven alternative class had a transient population that changed quite dramatically over the period that I observed. It began with twelve students, eleven of whom, were male. These students were either Pakeha, Maori or Pacific Islanders. Over the year many students were either suspended, officially excluded or left the school and the class population changed to include mostly ESOL students. Of the original twelve at the start of the year, only three remained by the end of the year.

Of the two special units on site at the school, I spent most time observing in one of the intellectually disabled unit classes. The students in this class ranged from Year Nine to Year Twelve. I observed the students from the physically disabled unit mostly during lunch breaks when I would often sit with them outside the unit building. Many students were in wheelchairs and although I chatted with most of them, I was able to communicate only in a very limited way with some students who were non-verbal.

(ii) Staff
As with the students, I had the opportunity to interact informally with a large number of teachers in the school over the period of my data collection. Of the nine class teachers who agreed to be participants, six held other positions within the school, with three of them holding Head of Department status and one being part of the management team. There was an even coverage in subjects taught by class teachers in relation to academic and non-academic areas. Other staff who agreed to be participants were the two resource teachers, a teacher aide, all members of the management team (Principal, Deputy Principal and the Assistant Principal), the Heads of Department for both the Intellectually Disabled Unit and the Physically Disabled Unit and a Guidance Counsellor. Prue, the resource teacher, (whom I observed during school time once a week) also taught in the Intellectually Disabled Unit and took a fifth form alternative class.

(iii) Parents
Five sets of parents (either one or both parents of a particular student) participated in my study. All parents interviewed had children with labelled disabilities. Four sets of parents had children in the year nine class (3BR) that I observed (Jamie, Lee, Raymond and Michael); the other parent
was on the Board of Trustees and had a student enrolled in the Intellectually Disabled Unit.

b) State Representatives

My three participants from the state sector can be defined in terms of local or national organisations and Ministerial or subsidiary. They worked in areas that related to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, Special Education 2000 Policy and its implementation. One participant had been previously involved as a curriculum writer of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. My participant at the subsidiary agency of the state worked in the area of at-risk or special needs.

c) Support Agencies

My seven participants from outside agencies also worked at either local or national levels. Some of the agencies were state funded whilst the rest were funded through charity organisations. These agencies provided student support to all schools but specifically to my case study secondary school. School support involved helping with severe student behavioural difficulties (Youth Education Services), student mental health issues (Youth Speciality Services, Presbyterian Support Services), needs and advice for special education students (Special Education Services), parent and systems disability advocacy (IHC and NZCCS), and care and protection/control and justice issues (Children and Young Persons Support Services).

Access To Participant Groups

Gaining access and recruiting participants resulted in slightly different approaches being undertaken depending on the sub-group involved and the type of data being collected.

a) School Community

When gaining access to a secondary school I did so with specific criteria in mind. Firstly, I wanted to be able to approach a school on the basis of a "Sociology of Acceptance". This theoretical approach has criticised
sociologists who have traditionally focused on difference as something "deviant" and only ever recounted negative examples of stigmatization and exclusion as though inclusive practices never occur. Sociologists, this approach says, have

found it difficult to account for the caring relationship that exist between people who are different and typical people. They have not studied successful attempts by human service workers to integrate people who are demonstrably different into the community. Further, they have largely ignored communities that do not exclude and literature that documents acceptance. (Bogdan & Taylor, 1987, p. 35).

I wanted to undertake research that provided a balance in terms of inclusion. By this I mean that whilst I assumed that there would be contextual factors that would hinder inclusion I also wanted to be able to document positive examples of inclusive practices and so it was important that the school I chose was welcoming to people with disabilities. A sociology of acceptance permitted me to do this. According to Bogdan and Taylor a sociology of acceptance is

directed toward understanding not only how people with deviant attributes come to be accepted in personal relations, but also in groups, organizations, communities, and society (Groce, 1985). ... the sociology of acceptance reflects on incidents where human service programs integrate people who might otherwise be isolated, excluded, or segregated from typical people. A fully developed sociology of acceptance would look at societal, institutional, and organizational conditions that are related to acceptance. It would try to account for differences in modes and frequency of acceptance from society to society (Edgerton, 1970), community to community, group to group, and situation to situation (1987, pp. 35-36).

Secondly, my decision as to which school I would try to negotiate access with hinged on the decision made by Jamie's and Lee's parents, about which school their children would attend. As outlined in my introduction chapter, I had been part of the preliminary enrolment interviews with them at a number of schools in the city. Both families wished to be involved in a school which openly welcomed and practised inclusive practices. Once the parents had made the decision to send their children to Westside High School I began negotiations with the Principal for the school
to become the case study site for my research. At a preliminary meeting with him, I was also introduced to the Deputy Principal. Both expressed interest in my research proposal and agreed for the school to be involved on the basis that I obtained written approval from the Board of Trustees and the school staffing committee. Once receiving written permission from the Board of Trustees I made arrangements to speak with the staffing committee. Simultaneously, I felt elated and terrified. I had approval at the governance and management level but realised that my study would only be viable if those who I would potentially be observing on a day to day basis felt comfortable about my project. I was also mindful of the conundrum that arises when deciding where to start access negotiations. As Glesne and Peshkin say:

it is risky to start anywhere but at the top of the hierarchy because acceptance by those in the lower ranks may be negated by those higher up. Yet it is also risky to gain acceptance at the top because others may feel ordered to cooperate or may think you are somehow politically aligned with one of several factions (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, pp. 33-34).

I attended the staffing committee meeting and interpreted the many questions I received both as a sign that they were engaging with my proposal but also as an indication of some resistance. I was unable to ascertain what the motivations were that lay behind this resistance. I could only speculate as to whether they were ‘testing me out’ because I was not a teacher and therefore was an immediate “outsider”, or if, as Glesne and Peshkin suggest they thought I was aligned to a particular faction of thought or group within the school.

I was to find out much later that the transitional shift towards inclusive practices were management-led and very recent in the school. My ease of access therefore, could well have been due to the converging of my philosophy in relation to inclusive practices with those in the most powerful positions in the school. I had been open about supporting inclusive practices and the school was now in the process of introducing an "inclusive" model that was deemed high stakes in terms of its success. My involvement could well have been perceived as an "outsider" legitimating the changes for management. Putting this speculation aside, I can only hope that the letter of approval I received from the staffing committee was a sign
that I had alleviated possible concerns they had about staff involvement in my study.

(i) Students
Next I set about negotiating the best options in terms of what was going to be logistically possible in relation to accessing students, as well as being agreeable to the school staff. The Deputy Principal introduced me to the Heads of Departments of the two special units. Jeff, who was responsible for the Intellectually Disabled Unit, was also the Year Nine Dean. Additionally, he was a member of a staff committee that had been set up for at-risk students, that included Jamie and Lee. I discussed possibilities of student participants with him. I explained that I had consent from Jamie’s and Lee’s parents and wanted to observe them but also the class as a whole rather than them individually. I also wanted to include any mainstreamed students if possible. Jeff suggested Michael and Raymond, two students who would be mainstreamed into the same class from the Physically Disabled Unit and suggested that I speak with the Head of the Physically Disabled Unit. This I proceeded to do and she agreed to contact the parents on my behalf and send out my information sheet and consent form. Both Michael’s and Raymond’s parents agreed for their children to participate in the study.

(ii) Staff
I negotiated class teacher access into the Year Nine classes through the Deputy Principal over the year. This was necessary because the students changed subjects and some teachers every 6 weeks. This meant that some subjects were taught only for one 6 week time slot whilst others were taught all year. By gaining access through the Deputy Principal I felt teachers could more easily refuse to participate than if I spoke to them face to face. Although I had gained access into most classes I was always aware that this position could at any time change. As Glesne and Peshkin pertinently state "gaining access is an initial undertaking, but maintaining access is another matter; it may be occasioned by changes that occur in the expectations and needs of both researcher and researched at any time in the course of the research process" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 34). Information sheets were issued and consent forms signed by all participants (see
Appendix Number 2 and Appendix Number 3 for template examples of my information sheet and consent form).

In one particular instance a class teacher had been slow to return the consent form although I was assured by the Deputy Principal that he was happy to participate in my study. I arrived at the class and checked with him to see if this was still the case. I was told I could observe for that class but doubt was cast as to whether I could do so in the future because he told me that Jamie and Lee were not staying in that class. As it happened they did remain in the class but as a signed consent form was not returned to me at this time, I made no further attempts to negotiate access. Later in the year the same teacher took the Year Nine class for another subject and at that time agreed for me to observe in the classroom and later was also willing to be interviewed.

When discussing access to students and classes with Jeff, the Head of the Intellectually Disabled Unit, I also asked about observing a teacher. Jeff suggested Prue, the resource teacher as a possibility for me to observe. She was Jamie and Lee's resource teacher, and also taught in the unit as well as taking an alternative fifth form class. He suggested he talk with her on my behalf, and so I left an information sheet and consent form with him. Prue agreed to participate but I followed this up with a conversation directly with her to ensure she felt comfortable about me observing her teaching. We discussed when would be a good time and she suggested once a week when she worked both in the unit and took the Year Eleven class.

(iii) Parents
My initial contact with Jamie's and Lee's parents was before my study started, as indicated in my introduction chapter. After they had enrolled their children into Westside High School, I rang both families and asked if I could send them an information sheet and consent form about my study. In this way, I felt I gave them the opportunity to choose not to participate if they so desired. At a later stage after they had agreed, I contacted them again and requested interviews with them. Both families agreed.

In Michael's and Raymond's cases, once I had received back the consent forms that the Head of the Physically Disabled Unit had sent out on my
behalf, I rang their parents. I discussed my study with them and advised them I would make contact with them at a later date. This I did and requested interviews. Again, they both agreed.

When accessing a parent representative from the Board of Trustees, I spoke to the Deputy Principal first for possible participants. He gave me one of the trustee's telephone numbers and I rang her to discuss my project. We agreed that I would send out the information sheet/consent form and my proposed questions for her consideration. At a later time, she rang me and agreed to be interviewed.

b) State Agencies

I gained access to state representatives initially via the telephone. I explained my doctoral study to each potential participant by way of a 'cover story' (using the questions developed by Glesne and Peshkin (1992)) and thus requested an interview. According to Glesne and Peshkin "a cover story does more than tell what your study is about; it prepares your others to take part most effectively for data collection. All cover stories address ...twelve points" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 32). (See Appendix Number 4 for format and Appendix Number 4A for an example). No requests for interviews were refused and so I continued to use this strategy when interviewing local and national state representatives. I offered to send each prospective participant a list of my proposed questions before the interviews and asked them to contact me if they had queries or concerns about any of the proposed questions.

c) Support Agencies

The support agencies I accessed had been referred to me by the school as agencies that the school used regularly. Sometimes I was also given the name of a person to contact. I followed the same procedure with the cover story and mailing out of questions as I had with the state agencies.
Settings

When gathering data in the secondary school there was a wide range of different settings. These are described below. Conversely, when collecting data from participants who were either representatives of the state or support agencies for schools, this occurred in only one setting.

a) School Community

For reasons of confidentiality I am restricted as to what I can say about the demographics of the school. What I perceive to be of particular relevance to my study is that the secondary school was urban, co-educational, small in relation to other co-educational state high schools in the city and in a middle to low socio-economic status area. There were two units for students with disabilities at the school: one for physically disabled and the other for intellectually disabled students. As is common in poorer communities, the school had a disproportionate number of students from marginalised groups in comparison to other schools in across-town suburbs. This included minority ethnic groups and students from working class backgrounds. The school had seen many staff changes over recent years, including at management level. The school had not always had positive media support but was recovering from a falling pupil roll.

There was a range of settings within the school community depending on sub-groups and type of data collected. When I was undertaking participant observations in the school, I observed many different school events in many physical settings. In contrast, interview sites were much more static depending on which sub-group was being interviewed.

Settings when observing
I had access to all public places within the school and attended and undertook participant observations in many different school-wide events. These included the following regular and special events:

- Regular school occurrences
  Assembly- Year Nine Level & School
  Bi-Weekly Tutor Group
At-risk Committee Meetings
Playground breaks/lunchtime/canteen
Staffroom

• Special Events
  1996 Year Nine's Parents' Night
  1997 Year Nine's Powhiri/Assembly
  1997 End Of Year Prize Giving
  1997 Year Nine Speech Semi Finals
  1997 School Fair
  1997/1998 IEP Meetings
  1998 Year Nines' First Assembly
  1998 Whanau Sports Day

Additionally, when observing the Year Nine class and also the resource
teacher, I observed in classrooms as well as in many different out of class
settings including the library, gymnasium, computer room and at the
swimming pool.

Settings when interviewing
When interviewing sub-groups within the school, the settings differed
according to status of participants and individual preference.

(i) Students
All student interviews were conducted in a small private conference room.
This was attached to a technology block and had an oval table in it with
eight cloth covered chairs around it. There were also coffee-making
facilities and a bench down one side. Two sides of the room had
whiteboards on them and there were two doorways at opposite ends of the
room. This specific space was kept locked when not in use and restricted to
staff only and so was unfamiliar to the students.

(ii) Staff
The settings for staff interviews ranged within the school according to staff
preference. Three Heads of Departments and all management staff
interviews occurred in their own office space. This meant that they sat
either at or behind their desk and I sat the other side of the desk. Other
settings used were the conference room that was also used for students, an empty office space, the staff room and in one case (due to unavailability during school time) at a staff member's home. The staff room setting was only used once as it was unsatisfactory due to interruptions, despite being during class time. I found out about the conference room after interviewing the Head of that Department and subsequently used it as much as possible as it was quiet and private.

(iii) Parents
All parent interviews occurred in their own home in a space of their choosing. This was however constrained by the need to be near a power point for the tape recorder. Settings ranged from being informal by sitting in easy chairs in lounge settings with participants to semi-informal by sitting at the dining room table in the living room. During most interviews brothers and sisters were present in the house but were either in bed or in other rooms.

b) Representatives from the State
All field work with participants from local or national state agencies occurred at their place of work. In every case this was in an assigned interview or conference room. At the local level, this meant in a small room with chairs and a low table in between myself and my participant. In contrast, at the national level, the setting was more formalised. In one case it was a room specifically for the purposes of interviewing with a high table between myself and my participant. In the other case, it was a board room with a large oval table in the centre of the room with high back chairs all around. In this setting, the three state representatives being interviewed sat down one end of the table at either side, with me in between at the end of the table.

c) Support Agencies
As with the state agency representatives, all field work with support agencies occurred on site. Settings ranged from being in representatives' own offices to small interview or conference rooms. In most cases settings were semi-formal, in that I was able to choose where I sat and either a small
table was between the participant and myself or to one side for the use of the tape recorder.

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection was undertaken in three ways: participant observations; in-depth qualitative interviews with stakeholders; and document analysis. I spent a period of sixteen months collecting data and this generated approximately 500 pages of participant observations, covering a period of five terms; and approximately 1000 pages of interview transcripts from participants. I also kept two folders with school information in it. In one I enclosed internal documents collected over that time. This included curriculum notes I had taken in classes, school newsletters, timetable changes, my sketch plans and other notices I had collected. In the other folder I kept the official school-wide documents I had requested, such as school policies, ERO report, strategic planning document, budget figures and media coverage of the school over my data collection period. I also maintained a log book in which I recorded thoughts and reflections, memos, supervision notes, and preliminary coding from when I first enrolled for my Ph.D until I finished writing my thesis.

Participant Observation

Participant observations were a technique that allowed me to obtain rich descriptive data through spending substantial amounts of time in the school listening to people's spoken words, engaging in conversations with participants and observing their activities and behaviour. According to Taylor and Bogdan (1984) "in participant observation studies researchers try to convey a sense of 'being there' and experiencing settings first-hand" (p. 124). Over a period of a year and a half, my intermittent attendance at the school allowed me to experience life at the school as my participants may have experienced it. I moved between "doing" student activities to "doing" staff activities. I attended and participated in classes like other students, "hung out" in the playground during breaks and also spent time in the staffroom with the teachers and attended both At-risk Committee meetings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings. Whilst I had a focus on
students with disabilities, my participant observations involved observing everything occurring in the setting I was in at the time.

Procedure

When undertaking qualitative participant observations, I made broad descriptive observations initially in order to get an overview of the social setting and what was happening in it. After leaving the site on each occasion I wrote up my descriptions of the observations on the computer as soon as was possible. In my fieldnotes I kept separate my interpretations, hunches and reflections by recording these in italics as separate paragraphs headed up as "Observer's Comments". These comments were to inform my propositions at a later time. When observing I did not take notes in the field except when it was part of a class activity, (such as copying from the board) or sketching seating arrangements. I maintained a folder for this which I took to classes. I took extreme care not to record anything in the folder about participants in case I mislaid it, or as did happen students asked to see what was in it. (I willingly showed them so they could see I was not checking up on them).

Frequency

Participant observations began when negotiating access meetings with the school. I also attended the 1996 Year Nine parents' night prior to observing in the school itself. Within the school I undertook participant observations initially on a full-time basis (8.45 am-3.15 pm each week day). I had decided to try to enhance my acceptance by the students in the Year Nine class by starting with them on the first day of the school year. In this way I thought we could be new together and I would be there right from the start. I continued to observe every week day for two weeks. I spent four of the five days with 3BR and one day a week observing the classes taken by Prue, the resource teacher. This involved observing in both the unit class as well as in the resource room of the IDU and in the Year Eleven English class. After having a break for 3 weeks (to present at an overseas conference) I reduced the number of days I attended the school to three (one with the resource teacher and two with 3BR). This was because the long periods of time spent observing meant that it soon became difficult to keep abreast of writing up
my fieldnotes. I maintained an average of three days a week during term time at the school for most of the year. The following year I undertook follow-up observations but these were confined to the playground and staffroom (due to the composition of the class being dramatically changed the following year) or IEP meetings.

**Interviews**

I utilised qualitative interviewing as one of my data collection techniques to provide me with greater understanding of my participants' perspectives, to give them an opportunity to speak, to enable me to follow up, and to clarify my interpretations from my observations. In addition, this method was consistent with my theoretical approach. According to Bishop:

> Semi-structured, in-depth interviews promote free interaction and opportunities for clarification and discussion between research participants through the use of open-ended questions rather than closed questions. ... Further, reflection of meaning rather than asking an interviewee to choose from a range of options predetermined and presented by an interviewer will better promote an interaction of ideas between the people participating in the interview (1997, p. 33).

**Procedure**

Formal interviewing consisted of face-to-face audio-taped one hour (minimum) sessions between myself and participants in order to understand their perspectives on their lives, experiences or situations (see Appendix Number 4B for example of interview guide). All interviews were transcribed and returned to participants to provide them with the opportunity to make amendments, comments or to withdraw any or all of the data. I conducted 40 interviews, mostly with individuals, but some participants were interviewed in small groups. This resulted in a total of 46 different people being interviewed. Several groups were interviewed twice, once at the start of my data collection and then at its completion. This included both Jamie's and Lee's parents; the Principal and Deputy Principal; and a representative from the Ministry of Education. All other participants were interviewed once. A breakdown of the number of interviews by group is as follows: National agencies (4); Local agencies (8); School staff (14); Students (13); and Parents (7).
The number of participants interviewed at the same time varied. In the case of parents, this was left to them to decide. After arranging an interview with a parent, I would arrive to find in some cases both parents there for the interview or only one. In one instance I arrived to meet two parents but one sat away from where we were sitting until I asked her to join in, which she agreed to do.

In contrast to this, when I arranged two separate interviews at the Ministry of Education, one after the other, I arrived to be told that they had decided to combine the interviews and I could interview them together. A third person sat in and took notes. I was however, able to re-negotiate extra time with one of the interviewees on his own after the first interview. The presence of three state representatives unnerved me at the time as a new researcher and left me feeling overpowered. I could only speculate at the time as to what the purpose of changing the arrangements had been and of having a notetaker present. At a later time when interviewing another Ministerial representative (but this time from the local office) I was told that the Ministry utilised a "communication strategy" whereby staff were told what to say to ensure the same information was given out by all offices. On reflection therefore, it seems possible that by ensuring that both Ministerial representatives were present during my interview each was able to listen to the other's position on every issue discussed. Furthermore I had not provided either interviewee with a list of the questions prior to the interview, due to it being in the very early stages of my data collection. (Subsequently after a prospective interviewee requested me to do so later into my data collection, I undertook to send copies of the types of questions I would be asking to all participants prior to the interview).

All other national and local agencies' interviews were with individuals. This was also the case with all school staff but I chose to interview students in small groups of no more than four. I did this so that they would feel more comfortable and in an attempt to create a more informal atmosphere. When I asked the students in 3BR to be interviewed, I asked that they write down between one and three names of other students with whom they would like to be interviewed. I assured them that they would be interviewed with these people if everyone had agreed on the same names.
Otherwise I told them I may have to split them. So if a student nominated three students but only one of those students listed that person as well, then I would interview them as a pair. As it happened all combinations of students listed each other and so no reconstructing of groups or renegotiations were required. Half of 3BR agreed to be interviewed and of this, twelve were female and one was male: Jamie. I can only speculate about this. Possibly it is due to me being female, and that I established better rapport with the girls than the boys. Also pertinent however, at this time was that there were only six male students remaining in the class apart from Jamie, Michael and Raymond. Lee had been shifted earlier in the year and I did not interview either Raymond or Michael because they were both non-verbal and I lacked the necessary skills to be able to interview them.

The interviews at the school were based on initial data analysis of the participant observations. This meant that interviews were semi-structured because the questions had been formulated from initial concepts and themes that had emerged from the data. Also in many instances the questions centred around points of clarification and/or my attempts to understand more fully the themes that were emerging and things that I had observed previously. I still, however ensured flexibility during interviews by adopting a semi-structured approach.

Rationale For Interviews

The following provides the rationale for my choices of interviewees.

State/Support Agencies

An important aim underpinning this study was to make connections between policy and practice and for this reason I thought it important to start my study by interviewing representatives at the Ministry of Education in the areas of curriculum and special education. At the same time I was also able to gain a viewpoint from a national disability advocacy agency who worked with schools nation-wide. I saw this as important as it gave me insight into how things might be happening in practice and some of the issues that the aforementioned organisation dealt with in relation to inclusion and schools. I knew also that some of my participants were members of this organisation. As part of a snowballing effect, this contact provided me with an opportunity to interview a representative who
provided professional development courses on special education at a College of Education. The special education diploma was the same as that being taught in the city where I was undertaking my research and so it provided important insights into the theoretical models being taught to special education teachers in New Zealand.

School

My initial interviews at the school with two members of the management team were undertaken on the rationale that as the leaders and managers of the school, they were responsible for the implementation of the vision and goals of the school on a day to day basis. It was therefore important to gain an understanding of the meanings they attached to inclusion, inclusive practices and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework in practice over time.

My decisions about which staff to interview at the school were based on those I observed and with whom I interacted. In addition because my interview questions were based on my initial analysis of the data, I invited all the class teachers and the teacher aide who I observed in 3BR to be interviewed. Six of the Year Nine class teachers, whose classes I observed in, agreed to be interviewed. Two of those who did not agree were on leave at the time I undertook my interviews but were still participants in my study.

In addition, Jamie and Lee along with the other students in 3BR who had been categorised as "at-risk" by the school, were overseen at a school level by a newly formed At-risk Committee. This committee included all resource teachers, as well as the guidance counsellor and senior staff. I attended a number of meetings and asked all members of the committee to be interviewed. In relation to the students, whilst my specific focus was on students with disabilities, my understanding and the way I defined inclusion meant that I was simultaneously interested in understanding the inclusion of all of the students in the class.

Interviewing Drawbacks

One of the drawbacks I found with interviewing occurred particularly when I conducted them in pairs or groups. Whilst on one hand it potentially had the effect of making it less threatening for individuals, it was problematic in
terms of some participants dominating others for speaking time but also possibly in opinions. I found that often during student interviews, the more vocal students would dominate the conversation and the quieter ones required drawing out by me. Although I was able to direct questions at specific people for some of the time, it is difficult to ascertain how much and in what way the responses by individual students were directly influenced by their peers' presence.

**Document Analysis**

Bogdan and Biklen, (1998) state that documents can "serve as sources of rich descriptions of how the people who produced the materials think about their world" (p. 133). For my study I obtained a variety of documents for analysis: official documents; internal documents and external communication. My focus centred on looking for all general references to inclusion or inclusive practices in the documents and in relation particularly to students with disabilities.

**Official documents**

I analysed two types of official documents: state policy documents and school-wide documents. According to Bogdan & Biklen (1998), official literature gets the researcher access "to the official perspective," as well as to the ways various school personnel communicate" (p. 137). In terms of state documents my focus has been on the New Zealand Curriculum Framework official documents, and Special Education policies particularly information relating to the implementation of Special Education 2000. At the school I drew on official school policies, the school charter, strategic plans, budgets, job descriptions and other school records to provide me with a framework of stated intentions. Analysis of documentation of this nature also provided me with an historical and contextual dimension for my study (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

**Internal Documents To The School**

By analysing memos and communication circulated within the school I was able to gain some insight into leadership styles and the organisation of the school (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). I also undertook content analysis on
Jamie's school books and reports as a way of adding to my understanding of his thinking and that of his class teachers during my data collection period.

**External Communication By The School**

I collected and analysed documents that exposed the public face of the school and the messages that either the school itself attempted to portray or the way other sources, such as the media portrayed them. These included school newsletters, a yearbook and newspaper clippings.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

My research approach was based on "interpretive-descriptive" analysis (Belenky, (1992) cited in Maykut & Morehouse, 1996). This involves the researcher

accurately describing what she or he has understood, reconstructing the data into a 'recognizable reality' for the people who have participated in the study. This [second] approach requires some selection and interpretation of the data, and the skilled researcher using this approach becomes adept as 'weaving descriptions, speaker's words, fieldnote quotations, and their own interpretations into a rich and believable descriptive narrative' (1990: 22) (Strauss & Corbin cited in Maykut & Morehouse, 1996, p. 122).

As it was a qualitative study my data analysis was an ongoing process throughout the research (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Maykut and Morehouse (1996) explain the process as "fundamentally a nonmathematical analytical procedure that involves examining the meaning of people's words and actions. Qualitative research findings are inductively derived from this data" (p. 121). By this they mean:

Hypotheses are not generated a priori and thus the relevant variables for data collection are not predetermined. The data are not grouped according to predetermined categories. Rather, what becomes important to analyze emerges from the data itself, out of a process of inductive reasoning (Maykut & Morehouse, 1996, pp. 126-127).

In my study I have used a method of modified analytic induction as defined by Bogdan and Biklen. They explain it as an approach for "collecting and
analyzing data as well as a way to develop and test a theory" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 63). Accordingly, the following steps are required:

1. Early in the research you develop a rough definition and explanation of the particular phenomenon.
2. You hold the definition and explanation up to the data as they are collected.
3. You modify the definition and/or explanation as you encounter new cases that do not fit the definition and explanation as formulated.
4. You actively seek cases that you think may not fit into the formulation.
5. You redefine the phenomenon and reformulate the explanation until a universal relationship is established, using each negative case to call for a redefinition or reformulation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 65).

Qualitative methodology is therefore not prescriptive but subject to modification as required during the analysis process (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 63). My analysis entailed three distinct phases: discovery, coding and discounting although there was a certain amount of overlap during the process.

**Discovery**

"You must learn to look for themes by examining your data in as many ways as possible" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 130).

During the 'discovery' phase I read and reread my data many times. I discussed my hunches with my supervisors as well as a small group of peers with whom I had formed a study group. I clarified ideas and hunches with several key informants at the school whilst undertaking preliminary analysis when still in the field. I drew on the observer’s comments from participant observations and interviews that I had made when writing memos. These memos served as a way of reflecting on my data and the process I was engaged in. I thought about possible recurring patterns, emerging themes and typologies. I developed concepts (concrete and sensitising) and theoretical propositions which according to Taylor & Bogdan moves the researcher beyond description to interpretation and theory (1984, p. 133). These types of concepts are defined by them as follows:
In qualitative research concepts are sensitizing instruments (Blumer, 1969; Bruyn, 1966). Sensitizing concepts, according to Blumer (1969: 148), provide a "general sense of reference" and suggest "directions along which to look."... Concepts are used to illuminate social processes and phenomena that are not readily apparent through descriptions of specific instances... Concepts from informants are referred to as concrete concepts (p. 133).

An example of this is the way teachers spoke about student behaviour in the school in relation to school rules. My initial concrete coding of this was "school rules" and "student behaviour". As I made the shift to sensitising concepts I realised that school rules and the way they were imposed on student behaviour was linked to ensuring conformity in the school generally and for the wider society. I therefore regrouped these codes under the sensitising concept of "conformity". As I engaged in the discovery phase it soon overlapped with the next phase as I began systematic treatment of the data during the coding process.

**Coding**

"The coding process involves bringing together and analyzing all the data bearing on themes, ideas, concepts, interpretations, and propositions" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 136).

I began by developing coding categories. I coded all the data and related both positive and negative incidents to the same category (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). The following describes in detail how I undertook this phase. My participant observations and interview data were grouped by type and differentiated visually by colour-coded paper. This meant that I could easily distinguish between the types of data sources and when analysing, it gave me a sense of time in relation to when the data had been collected. Participant observation data was colour coded by school term (term 1, white; term 2, green; terms 3 and 4, pink; and term 5 or following year term one, buff). Interview data from those directly involved with the school (that is students, staff and parents) were colour coded blue while outside agencies were colour coded cream.
Coding The Data

My initial data analysis occurred after I had conducted participant observations at the school for one term. The field notes generated (203 pages) provided descriptions of what I had observed, with my interpretations through observer's comments. I used a computing system to number consecutively every line of the field notes. I then coded my data. My data were "chunked" (or sorted) into separate field notes for each participant observation. In addition, each participant observation was "chunked" into areas reflecting subject changes and break times at the school. I found this way of organising the data reflected the patterns of time at the school whilst I observed.

I used a sequential numbering system to code the data. Each code was given a number which was recorded on the field notes as that particular code emerged in the data. A separate list was simultaneously maintained of all codes with the assigned number next to it. This generated 19 substantive areas with 103 codes and 57 sub-codes (totalling 160 codes). As a new code emerged I rechecked previous data for this code.

Sorting the data into coding categories
I then physically cut up the data and filed it under each code in separate envelopes, duplicating the data where more than one code was applicable. I worked through the data for each code, writing up what the code meant, citing the applicable lines in the data and looking for emerging themes. The following provide some examples of this process.

example one:
An example was the mechanisms teachers used to maintain control of students' behaviour in the classroom. Under code 4. Behaviour-Mechanisms for Teacher Control, In Class I defined it as follows:

Teachers use a variety of mechanisms to maintain control and compliance. They are all based on a behaviourist model of punishment and rewards with an underlying deficit model approach.
I then listed mechanisms observed and line numbers in the data. Some examples from term one were:

moving students into other seats (1:3630-3637)
placing students in seats as dictated by the teacher (alphabetically) (1:2295-2300)
removal from class on MSB yellow card (1:6295-6298) (1:3030-3032)
merit cards (1:6034-6040) (1:7141-7144)
choice and consequences (behaviourist deficit model approach) (1:42-53)
reward system with points (1:2941-2949), or lollies (1:7143-7144).

When refining my data I placed this code under a broader heading of *rules/regulations/control* and later under the theme: *Conformity*.

**example two:**
In another example, when observing I heard that the school was divided up into 5 subjects a day and at Year Nine level the language subject choices available were either Maori or Japanese. My initial coding of this data was under *code 3: subject choice*. When subsequently refining my codes I placed this code under the heading: *official curriculum* and at a later date under the theme: *What counts as knowledge?*

**example three:**
In my final example a theme emerged early into my data collection which I called *shared identity*. I defined it in part as follows:

*shared identity*
An emerging theme is that Jamie and Lee appear to share an identity. This is evident in the data based on the assumption that having the same labelled disability means that they are the same and learn the same way. The language used ("the boys") by one parent and teachers present them as a single unit without allowing for individual characteristics, traits or needs.

Examples in the data under this heading that had led to this interpretation were as follows:

(a) During an observation between the resource teacher and a teacher aide early into my data collection, it appeared that any discussion about Jamie and Lee was done as though they were one. I wrote in my fieldnotes:
One part of it she asked Jill, the teacher aide if she thought "the boys" were being mainstreamed too much and Jill said no it was really good for them socially. The main problem according to Jill seems to be that "the boys" are doing the work but are slower than the rest of the class to get notes from the board written down and examples done of different concepts.

(b) Another example of data sorted under this theme of shared identity, was during PE class one day when the teacher, Mike asked the class to all participate in the upcoming sports day. In my fieldnotes I wrote:

Mike then asks who will do what activity for the sports day on Thursday. He says it is fun and not about winning. There is general reluctance and so he starts selecting people out. He starts with Rose and suggests she go in several of them. The boys volunteer for the kayak activity and then he moves to a group of girls and says "come on girls". They sit there and he mentions the different activities and then one of the girls says she will go in one of them if Rebecca does. Rebecca agrees and then Mike moves to another group.

\textit{O.C. The entire time this was on, Jamie and Lee were not present.}

When they appeared Lee had a towel wrapped around him which meant that he was dressed differently from everyone else. Jamie had the same gear on as the others. Mike asked Lee (but not Jamie) "do you want to go in the swimming sports"? Lee replied "no" and it was left at that and Jamie was not asked.

Mike the teacher, I interpreted had treated Lee and Jamie as a shared identity and because Lee had said no to participating in the sports day, it had not occurred to him to ask Jamie. My initial coding of this theme was maintained under the broader 19 headings.

After cutting up all the data and documenting their definitions and examples I then re-grouped my codes back under the 19 areas and thought about the most significant codes or themes and the factors I needed to consider in relation to where I would focus next in my data collection process (see Appendix Number 5). Despite plans to do this at the time, I found it increasingly difficult to keep up with my data collection, write up all the codes and follow up on emerging themes all at once. So I developed questions that arose out of the data, to use as the basis for my planned
interviews with teachers, parents and other staff at a later date and as a way of ensuring that my questioning and the direction I was going in was grounded in the data.

I continued to collect data by way of fieldnotes and interviews in term 2 of the school year. Once again I adopted the computerised numbering system per line of data but printed out all fieldnotes from term 2 on green paper, so as to clearly distinguish the duplicate line numbers from term one. I then coded a further 48 pages from term 2 and used the same preliminary codes and procedure as above. This generated 9 new codes which I added to the preliminary analysis. I wrote about these new codes as per the procedure previously, and added data to support existing codes where applicable.

Refinement of categories
After a seven month period, I moved to a more abstract level of analysis by redefining and reducing my preliminary codes into sensitising concepts and social processes. This refining of codes meant that I now had 169 codes under 24 new sensitising concepts (see Appendix Number 6). I was able to account for almost all of the data and very little was left out. The remaining data was filed into an envelope under 'miscellaneous'. This data related to conversations people had that had no link to the school or my study and descriptions of settings unrelated to the context of the study. I then undertook another process of refining and re-grouping the 24 concepts into 8 broad headings. The process of doing this is explained as follows.

Refining analysis
I took the 24 concepts and sorted them (using yellow post-it notes) on a large piece of cardboard into similar groupings. I needed to have a rationale for the basis on which I sorted them and so I looked for commonalities among the sensitising concepts. I decided that school was made up of the people in it and how they related with one another, strategies and practices that are adopted by different groups to get different or the same things, and teaching/learning processes which I linked to knowledge. This left me with three broad areas:

- people/relationships
- strategies/practices
- knowledge.
With this focus I moved my sensitising concepts under these broad groups. I started with people and relationships first and focused on the negotiations between actors. This resulted in three subheadings: power, belonging, and construct of identities. Next I moved to strategies and practices where I retained conformity and added acceptance, blurring the edges and contested. Finally I sorted remaining relevant codes under knowledge. I found that they all were interwoven and that some codes overlapped. I decided to put each of the 24 sensitising concept subheadings under only one of the 8 broader headings but made a note for future reference. All of the 24 sensitising concepts fitted under at least one of the eight headings fairly easily except for "social relationships" which I realised was too broad in itself and required further refining. I redefined "social relationships" into the seven broad headings (see Appendix Number 7).

I then shifted to defining each of the 7 broad headings, what was meant by them and the questions that underpinned them (see Appendix Number 8). I coded the remaining data from term 2 and regrouped the codes under the 24 sensitising concepts. Time lapsed between this stage and when I returned to coding the remaining data. In the meantime I had undertaken interviews at the school and had done some preliminary planning for interviewing outside agencies. I returned to coding access data and the interviews I had conducted in the first term of school. Whilst meanings of inclusion had emerged as a major theme, I found it difficult to remember exactly how I had defined each of the 24 sensitising concepts underpinning it because I had failed to write it down at the time.

I therefore returned to the 24 sensitising concepts and defined each one in terms of meanings of inclusion (see Appendix Number 9). I then revisited and reviewed all 240 codes. I re-coded them in terms of making the shift from substantive codes to sensitising concepts. As Maykut and Morehouse state:

The look/feel-alike criteria was advanced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as a way of describing the emergent process of categorizing qualitative data. The researcher asks himself or herself whether the unit of meaning on one card is very similar to the unit of meaning on another card. In this systematic and painstaking way, salient categories of meaning are inductively derived (p. 136).
As I worked through my codes I decided whether to leave each code under the existing sensitising concept that I had already placed it under, or I changed it to another one. By following this process systematically I was able to account for all coded data.

**More coding**

I then turned to coding a small sample of new data, to see if my redefining was consistent with my data and whether the new definitions would still fit under the nine broad headings. (At this stage I also introduced a heading called Methodology). I decided to code three teacher interviews and I found that I could account for all of my data this way. My coding fitted under the headings quite easily although I added further questions and comments to each of the seven headings, thus broadening them as I went. I then wrote an analytic memo based on the three interviews under the nine headings. I found that data overlapped between themes but with a different aspect. For example, when I talked about the teachers' style in the classroom with the teacher aide present, it came under 'Power Relations' but also came under 'What Counts as Knowledge?' depending on the focus at which I was looking. I coded the three interviews to the 24 sensitising concepts under the nine headings and then physically cut them up (allowing for more than one copy of coding where it came under more than one heading) and put the coding into nine separate boxes called:

- Inclusion;
- Exclusion;
- Contestability;
- Constructs;
- What Counts as Knowledge?;
- Power relations;
- Conformity;
- Blurring The Edges
- Methodology.

At a later time I followed the same procedure for analysing the rest of my data, accounting for all of it. As before, any remaining data that was not relevant to the study was placed in a separate plastic sleeve marked Miscellaneous.
Exploration of relationships and patterns across categories

Once all data had been cut up and sorted under the 24 concepts I reflected on my hunches, interpretations and propositions. I closely examined the latter and explored how they stood alone or fitted together across categories. According to Maykut & Morehouse:

> Your goal is to study your propositions for those that stand alone and for those that form salient relationships and patterns. We refer to the propositions that are formed by connecting two or more other propositions as outcome propositions (1996, p. 144).

An example of an outcome proposition was that the HOD of the Physically Disabled Unit was restricting the mainstreaming of students from the unit in order to maintain the status quo and control of her unit. This proposition was supported by data categorised under Power Relations (whereby it had been made clear that it was the HOD’s decision as to how much mainstreaming students received) and by data coded under the Blurring the Edges category (which suggested that the HOD was very resistant to the changes that might increase the amount of time students were mainstreamed under the new "blurring the edges" model being implemented into the school).

In this way I was able to group propositions together supported by the empirical data in my findings. This process was to provide a holistic picture of my thesis findings and emerging themes.

Discounting data

"In most studies the researcher tries to come up with reasonable conclusions and generalizations based on a preponderance of the data... You should analyze negative cases to deepen your understanding of the people you are studying" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 139).

When drawing conclusions and incorporating segments of supporting data into memos I sought to discount data through negative cases. To do this I interpreted my data in the context in which it was collected. I took account of what participants had told me spontaneously and compared this with what I had solicited from them in interview settings. I reflected on the effect of my presence as an observer over time and the influence it may or may
not have had at different times during my data collection. I was always aware that the observational data was largely inferential on my part and so took care to try to substantiate my findings with data from participants in either observational or interview settings. Finally I took account of my own assumptions and presuppositions through revisiting my observer comments and reflecting on these during all stages of analysis (Maykut & Morehouse, 1996).

ETHICAL ISSUES

There were many ethical issues that I faced in relation to the methodology itself, and my behaviour with my participants. Whilst my research proposal was reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics committee, I do not believe that ethically my responsibility was confined to meeting its requirements only as laid down. I agreed that I should do no harm to my participants in any way but also felt an obligation as a researcher for those who followed me. I did not want my behaviour to restrict access for other researchers who may wish to undertake research in any of the settings at a later date. This raised issues of reciprocity and not just taking from participants without giving anything in return, or completing data collection and never making contact with participants again. I will discuss issues of reciprocity in greater depth in the section called Reflections: Issues in the Field in the conclusion chapter.

I believe also that I had an ethical obligation to be open about my positioning in relation to inclusive education when negotiating access to the school and throughout the research process. Having done this, it was equally important for me to represent all views, even those contrary to my own. I found that being exposed to such views changed some of my own and enhanced my understanding of the difficulties faced on a day to day basis by those trying to implement inclusive practices.

The willingness on the part of my participants to be part of my study and the time given by them, carries with it ethical demands for me to keep them at the centre of my research. I negotiated an agreement with them on this basis and it was important therefore that my thesis remains essentially about their lived experiences and not my own (Biklen, 1999).
New Zealand is a small country and to maintain confidentiality and anonymity is a challenge for any researcher. I have used pseudonyms in all published documents and tried to only include information pertinent to my findings that does not jeopardise my participants in any way and is relevant to my findings. It is difficult to maintain anonymity within a research site and for me this is particularly relevant in the school setting. I have therefore taken care to present findings in terms of themes and have not described characteristics of individuals or identified them by their specific role in the school. Instead I have tried to focus on the group to which they belong in terms of their role. For example, I have used management staff as a defining group rather than Principal, of whom there is only one.

The way I conducted myself in the field was something on which I constantly reflected. For example, I was asked at times to break school rules by the students but refused on the basis that it would not only be unethical for me to do so, but also I did not want the students concerned to think that I, as an adult and as such in a more powerful position than them, was condoning such behaviour. I faced many ethical dilemmas throughout my observation period and had to make difficult decisions about non-action on my part or choosing to "turn a blind eye". According to Taylor:

Fieldworkers constantly decide how to act toward informants to achieve rapport, how to resolve moral and ethical problems, how to deal with confidential information, how to present their identity, and how to respond when people act immorally. There are no definitive rules on which to base their decision, a task which is troubling to some, and inevitable to others (1987, p. 297).

Informed consent was obtained in different ways for different groups. All interviewees were asked to sign a consent form unless the interview was conducted in their role of employment. This was a standard that had been set down by the Human Ethics Committee. In this case a verbal agreement was obtained by telephone, followed by an information sheet being sent to them prior to the interview and in most cases my proposed interview questions as well. Permission to undertake research in the school was obtained verbally by the Principal and in writing from the Board of Trustees and the Staffing Committee within the school. This consent allowed me to
observe in all public areas of the school, such as the playground, staff-room, and at school-wide events.

Once on site at the school, permission to observe in specific classes was obtained in writing from all teachers through the Deputy Principal. It was done this way with the intention that staff would not feel coerced or obliged to participate although potentially the power differential between the class teachers and a management staff member may have caused some difficulty in this area. I took time to reaffirm voluntary participation to the Deputy Principal when applicable to try to account for this possibility. I also stated clearly in my information sheet given to all participants that they could withdraw their participation at anytime.

In terms of the students, informed consent was more difficult. I had blanket coverage in terms of meeting my obligations of consent within the school but it concerned me that students should be aware of why I was at the school and could then choose to avoid me if they so desired. After negotiations with the school it was decided that I could not get written consent from all students at the school or more specifically the Year Nine class that I was shadowing but I could speak to new students and parents at the Year Nine assembly on the first day. I did this and left some information sheets with the secretaries at the office as a way of contacting me, should anyone wish to. At a later date after being in 3BR for 16 months I gained signed consent from students willing to be interviewed in groups. A proviso to this was that they had shown their parents my information sheet and consent form so caregivers could withdraw permission for their child’s involvement if they so desired.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate meanings of inclusion from policy to practice. It focused on how specific policies (New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000) enhanced or hindered practices of inclusion for everyone (students, teachers, parents) with a specific focus on students with disabilities in a secondary school setting. Data were collected from three sources using a qualitative approach: participant observations, in-depth interviewing and document analysis. Analysis was undertaken by using modified analytic induction.
The chapters that follow will discuss in depth the way inclusion and inclusive practices are framed by the state and reinterpreted by participants in practice. Chapters five to nine present my research findings and are organised in relation to my research questions. Chapter five is split into Parts A and B. Chapter five: Stakeholders’ Understandings of Inclusion in Relation To The New Zealand Curriculum Framework presents the "appearance" rather than what occurs in practice. Part A provides commentary and critique of not only political factors but also the policy changes that occurred prior to the introduction of notions of inclusion in the New Zealand context. Furthermore it addresses the contextual factors that surrounded stakeholders’ understandings of inclusion in relation to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. Connections are made in this chapter to document analysis of policy documents and findings in relation to understandings by state representatives of both inclusion and its relationship with the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. This includes the stated, intended and delivered curriculums. Part B shifts to all other stakeholders and their understandings of inclusion and an inclusive curriculum. It also addresses what participants perceive as barriers to inclusive practices.

In contrast Chapters six, seven, eight and nine address the implications of state policy in relation to practice in a state secondary school. Chapter six is divided into Parts A and B. Part A explores the meanings of inclusion for two special needs units attached to the school which then provides the context for the mainstream and inclusive practice. Part B of Chapter six discusses the day-to-day practices within the school and manifestations of inclusion for students with disabilities.

Chapter seven draws connections between the utility of the NZCF for inclusive practices within the school on a day-to-day basis. It examines how meanings of inclusion are interpreted through the curriculum. It highlights the way conflicting messages by the state are being reflected at a class level and the resulting strategies adopted by staff in the school.

Whereas Chapters five, six and seven of my findings present meanings of inclusion, Chapters eight and nine shift to the barriers that hinder inclusion for the secondary school and beyond. This includes examination at both the micro- and macro-levels which incorporates school-wide
barriers in Chapter eight, as well as those beyond the school in Chapter nine. At the macro-level barriers to inclusion place the school into a wider political context.

The findings chapters are drawn together in Chapter ten, the Discussion chapter. This chapter is organised in relation to the themes that emerged from both my findings and methodological processes. In totality these themes will provide a holistic overview both at the micro- and macro-levels of meanings of inclusion in relation to the curriculum and my research process.

Chapter eleven, my Conclusion chapter offers my reflections as the researcher by focusing on what can be learned from my study. I discuss the implications of my study in terms of my method, theory and findings. Finally I consider what it all means in terms of possibilities for the future.
This first findings chapter provides the context for exploring the state's understandings of meanings of inclusion and inclusive practices in relation to the curriculum. This is an important way of contextualising my findings and accounting for changes over time. An overview of significant occurrences in New Zealand Special Education, from changes to the Education Act in 1989 to the introduction of Special Education 2000 policy in 1996, are presented. In addition, this chapter outlines the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) in relation to inclusive practices since its implementation in 1993.

Both policies were introduced in phases over extended time periods and in order to capture a sense of this and the impact the policy implementation had, this chapter interweaves three different sources of information together. Firstly, document analysis of policy documents provides a chronological picture of events as they occurred. This gives an indication of the stated or official intentions of the state in relation to the aforementioned policies. Secondly, findings from interviews of Ministerial representatives provide their perspectives and insights behind the rhetoric presenting some divergence to proposed policy outcomes as stated. Thirdly as a way of providing critique of the policy process over this time, commentary from critics in the literature is also included. In this way the chapter will address research questions that focus on both the convergence and divergence of the NZCF and Special Education policies as stated and intended rather than as interpreted or implemented. This will concentrate on the understandings of representatives of the state and intentions behind the NZCF, in relation to inclusion or inclusive practices and an inclusive curriculum. Finally, the chapter will focus on the barriers to inclusive practices including the continued role of segregated special units and schools.

SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS

When understanding the processes of policy it is necessary to acknowledge the importance of the state in its development and implementation of policy and the overarching power it holds (Whitty, Power & Halpin, 1998). This section provides the context for the secondary school selected for this
study by expounding the role of the changing state over the last decade and its relevance to this study.

Since 1989, as a result of major restructuring in the public sector the administrative framework of the New Zealand education system has undergone radical change. This was due to a philosophical shift from a Welfare state model underpinned by an egalitarian-liberal discourse, to utilitarianism in the form of neo-liberalism by the state. The latter has focused on a shift to individualism and devolution through a "rolling back of the state" resulting in, according to Ballard & McDonald a reduction of state spending in public areas such as education, health and welfare (1998, p. 3).

According to Codd, Harker and Nash in Ivory, (1993), the rationale for the shift was based on the notion of a legitimation crisis for the state:

The legitimacy of the State's "rule" came under pressure with the increasing economic crisis that interfered with the State's ability to perform its key functions. There was a perceived failure of the Welfare State, with its emphasis on achieving equity through intervention, to succeed in these goals. Thus, the challenge from the individualism of the New Right was able to gain ground. Now state intervention was considered a "fundamental threat to individual and democratic freedom" (Peters & Marshall, p. 79, 1990). Without state intervention, or interference, individuals could better decide how to meet their own needs. Rather than the State allocating resources, it was argued that the free market was a superior allocative mechanism. With less 'big' government the economic and social problems facing the country could be resolved (p.18).

Thus New Zealand has seen a shift away from state intervention towards greater individual responsibility under a New Right ideology.

For the education sector this resulted in a shift by the state to the self-management of all state schools. In 1989 the introduction of Tomorrow's Schools saw the replacement of regional education boards by parent-elected Boards of Trustees. Mechanisms were put in place however, to maintain accountability and thus a level of centralised state control. Drawing on the work of Codd (1993), Ballard and McDonald state that the "new Ministry of Education exerts a high level of centralised control through legal contracts
and regular reviews and audits that evaluate compliance with the National Curriculum and the procedures and goals set out in institutional charters" (1998, p. 69).

The shift to self-management meant a separation within schools of governance (whereby Boards of Trustees are responsible for policy direction) on the one hand and management (daily operations being the responsibility of the principal and management staff) on the other. This strategy was adopted to ensure "objectivity" by way of "setting, planning, reviewing, internal monitoring, and external reporting" (Codd, 1999, p. 47). Moreover, underpinned by managerialism, this model, according to Codd (1999), focuses on "quality" as "a powerful metaphor for new forms of managerial control" (p. 47). In practice this means that an instrumentalist approach has been adopted whereby the ends are separated from the means and outcomes have become more important than the process. The quality of education is defined in terms of what can be measured and people are valued only for what they produce (Codd, 1999). This form of economic rationalism has been based on principles of efficiency and effectiveness (Mitchell, 1995).

As the state has imposed a discourse of managerialism onto schools, which has been symbolised through language usage, it has simultaneously promoted the economic marketisation of education and hence greater responsibility has been devolved to school level. According to Fitzsimons, Peters, & Roberts:

Managerialism ... is a quasi-scientific response to the social world and many of its supporting theories are economic. Public choice theory and the new institutional economics (principal agency theory and transaction cost analysis) are integral to the practice of managerialism and to the justification for such changes in language and practice. ... Changes in language cannot be seen in isolation from wider shifts in policy and social practice (1999, p. 40).

Public Choice theory is based on an assumption of individualism whereby all social phenomena are reducible to individual behaviour and people are motivated by self-interest. Whereas education was portrayed as a "public good" for the benefit of society under an egalitarian-liberal model, it has now been reconstructed under Public Choice theory as a "private good." The implication of this assumption is that because people act in self-interest,
then sectors such as education are subject to public or provider capture by those working within the sector (such as teachers and educators). Concepts of contestability and competition are purported necessary and have been introduced by the state in a bid to to overcome such provider capture by those who might have a vested interest (Codd, 1999).

The outcomes in practical terms in relation to policy and state reform have resulted in much contradiction within the education sector. There have been positive outcomes in terms of schools being able to make their own decisions at local levels, but negative outcomes in other ways through the promotion of a New Right ideology by the state. Discourses of competition and contestability have become privileged as schools find themselves unavoidably within a quasi-market system and hence the promotion of concepts such as "social justice" have become increasingly undermined (Codd, 1999).

Moreover while reforms were occurring in education policy over this time the area of special education was perceived as too difficult for the state to reform at the time and was "left in the ‘too hard’ basket" (Fancy, 1999, opening address, p.7). It was therefore not until 1996 that a special education policy that reflected the shift to self-managing schools was announced in an attempt to bring it into line with other education policy changes that had already occurred. To understand the policy process and its development it is necessary to understand the historical events that occurred in this field prior to the introduction of Special Education 2000 Policy and it is to this that I now turn.

SHIFT FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Prior to the introduction of Tomorrow’s Schools a draft review report (Department of Education, 1987) had been produced in relation to special education. Ideas of mainstreaming in New Zealand were at the time informed by reform that had occurred in the United States whereby policies based on the "least restrictive environment" had been introduced. As stated by Ballard (1992) this
involves placing children in environments which are the 'least restricted' setting (that is, the least segregated) that will meet their needs. It assumes that the more severe the child's disability, the more likely it is that they will need segregated educational provisions and the less desirable it is for them to be integrated. It also promotes inequality between professional and parent because it supports the primacy of professional decision-making (p. 262).

Subsequently in 1988 a policy statement defining mainstreaming was published by the Ministry of Education as a supplement to the 2 May 1988 edition of the New Zealand Education Gazette (see the Introduction chapter for definition or for full text see Appendix Number 10). The mainstreaming definition, according to a Ministry official, remains current to this day despite the renaming of "mainstreaming" as "inclusion". For the Ministry to believe that it is possible to just change the term is somewhat problematic because firstly, it is not possible to just replace a term such as "mainstreaming" with another such as "inclusion" because they are underpinned by different assumptions and theoretical frameworks (as discussed previously in the first chapter). Secondly, as Ballard (1992) asserts "we know that these strategies do not work as mainstreaming because they mean that children with disabilities are not accepted as full-time participants in regular classes" (p.262). This completely contradicts one of the central tenets of inclusion and runs counter to proposed state policy as will be seen shortly.

Education Act 1989

As part of Tomorrow’s Schools, and as a direct result of pressure from parents and advocates, the Education Act was changed in 1989 and as a result for the first time in New Zealand history those with special educational needs (including those with disabilities) were given the right to enrol and receive education at state schools. The relevant section in the Act reads as follows:

Equal rights to primary and secondary education:
Under Section 8 of the 1989 New Zealand Education Act:

people who have special educational needs (whether because of disability or otherwise) have the same rights to enrol and receive education at state schools as people who do not.
There was still provision though for some children to receive "special" education when it was agreed between parents and the state, or where the Secretary of Education directed the child to be enrolled in a particular state school, special school or class.

Under Section 9 of the Education Act there was a clause that stated:

if satisfied that a person under 21 should have special education the Secretary shall -
(a) Agree with the person’s parents that the person should be enrolled, or direct them to enrol the person, at a particular state school, special school, special class or special clinic; or ...

Provisions for appeal however, by parents who did not agree with the proposed special education arrangements were also included under Section 10 of the Act.

Special Education Services 1989

In addition to changes in legislation in 1989, a state agency, entitled Special Education Services was set up for those categorised as having special educational needs from the ages of birth to 21 years. According to a national publication entitled Parent & School:

A new agency, the Special Education Service, was set up by the Education Act 1989 to employ the specialist advisory staff working in the area of special education. Contracted to the Ministry to provide support and advice for the benefit of students with special educational needs, to train staff, and to advise on the use of resources, the SES also provides a direct service to some children through the speech-language therapists and early intervention teachers that it employs (Parent & School, Feb/Mar, 1992, p. 33).

Although this meant the state agency held a dual role at times of both funder and provider, it was envisaged that this would be only a temporary measure. The service was eventually to become contestable, whereby state contracts undertaken originally by Special Education Services (SES) would be put up for tender, in alignment with the state move towards marketisation. Hence the rhetoric proposed that competition would ensure efficiency and effective practices. However contestability was not to occur at the time as a result of public opposition (Mitchell, 1995).
Special Education Discretionary Assistance (SEDA) Funding

An important role of SES was to allocate the Special Education Discretionary Assistance (SEDA) funding to regular schools through applications made on behalf of individual students by each school. Support was usually allocated only to those with high and very high needs, and concern was often raised by schools and families about the inequities of the SEDA allocations especially across geographical locations. Other criticisms about this system were that it meant that Principals, parents and teachers had to spend considerable time preparing a case to gain the SEDA fundings (Ministry of Education representative, 1997).

To add to the complexity surrounding funding issues the state was eager to bring special education into line with other education reforms under Tomorrow's Schools. A Ministry representative told me:

_Tomorrow's Schools_ decided that Special Education was too difficult and was consequently left to one side. This resulted in a mismatch between Special Education which was a highly centralised, and reliant on a very centralised structure within a Department of Special Education. With two thousand seven hundred schools, in a devolved system suddenly becoming responsible for the governance and management of schools, we have a very centralised structure sitting with a devolved system along with a Ministry of Education which was policy-driven, and an entity called SES. So you had central structures that just weren't compatible. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Furthermore by retaining a centralised system of funding allocations for one area of education, the state was highlighting the changes and exposing contradictions between the old and new systems, as well as the rise of the ideology of neo-liberalism.

Statement Of Intent 1991

In the first moves to bring special education into alignment with other education reforms, in 1991 the state published a proposal for special education entitled the _Statement of Intent_ (see Appendix Number 11). According to McDonald (1994) this policy "outlined a number of policy principles of operation for the provision of services with an emphasis on
local decision-making and maximising resource usage" which at the time
"engendered considerable debate" (p. 192).

According to an official at the Ministry the Statement of Intent was an
attempt
to find a way through resourcing some children who had quite
high needs, with the state to continue taking responsibility to
centrally resource these students. In addition most schools have
some students with behaviour and learning difficulties. The
resourcing for these students should be resourced directly through
schools. This was the thrust of the '91 review. This was followed by
the Special Education Policy Implementation Team (SEPIT), which
began consulting on that policy in 1992. There was considerable
opposition to some aspects of the policy because what essentially
was proposed, the cashing up of teaching resources for students that
were in special classes, experience units and these resources
distributed on an even basis across all schools. There was just
considerable opposition with the loss of many permanent
positions. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The public debate that occurred as a result of the release prompted two years
of consultation in regard to national special education by the Special
Education Policy Implementation Team (SEPIT) (Brown, 1996).

**Special Education Policy Implementation Team (SEPIT) 1992/1993**

The official purpose of the SEPIT review was to make recommendations for
the most effective way in which to implement the policy for
special education announced in the Statement of Intent in 1991. The
focus of the report is the proposal for future delivery of special
education resources developed by SEPIT, which was the subject of
consultation (Special Education Policy Implementation Team On
Delivering Special Education Final Report, August 1993a, p. 1).

Despite the rhetoric of public consultation, it is notable that the original
Statement of Intent released in 1991 prior to the SEPIT consultation process
subsequently became the basis of the Special Education 2000 policy. This
arguably is because of the ideologically driven economic constraints placed
on the Ministry by the state despite the consultation process. A Ministry
official stated that:
Special Education Policy Implementation Team (SEPIT) consulted for about eighteen months. They attempted to consult on the policy in the context of education cuts and other stringent measures. The sector, during consultation was saying "actually we need more money", and that was very clearly said, at nearly every meeting we conducted. SEPIT reported back in mid-'93, with a number of recommendations. There was little immediate response by the Government. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Finally in 1995 the National Advisory Committee on Special Education was established to advise the Minister and develop special education guidelines. This was prompted by factors other than public dissatisfaction. Firstly, there was a general trend of national roll growth of school age children. Secondly more and more children under the new Education Act were now being enrolled into regular schools as well as an overall increase of children with disabilities entering the education sector. An official at the Ministry explained:

Other factors were the factors which goaded us into doing something. These included a fairly massive roll growth that was occurring right around the country, and that began sort of in the early '90s. This first impacted on the primary sector. There was also an increase in the number of children coming into schools with multiple disabilities, that hadn't been involved in a special school at all. I have had a lot of special school principals say to me, "eight years ago we didn't have any of these children in our school. Now all the children that were coming to our schools eight years ago are now in regular schools, and we’ve got these children with multiple disabilities". I think this is due to the factors like, the gestation period coming down to twenty-four weeks or twenty-three weeks in some cases, and that’s impacting on the sort of children now coming into the system (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The movement of greater numbers of students with special needs into regular classes was also indicated through the increase in SEDA allocations at the time (Ministry of Education, 1996d). In previous research I found that at 1 July 1995, approximately 65% of students designated by the Ministry as special education students were enrolled in regular classes. A further 21% were in special classes attached to regular schools and 14% attended special schools. The number of special education students in regular classrooms increased by around 12%
from 1994 to 1995. A source from the Special Education division at the Ministry of Education said that the number of students with disabilities in regular classes was (as at 30 June 1996) standing at approximately 71 to 72%. This would suggest a further increase of 6 to 7% over the previous year (Hulston, 1997, p. 2).

Special Education Policy Guidelines 1995

As a result of these factors and the desire for alignment with other self-managing policies the following principles underpinning special education guidelines were published in the 1995 Special Education Policy Guidelines:

1. Learners with special education needs have the same rights, freedoms and responsibilities as people of the same age who do not have special education needs.

2. The primary focus of special education is to meet the individual learning and developmental needs of the learner.

3. All learners with identified special education needs have access to a fair share of the available special education resources.

4. Partnership between parents/caregivers and education providers is essential in overcoming barriers to learning.

5. All special education resources are used in the most effective and efficient way possible, taking into account parent choice and the needs of the learner.

6. A learner's language and culture comprise a vital context for learning and development and must be taken into consideration in planning programmes.

7. Learners with special education needs will have access to a seamless education from the time that their needs are identified to post school options.

(Ministry of Education, 1995a).

As the policy has been implemented over the last couple of years the state's ongoing shift towards managerialism has been mirrored in the way the theoretical framework of special education has also shifted. In 1999 a revised set of Special Education Policy guidelines were published changing the humanist ideology underpinning the first principle from "rights" and
"freedoms" to a market ideology of a "high quality education". This meant the first principle now reads:

1. Young children and students with special education needs have the same rights to a high quality education

**Special Education 2000**

From the initial Special Education Guidelines in 1995 the Ministry announced the implementation of *Special Education 2000* policy in May 1996 (b) that would be introduced in phases over the next three years. The announcement of Phase One: The Special Education Grant was to coincide with the start of my data collection.

The state purported a model of inclusion for the new policy. This signified a change in language from mainstreaming to inclusion. The letter that was sent to all Principals and Board of Trustee Chairpersons, accompanying the new *Special Education 2000 policy*, by the New Zealand Minister of Education at the time read as follows:

> Both I personally, and the Government generally, have a strong commitment to special education. We aim over the next decade to have in place a world-class model of inclusive education. Every child has the ability to learn. Every child has the right to be taught in the company of their peers. This government wishes to ensure that this right to an education can occur within regular class settings or in special schools or classes *depending on the preference of parents and family.* (*emphasis added*).

Although the rhetoric of inclusive practices was being proposed the policy continued to be underpinned by the 1988 definitions of mainstreaming (see Appendix Number 10). Furthermore the statement by the Minister of Education is somewhat problematic because despite rhetoric of inclusive practices, continued exclusionary practices of segregation were also being legitimated under a purportedly inclusive model. By focusing on the rhetoric of parent choice, not only was the status quo being maintained but assumptions underlying the working definitions of inclusion being used in this thesis were not being realised.
Officially the state established three key principles for the Ministry of Education to follow in the development of the policy:

They were that children with high and very high needs should be able to receive levels of resourcing according to their education needs, rather than being labelled or categorised. The second key principle of Special Ed 2000 was the desire to resource children wherever they were in the system. The third principle was that the government would continue to fund students in whatever setting parents chose, as long as that was supported by the enrolments (Ministry of Education official, Fieldnotes: Interview).

In relation to the third principle it appeared that the state’s agenda of individualism overrode current world-wide trends in inclusive education. This was acknowledged through the comments of a Ministry official:

Now that’s probably slightly different from a number of trends in the Western world, where governments have moved to a more definite inclusionary approach which resulted in the closure of special schools. The government has chosen to retain the ‘choice’ option which is possibly the most expensive option. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Underpinned by these premises the Special Education 2000 policy has been introduced into New Zealand schools since the beginning of 1997. The policy has followed a needs-assessment approach with those categorised as having high or very high needs in relation to accessing the curriculum, qualifying for individual entitlements. The funding for these two categories of students was initially retained by Special Education Services, an agency of the state. However as implementation of the policy proceeded and just before the end of my data collection period it was announced that schools with approximately 20 or more of these students would be able to become their own fundholders, thus dealing directly with the state. This in effect has meant that the intention for contestability of SES as outlined in the Statement of Intent in 1991, and rejected during the public consultation process of SEPIT had resurfaced and was being implemented anyway. Those now categorised with moderate needs (including many students who held existing Section 9 agreements with the Secretary of Education) would become the responsibility of schools.
Within the categories of high and very high needs were the following subgroups of categories based on a preset allocation of 1 per cent of the population under each sub-category: Speech-language, Severe Behaviour and the Ongoing Resourcing System (ORS). Despite the purported shift to non-categorisation by the state to a needs-based approach (which in itself is still problematic), under this policy according to Mitchell (1999):

Even though the stated intention of the new policy was to move away from a medical paradigm, vestiges of it remain, with several components of the new policy focusing on identifying individual students' deficits and providing resources to schools to provide programmes for them. In particular, the concept of identifying students with high and very high needs and certain categories of students with moderate needs reflects what Moore et al., (1999) call a "functional limitations model" in which little, if any consideration is given to the educational environments of these students" (p. 205).

Furthermore, Baldwin (1986) has highlighted the problematic nature of needs-based assessment within systems because it is "at risk of 'professionalisation' by experts" or professionals who get to define and create needs in their own interest (p. 143). Moreover difficulties also arise when resources are limited and scarce resulting in resource allocations based more on supply than need (Baldwin, 1986).

The other funding category, that of "moderate needs" was provided through:
- Special Education Grant (SEG)
- Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour (RTLBs)
- Special funding categories for sensory, physical and medical needs.

At the time of this study the aspects of Special Education 2000 policy that had been introduced with impact on Westside High School were the ORS funding, the SEG grant and speculation about the RTLBs. According to an official document released at the time (June 1996c) the Individual Entitlements of the ORS funding and the SEG grant

will avoid both the need to have a centrally administered pool of discretionary funding and the associated need for a time-consuming allocation process. The strategy involves students with high and very high needs receiving an individual entitlement
together with schools being provided with the Special Education Grant so that they can meet the needs of students with behavioural and learning difficulties (Ministry of Education, 1996c, p. 9).

These elements of the policy were consistent with devolving educational responsibility back onto schools. According to the Ministry the criteria to be eligible for ORS funding were based on inability to access the curriculum. This was premised on an assumption that the curriculum would be adapted for students as required, in any setting. A Ministry official told me that there were three elements for meeting the criteria for ORS funding:

One, a need for total or major adaptation of the curriculum, to meet the needs of the student, and that doesn't mean just modifying the reading programme. It really means adapting the content of the curriculum, for the child. So that's the first sort of area.
The second is the need for one-to-one assistance, and that's more in the paraprofessional area in terms of providing access to the curriculum. For example, positioning, administering medication, toileting etc.
The third is the need for specialist support, and that's specified as a range from once a week to once a month.

We're looking at it in terms of what is in fact, how much of the curriculum has to be adapted to meet the needs of a particular student is primarily going to drive the Individual Entitlement scheme with the Phase 2 part of the high and very high needs group. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

**Special Education Grant**

In contrast to the individually-targetted funding by the state, the SEG grant followed other educational reform policies by devolving responsibility for students with moderate needs to the school level. It was not however targetted to need but based on roll size and socio-economic status decile rating. Therefore regular schools in decile one areas were allocated more funding per student than schools in decile 10 areas (with the exception of special schools who received maximum funding initially by being funded at the same rate as decile 1 schools). However there was an anomaly in this, in that no allowance was made (apart from the special schools) for magnet schools that attracted more special needs students than other schools.
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Moreover by devolving responsibility to the individual school level there was no accountability by schools in their spending of the SEG grant, as was intended by the state. This was confirmed by the Ministry when I asked an official about the accountability of schools in relation to the SEG grant:

Very little. It’s a grant, schools are entitled to use it how they like to meet the needs of students who are having learning difficulties, that’s how it’s set out. They will of course go through the financial audit and they will have to state how they’ve used it but it, I mean schools could use from any number of ways, to say well we’ve bought 15 computers and that’s meeting the learning needs of 300 students over a year and we’ve defined learning difficulties as that. It could be something along those lines. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This exposes the contradictory nature of the policy, in that the policy rhetoric talks of meeting individual needs and targets specific groups in one category while on the other hand it introduces a grant to all schools for another category regardless of need. Additionally, it provides funding for special needs students to schools who potentially may have very few if any special needs students. The rhetoric says that by providing all schools with funding for special needs students, all schools will have to take responsibility for all of their students but the reality as asserted by the state’s own representatives, is that there is no accountability under such a devolved system to ensure this.

To add to the inconsistencies surrounding the Special Education 2000 policy, after its first year of inception, in 1998 a "political decision" saw the formula for funding changed. The proportional amounts per decile ranking changed so that the ratio setting out what each school got depending on decile ranking per student numbers was lessened. According to Mitchell, (1999):

In determining that schools’ decile rankings should be the key "driver" of SEG, the MOE argued that research showed a high correlation between moderate learning and behavioural difficulties and socioeconomic factors. This argument took on rather less force, however, when there was a political decision to make significant grants to schools with high socioeconomic catchments. Thus, in 1998 the difference between grants to decile 10 and decile 1 schools went from a ratio of 1:7 to 1:2 (p. 202).
In other words the initial range between decile schools had been based on $34.50 per student for decile one schools as against $5.00 per student for decile ten schools (Ministry of Education, 1996c). The following year, in 1998 the formula was changed to $51.00 per student for decile 1 schools and $24.00 per student for decile 10 schools (Ministry of Education, 1998a). This means that in one year, decile one schools received a 48% increase in their base amount (or amount per pupil allocation) in contrast to a 380% increase for decile ten schools. Not only were schools with high decile rankings more likely to have greater roll numbers and thus gain more funding than poorer schools, but most magnet schools for students with special needs, as acknowledged by the Ministry were low ranking decile schools. In practical terms this meant that Westside High School, for example, was likely to get an approximate increase in their SEG grant in 1998 of $10,000.00 compared with the school that did not welcome Jamie, which was likely to get an approximate increase of $38,000.00 to their SEG grant in the year.

**Resource Teachers Of Learning And Behaviour (RTLB)**

The other component of the policy for meeting moderate needs was the introduction of Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour (RTLBs). Existing special education teachers in the attached units that would be dis-established would have to re-train into new positions as RTLBs. They would work with school students year 0 to year 10 with learning and behaviour difficulties on both an itinerant and in-class basis. Training at graduate and undergraduate levels would be provided for these new positions but after implementing this phase of the policy, it was announced that only those living in some geographical areas would be able to re-train in the first year. This meant that during the crucial phase of transition, newly-appointed resource teachers in these areas took up the positions with only traditional special education models of teaching and learning from which to draw. Moreover this also meant that these teachers started on a premise of acceptance of working with students with special needs in segregated units.

The RTLBs would be employed by a cluster of schools and responsible to the Board of Trustees of the school in which they were based. According to the Ministry, clusters of schools would be told:
We will say to a cluster "here is your total teaching resource to meet the needs of the students with behaviour and learning difficulties. You decide, where you want these teachers located and how you want to operate". Schools have been telling us that they know best how to meet students' needs with behaviour difficulties. This approach will enable this to occur. There are going to be management committees, because they're going to have to manage that resource. We're expecting this to be done locally. If they want SES involved then they will have to pay for it out of their Special Education Grant, but my belief is that they're likely to not want SES involved because I think they would say "we know exactly who we want and we want this sort of priority and system (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Once again, as happened with the SEG grant, by the state devolving responsibility from the centre to the periphery, accountability procedures for the RTLBs at this time were weak (Mitchell, 1999).

In summary, this section has outlined the changes to special education policy since the introduction of Tomorrow's Schools. It has demonstrated the way special education policy changes have occurred as a strategy to bring this area into line with other neo-liberal education reforms. Purported as a model of inclusive education, Special Education 2000, (borne out of policy development as early as 1991), is also premised on utilitarian notions of individualism and choice. This serves to highlight the contradictions and disparity between the model of inclusion being used in this thesis and any claims of inclusion by the state through its special education policy development over the last decade. Despite this, elements of the new policy were to provide the impetus for schools to move to more inclusive practices if they so chose. A shift away from the state funding special education students by category of disability to new criteria premised on need in terms of accessing the curriculum requires an exposé of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and its convergence or divergence with inclusiveness. This will be addressed in the next section.
NEW ZEALAND CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK (1993)

Background

In this section, discussion of the introduction of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (1993) will centre on its connections with its stated and intended aims for inclusiveness. An understanding of the context in which it was introduced is required in order to reveal the philosophies and ideologies on which it was based. The first part of this section will give an account of the chronological events that occurred from the 1980s until the implementation of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework.

According to McGee (1997) there was concern raised in the 1980s by the incoming Minister of Education (Russell Marshall) of the Labour government about the curriculum in New Zealand in relation to the content’s lack of relevance for some children and its monocultural nature. In response to this a curriculum review process was undertaken in 1987 by the then Department of Education, in which widespread public consultation was undertaken and over 20,000 submissions were received (McGee, 1997). After compilation of the submissions a report entitled The Curriculum Review: Report of the committee to review the curriculum for schools was released. In this report fifteen common principles were identified as being fundamental to the curriculum of all schools in New Zealand.

In direct relation to inclusion, Principle number 13 stated the following:

13. The curriculum shall be inclusive.
All students should feel part of an education system which has been designed with their active involvement - it should be learner-friendly. The curriculum will take account of the needs and experiences of all students, including their background knowledge and existing ideas, and the diverse character of the community (Curriculum Review, 1987, p. 11).

From the review a proposed framework for a national curriculum was constructed entitled The National Curriculum Statement (1988) whereby teachers were recognised as the key decision makers and the fundamental principles of "balance, coherence, equity and cultural identity" were identified (McGee, 1997, p.60). Cited as a "forward-looking" and "potentially transformative document", McGee states that
it had the possibility of breaking the shackles of the long-standing domination of the traditional subjects, while preserving the best of them. It introduced new ways of organising subjects and advocated a broadly-based education for children which took their cultural background into account. However it was never implemented (1997, p. 54).

The political shift towards the right, of the fourth Labour government meant that such a curriculum proposal was out of place with the restructuring reforms occurring in the public sector. The proposal was dropped and in 1989 under *Tomorrow's Schools* the curriculum development division in the Department of Education was dismantled to coincide with the Department becoming the Ministry of Education. A change of government in the 1990s saw the distribution of a new discussion document in 1991 entitled *The National Curriculum of New Zealand* (Ministry of Education, 1991). The aim of the discussion document was once again to develop a curriculum framework but with a quite different philosophy underpinning it. Little time was allocated for public response and after little change to it the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* was released in 1993 (b) as the national curriculum policy for all New Zealand schools (McGee, 1997). In contrast to the previous 1988 proposal,

it mainly reinforced the status quo. Ideologically, it was heavily influenced by the government's desire to get more rigour into schooling with the intention of producing citizens who were equipped with skills that would be applied in the quest for greater international business and trading competitiveness (McGee, 1997, p. 54).

The policy saw more focus on competitiveness and economic efficiency and a shifting away from a syllabus approach to a prescriptive and structured design (McGee, 1997).

**New Zealand Curriculum Framework Overview**

The Framework would become the official policy for teaching, learning and assessment in New Zealand schools, covering all years of schooling from years 1 to 13 (ages 5 to 18). It included nine principles, seven essential learning areas, eight sets of essential skills and "commonly held" attitudes
and values to be "developed and reinforced through the school curriculum" (Ministry of Education, 1999a, p. 69).

Additionally, National Curriculum statements have been progressively published since 1993, in draft form first and then after trialling, in final form by being gazetted for mandatory implementation (Ministry of Education, 1999a). According to McGee (1997) in recent years the way the curriculum has been developed reflects the shift to neo-liberalism (underpinned by Public Choice Theory). According to Jesson (1995), this shift has resulted in a separation of policy formulation from the actual curriculum writing and implementation. This practice (purported to avoid provider capture) has been used as a ploy to take decision-making away from teachers and schools:

It is clear that the centre [the state] holds the decision-making authority about what is included in national curriculum documents. In this case, the decision-making of the school relates to specific interpretations of those documents to make adaptations to suit local conditions. It is very much a response situation. Second, the real decision-making power for schools comes in the implementation of the curriculum. Yet even in this sphere, the central authorities exercise control. The Education Review Office has considerable powers to check on what schools do in curriculum delivery and so acts as a constraint to innovation (McGee, 1997, p. 289).

The timetable for the introduction of the National Curriculum statements in the seven essential learning areas has stretched over years with many curriculum statements staying in draft form for considerable lengths of time. The proposed date for the gazetting of all curriculum areas is 2002 (see Appendix Number 12). (Ministry of Education, 1999a)

**Commentary On New Zealand Curriculum Framework**

There has been much commentary and critique in the literature surrounding the New Zealand Curriculum Framework since its inception. Such commentary has centred on either issues of application or issues of its philosophical nature.

On a practical level, the application of the Framework prompted mixed responses at the time of its introduction. According to Elley (1993) the time
frame for its implementation was too short, resulting in insufficient trialling in schools. In addition, it was based on a British model (which had been discredited locally as 'unworkable'), with an eight-level progressive structure in each curriculum area that according to Elley (1993) was "presuming a similarity across subjects, which has no basis in research or teacher experience" (p. 38). Such an approach, he argued assumed a linear progression in all curriculum areas, ignoring the multi-dimensional nature of knowledge-based subjects. Furthermore Aikin (1994) stated that it assumed that what constituted progression to a higher level was clearly understood. Despite these drawbacks, there was, according to Aikin (1994) general support at the primary level from both teachers and Boards of Trustees for the introduction of a NZ Curriculum Framework.

Later there was also some direct commentary in the literature, regarding the possible connections between the Framework and an egalitarian approach especially in relation to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Ryba (1995) suggested that the essential skill areas of the Framework related well to inclusion. In particular he cites "social and co-operative skills, communication, and self-management of learning" (p. 54). This is problematic though because these embedded skills were being seen as transferable and able to be developed across the curriculum despite different contexts. Jones et. al. (1995) pointed out that "skills cannot be separated from particular content, and the contexts in which skills are learned therefore become critically important. Furthermore, if it should be granted that there is a need for specialist skills, it is not obvious that such skills can be developed from a general generic skill base" (p.103). This approach is also challenged through the work of Weiler (1988) who states that under production theory in critical educational theory, all knowledge is socially constructed and therefore people continuously negotiate and create meaning based on the context they are in.

Philosophically, whilst the NZCF was influenced by a number of different theoretical frameworks, it followed other educational reforms introduced by the National Government at the time that reflected an ideological shift to utilitarianism. Jones, Marshall, Matthews, Smith, & Smith (1995) state that the Framework endorsed the New Right utilitarian shift that had had a significant impact on the New Zealand education system over recent years.
Rather than education being viewed as a mechanism to gain knowledge, the Framework promoted education as a way to gain skills to meet the demands of a consumer society. This shifted the ideological basis of education to a training model (where information replaced knowledge), rather than one based on understandings of the nature of knowledge. According to Akin (1994) the timing of the Curriculum Framework was prompted by an international economic crisis which saw OECD member countries move towards a more performance-based notion of curriculum policy.

Marshall (1995) reiterates the shift to a utilitarianism approach in the curriculum documents when discussing the development of the NZCF:

In an earlier document, *The National Curriculum of New Zealand*, there is reference to knowledge but this is essentially phrased in utilitarian terms, of knowledge that will be needed 'to enable students to take their full place in society and to succeed in the modern competitive society.' Similarly in the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (p.9) education is said to enable school leavers to be more adaptable for employment, to be better prepared to cope with constant change, and to be better placed to take a full place in the society in which they will live. It will enable students to access a wide range of opportunities. That these are narrowly instrumental justifications is clear. Nothing is said about the importance of knowledge for its own sake (Marshall, 1995, p. 47).

According to Lee and Hill (1996), Peters supports Marshall's stance regarding the utilitarian shift through neo-liberalism in the Curriculum Framework and goes on to say that

given that the framework reflects "a curriculum of enterprise and competition", it is hardly surprising that critics have drawn parallels between it and 'New Right' ideology. This ideology they argue, underpins the curriculum reforms, and is not confined either to the essential skills identified therein. It is a policy which unashamedly professes allegiance to the values of "excellence", "quality", "individualism", and "competition", within the context of the "free market" environment (Marshall & Peters, 1991; Fitzgibbons & Peters, 1994, Peters, 1994, cited in Lee & Hill, 1996, p. 24).
This is further substantiated by O'Neill (1996), who states that the curriculum reforms since Tomorrow's Schools "penetrates the heart of the neo-liberal restructuring of education and policy making" (p. 5).

The implications of a shift away from knowledge to information and skills has far-reaching consequences for the role of the class teacher who becomes reconstructed primarily as a technocrat. Furthermore whereas in the past teachers had been recognised as the "experts" in curriculum development, the recent ideologically-driven reforms of education suggest serious attempts seem to have been made to de-professionalise teachers with respect to curriculum. Curriculum development at the national level has been privatised (done on contract) and teacher organisations are no longer a recognised partner in the development process. There also seems to be little involvement of teachers at the policy level in development of the senior secondary assessment and qualifications system, something which is an integral part of the curriculum. Because the real curriculum is what is finally enacted in the classroom between the teacher and students, we believe that excluding teachers from the development process is a serious mistake (Biddulph, & Biddulph, 1997, p. 2).

This section has provided the context for the introduction of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and examination of its inclusiveness. It has demonstrated the way the Framework has converged with other reforms in education since the introduction of Tomorrow's Schools in 1989. Captured in part by an ideological shift to utilitarianism through neoliberalism, curriculum development shows signs of an instrumental approach based on technocratic rationality. This has led to an outcome-based approach whereby knowledge has been reconstructed as a set of skills required to be taught to meet the demands of the market. Furthermore the NZCF underpinned by a set of developmental levels of achievement, potentially provided teachers with expectation levels for their students based on constructions of "average" and "normal". Such an approach diverges from philosophies of inclusion and inclusive practices.
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE CURRICULUM AND INCLUSION

Having critically looked at the concurrent egalitarian and utilitarian discourses on which the NZCF is premised, in this section I will examine the theoretical framework and rhetoric of the stated curriculum as it relates to inclusion and inclusive practices. If, as was being suggested by the state, a shift was being promoted within New Zealand schooling towards a world-class inclusive education system, and the Special Education 2000 policy was currently being implemented for this purpose by enhancing students’ access to the curriculum, then it was imperative that the national curriculum also being implemented was consistent with and supportive of such aims. In order to determine whether this was the case document analysis was undertaken of the stated curriculum in relation to the Framework documents and selected curriculum statements. Whilst this provided some insight it could be constructed as rhetoric only (or the "appearance" in terms of Hegel’s immanent critique (as cited in Kiel, 1995, p. 130) and so it was also necessary to investigate and understand the intentions from those involved in its development at the state level. Firstly I will discuss the documents as stated.

Stated Curriculum

The premise on which the Framework was founded, according to the Ministry was:

Among the principles underpinning this document is the need for education to be inclusive for all students, and responsive to individual needs, recognising the wide variety of abilities and backgrounds children bring with them. (Maris O'Rourke, Secretary for Education, 14/7/96).

The Curriculum Framework document states a commitment to equal opportunities for all (including students with disabilities) and guarantees sufficient flexibility in schools for teachers to respond to each student’s learning needs through its nine guiding principles which give direction for teaching and learning. Two of the nine principles stated are of particular relevance for students with disabilities. They are numbers 3 and 6 as follows:
(3) The New Zealand Curriculum provides for flexibility, enabling schools and teachers to design programmes which are appropriate to the learning needs of their students. (p.6)

The school curriculum will be sufficiently flexible to respond to each student's learning needs, to new understandings of the different ways in which people learn, to changing social and economic conditions, to national needs, and to the requirements and expectations of local communities.

(6) The New Zealand Curriculum provides all students with equal opportunities. (p.7)

The school curriculum will recognise, respect, and respond to the educational needs, experiences, interests, and values of all students: both female and male students; students of all ethnic groups, students with different abilities and disabilities; and students of different social and religious backgrounds. Inequalities will be recognised and addressed. All programmes will be gender-inclusive, non-racist, and non-discriminatory, to help ensure that learning opportunities are not restricted.

Additionally, it is proposed that within the National Curriculum statements for each of the seven essential learning areas promotion of inclusive practices will be included and a promise to meet the needs of all students in New Zealand schools (regardless of disability) through an inclusive curriculum (New Zealand Curriculum Framework, pp. 3, 6).

**National Curriculum Statements**

In actuality there appears to be conflicting messages across the curriculum statements. Whilst it is not surprising that the styles used and some of the language utilised varies due to curriculum statements being contracted out to different groups, they are all at times internally contradictory despite a common thread of egalitarianism. This is probably due to being constrained by state rhetoric of equality of opportunity on the one hand and an agenda of marketisation on the other. The following section presents my findings in relation to document analysis of the curriculum statements.

**Mathematics (Ministry of Education, 1992b)**

The first curriculum statement to be released was *Mathematics in the New Zealand Curriculum* in 1992. It provides a section on "catering for all individual needs" which follows an egalitarian approach by providing
opportunities for all students with a hint of some "market-speak" (that is, "personal standards of excellence"). To add to the complexity, students with disabilities are not specifically mentioned unless they are defined as the "lower ability" group. This being the case on the one hand we are told that all students "should be enabled to achieve" but for students of "lower ability", there is an expectation that they only "need to have the opportunity to experience a range of mathematics" (p. 12). This is followed by a discussion about students who have failed to reach their potential but is confined to Maori and girls only, thus ignoring those with disabilities.

Science (Ministry of Education, 1995c)

The Science in the New Zealand Curriculum statement was introduced in 1995. This document provides greater detail for the promotion of an inclusive curriculum. Despite this, analysis of the document highlights similar contradictions as the Mathematics statement. Four particular groups (Girls, Maori, Students with Special Abilities and Students with Special Needs) are specifically selected, in reference to the following statement:

An inclusive curriculum that recognises the perspectives of a particular group of students can enrich education in science for all students (Science National Curriculum Statement, p. 11).

The document includes a list of the opportunities that an inclusive curriculum will provide under separate headings for each of the above mentioned groups. For the purposes of this chapter I will examine two of these to demonstrate the contradictions that are apparent.
The following tables contain extracts from the document itself:

**An inclusive curriculum in science provides opportunities for:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>to learn science that they value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>to learn science that they, their peers, their teachers, their whanau, and the wider community value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special abilities</td>
<td>to have their ability in science valued by their peers, their teachers, their families, and the wider community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special needs</td>
<td>is one where, they, their peers, their teachers, their families, and the wider community work together to plan and deliver programmes which meet their particular learning needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Science in the New Zealand Curriculum, 1995, pp. 11-13)*

For girls and Maori, the starting point is science, that they can value, whereas for students with special abilities, the focus is on having other people value them. However, for students with special needs, there is no expectation that the curriculum will provide any opportunity for them to value science nor will their input be valued. In this way the curriculum statements are specifying different aims of unequal value for particular groups. This deflects from and contradicts the notion of being inclusive whereby the education of each student is of equal importance. In the second example an inclusive curriculum in science provides opportunities for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>to use their language strengths and co-operative learning skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>to use their preferred learning and communication styles, such as co-operative learning and holistic approaches; and have oral contributions recognised for both learning and assessment purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special abilities</td>
<td>to use co-operative and problem-solving approaches to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special needs</td>
<td>they are given encouragement and support to enable them to participate as fully as possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Science in the New Zealand Curriculum, 1995, pp. 11-13)*
In this example, although an inclusive curriculum does not emphasise the opportunities that it will provide for students with disabilities to engage in co-operative learning (as it does for the other groups specified), it does endorse participation for all students. Furthermore this gives an implicit message that this is the expectation and that it should occur on an ongoing basis.

In these two examples, on the one hand the Curriculum Framework is promoting involvement and support for students with disabilities and on the other it is undervaluing their worth and their perceived ability to be able to gain from learning in this subject area. These contradictions provided in the curriculum statements give teachers unclear and inconsistent messages about expectations regarding an inclusive curriculum.

**English (Ministry of Education, 1996e)**

The *English in the New Zealand Curriculum* statement introduced a year later in 1996 adopts an egalitarian discourse through its promotion of equal educational opportunities. It focuses on inclusive practices by drawing extensively on the essential skills within the curriculum to promote social and cooperative skills and respect for individual differences:

In selecting authors and texts, schools will have regard to gender balance and to the inclusion of a range of cultural perspectives. The curriculum will promote the use of language that does not discriminate against particular groups of people. Provision will be made for students who have special learning needs in the area of communication. (The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, 1993, p. 10).

Whilst this statement addresses special learning needs and presents the importance of equitable outcomes for all, it is problematic in that it presents an overemphasis on communication:

*Learners with Other Special Needs, p.15.*

The English language programme must offer students with communication difficulties and disabilities every opportunity to develop their communication skills. Such students should have access to the balanced English curriculum. They may also require opportunities for intensive teaching in order to learn skills specific to their needs through, for instance, visual communication in
deaf culture; technology, such as Braille; and special intervention, for example, in the Reading Recovery programme, and in the provision of readers, writers, or interpreters.

Furthermore there is an implication when it is suggested that intensive teaching may be required that this will require outside help which could detract from the responsibility of the class teacher to meet the needs of disabled students in their classroom. Apart from this the document presents an inclusive approach.

The following curriculum statements are still in draft form, and are yet to be gazetted: Technology, Social Studies and Health & Physical Education.

**Technology Draft (Ministry of Education, 1995b)**

The Technology curriculum was also introduced in 1995 but has remained in draft form to date and therefore is still subject to change. This statement reflects a practical based subject (and one which has previously been the area into which students with disabilities have been mainstreamed) and is a very inclusive document. It states that "Technology is challenging and rewarding, and open to everyone". It recognises diversity in terms of gender, culture and disability and is based on a rights discourse in relation to achievement:

Technology education recognises that students have different starting points and will progress at different rates: the teacher's role is to motivate, encourage, support, and provide feedback to students. (p. 16).

All resources used should be critically reviewed to ensure that they support gender-inclusive, non-racist, and non-discriminatory programmes. (p. 15).

**Social Studies 1997**

The Social Studies curriculum statement has seen the development of two drafts. Much controversy surrounded the release of the first draft in 1994 (b) particularly by right wing lobby groups such as the Education Forum who criticised its lack of coherence and its, in the forum's view, "political correctness" (Education Forum, 1995). This resulted in a revised draft being published in 1996. Subsequently the final version was published in 1997 to
be gazetted in 1999. The revised draft of 1996 states that a balanced programme will include the following perspectives: Bicultural, Multicultural, Gender, Inclusive, and Future perspectives.

The inclusive perspective adopts a rights discourse and cites that programmes should be consistent with human rights legislation. It states that an inclusive Social Studies curriculum will enable students to:

- Use and broaden their range of experiences as a basis for learning;
- Use a variety of learning activities that will encourage full participation, independent learning, critical and creative thinking, and social action;
- Make informed choices about participation in any specific activities that may conflict with their religion or culture;
- Access and use appropriate resources, including those in the wider community;
- Learn through experiences that recognise the different learning styles of students. (Ministry of Education, 1996a, p. 31).

The Social Studies curriculum focuses on participation and learning through experience but fails to specifically address special needs students in this section. In 1997 this version was revised again into a final version and this section on inclusive perspectives has been completely removed and replaced with perspectives on current issues that focuses on the media. There does not appear to be any explanation for why this section was omitted. This means that whilst there is still acknowledgement of perspectives surrounding biculturalism/multiculturalism, and gender issues a discourse of silence prevails over inclusive practices. Furthermore this document, unlike other curriculum statements, has no definitions framed by a philosophy of an inclusive curriculum. This possibly reflects the influence of the right-wing lobby group, manifested as a move away from egalitarianism principles.

Health & Physical Education (Ministry of Education 1998b)

The Health & Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum 1998 has been released in draft form. At this stage it is underpinned by an egalitarian model of equality of educational opportunity. It emphasises attitudes and values that include:

- respect for the rights of others, including:
  - acceptance of a range of abilities;
  - acceptance of diverse viewpoints;
- tolerance and open-mindedness;

- social justice, including:
  - fairness;
  - inclusiveness and non-discriminatory practices;
  - discouraging behaviour that breaches social values (for example, physical or verbal abuse). (p. 11).

It has separate sections on cultural and gender inclusiveness, and provides not only for students with special needs but also promotes adaptation of the curriculum for them:

Students who are exceptional and talented in their ability in health education and physical education, along with students who have a temporary or permanent disability, whether sensory, physical, social, or intellectual, require programmes that extend, challenge, enrich, and broaden their abilities. These students will require programmes that are adapted and organised to provide access to relevant opportunities, that will meet individual needs, and that will contribute to the development of personal identity and self-worth (Ministry of Education, 1998b, p. 20).

This curriculum statement, another practical-based subject, provides an inclusive framework at this stage. However this is in draft form only, and subject to change.

In summary this section has demonstrated that analysis of the curriculum statements shows some contradiction across statements. Despite this the dominant rhetoric of the documents supports an inclusive curriculum.

**Intended Curriculum**

In this section I will investigate the intentions of the state behind the New Zealand Curriculum Framework in relation to students with disabilities. My findings from interviews with key officials in the Ministry suggest that despite the rhetoric in terms of an inclusive curriculum, students with disabilities were largely unseen or invisible, in the Framework while the intention of the document focused on the general education population.
Meaning of "Inclusion" In Relation to the Framework and Schools

A Ministry representative utilised a market discourse when asked to define the term "inclusion" by placing the responsibility for the Framework's implementation onto individual schools:

I think that the Framework is quite explicit in one sense about that and basically it is saying that every child, every child needs an education that's, that is absolutely individually suited to them, that it is the job of the school to ensure that every child's needs are catered for. So that's what, I mean I think in broad terms that's what inclusion means. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

By utilising an individualised approach that was seemingly in the best interests of each individual, the state was able to promote inclusion within a utilitarian framework.

Meanings of an "Inclusive Curriculum"

Before discussion took place of an inclusive curriculum, the Ministry representative explained different meanings of curriculum. This enabled him to then devolve responsibility for an inclusive curriculum away from the Ministry onto the school:

The literature is full of a definition that runs like this, there is the "intended curriculum" which is the paper stuff which the government puts a stamp on, then there is the "delivered curriculum" which the schools actually do and then there is the "received curriculum", that's what the kids perceive the curriculum to be... So in that sense if you are talking about an "inclusive curriculum" and you're talking about children with disabilities of any kind you're really talking about the delivered curriculum in a sense, what we are really saying is that it is the responsibility of schools to address the individual needs of kids. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The rhetoric of the Ministry in terms of the curriculum meeting all learners' needs through an "inclusive curriculum" was in conflict with other policy statements that supported the continuation of segregating students with disabilities from regular schools. This contradiction was reiterated in the following statements by a Ministry representative:
I do think that it is possible to have unrealistic expectations of the capability of schools to respond to all the needs of all kids. ... I think we probably acknowledge, we do acknowledge that there is a place for special schools for children whose needs simply can't be catered for in the mainstream. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

Moreover analysis from these interviews suggested that in terms of an inclusive curriculum, students with disabilities were largely unseen or invisible, with the intention of the Framework focused at the general education population. One of the participants involved in the development of the Framework indicated that:

> a lot of the language which was used in the development of the curriculum as such, was directed at the broad sweep of the kids and wasn't in any way focusing on children with disabilities. So we were thinking of 'gender inclusion', we were thinking of 'cultural inclusion', 'ethnic inclusion' all those kin of things as much as anything else. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

This assertion that the intention behind the document was directed more at the general education population rather than students with disabilities specifically, appears to contradict the stated aims of inclusion in the Framework document, unless students with disabilities were not considered to be part of the group of *ALL* students. The implications of this invisibility for the development and the delivery of the curriculum is that not only is this group (students with disabilities) not represented in the political process of its development but this group is also not catered for in the documents when schools undertake to implement the Framework.

In addition, the definition of inclusion utilised by the Ministry in the Curriculum Framework is somewhat different from those that I am using as my working definitions in this thesis. Whereas Ballard's definition for example is based on a discourse of rights, the Ministry's stand is in line with a market discourse, as part of their wider promotion of neo-liberal ideology.

Under a market discourse efficiency is obtained through individualism and the promotion of excellence. This is problematic because under this ideology, freedom of the individual overrides equity and any sense of community. The most vulnerable groups in our community, such as people with disabilities, are disempowered and unable to participate in a
completely inclusive way. In terms of the Ministry's definition of inclusion, the starting point becomes the school rather than the rights of the child (as in Ballard's definition). There is nothing in the Ministry's definition about the rights of every child to an education or the opportunity to participate in any school setting. It is possible under the Ministry definition for someone to say that a child with a severe disability needs minimal education. It begs all sorts of questions about who decides what is a suitable education for each child and is so broad that schools can interpret "inclusion" in any way they like.

By placing the responsibility for the Framework's implementation onto individual schools, accountability for liberal-egalitarian principles such as equity and participation for all is devolved away from the Ministry. A market discourse is evident here also, which reflects Ministerial fiscal control (by way of funding allocations as outlined earlier) but with the fiscal responsibility devolved to individual schools. Furthermore, through the state placing responsibility for students' inclusion onto individual schools and simultaneously preserving the "unit" or special school option under the guise of "parent choice", schools were left with confusing messages in relation to guidance for implementing inclusive practices.

CONTINUED ROLE OF SPECIAL UNITS OR SCHOOLS

Under the state's definition of inclusion schools could segregate a student into a unit and at the same time purport to be using an inclusive model for the curriculum. The state's overarching discourses of individualism and choice meant that this contradiction of meanings of inclusion was being supported by the state: "I think the special schools fulfil a fairly important role, in terms of acting as that sort of alternative", (Fieldnotes: Interview). It also meant that despite the policy changes depicting a world-class inclusive education system the status quo was being validated through legitimacy of the continued role of the special school or unit. This can be seen explicitly in the following statement:

I do think that it is possible to have unrealistic expectations of the capability of schools to respond to all the needs of all kids.
... I think we probably acknowledge, we do acknowledge that there is a place for special schools for children whose needs simply can't be catered for in the mainstream. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

The convergence of policies which reflected notions of inclusion that included segregation on the one hand and individualism on the other by the state was legitimated by defining inclusion in terms of parent choice.

In relation to whether the NZCF applied to the special education sector, contradictory opinions arose between Ministerial representatives, depending on whether the representatives were from the general or special education areas within the Ministry. State representatives in the area of special education supported legislation requirements in regard to the NZCF being applicable for all students including those enrolled in special schools:

One of the critical things I think about the issue of special schools is some of the special schools have said well the Curriculum Framework doesn't really apply to our type of children and I think what we really want is to be thinking about how it can apply and how can they use the Curriculum Framework... *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

This meant that there was an expectation that special schools should follow mainstream policy such as the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, which when deconstructed means that there was an assumption that the concept of an "inclusive curriculum" could be introduced in a segregated setting by this sector.

In contrast, the state representative (and one of the original curriculum writers) from the mainstream or general education position rejected any possibility of all students being taught from the national curriculum framework. He drew on a lay discourse suggesting that instead their exclusion was only "common sense":

And that's another aspect of inclusion, basically those kids have got to be included in what society has decided are the proper outcomes, the educational outcomes for kids, but again there is a sense of um, in which we can't afford to be unrealistic about this. But if you talk about children with severe intellectual handicap for argument sake, then some of the objectives of the curriculum
are simply nonsense, just nonsense. I mean that wouldn't be inclusive it would be cruelty so we have to, well it's a question of balancing. But if you like to put it a different way and this is not a phrase which is used very often around here, it is really just personal common sense. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

These comments contradict the stated Curriculum Framework document because the document does not say that it only applies to certain groups based on "common sense", but to all learners and it acknowledges that people will work at different levels and purports that it will have the flexibility to do that. That is of course on the proviso that the curriculum as stated is not only rhetoric and was intended for all students including those with disabilities. His comments also suggest that the divisions apparent in schooling in relation to special and general education are a reflection of the divisions which are present also at the state level.

In summary this chapter has set the scene for exploring and understanding meanings of inclusion in relation to the introduction of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000 policies in the New Zealand context. Analysis of documentation, along with explanations from state representatives and the literature has served to highlight the contradictions and divergence between the stated and intended policies. This reveals that despite the rhetoric of an inclusive curriculum for all students, it was never intended that this would include all students with special needs. Instead inclusion has been defined to encapsulate continued provision for the segregation of some students.
This chapter investigates the perspectives of other stakeholders who had connections with the school in relation to meanings of inclusion and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. It explores the impact of the State's understandings and considers what Hegel (as cited in Kiel, 1995) called the "appearance" in terms of the aims and rhetoric of meanings of inclusion by different participants involved with the school in some way. This will firstly be illustrated through school documents and policies. Secondly, understandings of inclusion by not only groups within the school (management staff and teaching staff) but also those in the wider community who are in some way linked with the school (parents, outside support agencies and colleges of education) will be provided. Other questions will also be explored through the perspectives of participants such as obligations of schools and the barriers to inclusive practices for them in relation the Curriculum Framework.

**INCLUSION**

The first section in this Findings chapter addresses the construction of the concept "inclusion" as stated in the school through school-wide policy documents. This provides understanding of the way meanings of inclusion have been interpreted by the management staff and trustees of the school and the messages they have been sending to their school community.

**School Policies**

School-wide policies at Westside High School gave an indication of the way meanings of inclusion had been interpreted within the school and the direction and expectations that were placed on the staff and students in relation to inclusion and inclusive practices by the school. Four of the official school policies were of particular relevance to the meanings of inclusion being promoted by the school:

- Attached Units policy;
- Physical Disabilities Department policy;
- Students With Special Needs policy
- Equity policy

(See Appendices Numbers 13, 14, 15, 16)
Attached Units Policy

The Attached Units policy was an indication that the school welcomed and promoted the presence of units within its meaning of inclusion at the school. The policy reflected an egalitarian approach and advocated the purpose of the units as a way of meeting "equal educational opportunity". It was purported that the units were "welcomed" by the school because they "enrich the lives of all people involved in the school" but it is not explained how they do this. This policy therefore assumes a taken-for-granted understanding of the value the units provide to the rest of the school (see Appendix Number 13).

Physical Disabilities Department Policy

There was also a policy for the physically disabled unit which had a focus on delivering "appropriate quality education" that "provides programmes of work appropriate to the needs of each individual student in collaboration with the student and his/her parents". This suggests a discourse of individualism that does not necessarily require an inclusive approach. Moreover, as can be seen by the following, the promotion of involvement with regular students was restricted to break time and school events rather than in-class socialisation:

6. To maximise social interaction opportunities with same age peers, by ensuring student availability at interval / lunchtime and by assisting with access to school social and sporting events, peer support and school camps.

The policy appeared to also reflect a traditional special education model. Language such as "appropriate" used a number of times, begs the question, as to who decides what is appropriate? Furthermore the language in the policy appeared to be professional-led rather than child-centred and thus reflected a discourse of expertism. For example:

3. To provide sufficient professional and support staff to ensure that care needs, educational needs are met in all settings.
(see Appendix Number 14).
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Students with Special Needs Policy

Whilst there was a separate physically disabled policy this was not the case for the intellectually disabled unit. Rather intellectual disabilities came under the umbrella of the Students with Special Needs policy. This addressed all groups of students within the school who were identified as having special needs. Curiously the physically disabled group was also included within this policy, so it catered for them twice. It is notable that students with intellectual disabilities are combined with physical disabilities but focus is given to physical issues (see italicised words) rather than learning needs or inclusive practices. The policy stated as follows:

Students with Physical and Intellectual Disabilities
We have attached units for Physically Disabled and Intellectually Disabled Students where specialist programmes and services are provided to meet students' academic and physical needs.

1. Some Teacher Aide funding is available through the school.

2. We have made environmental changes with ramps*, and have an upgraded Unit for Physically Disabled students.

3. We have access* to appropriate therapy*.

4. We have relocated resources personal [sic] to enable access* by disabled students.
   (*italics added). (see Appendix Number 15).

Equity Policy
In addition to policies that addressed the role of the units within the school, there was also a general Equity policy. This policy was very inclusive and recognised diversity by promoting anti-discrimination on the basis of "gender, ethnic origin, social or family background, religion, ability or disability or sexual orientation". It supported the development of programmes within the school that educated and encouraged "respect for the rights of all, especially those who have some perceived difference" (see Appendix Number 16).

This section has shown that the school's guiding documents for staff and students provided meanings of inclusion that supported the presence of segregated units. Furthermore whilst some policies appeared to be directed
at students with disabilities, there appeared to be a greater focus on students with physical rather than intellectual disabilities. In direct contrast the general equity school policy advocated inclusive practices across the mainstream. Therefore like the contradictions apparent in State policies, the school policies also reflected inconsistencies.

**Meanings Of Inclusion**

The ways in which meanings of inclusion were constructed at the school were as divergent as the state definitions and equally as contradictory. Simultaneously, there was a strong theme within the school of egalitarianism as well as elements of managerialism and neo-liberalism. The latter served to distort meanings of inclusion and highlight inconsistencies.

**School Management**

Management staff engaged in an egalitarian discourse when constructing meanings of inclusion. They were open to the inclusion of Jamie and Lee into regular classes and very welcoming especially to their parents but simultaneously promoted the presence of the units.

Well this is what we are working on, this is the plan for this year and we spent a lot of time talking about it last year, it's quite a big issue because staff have to feel comfortable about what they are doing. I think there is a fear that they are going to have unleashed upon us kids who are doing bizarre things in classes and the reality is that a lot of the kids in the unit socially and academically have performed as well or better than some of the kids who are mainstreamed in the school. And with the appropriate support, we can get a better education for kids who are designated to be in the unit and the kids who are mainstreamed in the school. It's a real blurring of the edges and allowing the expertise (*Fieldnotes: Interviews*).

On the one hand it was recognised that students from the unit were succeeding as well as, if not better than many regular students in the mainstream, but on the other hand, there was no reflection on the implications of such an assertion. No-one appeared to question the continued enrolment of students in units even though the students were succeeding so well in the mainstream. Furthermore the management staff
also engaged in a discourse of expertism when talking about the role of the unit staff in the mainstream.

In relation to inclusive practices there was a belief by the management in the school that there was an environment of acceptance within the school in relation to difference due to the presence of the units. Students with disabilities were "just part of the school scene". Furthermore:

Kids don’t look at other kids because they look different which may happen in other schools. You may have one or two visually different looking kids in the schools. There’s quite a natural level of acceptance in the school. I mean a few kids will say "well you look funny" but you know (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The school promoted a model of mainstreaming rather than inclusion and seemed unaware of the differences between them. This was consistent with the messages given to schools by the Ministry. The Principal defined inclusion as:

Weil, inclusion really means the student is taking part in the normal programme of the school, for each student it’s different but the particular students we’re talking about, participating in all the option programmes, physed, extra curricular programmes, the whole lot (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The Principal utilised an equality of opportunity discourse which focused on treating everyone in the same way when talking about how the school accepted difference:

But I think in terms of staff, I think our staff, teaching staff, our guidance staff in particular our Deans, have a very strong sense of seeing each kid as an individual, who’s entitled to exactly the same deal as every other kid and work really strongly for that. I think the school’s got a very strong culture in that sort of area (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

As way of contradiction the HOD of the Physically Disabled Unit stated that she placed students on the basis of what she called "parallel mainstreaming":

The most important thing is to get them to a place where they might be able to mix and mingle a little bit, be involved in
discussion and that sort of thing and sort of associated with that, or because they're interested in the subject but they're not capable of really working at the level of their peers, we do what I call parallel mainstreaming (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The way she defined inclusion matched the 1988 Ministry Gazette statement on social mainstreaming.

School Teaching Staff

The ways in which teaching staff defined meanings of inclusion was dependent on the area of education in which they taught. Differences were apparent between the way mainstreamed teachers defined inclusion, in comparison with those involved in special education. For some of the class teachers, like the State, the focus was only on regular students and issues of culture. The following is a typical response:

We've talked about having, I've talked about having a chart of Maori words in the classrooms, on the wall; just something like that and it is a real uphill battle to get those sorts of things. That's something I want to start with next year, I've ordered them and I'm going to have language charts in every English classroom (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

In contrast the special education teachers appeared to focus on mainstreaming rather than inclusion and used the terms interchangeably which suggests that like the state they were unaware of the different premises on which each was based. For instance as already stated the HOD of the PDU talked to me about social mainstreaming but called it "parallel mainstreaming". The resource teacher also used the terms interchangeably and presented inclusion in terms of physical presence:

So even though there is a feeling, yeah I think there is quite a good feeling that mainstreaming or inclusive education is something to foster within reason and I even think that myself.

My job at the beginning of the year was very muddly. I was employed as a special needs teacher which is all to do with inclusive education but there was no clearly defined job description when I started. The huge chunk of my job, working with inclusive, yeah the inclusive side of it, was undefined for the first couple of months (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
"The inclusive side of it" suggests that inclusion is something that can be adopted in a piecemeal way and can be seen as an add-on. This means that inclusion is being defined only in terms of practices rather than as a philosophy. This supports Skrtic's (1995) critique of a traditional special education approach to the inclusion debate that focuses only on practices, models and tools whilst ignoring the assumptions and theoretical framework underpinning definitions of inclusion.

In contrast to this, Jill the teacher aide (who worked part-time for a community disability agency who advocated for inclusion using a different model) defined it as follows:

They say inclusive, yeah, it's going a step further than like being mainstreamed, the inclusiveness of all, including everybody, accepting differences and adapting to you know, to suit everybody's learning styles (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Jill differentiated inclusion from mainstreaming in her definition by incorporating not only presence, but also acceptance and allowing for difference.

Parents

All parents interviewed wanted their children to be included in the mainstream as much as possible. Jamie's and Lee's parents had somewhat different expectations from those of Michael's and Raymond's parents in relation to expecting more than just mainstreaming. They also wanted the school to take account of their children's differences. Jamie's and Lee's parents adopted an equality of opportunity discourse as did the school, but also expected the school to accept and include their children at all times. Jamie's father, Mr Williams said:

In the context of the school, I see it as the child, Jamie being offered exactly what the other children are being offered unless there had been some sort of prior agreement made about the treatment he's receiving and we expect he'll be treated the same as the other children and required to meet the same standards as the other children. Once again unless we had accepted some alternative and because Jamie is a special needs child I would hope that the school would keep me informed if something was,
anything that was happening that was out of the normal expectations of the other children. So if anything was happening they wouldn't just allow it to continue happening. Basically I think that's it (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Those parents whose children were enrolled as regular students did not see it as necessary for their children to be withdrawn from class if they were unable to do the same schoolwork as the others:

I don't think the support should go directly to the student from the resource teacher. So it shouldn't be a one-on-one situation necessarily. I mean if, say for instance Lee was unable to do a particular thing in Mathematics, I don't think the answer is for him to be removed and work one to one with the resource teacher. I think the resource teacher is much better off, to give the teacher and the teacher aide an alternative or perhaps a simplified version of the same concept. It may mean dropping it back... (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This approach reflects an inclusive discourse in that the parents' starting point is an expectation that their children are in the classroom as full-time members whereas another parent whose child was enrolled in one of the units assumed a starting point which was out of the regular class and spoke about wanting as much mainstreaming as possible. This parent has been told that the level of mainstreaming possible was contingent on the amount of funding the school received for teacher aide support:

The more the merrier I think for Raymond because I think today the disability thing is becoming more and more integrated socially, so then it should follow that schooling should be the same too. So that he's only limited by his disability, getting back to what I said before, try as many things as possible now when he's impressionable and he's learning, so yeah. The unit's got a place certainly, for the Physios and the speech and so on, they can top up what he's not learning out in the normal school but yeah as much as possible so this comes back to the funding issue. You know I'd like to see more funding so that he can try his hand at everything and then specialise later on (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This demonstrates that parents' expectations and the ways in which they defined inclusion was directly related to contextual factors. In the first example Jamie and Lee had always been enrolled in regular classes
throughout their schooling and the parents therefore had similar expectations to other parents of regular students. In contrast, Raymond had been enrolled in special facilities throughout all of his schooling. It appeared that the parents had lower expectations in relation to Raymond's involvement in the regular school. Furthermore Jamie's and Lee's parents adopted a rights discourse when expressing their expectations of the school in comparison to that of a charity discourse taken up by both Raymond's and Michael's parents. The latter had less expectations of the school for their children expressing gratitude for everything the school did for their children, thus exhibiting their vulnerability.

As an official representative of the school a Board of Trustee member explained to me the importance of support in relation to her definition of inclusion:

So I believe that my philosophy and the philosophy of the school as far as inclusion goes is to be able to be side-by-side with their peers, involved in a variety of educational activities.

... in order for inclusion to be successful I believe that the teacher, the people involved in having these students in their class or in their gym class or in their sport activity must want to have the child there, ... And I do know that there are sometimes difficulties not because the teacher's not good but because of their ability to deal with children that are different, because when they went into teaching they didn't go into teaching to teach children that were different, so that isn't a criticism on the teacher, it is just that that teacher is sometimes put in a position where the choice is almost taken away... So so I think for inclusion to work well, it must be that the teacher receives support, to allow it to happen, the teacher's kept informed, that it's done in a way that's appropriate for the children or the student (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This definition could also apply to mainstreaming and so once again a clear differentiation was not being made. She also maintained a demarcation between special and general education. She made an assumption that teaching in regular classes was based on a philosophy of teaching only those considered "normal" and by implication anyone seen as different was not expected to be there. This serves to maintain the status quo and negates an inclusive philosophy that sees all students having a right to be full-time members of the class.
Outside Agencies

The outside agencies interviewed can be differentiated into two groups. They were state agencies who were fully government-funded and community-based agencies who received little government funding but who had opportunities to contract for funding in exchange for service provision.

The government agencies not surprisingly engaged in a discourse of "choice" that allowed both mainstreaming and segregated options. A special education representative told me that she believed provision should be set aside for withdrawal of students with disabilities into resource rooms especially as they got older and required greater support from others with disabilities:

... some, resource, resource room time, can be, it can be a very positive thing, some withdrawal can be a very positive way of spending some time so like a mix, so ... a range of resources is always very useful. ... particularly at adolescence is often a time when young people, ah they're growing, their their body weight um sometimes they need more, physical support and the system's, you know it's no longer easy to pop a child out on the floor and those sorts of things, um, but it's also socially and emotionally ah it's its a very difficult time for, those young people particularly if they're cognitively aware of their non-disabled peers, and sometimes there's the kind of support that they can get 'cos we need some time with other children who have disabilities. It can actually be very empowering, and I think that's a point that isn't appreciated by people who don't have a disability (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

On the one hand this stance supports meanings of inclusion in terms of it not always necessarily being the best thing for children to remain in regular classes at all times and secondly, there can be advantageous outcomes for disabled students to be able to share similar experiences with other disabled students. However, it also has the danger of assuming that students with disabilities are a discrete group of people who all face the same issues. Moreover it maintains the status quo by promoting the idea that as people with disabilities age they are better off with their "own kind".
A community agency who advocated for people with disabilities defined inclusion in a similar way to the working definitions utilised in this study:

It's meaning more and more all the time, I think, and it's interesting as time has gone by there are things going through in the literature that are indicating that it's a very complex concept, it's not just being there, it's a lot more than that, it's being really involved and accepted and valued in a whole range of ways. So, in education for instance, it's not just bunting your kid in a classroom with a teacher aide at their side and saying we are doing inclusion, it's really seeing that children and young people are fully involved in the life of the school and their classroom and that extends out of school too to extra-curricular activities, friendships, all those sorts of things (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This definition envisages the starting point of inclusion with the child at the centre and adopts a rights discourse in terms of what the child can expect. This contrasts with the Ministry definition, in which the starting point is the school.

**College Of Education**

Colleges of Education play an important role in the skills and messages they give to teacher trainees in relation to meanings of inclusion and acceptance of students with special needs. The Colleges are in a position to challenge the lay discourse that many bring to their training and have an important impact on what occurs later in practice in the classroom.

A representative from a College of Education who taught in the special education area also provided contradictory messages when asked to discuss the College’s position. On the one hand she differentiated between mainstreaming and inclusion by positioning inclusion at a starting point of students being "in" as well as taking account of the context:

I think it is an evolving thing, is because we started from a segregated set-up, although we’ve always had mainstreamed, but most of our schools and classes and what not were separate so we’ve had to have this notion of mainstreaming bringing them in, which was fine for the time because they were out there and they had to be brought in, but I think that it really is the wrong way to look at it, that we should be looking at how to include, that everybody should be there and what do you need to do to the
environment to make it a safe and fruitful learning environment for everybody, so that's what we mean by inclusion (*Fieldnotes: Interviews*).

On the other hand she continued to advocate for the separation of special and general education:

I don't necessarily believe that children should be in the mainstream class from nine to three. I know kids from my experience as a psychologist, that would find that experience extremely stressful with the other kids and that the needs of the child, so we need to start with 'how do we keep this child in the class as much as possible' but you must in the end look at the needs of the child and not the needs of ideology (*Fieldnotes: Interviews*).

Her assertion that the needs of the child must be catered for in the end suggests that she did still see a place for special units. It is also notable that she justifies this position on the basis of her previous training as a psychologist which suggests she is engaging in a traditional special education discourse of expertism.

In relation to the definition of inclusion used in this thesis, the College representative deviated from it by advocating for a separate functional curriculum approach. This traditional behaviourist approach sees the focus of the curriculum for special education students centring on developing functional living skills for greater independence. Thus the curriculum becomes based on things such as social skills and self-care skills. Unlike regular students who are provided with opportunities to gain these skills in an inclusive setting through day to day authentic situations this approach teaches these skills as splinter skills often far removed from a "real" context. The College representative said in relation to Ballard's definition:

Well this is where I might just deviate a bit from Keith [Ballard] particularly once you get to the secondary level [and support instead] ... a series of decision making steps about what is the best way to teach this child and I have seen some excellent programmes in America where without any doubt, the student was part of a classroom but not from 9 to 3 because so many afternoons a week they did community referenced stuff that had far more relevance to them than sitting in a classroom necessarily doing what everyone else is doing. There is no point having a kid.
sitting doing sixth form calculus. Now you could say "right then you need to be doing something else" that's fine but perhaps what that child really needs is maths outside the classroom, you know, learning how to go shopping (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Through advocating a separate curriculum for some students, by implication legitimates a need for specialist help and removal of students from the regular classroom. It also presents a narrow view of the national curriculum. The assumption is that the latter would not be broad enough to include functional skills for all. Furthermore it is implied that they are needed only for those with disabilities.

In summary this section has investigated the perspectives held by the following groups in relation to inclusion: management staff, teaching staff, parents, outside agencies and a representative from a College of Education. This has provided what Hegel called the "appearance" in relation to different groups' understandings and demonstrated the differences between them. In the section that follows investigation will be undertaken of the same groups' understandings of an inclusive curriculum.

INCLUSIVE CURRICULUM

An important part of this study is people's understandings and meanings of an inclusive curriculum. This is because an inclusive curriculum provides the link between inclusion and the national curriculum. The introduction of the Special Education 2000 policy was based on funding in relation to "the needs of the students to access the curriculum". Additionally this term as previously discussed in Chapter 5 Part A, had also been used extensively in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework documents.

A useful framework developed by Yates (1990) states that an "inclusive curriculum" has three main characteristics: equity (meaning social justice and equality); cultural (in relation to school knowledge reflecting our lived common culture and including the full range of purposes, values and experiences); and pedagogy (the way teaching and learning is shaped and whether it is based on inclusionary practices). My findings suggest that like definitions and meanings of inclusion, an inclusive curriculum was also
defined in contradictory ways with no clear shared meanings between stakeholders.

**School Management**

In relation to Westside High School's official curriculum statement, the term inclusive curriculum was not used but their school policy advocated that all curricula be examined regularly for "equity and racial bias". The ways in which management staff interpreted an inclusive curriculum differed. Malcolm's understanding reflected a generalist approach that focused on the word "inclusive" in terms of subject options:

The Curriculum Framework is one of a whole lot of things that, I think we do have a fairly inclusive curriculum in the year 9 our kids don't have any options but they basically do everything apart from languages where there are some options - Japanese and Maori. But it is inclusive in boys, girls whatever do everything and there are choices at fourth form and right through the school we have a health education curriculum option in the senior school, students pick up a whole range of things that I think fits in with the New Zealand curriculum *(Fieldnotes: Interviews)*.

George in contrast, defined it in a similar way to the Ministry, in which the focus was on everyone accessing the curriculum in the circumstances that best met their needs:

Well everybody has got to have access to it. That's what I see as, and access to it in the conditions or circumstances that best meet their needs but that the curriculum must be accessible to all students. Either way what best meets their needs *(Fieldnotes: Interviews)*.

Whilst this definition was egalitarian, it was also problematic in that it allowed for the continuation of segregation if it was deemed by someone that a student's needs were best met in a special class.

**School Teaching Staff**

Both class and resource teachers also disclosed conflicting meanings of their understandings of an "inclusive curriculum" when asked about this term in relation to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. Several teachers (including one of the resource teachers) were unaware of the term, whilst
others defined an inclusive curriculum only in terms of race or gender suggesting a generalist approach:

There's, I presume that sort of thing is aimed at racial differences and so on and using teaching methods that are not biased in one direction sexist or racist or those sort of things (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Bill, for example, who is a class teacher, talked about the way they tried to include Taha Maori into all subjects and how he found it difficult to do this in his area. In contrast, Bruce, another class teacher was uncertain at first, but later speculated as to whether it was a curriculum that all the students could follow or a complete curriculum:

I don't know. An 'inclusive curriculum', is it I could think of three or four ways it could be inclusive, does it include all students so that the curriculum means that all the disabled kids, the kids in the bottom classes can follow the curriculum, is it inclusive because it includes a complete curriculum? (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

On the other hand, Betty, the other resource teacher, saw an inclusive curriculum as referring to the range of levels operating in the class at the same time, rather than in relation to specific groups of students:

I guess it means levels, the way the levels work, so there's a Year nine Maths class but there's somebody in there, there's five kids working at level four, 20 kids working at level three and two kids working at level two and then the teacher provides, you know experiences at those three levels for those different kids (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Several other teaching staff including the teacher aide were completely unaware of the term which, along with its omission from official school policy documents, suggests it was not a concept spoken about as an integral part of delivery of the curriculum.

Parents

In relation to an inclusive curriculum, as purported in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, none of the parents interviewed were aware of it but several of them still had quite clear expectations within their own
definition of what an inclusive education meant. Jamie's and Lee's parents all assumed that if adaptation to the curriculum was required within the classroom then it should occur:

I'm always aware that it might be a lighter version of what's being offered, like doing 2 questions in a test rather than the 10 and possibly still on the same subject but more within the range of what's expected to be taken on board about it. But definitely sort of, always being offered the same, (pause) types of different subjects as the other children (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Another parent told me:

So I think that, where a student is struggling or there is a need, then perhaps adaptations do need to be made and I think that's the teacher's responsibility. I'd like to see more liaison between the teachers and the teacher aide and that's where the adaptations could come into it, like for instance if the teacher aide feels that that particular subject area is causing problems then they should be able to go to the teacher and say "what material or what can we do to change that, to alter the curriculum"? (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Outside Agencies

To outside support agencies the New Zealand Curriculum Framework was generally an unfamiliar document. However one exception was a disability advocacy agency who had a clear stance on an inclusive curriculum in relation to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. I was told:

Yes, I think it does all fit together and I would read that as a really good open curriculum statement but unfortunately teachers don't always see it that way and sometimes if you give them some examples like if they are doing photosynthesis and most kids are expected to learn the formula that goes with it and understand the chemistry of it, a student with an intellectual disability may need to learn that trees are green and that they need water and sunshine to grow that sort of thing to me, that's making the curriculum inclusive. And looking at activities that are using co-operative learning and all those sorts of things.

Me: So are you saying that teachers need to take in and make adaptations where necessary?

Yes, but not just adaptations because I think that idea of sort of watering it down all the time is not wildly attractive to teachers.
and not necessary inclusive, if say, everyone is sitting in the science class and Freda is sitting over here colouring in pictures that shows trees are green if she is not included in the activities of the class. I think there are ways that teachers need to think about how they include all children and a range of activities so it’s more than just adaptation (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This suggests that an inclusive curriculum is possible within the New Zealand Curriculum Framework but that a broader definition is needed so as to include the context. This would mean that any adaptations made to the lesson for some students in the class, would be done in such a way as not to hinder the inclusion of students with disabilities with their classmates.

In summary it can be seen that an inclusive curriculum means different things to different groups and lacks any shared meanings. There are inconsistencies apparent between the stated, intended and delivered curriculum perspectives. In addition a number of barriers to inclusive practices in relation to the NZCF were highlighted by some groups. It is to this that I now turn.

PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO INCLUSIVE PRACTICES

Some of the barriers to inclusive practices in relation to the NZCF were conflicting attitudes by state representatives depending on the area in which they work, constraints at the school level, teaching methods used, perceived flexibility of the curriculum, and Individual Education Plans.

There appeared to be contradictions in the statements made by Ministry representatives in relation to the NZCF and inclusion. Gerald, a Ministry of Education representative, thought traditional attitudes of teachers and schools were the major barrier to the curriculum being inclusive:

I think one of the major barriers I see is the perception by both teachers and schools because of a particular student's disability or whatever that they can't in fact participate in the curriculum at all and therefore often we've got schools in attached units in fact developing a style of curriculum that is in fact like a baby-sitting type of approach that these students can't take part in the English part at all and therefore what we'll do is some sort of work skills, life skills type of approach... (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
This appeared to be in direct contradiction to other statements made by the generalist representative, Colin, who did not see the curriculum as referring to all students and had no expectation that the NZCF would be applicable for some students with disabilities. Furthermore his stance devolved responsibility yet again from the Ministry onto individual schools and teachers. This ignores beyond school issues, such as training and funding. A representative from a national disability agency spoke about this:

And, maybe a barrier from the Ministry is to do with resourcing and, I don't know, in training. I think that is another huge area that needs to be addressed, is that teachers still say that they have not been trained to teach “these kids”, you know, well, it's time they stopped saying that, but it's also time more serious training was put into place and I don't know what happens when teachers go off to do their curriculum training days in science for instance. Do they get taught how to make the curriculum inclusive? Possibly not, and those are the sorts of areas where I think barriers could be addressed at Ministry level by funding and making training available... (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The teacher training provider also thought the upskilling of teachers was critical not only for an inclusive curriculum but also for the new Curriculum Framework:

Well I think that the thing about the 'inclusive practices' is the same sort of barriers that you find to the whole notion of the new curriculum. The new curriculum requires new types of teaching methods. You can't teach kids group skills sitting in rows ... And so one of the biggest barriers is lack of skill of teachers and with lack of skill often goes an anti-attitude, I mean attitudes and behaviours are interwined. If you train teachers to be more skilful in the methods that are suitable for the new curriculum which are also inclusive type methods, the attitudes will change too I believe (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

So a number of perceived barriers to inclusive practices in relation to the curriculum were highlighted by participants beyond the school. Furthermore the school staff also made connections to outside constraints that impinged on their ability to deliver an inclusive curriculum.
School Constraints

At Westside High School the issue of funding shortages was very much to the foreground in relation to an inclusive curriculum. Malcolm, a member of the management team, agreed with the rhetoric that the NZCF should be flexible to meet all learners' needs. However he emphasised the difficulty of such a policy on a practical level when the school was faced with staffing shortages and constraints on curriculum options because of funding shortages. This was also highlighted by another management team member in relation to teacher aide support:

I think one of the things that I already said is the lack of support. I think to be fully inclusive we need, or to meet the needs of some of our students we need more support than we are getting. Things like teacher aides and assistance in those areas are really vital and we just don't get enough. It's a constant battle, it's a decreasing pool (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

As well as issues around funding shortages the perceived flexibility of the curriculum to meet all learners' needs posed some contradictions in regard to special education policy.

Flexibility Of The Curriculum

Principle (3) : The New Zealand Curriculum provides for flexibility, enabling schools and teachers to design programmes which are appropriate to the learning needs of their students. The school curriculum will be sufficiently flexible to respond to each student's learning needs, to new understandings of the different ways in which people learn, to changing social and economic conditions, to national needs, and to the requirements and expectations of local communities (New Zealand Curriculum Framework, 1993, p. 6).

The purported flexibility of the Curriculum Framework raised questions about the continuation of special education IEPs under the new policy. In the Special Education Service manual (undated) an IEP was defined as:

a written plan for a learner whose learn-ing (sic) needs are different to (sic) what is normally required for age mates and whose teaching needs require some change in the regular class or centre programme or environment (p3.29) (cited in Thomson & Rowan, 1995, p. 5).
If the new national curriculum as stated was able to respond to each students' learning needs then either IEPs would no longer be used as a planning document for individual teaching and would therefore be obsolete, or the State was sending messages that the Curriculum Framework did not actually apply to all students. The latter was consistent with my findings in relation to the intended curriculum.

When I asked about this at the Ministry I was given conflicting messages. The generalist representative said:

> But the curriculum is very broad what does it mean? I mean, I, if I pick that up (picks up the framework document and waves it in front of me) and said I was going to deliver that curriculum to you, I can read it to you in 10 minutes it wouldn't make any damn difference and at the end of the day the curriculum is what is delivered on the basis of your needs, so this is a framework only (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This failed to take into account the curriculum statements that would supposedly back up the Framework itself and devolved responsibility back onto schools. He went on to say:

> it still comes down to a question of negotiating in a sense, negotiating between the teacher and the student as to what it is you need and where you're going to go to next (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Conversely, the special education Ministerial representative acknowledged that IEPs would no longer have a place under the rhetoric of the Curriculum Framework but like the general education representative still deflected responsibility back onto schools by focusing on classroom teaching practice rather than what the curriculum statements would be able to provide:

> I still think that a teacher, a good teacher should in fact be for a whole class of students, should in fact be individualising their delivery of the curriculum to meet the needs of each student rather, I mean therefore in a sense it does make the IEP totally a waste of time in that case because the teacher is doing it for everyone (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
Other stakeholders beyond the school also advocated the status quo for the continued use of IEPs. One agency advocated a starting point of individual goals followed by adapting them into the class curriculum rather than starting with the class curriculum and then adapting it for individual needs:

Me: So you still see a place for the IEP?

Yes, well not necessarily called an IEP anymore [but a] system for looking at curriculum planning that is individualised and when Di and Phil Fergusson were out here last year, yes last year I think, they had some nice planning ideas too for incorporating individual goals into whole class curriculum goals (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This maintains the premise that the student is separate and that the role of the teacher is then to see how they can fit the student in with the rest of the class. If the NZCF is as flexible as it is purported to be, it should be possible for the curriculum to be the starting point and adaptations made to it for any given student as deemed applicable.

General Versus Special Education

The issue of the IEP raises a broader theme of perceived differences between general and special curriculums. Traditionally IEPs for students with special needs have been based on a special education behavioural approach that has focused on individual weaknesses and strengths. Operating on a deficit model the context was often ignored. Carol, a College of Education representative, said:

They're [IEPs] framed up in a mindset that really starts with a deficit model in the child even if they put in strengths. The strengths are always less than other kids have and so they are looking at what they need to do to remediate this kid and here again ... I'm suggesting we should move from the least restrictive environment to the notion of the most inclusive practice (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The separation of IEPs from the rest of the classroom curriculum meant, according to Carol (during an interview), that "a lot of teachers saw IEPs as Special Ed curriculum" and there was a need to clarify "what is special about special education". Whilst she advocated that what "special education
people should be learning to do is to know what is the curriculum and how do we adapt it" this supported a continuing role for special education teachers and by implication the continued separation of special education from general education.

In summary, this section has highlighted a number of perceived barriers to an inclusive curriculum in connection to the NZCF, as articulated by different groups. Apparent contradictions by different factions of the Ministry seem to send confusing messages to schools for the use of this document as a tool for inclusive practice. In addition, along with funding constraints and inconsistency in relation to the perceived flexibility of the curriculum, Westside High School is provided with messages that promotes the continuation of separate curriculums for special and general education.

The consequences of such confusion in relation to inclusion and the prospect of an inclusive curriculum as an everyday practice raises issues of parental rights. What rights do parents have to insist on an inclusive curriculum for their child at high school and what redress do they have if this does not occur?

PARENT REDRESS

It seemed that under both the NZCF and the Special Education 2000 policies the responsibility for their interpretation and implementation was left up to individual schools. From my discussions with representatives of the state it became apparent that neither the Education Act 1989 nor the Human Rights Act 1993 were able to provide any redress to parents if the school in which their child was enrolled failed to provide an inclusive curriculum. A representative from the Ministry suggested that:

at the end of the day a curriculum which is not suitable for an individual child, I mean it would be senseless for the parents to take redress against the school for not delivering it and ... if you were to have, you were to have a curriculum which was mandatory on all schools and all teachers to deliver with redress, then you put the students that you're talking about in that situation, it's a nonsense, not common-sense (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
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These comments by the Ministry official are based on an underlying assumption that suggests there is no expectation that all students will have access to the New Zealand Curriculum and therefore any talk of the curriculum being mandatory or parents being able to seek redress for its lack of inclusive practices is seen as ridiculous.

Whilst it was suggested by another source in the Ministry that parents could seek redress through the IEP process, IEPs are not a legal requirement in New Zealand. Even the Special Education 2000 policy which outlines the direction of special education policy for New Zealand in the future is powerless to address this issue. This was confirmed by a source in the Ministry as can be seen in the following quote:

There's a raft of things that we will try from the positive side but we are actually quite powerless to insist that you have every child in the place and the parents will probably put pressure on but there is certainly, I think an increasing level as a child goes on into a secondary system there is that sort of tendency to create the separate unit for people who are different (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Under the current self-management model for schools, the only recourse of the state, according to a local Ministry representative, was to suggest to parents that they take their child to another school. In this way the state had ensured that redress had become an issue between individual parents and individual schools with no responsibility resting with the state.

The way Westside High School interpreted their reponsibilities to parents in relation to the curriculum and inclusive practices was explained by a Board of Trustee member as follows:

I believe that if if crunch came to crunch, that we do have a legal responsibility, um, that that we provide, um, appropriate education to every student within the school to meet their individual need, (pause) um and I and I, I feel very very strong about that, um, because a child, has a particular special need be it a slow learner, um a English as a second language or whatever, if they're if they come to the school I believe that by enrolling them we as a Board, have a contract to that family to provide, the very best education we can to meet that child's needs (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
According to the Board representative, Westside High School was one such school that had taken up the responsibility for inclusive practices for all students enrolled. In the next chapter I will follow up what this assertion means in practice on a day to day level at the school.

In summary this chapter has examined the "appearance" in terms of the rhetoric of participants in relation to meanings of inclusion and an inclusive curriculum. It has shown that the contradictions evident in the way the state defined meanings of inclusion were reflected by other stakeholders involved with the school. This has served to exacerbate other perceived barriers the school is faced with when trying to implement an inclusive curriculum. Confusion at all levels of education regarding the flexibility of the general curriculum and the role of IEPs was evident. This has maintained perceptions of special education curriculum as being separate from the general curriculum and placed parents in a powerless position to be able to insist on an inclusive curriculum for their child.
This chapter will investigate the meanings of inclusion as exemplified through day to day practices at Westside High School. Part A: Setting the scene will provide the context that informs the meanings of inclusion for the participants within the school particularly students with disabilities, by discussing the operations of both the Physically Disabled Unit and the Intellectually Disabled Unit at the school. Such investigations will focus on the messages given by their practices to the mainstream teachers and students. Part B The Mainstream will make a shift to focusing on mainstream settings in relation to practices of inclusion. It will investigate the impact that the continued operation of attached units had on the mainstream, as the latter shifted towards more inclusive practices for some students. It will highlight some of the difficulties encountered in the merging of both groups and the ramifications of these difficulties for students with disabilities.

PART A: SETTING THE SCENE

Westside High School, a state co-educational school was not quite a medium size school. It had two attached units for students with ‘special needs’: one for students with physical disabilities and the other for those with intellectual disabilities. The modes of operation differed between each unit and each had their own Head of Department and staff. The Physically Disabled Unit (PDU) maintained its own budget (staff had requested it several years beforehand) and administration. In contrast the Learning Resource Centre (LRC) for students with intellectual disabilities operated as another department within the school and, according to George, one of the management staff, was more “integrated” with the rest of the school. An explanation of each unit follows as a way of contextualising my findings in relation to the wider school and meanings of inclusion. This is because the presence of both units and the discourses utilised had far reaching effects on mainstream practice.

The Physically Disabled Unit

The Physically Disabled Unit (PDU) had 14 staff which included two class teachers, teacher aides, teaching assistants and the following full-time therapists on site: occupational therapist, speech and language therapist and a physiotherapist. Additionally, the unit staff provided an itinerant
specialist service to local schools in the area. This service provided the unit with extra money but not extra staff. Within the school there were 24 students enrolled in two classes. One class operated as a homeroom where students undertook a remediation programme, and the other was for mainstreamed students who would come and go. The latter were taught by the Head of the Department because this allowed flexibility to enable her to visit the itinerant schools and undertake her Head of Department role of administration and coordination with the mainstream. The unit operated quite differently from mainstream classes at secondary school with a wide range of ages in the same class, their own rules, and teaching methods that followed a special education tradition.

The role of the unit, according to Marie, the Head of Department (HOD), was to firstly, "provide support for students and work out their stresses and concerns", secondly, "remediate students" and thirdly, "help them work out their study plans etc". There was no explicit focus on including students into the mainstream in her definition of the unit. Indeed the way she defined the unit meant it could be seen in itself as a discrete entity. Despite unit staff interacting with the mainstream and some students being mainstreamed for some classes, the unit did appear to operate quite separately from the rest of the school. The HOD's statement "it's like a mini school inside a school" symbolised the detachment of its operations from the rest of the school. All administration pertaining to the unit was kept separate from the general administration area of the school and all liaison with community support groups was undertaken through the unit. All specialist staff and teacher aides attached to the unit attended weekly departmental administration meetings organised by the HOD.

**Head of Department Role**

Marie, the HOD, had been at the school for a considerable length of time and appeared to be very powerful within her area of the school. Whilst she talked about group decisions being made at IEP meetings with other staff and parents, when discussing students' placements in the mainstream of the school she always talked in the first person:

*I've looked for the right class for the student and then put them in there. For a long time I mainstreamed my students into the top*
stream because students in that level were more sympathetic to my students' needs... *(Fieldnotes: Interview)*

It appeared that by keeping the PDU separate the HOD was able to maintain a sense of control over her area of the school. She had seen many changes over her time at the school especially in relation to special education policy and appeared to resist the changes occurring. She used different mechanisms to do this such as the way she defined the role of the teacher aides, and she maintained a context of authority, which meant that the parents I interviewed believed that any communication with the school must be done through her.

**Teacher Aide Role**

Teacher aides were not assigned to one student, but rather they escorted many different students to the mainstream classes. This strategy can be seen as useful if students or aides are absent because of illness or if an aide does not establish rapport with any particular student. Marie strongly believed in not assigning teacher aides to particular students on the basis that:

I don't believe and my staff don't believe that it is right to target one student to one teacher aide and have the narrow tunnel view and to only relate to that one teacher aide and if you've got a teacher aide that's a very overpowering person it's quite scary and if they stayed with that student for a long time that's even scarier still isn't it? So our policy is that teacher aides, the classes that they attend whereer possible they're things that they're interested in. ... If you gave the same child to the same teacher aide all the time you could lose them because some of them are quite stressful to work with. So for the teacher aides and for the students we mix and match and muddle and stretch the boundaries as much as we can to give the kids and the teacher aides the best possible solution to their mainstreaming support. *(Fieldnotes: Interview)*.

Despite her aims to give students "the best solution for mainstreaming support" there are a number of other aspects to her approach that I believe had the potential to hinder students' inclusion and possibly served to enhance Marie's power. Because teacher aides were constantly shifted around, students were not necessarily able to build up relationships and trust with any one teacher aide over time. There was a lack of continuity for the student about what was being taught when they had different teacher
aides all the time, and for the teacher aide it was possibly difficult to be able to inform the student about subjects or topics over time. This also could have had ramifications for the relationship opportunities between class teachers and aides, and between parents or caregivers and the aides who worked with their children. It placed the HOD at the centre of all these relationships because unlike the teacher aides who were constantly shifted around, Marie's role remained the same all the time. So Marie became the person with whom class teachers and parents always had to negotiate. This ensured control and maintained the HOD's power in relation to this group of students.

Teacher aides spent considerable amounts of time in the unit and no students were allowed to go to the mainstream without teacher aides. This placed restrictions on their inclusion into regular classes and meant that decisions had to be made not on the basis of students' aptitude for, or interest in, subjects but on how much funding was available to place a teacher aide in the mainstream with a particular student. There were exceptions when on some occasions one teacher aide went with more than one student to the mainstream. The general policy of attaching teacher aides to students also followed through into the unit. Teacher aides and teaching assistants also worked one-to-one with students in the unit. When I observed in the remedial class one day there were five students present and 5 adults working with them.

Marie adopted a hegemonic discourse of professionalism to maintain her authority and control in the unit. She purported a two way transactional discourse of professionalism that was based on empowering parents and students to become their own decision makers. Whilst all parents interviewed felt included in the IEP process undertaken by the HOD, they all expressed how much their children enjoyed going into the mainstream: "I suppose he's like all kids, like him, they like being near other kids that are in the mainstream," (Fieldnotes: Interview) and they wished that their children could have been mainstreamed more. The parents had been given the impression by Marie that the number of hours their children could be mainstreamed was restrained by the level of funding the school received for teacher aide hours.
In addition, it seemed to the parents in my study that the unit was the whole of the school. All communication was undertaken with the unit staff particularly the HOD. None of the four parents interviewed had met the class teachers of the subjects into which their children had been mainstreamed and all said that any queries they had were directed to the HOD. They found it frustrating that the teacher aide changed all the time because this meant they lacked the opportunity or knowledge of whom to discuss their children with apart from the HOD. One parent told me this was consistent with the way power was maintained by the HOD:

Well he's got lots of teacher aides, there seems to be so many out there and I've met them but I'm not sure because I get a bit confused with some of them actually. And sometimes they write in here [communication book between school and parents] and I don't know who's talking to me anyway because they don't sign it. ... I don't know who feeds him, who takes him to the toilet. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

Furthermore there was also some disparity between what Hegel calls the “appearance” and the “reality” in terms of the model of professionalism the HOD promoted in relation to her purported responsibility for modifying the curriculum. Marie asserted that modifications to the curriculum for students going into the mainstream were undertaken in the unit but with the proviso that occasionally teacher aides did have to make decisions on the spot when in the mainstream. The “appearance” of Marie's assertions that modifications were undertaken in the unit however, did not appear to match the “reality” in both my observations in mainstream classes and from information given by some teacher aides. Several teacher aides told me it was left up to them to organise the students' modifications in the mainstream even though it was not part of their job description. This contradicted the two-way transactional approach purported by the HOD when describing her role as a professional.

**Teaching Methods**

Teachers in special units were trained in special education, and this informed their practice and the teaching methods that they utilised. All of the teachers in the units followed a behavioural approach and focused on functional programmes. The staff in the PDU undertook a lifestyle plan when students were first enrolled and from this Individual Education Plans
were formulated. They followed precision teaching methods and other behavioural techniques taught under traditional models of behaviourism. An example of this was in Michael's IEP under Oral Language:

**Annual/Long Term Goal:**
Language Oral: To improve sentence structure

**Short Term Teaching Target:**
Michael will use is in simple sentences at 80% accuracy.
He will use pronouns I, you, he, she, with is + verb + ing
He will use why questions
He will increase frequency of 3 & 4 word sentences by 10%

The unit provided extra-curricular classes weekly for students in the unit who did not go to the mainstream. These included an art and craft period during which students worked in a group in the unit, a social sports period and a social time during which they learnt leisure skills such as computing and board games. These teaching practices appeared to be based on a readiness model and low expectations. On one occasion I was told by a teacher aide that the unit students were doing a play at the time and when I asked if they were doing it for the rest of the school I was told "Gosh no, just for those in the PDU. They would be much too slow to show it to the rest of the school and much too amateurish."

In summary the PDU maintained a programme of mainstreaming students that at times provided the rest of the school with conflicting messages. Whilst students with physical disabilities were included for some classes, it was constrained by the exclusionary practices that continued to be legitimated through the unit. The other attached unit in the school was the Learning Resource Centre (LRC) for students with intellectual disabilities. In the next section I will discuss the policies and practices undertaken in the LRC.

**The Learning Resource Centre**

The Learning Resource Centre (LRC), (previously called the Work Experience (WE) unit), had undergone dramatic change prior to the start of my data collection. Recent change in management staff in the last few years (in both the general school and in the unit staff) had seen the development
of new policies in relation to mainstreaming of students from this unit into the school.

Historically the Work Experience unit comprised two classes and students enrolled in it were rarely mainstreamed. Consequently the unit had operated quite separately from the rest of the school. The change in policy was to result in much more contact at all levels between the LRC unit and the mainstream but less with the PDU than had historically been the case.

The LRC had 24 students enrolled in it, two fulltime class teachers, a resource teacher who also taught in the mainstream and a full time teacher aide. My access negotiations into the school coincided with the Head of the Department of the WE unit (as it was still called at that time) having a proposal called “The Model” being accepted by the BOT for implementation the following year. This means that my study reflects not only the initial implementation of the proposal but also a witnessing of a school undergoing change and restructuring in terms of its mainstreaming and inclusion policies. (See Appendix Number 17).

The Head of the Department (HOD) of the Work Experience unit defined Westside High School as “a school in a state of flux” but with much entrenchment of attitudes and practices hanging over from previous practice. All senior students in the school for example had only ever witnessed segregation of the students from the WE in the school and this was to have implications for subsequent exclusionary practices that occurred and will be discussed later in this chapter. According to Jeff, the HOD, his model (as it came to be called by other staff) would see all students from the unit spending a minimum of 33% of time in the mainstream. He thought though that this would be difficult for senior students from the unit because they were not part of “a mainstream culture”. These students therefore, would continue to spend most of their time in a homeroom in the unit.

The change of name from the Work Experience unit (which like other WE units had traditionally been set up for students from special classes who were labelled as having "mild" disabilities) to the Learning Resource Centre (LRC) was purported to be a “reciprocal” system for the unit and the
mainstream. The idea was based on the premise that by mainstreaming unit students as much as possible, unit staff who had previously taught these students all day would be freed up in terms of time, to enable them to give their "expertise" to regular students. They would hence act as special education teachers in the homeroom and resource teachers for at-risk mainstream students who would be pulled out from the mainstream to work in the unit classroom, now re-designated as the Learning Resource Centre.

This proposal was said to be a "trade-off" by management staff on the basis that students from the unit would be placed into mainstream classes where "appropriate" and mainstream staff would be able to refer regular "at-risk" students for "pull-out" to the unit and the teachers would gain support from specialised special education teaching staff in return. The other classroom in the unit would continue to operate as a homeroom for students enrolled into the unit but who were now mainstreamed for differing amounts of time. Whilst there was recognition by the management staff of initial fears that mainstream staff would have about the new model, there was an overarching theme that it was a way of ensuring a "better education for all the students" at the school.

The participant-generated term "blurring the edges" came to signify the way the model was constructed and the meanings people attached to it. Underpinning the proposed changes was an "ideology of expertism" whereby the special education teachers (and especially the new Head of Department, Jeff) were posited to be the "experts" by management and representatives of the Board of Trustees, whom the mainstream teachers and students would be able to access and from whom they would benefit. The assumption that outside expertise was required by professionals (or in this case the special education teachers) rather than an upskilling of existing staff in the mainstream was consistent with a traditional epistemological framework of special education. The implication of this stance was that the status quo would be maintained and special and general education would remain separate. Hence the responsibility for special needs students would remain in the hands of the special education teachers.

Furthermore Jeff's position in the school also reflected the model in that he held not only the position of Head of Department of the unit but was also
the Year Nine Dean at the school for that year\(^1\). This dual role not only enabled a "blurring of the edges" between the LRC and the mainstream but also meant Jeff held a lot of power within the school. Jeff followed a traditional special education behaviourist approach in both his roles as Head of Department of the LRC and as year nine Dean. This meant that all actions discussed were explicitly defined in terms of behaviour and a deficit-based approach was used when referring to students. This occurred in both mainstream and unit settings, in relation to student placements, regular students and to explain all incidents. For example if students acted out in any way or had a disagreement with another student or teacher, he would define it in terms of the student requiring social skills training. This behaviourist approach was applied consistently in his role as Dean and as Head of Department of the unit. A typical example occurred during an observation with the homeroom students from the LRC in the library where I witnessed Alice displaying some distress over John's presence in the room (a student also enrolled in the unit who went home at lunchtimes). She sat in a corner of the room away from him and started to cry. Later after class, Prue, the resource teacher talked with Jeff about what had occurred. My fieldnotes say:

> Prue, the homeroom teacher calls Jeff into the room and asks him to shut the door. She says about Alice and John. Jeff says that Alice is getting herself worked up about nothing and is looking for attention. He says that everyone must ignore her and not reinforce her behaviour. I ask why she is frightened of John. Jeff says that a couple of weeks ago he pushed her and she is still going on about it and this is what she does and gets herself all worked up and into a state. (*Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*).

Not only did Jeff define this in behaviourist terms but he also utilised a deficit approach when doing so. Another example of staff ignoring contextual factors was during an incident when Jamie and Lee were encouraged by older students in the school to perform the haka and dance in the playground.

---

\(^1\) Each form had a Dean who moved each year to the next level with the students. So the Year Nine Dean would shift the following year to become the Year Ten Dean, then the next year the Year Eleven dean and so on until Year Thirteen. They would then revert back to being the Year Nine Dean.
I asked the teachers about Jamie in the playground and whether Lee was also dancing. Jeff said he understood that it was both of them and he had seen them himself and moved them on. He said they sat in the main thoroughfare and were getting lots of attention.
I suggested maybe they were getting "egged on" by others.
Jeff said "we can't change everyone else in the school, it is much easier to change their behaviour." (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Jeff’s continual use of a individualistic behavioural approach served to undermine the inclusive intentions of the model because it meant focus was placed only on individual students rather than also addressing contextual barriers that continued to perpetuate exclusionary practices. This had far reaching implications for the way the discourse of inclusion was defined for the LRC and the mainstream and what occurred in practice.

Mainstream Placements

Jeff had the power to place all unit students onto the mainstream class lists which ensured their placement into mainstream classes if deemed appropriate. In most cases students from the unit were enrolled into mainstream classes in pairs. In this way negotiation regarding their placement with mainstream class teachers was not required and unlike the PDU it was not necessary to contest for positions in classes. When discussing this with a class teacher I was told:

No. I believe that at this school mainstreaming of those students had become a fait accompli because of the conviction of a couple of people. Now I am not saying I disagree with it but I think those people have found that in the wider school community when it's debated it doesn't change anything. So I think they've come in with a very clear agenda that says it is going to happen and it is going to happen here and the consultation doesn't necessarily change the outcome which is that they are going to be mainstreamed (Fieldnotes: Interview).

A central tenet of inclusion under a rights discourse is a starting point of "in" the classroom as of right like other classmates and then withdrawal in rare cases if required. Under the model the potential for this to occur was realised by placing all students from the unit on mainstream class lists.
However this practice was only used as a way of guaranteeing their placement in mainstream classes where it was perceived as "desirable" and their enrolment status continued to be in the unit. This meant that the students were still in effect starting from a position of "out" and then being mainstreamed into some subject classes based on decisions made not by mainstream class teachers, nor by students and parents but by unit staff. This allowed those in charge of the model to maintain control of the programme and the mainstreamed students should they encounter any opposition.

In his role as Year Nine Dean, Jeff was also able to decide classroom placements for all Year Nine students. This was done based on a notion of "spreading behaviour problems around". When Jamie's and Lee's parents were negotiating access into the mainstream of the school, Jeff's involvement was seen as crucial by management staff and they were told that the school was "lucky to have him". In relation to his formal status in the school Jeff told me that as Dean he saw himself as falling between the class teacher and the deputy principals with no mention of the Heads of Departments. This was later corroborated by a Head of Department who told me that the Deans held an enormous amount of power within the school, second only to the management staff.

At-risk Committee

An important element of the model was the formation of the "At-risk Committee". This committee defined at-risk students and referred them for remediation into the LRC. It was the responsibility of Deans to gather information through a standard form given to class teachers about individual students. Referral to the committee would occur if students were coming to the attention of the Dean regularly, or alternatively if a class teacher brought a student to the Dean's attention. In the latter case the Dean would then be expected to request information from all the student's class teachers and then make a referral if deemed necessary.

The At-risk Committee was made up of George, a management member of staff, resource teachers who would be allocated a number of at-risk students, a reading recovery teacher, the guidance counsellor and Jeff, HOD of the LRC. The official list of members included Marie the HOD of the PDU but her involvement had been confined to providing advice when the
committee was initially set up. At each meeting new referrals would be discussed and offers made by resource teachers to take on different students. Although most students who were allocated a resource teacher went to the LRC for remediation, there were exceptions such as Jamie.

The workings of the At-risk Committee were constrained in a number of ways. Withdrawal from regular classes into the "unit" for remediation was in some cases resisted by students because of the stigmatisation that continued to exist despite the change of name and purpose.

Betty tells me about Peter, Forest and Leo who are due to come to the unit for remediation. She explains that at the beginning they were always late, about 10 minutes after the bell before they would come in. They would be hanging around outside. The reason was that they were waiting for the other students to go into class so they wouldn't know they are coming to the unit. I said "so there is a stigma attached to coming here then"? Betty says that she doesn't think so because she has the netball girls come over here. She thinks that it is just in the boys' heads but they unlock the fire exit door and the boys come in that way. The fire exit is around the corner and out of sight. Prue adds that the boys wouldn't come at all otherwise. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This appeared to create some conflicting messages. On the one hand some of the teachers were denying that the units continued to be stigmatised but on the other were acknowledging it by fostering secrecy and a continued belief that it was a place to be avoided. Furthermore these issues were never addressed and because places were contested due to funding constraints the students who resisted the stigmatisation of being associated with the unit, also jeopardised their placement on the programme. During an At-risk Committee meeting when the same three boys were discussed:

Betty started by talking about Peter, Leo and Forest. She said "I've had to yellow card them three times for coming late, they just won't come sometimes." This started a discussion about how great their need was to be on the programme and Prue said that Leo had a very high need and Betty agreed. Graeme and Jeff talked about how there were other students that could benefit from being on the programme and they thought they should be taken off. George said something like that they should be taken off until they agreed to follow the rules and if that meant that in a week's time they were going to co-operate then they could come back on
but they had to make an effort. *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*

This suggested that the contested nature of the programme meant that inclusion into it relied less on need and more on the conformity of students. The focus of the programme appeared to be more centred on behavioural issues and meeting academic needs, rather than on shifting towards more inclusive practices. This was confirmed by one of the committee members during an At-risk Committee meeting one day. He said "you know we need to be more inclusive next year. So far we have only looked at either behaviour or learning needs."

**Teacher Aide Role**

There was only one full-time teacher aide allocated to the homeroom in the Intellectually Disabled Unit and this was due to lack of teacher aide hours attached to the junior students enrolled. Three Year Eleven students had a large number of hours, but Year Nine and Year Ten students had none. This meant that Claire, the teacher aide attached to the unit, not only spent time with those to whom she was assigned but also helped all the students in the homeroom and went with different students to the mainstream. In contrast, Jill the teacher aide assigned to Jamie, Lee and several other students for short periods of time from 3BR in the mainstream, was not officially assigned to the LRC but was still answerable to Prue as their resource teacher and to Jeff because he was in charge of the model. Unlike the PDU, neither teacher aide was given any training in the LRC about their roles as teacher aides or expectations in the mainstream.

**Resource Teacher Role**

Four teachers in the school were also assigned roles as resource teachers: Jeff and Betty, both special education teachers in the unit; Prue who had been hired under a special funding scheme specifically as a resource teacher and Darryl an existing English teacher in the school who had special needs training. Three of these people had a special needs Diploma and one had taught previously in special needs facilities and during my study was accepted for the one-year special needs course available to teachers at one of the Colleges of Education in the country. This meant that the practices undertaken by these teachers were informed by traditional special education
behaviourist techniques and philosophies. It also helps to explain the
dominance of behavioural practices apparent within the model.

In addition, the school was part of a school support project initiated and
funded by the Ministry for schools in low socio-economic areas. Prue's job
description fulfilled some of the targets stated in the funding objectives. The
model was part of this in terms of raising the literacy and numeracy skills of
students in the mainstream. According to a member of the At-risk
Committee, the school had developed the resource teacher initiative
because of lack of funding for teacher aides from the Ministry. However one
of the major drawbacks with the resource teacher role was that continued
lack of funding meant little time had been allocated for Prue to be the
resource teacher for Jamie and Lee except for organising IEP meetings and
advocating on their behalf.

**Teaching Methods**

Teaching methods under the model consisted of individual remediation,
small group and whole class school work. When I observed students in the
LRC they worked on their own, or on a one-to-one basis with the resource
teacher and precision teaching techniques were used. Whole-class school
work within the mainstream involved dividing a class into two. The class
teacher would then take one half of the class and the resource teacher would
withdraw the other half of the class to the LRC. Half way through the lesson
the students would swap groups and locations. This worked on a very ad
hoc basis in that it was negotiated with individual mainstream teachers
rather than being implemented as school policy. This occurred in a
Mathematics class and several English classes where the groups were
divided in half for reading and writing. In contrast, in the homeroom
during English lessons students worked individually, in pairs and in whole
class activities. Most school work was remedial in which the class would
play word games such as having to find pronouns from a particular page
and their scores were kept on the board.

An unintended consequence during this time was a redefining and
modification of the model in one classroom. Whilst the initial intention
had been to implement the model in the pull-out way described, student
resistance to withdrawal prompted a redefining of the situation for those
involved. A student who had been targetted to be withdrawn to the LRC for remediation from the mainstream refused to go, with the result that the resource teacher worked within the classroom with the whole class and the mainstream teacher through utilising team teaching methods. This demonstrated not only agency on the part of the student and the continued stigmatisation of the LRC, but also a flexibility within the model and a willingness of those involved to at times adapt and modify the programme.

The introduction of the model, which was intended to be more inclusive for students, also had the effect of continuing exclusionary practices. Unit teaching staff required time to fulfil their role as resource teachers for the mainstream, and also to accommodate the students in the homeroom who were still mainstreamed for very limited periods of time. The compromise was that the homeroom students continued to go to some mainstream classes as a group rather than being individually included. According to one of the mainstream teachers because they "had to empty the unit" this meant trying to teach students, ranging from Year Nine to Year Thirteen, in one class.

Exclusion

Contradictions about the perceived need for some students to be enrolled into the unit at all created continued exclusionary practices and left me to speculate on the motivation behind this. Jeff told me that there were some very "high functioning students" in the unit who were functioning better than students not attached to the unit and who should never have been put in there. He said he was working to place these students into the mainstream as much as possible. Other staff told me of similar incidents. For example, in one case a student from the unit had topped the class in one of the mainstreamed subjects. This raised several possibilities as to the reason(s) for their continued segregation into the unit. It may have been that the students were being segregated for reasons other than their academic ability, or it may not have occurred to staff to question their continued enrolment.

The ways in which the homeroom was defined was also at times contradictory. Whilst on the one hand it was seen as a nurturing type of environment where students could feel comfortable it was also defined as being for students who "still act inappropriately" and required "structures
and guidelines" *(Fieldnotes: Interviews).* This suggested that the homeroom acted as a conforming device for the mainstream and was related to constructions of normality in that if a student was not able to conform, then he/she was not normal and must continue to be segregated. This became clear when one of the resource teachers told me about the success of the students from the unit in the mainstream:

So we’ve actually had teachers come back and say to us that these kids are doing really well and that’s "yay" and the kids are working really hard and I mean we’ve also had kids that we’ve had to withdraw from mainstream classes because of other factors to do with things like truancy or out of school behaviour where they’re just actually jeopardising places for other kids who might follow ... *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

From my analysis it seemed that the mainstream placements were highly contested and could be jeopardised at any time by lack of conformity. Moreover this was not only related to in-class actions on the part of the students but also out-of-school behaviour. This suggested that one of the functions of the unit was to regulate all student behaviour in the mainstream by sending a message to all students that non-conformity may result in withdrawal into the unit and inform students from the unit that if they do not conform even when outside the school, they will be constructed as abnormal and will have to spend greater periods of time segregated from their classmates. It was not surprising then that regular students from the mainstream did not wish to be in the unit themselves or to associate with those who were. When interviewing a group of students from 3BR I asked them about the students from the unit:

*Me:* Would you ever mix with those kids?
*Jenny:* Well to be perfectly honest I don't think so. That may sound mean but I mean I don't know ... it'd probably be for our reputation because people like say "oh he hangs round with the hams " and all this.

*Me:* How do you think you'd feel if you if you were in the unit?  *(pause)*
*Jenny:* Well, I'd probably feel ashamed.
*Margaret:* Yeah 'cos you'd get really teased I mean.
*Jenny:* That's right like 'cos people you know, they say you know "oh the hams go there" and stuff. Yeah yeah so I just I think I'd probably feel ashamed I wouldn't want to go, I'd ... I wouldn't want to go
from a mainstream class like I am in now to go to
the unit. I wouldn't want to, because, I yeah, I, I
no I don't think I'd want to go.

Me:
    How do you think you'd feel Lorraine?

Lorraine:
    I don't think I'd like it very much. (Fieldnotes:
    Interview).

It appeared that through their very segregation, the students from the
intellectually disabled unit in particular were stigmatised and seen as
"outsiders" by regular students. This was demonstrated in the following
vignette. One lunchtime when observing in the school I went for a walk
with a group of students from the unit and they took me around the side of
a building towards the home economics room. But they stopped when they
saw some regular students there and directed me away to "their hut":

"I haven't been around here before. What's it used for" I ask?
"Haven't you" says Mary.
Caitlin says "It's the home economics and technic building".
I can see two prefab classrooms joined together to our right and
there are students (about 6 or so) standing on a covered verandah
outside one of the classrooms. There is a patch of concrete in front
of the rooms and then grass which we are standing on. Caitlin
and Mary direct me away from there and say we're not going
there now.
"Come with us and we will show you our hut" says Mary.
"Why aren't we going there" I ask, pointing to the home
economics rooms?
"Because they're mean to us" replies Caitlin.
"Why are they mean to you?"
"Because we're in the unit. They call us hams" says Mary.
"What does that mean" I ask?
"I tell them we're not hams because you can't eat us." says Caitlin.
We go around the corner and there is a gate into a small
courtyard. It is concreted and there is a classroom on one side.
Caitlin says "we come in here to get away from people when
they're mean to us." Mary says "I ran away to here when I was in
Year 9 once".
I ask "what do you like about school"?
"Nothing" they both reply.
"Do you like the unit" I ask?
"No" they both say.
I say "do you go to any classes in the mainstream?"
"No" says Mary.
Caitlin says "I go to home economics."
"What's it like in the mainstream with the others" asks Mary?
"They ignore me" says Caitlin.
"Were you both in a unit when you were at primary school" I ask?
"No", Mary says "We're only 8 or 9 you see that's why."
"Would you rather be in the unit or the mainstream" I ask?
"IN THE MAINSTREAM" they both say in unison very enthusiastically. The bell goes and I say we'd better go. We go out and Caitlin shuts the gate (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

So despite both students having experienced teasing from regular students and Caitlin being ignored when she does go to a mainstream class, they would both still prefer to be mainstreamed. This would suggest that these students perceive the exclusion they are encountering to be a result of belonging to the unit rather than because of their disabilities or special needs. In addition, by them either attending the mainstream for only one class or not at all, the opportunities for them to be accepted by regular students are hindered.

In summary, over time the blurring of the edges continued to be specific only to one of the units in the school and the mainstream. There was increased collaboration between the LRC and the mainstream school but as a blurring of the edges suggests, essentially the core practices of each area remained discrete. The PDU continued to operate quite separately from either area of the school and maintained its function as a quasi-school within a school.

In conclusion, Part A of this chapter, Setting The Scene has outlined the operations of both attached units at Westside High School. It has not only demonstrated the distinctness of each unit but also highlighted the convergence in their understandings of epistemology and the following by both of a traditional special education model. The implications of this way of operating within the school had far-reaching implications for the meanings of inclusion in the mainstream. The shift to a more inclusive model by the LRC had positive results for the school but was hindered by the continuously contradictory messages and practices within the school. The implications for inclusive practices of the continued presence of the units within the school will be addressed in Part B, that follows In the Mainstream.
PART B: THE MAINSTREAM

Part B of this chapter focuses on the mainstream setting at the school and explores meanings of inclusion for all but especially for students with disabilities on a day-to-day basis. It explores what impact the presence and practices of the attached units had for the mainstream and the introduction of the model for inclusion. In the first section I present findings in relation to attitudes and philosophies within the mainstream of the school that fostered support for inclusive practices. However this was within a context of contradiction and constraint and therefore inclusionary practices were not embraced by all groups. This is evident in the diversity amongst class teachers in the ways in which they interpret these messages and implement them in their classroom practice. The implications that this has for students’ understandings and actions in relation to inclusion are explored in the final section.

Support For Inclusion

The following section presents the attitudes and philosophies evident in the school in relation to inclusive practices. It also provides detail of the support the school was able to utilise in its shift towards inclusion.

Management Staff

The management of the school were supportive of the shift by the school to more inclusive practices and there appeared to be resounding support for the model. A good working relationship between the management at the school, the Board of Trustees and the wider community seemed apparent. Outside agencies spoke highly of the school staff and that the school had "one of the nicest sort of feelings about it". The school had been subject to negative community perceptions resulting in a falling roll in previous years which had resulted in major staff changes including at management level. There was a subsequent turn-around in roll numbers in the year I began data collection which led to a certain degree of caution and reflexivity on the part of management in relation to the appearance matching the reality. Malcolm told me:

I have to be careful in what I do in sort of marketing or whatever you like to call it, that the reality has to match what you're saying.
You can’t go out there and say we’re doing really great things in this school and then have parents coming in and having bad experiences with their kids at school....What you say is what you have to do... (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Management staff also appeared to be supportive of their staff and spoke highly of their commitment to the school. In return most of the staff I interviewed felt included and well supported by the management team and able to challenge the hierarchy. In one instance a teacher aide told me that the Principal had omitted two teacher aides when he introduced new staff at the powhiri at the start of the year and so she had brought it to his attention. A few days later when I attended school assembly, the Principal stood up and welcomed the teacher aides concerned. This quick response to matters brought to the attention of management staff was to be a theme throughout my study especially in relation to incidents occurring or concerns raised by parents. It was important for this school, one under threat with such a tenuous roll situation and negative public image, to react swiftly to address issues or to silence them. The Principal told me "the real judge of how a school is going is how it deals with its problems rather than the fact that it has problems". The next section looks at the support the school was able to draw on from its community.

Support Agencies

The school was able to access support from the local Ministry office, other government-funded agencies and charity-based agencies. School representatives were happy overall with the services they received from all of these bodies. The agencies I was referred to by the school (see Methodology chapter for details) provided differing levels of support and varied between agencies and individual cases. The services provided included in-school support to work with individual students and families, withdrawal of students for short periods of time, group education courses for referred students in areas such as drug education and anger management and class teacher and guidance counsellor support. In addition the local Ministry of Education provided legal advice and supported the school in terms of advice regarding issues such as resourcing and staffing.
Most agencies had a referral system into which the school entered, and after
a period of time the school would be contacted and assistance would be
given where applicable. The referrals system in most cases appeared to work
well and appointments were followed up relatively quickly especially by
those agencies that were fully government funded. One qualification of this
was that waiting time was dependent on the time of the year as demand
increased over the winter months. Despite a generally positive and
successful system, problems (such as the one that occurred during my data
collection), happened sporadically. In this particular instance one of the
agencies with which the school often worked had a pull out system for
"conduct disordered kids" but had planned on being more outreaching to
schools and providing in-school support. During this trial an increase in
workload back on site meant that the agency representative had to withdraw
some of the support he had been giving to schools. This had direct
ramifications for Donald in 3BR who had been identified by the school as at-
risk and was being supported by this agency. There was no replacement and
so Donald according to staff at the school "really got left without that follow-
up." (Fieldnotes: Interview). Despite this occurrence at this time the school
was pleased overall with the service the agency provided to it.

 Welcoming of Students

There was an openness by the management staff to new ideas and a shift
towards more inclusive practices for students. The historical practice of
mainstreaming students from the Physically Disabled Unit and the presence
of many students from diverse backgrounds meant that the staff in the
school had been previously exposed to difference within the mainstream
and this helped to set the scene for the openness experienced by Jamie's and
Lee's parents. Malcolm told me:

 Staff here are very used to coping with kids who aren't ... I keep
saying that nobody is normal around here, you know and that's
really good because kids come from all over the place and all sorts
of backgrounds. So I think, "here's yet two more kids", rather than
here's two kids who are different to everybody else in the school
(Fieldnotes: Interview).

Jamie and Lee specifically were both welcomed by the school and, at the
parents' requests, their enrolment as regular students rather than in either
of the units was accepted without question. The following year other
students were enrolled in the same way. All of these students had been previously mainstreamed for all of their primary schooling. The warmth and openness that were displayed was expressed by one parent as follows:

I like the warm friendly feel about the whole thing. It has a real family community about it, that you’re welcome there, that you don’t have to make appointments or whatever. You can, calls are always returned if you leave a message and things like that (Fieldnotes: Interview).

It was suggested by the Dean and management to the parents that Jamie and Lee be placed under the At-risk Committee within the model. This meant that they became part of the model and each had a resource teacher (Prue) who monitored their inclusion, liaised with teachers and oversaw their teacher aide (Jill).

In relation to funding the school supported the parents’ rejection of a "paper enrolment" despite the lack of funding available for teacher aide support to the school. A "paper enrolment" in the unit meant that the school could get more funding for Jamie and Lee (who would be enrolled in the unit but would attend mainstream classes). The parents adopted a rights discourse and rejected enrolment in the unit on the rationale that they wished their children to be enroiled as regular students in a bid to send a message to the Ministry that they wanted their children included in the mainstream rather than being enrolled in units. Despite separate enrolment being in the school’s best interests financially, they respected the wishes of the parents. Whilst there was an openness by the school to difference it was marred by the contradictory nature of the philosophies on which the school was operating. It is to these that I now turn.

**Philosophy and Attitudes**

There were several dominant philosophies apparent within the mainstream of the school which were contradictory in terms of their theoretical framework. This had implications for the way inclusion and inclusive practices were defined and practised.
Positivism

The ways in which the management staff and Board of Trustees representatives had constructed the special education staff as the experts in the school served to reinforce the legitimation of positivist knowledge into the mainstream. This meant that what counted as knowledge became underpinned by a positivist approach that overwhelmingly focused on student behaviour and often ignored contextual factors. Managing student behaviour became the total focus in the school. The school had a system in place which dominated all classroom activity. I was told by a staff member that despite it not being in their job description:

I consider it's part of my job to try ensure that the class groupings exist in the year that I'm responsible for are working effectively and happily, that there isn't any major problems in any one class that requires whole class behaviour modification (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Meanings of inclusion were also constructed in an individualistic way that ignored the context and became people's taken-for-granted way of looking at the world. This resulted in a belief by some that the school had achieved inclusion, despite the continued segregation of students into attached units within the same school setting.

Despite the drawbacks the model did have positive effects in the mainstream and provided a shift closer to a more inclusive setting for some students. The inclusion of students in itself dispelled people’s fears and ignorance. The inclusion of Jamie and Lee saw teachers’ attitudes change over the year as the lay discourse the teachers had known previously was challenged. I was told by a parent that "they did not think he should have been in the class at the beginning of the year but now thought differently". In relation to the students I was told by resource teachers that they thought Jamie and Lee had really benefited by being in the mainstream. The irony was that both Jamie and Lee had never been anywhere else but the mainstream.
Social Democracy

The other discourse underpinning the philosophical framework of the school was a liberal egalitarian discourse of social justice. This flew in the face of the new right ideology that was being continually imposed on the school by the state in the form of policy changes and ministerial requirements. Teaching staff, aides and students alike at the school spoke of the importance of "fairness" when dealing with students especially those perceived as disadvantaged. Teachers saw their role as helping their students as much as possible. The following comment by a teacher was typical: "I think most of us deep down most of us still feel 'oh well we've got to give these disadvantaged kids as much chance as we can'.". In relation to students who were different I was told "you've got to be fair to all you know, you've got to treat them all the same but you've got to treat them differently". The school continued to try to address any issues immediately as they arose with Jamie's and Lee's parents, although the focus remained on behavioural issues. The staff continued to operate on a philosophy of social democratic principles by striving to improve their practice in relation to their students. At a meeting organised for the parents to give the school feedback about improvements the school could make, George stated:

You know, we know we haven’t done that great a job with your children and we are learning how to do this but we want to try and do as much as we can (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Shared Decision-making

In terms of the school structure within the mainstream the official school decision-making process was also underpinned by the humanist ideals of democracy and collaboration. Based on a flattened decision-making committee structure called "shared decision-making", each staff member was required to be on one of the five staff committees (personnel, student welfare, assessment, curriculum, and environment) which then reported to the school staff council once a fortnight. Each of those committees was then linked to a Board Committee. The Principal had the right to veto decisions and was able to use his power to influence committee decisions should he not agree with them. According to the Principal "shared decision-making" meant that:
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Everyone is on a management committee and is involved in making decisions about the direction of the school within that context. So there's not a lot of resentment about "decisions are made here, they've been made by people who've got the power as opposed to the people who haven't got the power", they've been made in a prescribed way (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The Principal also saw this as a way of making people aware of the difficulties that goes with making decisions in a democratic way:

The powered and the powerless; and I think it makes a lot more people aware of, of the complexities that are involved in making the decision, you know that there are competing issues and you solve one problem and create two others, or you've got to solve it in such a way that you don't create two more. You solve two problems and create one maybe (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Although this structure was supported by management staff, there was an emerging sense of managerialism in the talk of one management staff member, about the need for reviewing the whole process and the frustrating length of time involved when using the existing process.

Day-To-Day Practices

On a day to day basis teachers were able to be agents for inclusive practices at the class level despite the constraints they were faced with at wider levels within the school and beyond. The contradictory context of the school though meant that they were sporadic attempts in nature and lacked consistency. Where teachers were able to make a difference for the inclusion of all students was at the micro level on a day to day basis by giving status to students of difference, demonstrating understanding and compassion to students' needs, and encouraging openness about issues particularly those surrounding disability and difference.

Status

Some teachers gave students with disabilities "status" by entrusting them with some responsibility within the school, but this was usually limited to senior students. In one incident I was told by Jamie's father, Colin, that the Social Studies teacher, George, had asked Jamie to help him and Jamie had
left his jacket in the classroom and so George gave him the keys to go get it:

Colin says George told me that Jamie had helped him with some stuff and left his jacket in the classroom and had come over to his office and asked if he would go and open the door so he could get his jacket. George said "I had about 16 people to see and so I thought this is a good opportunity to give him some independence so I gave him my keys."
"Did he come home with his jacket" I ask?
"Yes he did. George said 'but I haven't got my keys back' but Jamie put them back in his office so he should find them tomorrow" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Compassion and Understanding

Some teachers took a particularly humanist approach with all of their students that encouraged reciprocal respect and provided an environment that was warm, encouraging and felt inclusive. Students' preferences for classes had more to do with the qualities displayed by the class teacher than the subject area or content. School staff who demonstrated understanding of students' opinions and were compassionate in regard to their needs were seen as the "best" teachers. For example, Bruce (cited by the students as a "good teacher") took the time after class to discuss with the students a disagreement that had occurred between themselves.

Mike was another teacher who seemed to demonstrate compassion to his students. He talked about the ways in which students confided in him and how it made him feel like he was making a difference for them when they trusted him enough to talk about things such as drug-taking. Some of the same teachers who were cited as the best teachers were also the same ones who actively encouraged inclusive practices towards Jamie and Lee from the other students. Very early on in the year, Mike encouraged students to include Jamie and Lee in group games:

Mike says to me that the boys are getting changed and don't have their swimming gear with them. He then goes over to those playing basketball (3 boys and 4 girls) and says "now when Lee and Jamie come out I want you to include them in your game."
One of the boy's replies "they can go one on each team."
"Yep okay" he replies and this is what occurred (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).
On this and other occasions, when the teacher encouraged inclusive practices the students responded without hesitation.

**Education of Difference**

The opportunities for students to understand and be educated about difference were limited due to the teachers' own limited experiences (which I discuss in more depth in Chapter 8). There were however exceptions to this.

Apart from Jamie and Lee in 3BR there were two students, Michael and Raymond from the Physically Disabled Unit, who were mainstreamed for Science and Health. On the second day of the school year the class was educated about the communication systems that Michael and Raymond used during a Science class. This was instigated by the class teacher.

Michael and Raymond were wheeled in by their teacher aides. One of the teacher aides moved so Raymond could be sat next to Michael but Ms Hunt asked that he sit at the next group to make up the four. Ms Hunt asked about their communication boards and moved down next to Raymond. The teacher aides explained about Raymond and Michael's voice communication boards. One of them did something to Michael's machine and then a recording said "I am having a good day," Everyone in the class listened quietly. The other teacher aide explained that Raymond points to "yes" and "no" and you can tell if he crosses his arm then that is "yes" (*Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*).

The teacher in this scenario ensured that Michael and Raymond got to mix with other students and provided the potential for further interaction between Michael and Raymond and their classmates by showing that although these students were non-verbal they were still able to communicate.

In another example, as part of the Health syllabus, students in the Year Nine class had a topic on physical disabilities (but not intellectual disabilities). Mike, the Health teacher introduced the topics the class would cover including physical disabilities. He told them:

that they were lucky at this school because they, unlike a lot of other kids got the opportunity to mix with people with disabilities
because of the unit and that they would be visiting the unit. Raymond was in the class and at the request of the teacher, the teacher aide told them about Raymond's communication Macraw and told them to talk to Raymond because he could respond to them (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

These two teaching moments resulted in students subsequently communicating with Michael and Raymond when in their classes.

One other occasion when students were educated about difference was when Jamie himself used his own agency to educate his classmates about his labelled disability. All students in the Year Nine class had to do speeches in English which were to be judged by the relieving teacher. Each person got up and read out their speech and then sat down. There was murmurings in the class during the speeches as some of the students whispered to each other. When it was Jamie's turn he stood up and went to the front of the room.

He informed the class that his speech was on his labelled disability. He explained how when he was a baby he had trouble feeding and how he had [biological factors] which made him different but he still liked two teaspoons of sugar on his weetbix. The class laughed at this. The class reaction was amazing. There was silence throughout the speech. At the end the class clapped (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This was the one and only time I was to see this kind of reaction from students during the class speeches. No-one else was given this reception when presenting their speech. On the one hand the students displayed a curiosity and a sense of bewilderment through their silence and an inclusiveness on the other by their spontaneity and supportive reaction.

Despite evidence of inclusive practices at the school, mostly through the actions and agency of individuals, the impact of lack of education and openness along with the wider context meant that inclusion was mostly hindered and students and teachers were left to flounder for themselves on an individual basis. This resulted in exclusionary practices also being prevalent at the class level by both students and teachers.
Different Expectations

The changes in the school structure (through the introduction of the model) that allowed for more students to be mainstreamed resulted in new situations for teachers. The lack of upskilling of mainstream teachers meant that they engaged in a lay discourse and often appeared to have lower expectations and adopted different rules for mainstreamed students in comparison with their fellow classmates.

Some teachers had lower expectations for the students with disabilities in relation to their schoolwork. George, for example talked about presentations that the class had done for their Maori projects and spoke highly of Jamie’s and Lee’s presentations. This however ignored the content of their projects because he had been unable to understand everything they were saying and so all emphasis was being placed only on their organisation skills:

George says "well I had 3BR give their summary talks today about their Maori projects and Jamie and Lee did really well. They were well organised and had really prepared it. Unfortunately I and the class couldn't always understand what they were saying but it was really good" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

On other occasions when Jamie demonstrated skills such as playing the keyboard, teachers were amazed. When Laura was mainstreamed into the English class in the middle of the year and the class had a test on material which she had not been present to learn, the resource teacher was less concerned about how much of the test Laura was able to do, than with whether Laura had looked like the rest of the class by doing something:

I mentioned that 3BR had had a test and that Laura was there. Prue said "so did Laura do it okay"?
"Well it was really hard for her I’m sure because it was stuff they have done this year which she hasn’t been there for," I replied.
"But did she look like the rest, did she look like she was doing something" asked Prue?
"Yes I suppose so, she had her head down like the rest of them" I replied.
"Oh, that’s good" she replied (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).
These examples suggest that these teachers held lower expectations for the students with disabilities and as long as they appeared to be doing what others were doing that was acceptable.

In terms of social relationships with other students, teachers also made the assumption that regular students would not want to mix with the students with disabilities by choice. Lorraine, for example, had been friends with Lee since kindergarten and their parents were friends. They sometimes spent time together in the weekend (for example they went to movies) but teachers spoke about being concerned that Lorraine was being "used too much" and "she might mind" in relation to her friendship with Lee or of her offers of help in the classroom. There was also mention made from another teacher of students whom Jamie and Lee had known at their previous school being "overused". These comments suggest that some teachers perceived that students were being made to interact with these students and did not enjoy it. Attitudes such as these served to separate out the students with disabilities as not being equals with their peers.

Bill, a class teacher, used a charity discourse to explain the way the other students perceived Jamie and Lee and his own expectation and fear that they would be victims of taunting:

I haven't had any problems that I'm aware of. The students or teacher aides haven't or people in charge haven't said there is any problem with students in my class so I guess it's working. Most of the other students are pretty good at assimilating such kids too. You'll get the occasional other student who will sort of take a motherly interest in the disabled student and make sure they are not just floundering. And if the disabled one is not doing what they should, there will often be another student who will tell them what they should be doing.

Me: And are you quite happy about that?

Bill: Yes. Yes it was a bit of a worry to me before I actually had them in the class that if I had a disabled student there could be kids who would actually, give them cheek or have them on, type of thing. In the public you hear of people with disabilities being taunted and so on and that certainly hasn't happened within my experience so, that's a good positive thing (Fieldnotes: Interview).
By using the term "motherly interest" Bill is suggesting that there is a perceived power differential between students with and without disabilities. He constructs interaction as being one-way, as distinct from what may be interpreted by others as friends helping each other.

Constraints for Class Teachers

Constraints that faced the teachers in the school impacted on their openness and ability to be able to practise inclusion. These included workload, lack of resources, stress issues, staff turnover and lack of professional development. Teachers had an enormous workload because of a number of factors. Rather than the number of staff being determined by the number of people required to operate an institution, it was dictated by the roll size of the school and because the roll size was down, there was a staffing shortage which in turn increased the workload for existing staff.

In addition, to be competitive in the educational market the school, (especially when faced with a falling roll), had to be able to continue to offer as much breadth in the curriculum as possible. This meant offering the widest possible range of subjects. So it had been negotiated by management with the teaching staff to teach extra classes. This meant that the staff at this school were teaching more classes than would have been expected of them had they been at another school. Class sizes less than the funding formula in the senior school meant they did not attract enough funding for each level and so teachers were expected to combine sixth and seventh form subjects and teach them at the same time to composite classes.

To add to this pressure there was a lack of resources and frustration from teachers about the differences between the resources they had for school use in comparison to their colleagues at other schools. Staff found themselves having to supplement their school budgets for classroom materials. Unlike other private schools or schools in high socio-economic areas the school was not able to rely on large injections of funds from its community. One teacher saw the lack of government support as the biggest constraint for him as a teacher.

The lack of government funding is the biggest one. I've always being interested in computers, I've always been very jealous of the
two local private schools who hold a fair on a Saturday and get $50,000.00 and buy 10 new computers for a new computer lab. We hold a fair and get $6, 7, 8,000.00 and it goes into, well sure it goes into some computer and some sports and so on, but it shouldn't rely on parent and teachers and PTA and so on to go out and raise money to give the basic education to the kids (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Fundraising for such events took up valuable teacher time and according to management staff "comes at the expense of teachers' energies and teachers' health and those sorts of things." (Fieldnotes: Interview)

These constraints added to the stress of teachers in their daily practice. Teacher morale suffered as a result and teachers got into "spirals of despondency" about their roles. The prevalence of relievers was at times high in the school as a result, despite teachers' reluctance to take time off. Parents commented on the high number of relievers their children appeared to have had and although George, one of the management staff, did not think the level was unusually high, he did acknowledge that he knew of classes that had had four relievers a day. Furthermore it is likely that the stress on teachers working in a school that lacked adequate resources contributed to the 25% staff turnover the previous year with one teacher telling me that at the end of the year he was leaving the teaching profession because he "couldn't take this anymore" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Constraints such as these made it difficult for staff to be willing to take on any more in terms of workload including having students who had previously been in the units. Furthermore class teachers felt they lacked the skills to teach those children. This was firstly because of a perception that children with special needs required extra or specialist help from unit staff and secondly because in their own pre-service training this perception had been fostered with education about disability or special needs being omitted from their general training programmes. To reinforce the notion that special needs students required specialist assistance, during my study the mainstream staff within the school attended a staff development session organised by two resource teachers from the unit. At this session they presented information for working with "at risk" students based on the
traditional special education technique of precision teaching. The following is an excerpt from the handout distributed to staff:

You can analyse the content of what you teach further. Break it up into its component skills or discrimination and teach them in small steps. It's a bit of work, but once the students have adjusted to the shorter, quicker tasks, the students can move through the component skills relatively quickly. If they don't, you will be able to see exactly which skill or area they are having trouble with. Then you can practice activities to build performance.

(Handout entitled "Working with "At-risk" students" for staff development session, May 1997- (see Appendix Number One ).

This approach re-emphasised the discourse of expertism from the unit staff that appeared prevalent in the school in relation to special needs students. Moreover it served to reinforce the legitimation of positivist knowledge.

The contextual nature of the school that demonstrated much divergence of practice by teaching staff across all areas of the school and the constraints that the school faced on a day to day basis had huge implications for the way students from 3BR experienced, constructed and understood meanings of inclusion in relation to themselves and each other. The ambiguity and silence surrounding issues of diversity and difference demonstrated by the adults was also an emerging theme amongst the students in the school. Most students were therefore left to negotiate their own meanings of inclusion with each other.

Life As A Student

Life as a student was complex and shared meanings of inclusion were at times blurred and ambiguous. Inclusive practices and shared meanings of inclusion that occurred between students centred on themes of acceptance, friendship, looking out for others and acceptance of difference. Simultaneously and in contrast, exclusionary practices occurred when students failed to take the role of the other, had no shared understanding and engaged in a lay discourse of prejudice and ignorance. Exclusionary practices manifested in actions like physical fighting, teasing, isolation of difference and negative labelling. At other times these apparent dichotomies were blurred and ambiguity arose due to shared understandings not being static, and the changing of interpretations over
time as students continually negotiated and re-negotiated their meanings. This resulted in contradictions and at times a supposed shifting of positions with one another.

**Shared Meanings Of Inclusion**

In the following section I will explore the themes that emerged firstly in relation to shared meanings of inclusion in 3BR.

**Acceptance**

Acceptance appeared to be at different levels amongst students and was constantly negotiated and re-negotiated. This happened in various ways. Some students appeared to be "insiders" and others were "outsiders" of the dominant group in the classroom. Generally, the more extroverted girls (with a few exceptions) mixed with the more extroverted boys and this group appeared to be the dominant group in the class. The "quieter" girls mostly kept together and so did the other boys in the class, although several more extroverted ones also appeared to be "out". Jenny articulated this when I asked her about how people became accepted in the class:

**Me:** Okay, how do you think you become accepted in 3BR? Or have you been accepted in 3BR?

**Jenny:** Yep, I think we all have, I mean you know, they have, like you know the pop- the louder ones and the more popular ones and then they have the quieter ones, so I think that's just, you know well I think that's just part of our class. Um probably every class has, people like that *(Fieldnotes: Interview)*.

Students appeared to negotiate acceptance amongst each other into broadly defined "in" and "out" groups. Whilst it worked for some students to be accepted in the "in" group, it did not seem to work for others. Failure to be accepted was often as a result of differences in the way students defined the situation, lack of shared meanings or where both parties were unable to take the role of the other.

Shared meanings centred around knowing what was "cool and "uncool" and lack of understanding seemed to be part of the criteria that saw students being constructed as "outsiders". "Coolness" was defined slightly differently
by different groups of students, probably depending on which group they identified themselves with. However the common theme was that the "goody goods", those who got on with their work were "uncool" and those who broke the class rules and were withdrawn from the class were seen as "cool". However the contradiction seemed to be that some of the students who did break the rules were differentiated from actually "being cool" to "trying to be cool" by breaking the rules. This contradiction suggested that this was not the determining factor and that rather it depended more on who the student concerned was, as to whether they were deemed cool or not, for breaking the rules.

In the Year Nine class observed, three classmates, Hemi, Donald and Jane, (two of whom had been labelled "at-risk" by the school and were therefore part of the model), appeared to be the students who were most stigmatised and seen as "outsiders". Jane was disliked mostly because she was seen as "annoying", whereas Hemi and Donald were named by all the students interviewed as "smart, smart mouthed or tries to be smart". The common link between the three students appeared to be that they all often reported other students to the staff. This supported in practice one of the differences between "insiders" and "outsiders". Of the three students named above, Donald was the most disliked by all students interviewed.

Donald did not have a shared understanding with most of his classmates. It seemed as though he was unable to take the role of the other and as a result had no awareness of the students' informal rules about what was cool, what was acceptable and what was not. Conversely, his classmates did not appear to understand him or to be able to put themselves in his place. When some students asked him questions, from day one he replied with questions. Donald used a writing aid and was asked about it by students at the start of the year. This following example was typical of the way Donald responded:

Rose turns to Donald and says "why can't you write?"
He replies "why do you go to school"?
Rose looks quite offended and says "To learn, I just wanted to know."
There is some chatter and Greg sitting next to me says to Donald "Why don't you be a normal person?"
Amelia says "hey stop hassling you guys."
Later on when they were all working, suddenly Donald says in a big voice "I'm not spastic, I can write."
The teacher did not comment at all at any time (*Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*).

Donald was often constructed as an outsider by fellow classmates. His attempts to gain acceptance often suggested failure to define the situation and lack of shared understandings with his fellow classmates. Despite trying to imitate the actions of other students to gain acceptance, such as calling out, whenever he did so he did not receive the same reaction as that of the "insiders". During English class one day Donald gave silly responses to the relieving teacher when the class were asked to call out their favourite band:

Most of the class called out names I had never heard of. When it came to Donald's turn he said something like Rudolf the reindeer and a loud groan could be heard throughout the class. He added that it was by Kevin Bloody Wilson and the relieving teacher disputed this until others said yes that was the singer's name.

When it came to their second choice of band, Donald said Banana in Pyjamas for his choice. He then swung back on his chair and laughed. No-one laughed. Rose made a comment about him being 'a try hard' or something similar (*Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*).

Donald's attempts to be accepted into the class appeared to be unsuccessful, resulting in his isolation and exclusion.

In addition, not only did Donald not seem to be able to empathise with other students in his class but he was the only student I observed in the Year Nine class being negative about Jamie. This may have been his way of trying to be accepted or gaining the attention of his classmates, (which he appeared to do on many occasions), but it highlighted once again his lack of shared understanding with others or his inability to take the role of the other.

Donald was back today. Roger sat in between Lee and Jamie. A teacher aide told me that she was supposed to be with Michael but he didn't arrive. She sat next to Jamie (who had left his glasses at home) and helped him. One part of it the teacher aide asked where Jill was (she was away that day) and when Jamie said he didn't know, Roger said I'll help Jamie. The teacher aide said "okay."
Donald turned to Roger and said "don't help him". Roger replied "why" and Donald said "Because he's a dork". Roger ignored his comment and did help Jamie. He had trouble seeing the writing on the board and Roger dictated it to him. Donald kept calling out and making noises.

(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation)

What Counts As A Friend?
Students who seemed to hold a shared understanding became friends. When I asked students "what counts as a good friend", those interviewed identified similar qualities. This would suggest that each group of students had a shared understanding of the same values in relation to friendship. For all groups the main focus was on trust and other altruistic values. Other students were misunderstood and their negotiations with others failed and no shared meaning occurred resulting in them not being seen as a friend by other students. This led to their exclusion and in practice was demonstrated by the way some students were teased, became stigmatised and labelled as "outsiders".

Exclusion

At a class level the exclusionary practices that often arose between students took the form of physical fighting, teasing, isolation of difference and negative labelling.

Physical Fighting
In relation to physical fighting on most occasions it was difficult to differentiate between what was serious fighting and what seemed more like a shared understanding of teasing. What seemed evident, however, was that the students who reported other students to staff when this happened (and potentially breached "trust" between them) were the same ones who later became labelled as the "outsiders" within the classroom. Donald was often involved in physical fighting and would then go and complain to staff.

In contrast other forms of contact or teasing between those who did and did not have a shared understanding, appeared to be an accepted form of negotiation. The students, when asked about this form of negotiation,
explained that there were different types of teasing depending on whether the recipient was a friend. Teasing was acceptable if someone "teased you first", "said something smart" or did something "really stupid". In these cases students thought it was acceptable to name call. Teasing between friends was accepted also but was seen as different from teasing non-friends because it was done "in a fun way" (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

In the case of Jamie and Lee "egging them on" to do something was another form of teasing by some students. Whilst no-one was openly negative about them to me, at times other students would encourage them to do something that would make them look silly in front of others. One day I arrived at the school at lunchtime to find Lee looking very unhappy:

Lee and Jamie arrived in the place they usually sit for lunch and the quiet girls from 3BR were there also. Lee put his head in his hands, looking unhappy. I asked Jenny what was wrong with Lee. She replied that he had been kissing everyone in Maths class, especially Lorraine and even some boys. She added that the boys were telling him to do it. Lorraine (who is usually so quiet) agreed and smiled. They added that Jill, the teacher aide had told him off and this was why he was unhappy (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This kind of teasing occurred in the playground on a number of occasions but did not usually involve their own classmates but older students in the school.

Teasing
Another difference between those who were seen as insiders and those who were outsiders appeared to lie in whether or not those same groups of students would look out for each other especially if the other was not a close friend. Students perceived to be the outsiders in the class stated that they would not look out for other students because they would not want "to get involved". In contrast, those perceived to be cool or insiders within the class said they would "stick up" for others even if they were not their friend, particularly if the incident involved fighting or it involved teachers.
Acceptance of difference

In terms of the students' acceptance of difference, all students interviewed constructed the mainstreamed students in their class in a slightly different way from their other classmates. They were positive, talked about them as equals with some of the "in" group appearing to have a respect for these students that was not always evident when talking about other classmates.

Rose: But Donald used to pick on him and we used to help Jamie,
Me: Oh okay.
Rose: 'Cos like, we respect Jamie 'cos like he's a you know,
Me: 'Cos he's what? (pause) say it?
Amelia: A little bit out of it, not you know not not different to us,
Me: Right.
Rose: He's yeah he's different yeah that's the word
Me: So it's okay him being in the class? like ...
Rose: Yeah yeah he's cool.
Amelia: He's really good.
(Fieldnotes: Interview)

There seemed to be an unspoken rule within the class that no-one teased these students and when there was fighting between Jamie and Lee, some of the "in" group in the class stepped in to stop them.

I arrive to see Jamie and Lee coming quickly down the stairs towards me with Jake close at hand. The class is waiting for the teacher to arrive for Social Studies. They all go past me and I walk up the stairs. I look over the rail and see that the two boys are fighting. I can see Jake nearby but cannot see exactly what he is doing. I ask two of the girls if there has been fighting between Jamie and Lee and they say yes.
"Is Jake stopping it" I ask?
"Yes he is, Jamie is clinging on to Jake" replies Jane.
The teacher appears and it stops and Jamie comes up the stairs followed by Lee. Lee comes up towards Jamie and apologies.
(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation)

The practice of looking out for Jamie and Lee by this group of students did not appear to change their perceptions of them as equals:

Me: Do you see Jamie as an equal or do you see him as like younger?
Debra: As an equal
Kirsten: Yeah
Debra: We just treat him like we treat other people
Cathy: We walk in the class and say hi to him
Lucy: Yeah

Me: Okay, I was wondering how you see Jamie in your class, whether you see him as an equal or would you see him
Lesley: He's no different to anyone else in the classroom, its just that he's
Patricia: He is a bit different
Lesley: Yeah but he's not much different to anyone else. Like you still treat him the same as you would anyone else
Katie: Yeah because he's got feelings too

Lorraine: They have to be sort of treated different, because of their disability but,
Jenny: That's right
Lorraine: they have to be treated the same,
Jenny: for rules and stuff,
Lorraine: Yeah (Fieldnotes: Interview).

All of the students said they viewed Jamie as an equal and when talking about Lee, although some did not like Lee, that dislike was not associated with his disability, but rather appeared to be because he was mean to Jamie. Despite the claims by the students that they saw Jamie and Lee as equals, this did not appear to extend to treating them as close friends or "insiders". But then they did not treat them as "outsiders" either. Rather they were somewhere "in-between." It appeared that the "insiders" would look out for them and protect them but would not go as far as seeing them as close friends.

The difference between the insiders and the outsiders seemed to be less about what they valued in a friend and more about whether they would stand by anyone, other than a friend. It seemed the outsiders would not and the insiders would. My data supported this to be the case with the insiders supporting Jamie and Lee - treating them well and ensuring that they did not hurt each other. However Jamie and Lee were still unable to break through the barrier to real friendship with non-disabled students. Students did not sit next to them in classes when the opportunity was there and no students chose to be interviewed with Jamie.
If friendship was built on taking the role of the other and shared understandings in the form of trust, then it would explain that whilst they respected Jamie and Lee they misunderstood their disability and therefore were unable to take the role of the other in their cases. Moreover if they were unable to see Jamie and Lee intellectually the same as themselves, then perhaps they would not consider that Jamie or Lee could be trusted (even though they might not actually report on them). So their construction would become blurred neither "in" nor "out" but somewhere "in-between".

Although students did not position the mainstreamed students in their class as friends but as "in-betweens", they would use their agency to demonstrate inclusive practices towards them and resist exclusionary practices. I observed many incidents in which students took the initiative to act inclusively particularly towards Jamie, Lee, Michael and Raymond. This took the form of volunteering to work with the mainstreamed students when their teacher aide was not there and at times including Jamie and Lee in games during Physical Education (P.E.) time.

After interval we went to P.E. and they had to complete a circuit and record their scores individually. Lee and Jamie stuck together and Jill, the teacher aide helped them. They all then went outside and had the choice of playing either T-ball or cricket. Rose called out to me to come and play with them which I did. Jill joined in also and we played T-ball. Everyone got the chance to hit the ball on the tee and then run around the bases. There was a back-stop and everyone else was a fielder. There were no teams as such because once you had a turn you became a fielder. Lee hit a huge hit and everyone cheered him on. Jamie hit the ball too but not as far. Neither of them was caught out at any stage. They joined in with everyone else (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Despite these examples of inclusive practices, the contradictory nature of the context also led to much exclusion. The presence of the units, the discourse of silence and lack of knowledge that teachers had about Jamie’s and Lee’s capabilities (and arguably Michael’s and Raymond’s) resulted in much confusion and inconsistency in the way these students were treated.

Incidents of making exceptions for these students by teachers served only to accentuate their perceived differences (namely by assuming that they were incapable of following the rules). It also sent messages to the other students
that Jamie and Lee did not have to comply like they did and were therefore not really "regular" students. This was a covert form of exclusion.

In one example, Lee was given more chances than would usually be the case to avoid being yellow carded (the issue of a yellow card to a student by a teacher meant withdrawal from the classroom for the rest of the lesson) when he broke one of the class rules about taking other people's equipment:

Lee took Debra's speech card and she asked for it back. Bruce, the teacher went over and told Lee to give it back. Lee ignored him and looked the other way. Bruce kept saying a number of times "look Lee that is important to Debra now give it back." Finally Lee said he had given it back and Debra said he hadn't. Bruce said he would have to yellow card Lee if he didn't give it back. Lee continued to ignore Bruce. Bruce walked over to his desk and got out a yellow card. He said to Lee "now this is your last chance Lee or you will be yellow carded." Lee gave the card back to Debra under the table (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Incidents like this caused resentment with some students, because it was seen that Jamie and Lee had different rules from them. It also sent messages to Jamie and Lee that they were able to behave in ways in which other students were not.

In contradiction to this, at other times, it seemed as though the students with disabilities were not allowed to behave the same as other students, but rather had to be the "perfect student". Teacher aides reprimanded Michael and Raymond when they joined in when other students in the class were laughing or being noisy despite nothing being said by the class teacher to the regular students. Often the presence of the teacher aide also meant that students with disabilities, unlike other students, had adults permanently checking up on them. This resulted in students informing on them to the teacher aide, a scenario that I did not see happening for other students. Fighting in between classes occurred infrequently. Whenever this happened and teacher aides were present, they ignored it and mostly so did the other students. If students did become involved it did not usually mean reporting to the teacher or teacher aide. However for Jamie and Lee it was different, with students running to Jill, their teacher aide whenever an incident occurred.
We all walked down the stairs and along the corridor towards the outside door on the way to English. In front of me I noticed Lee and Jamie fighting and Jamie pushed Lee away from him. Jane was just in front and quickly turned around and ran back to Jill, the teacher aide saying "Jamie and Lee are fighting Jill." By this time they'd stopped. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

The issue of Jamie or Lee fighting extended to the school level whereas this did not appear to happen for other students. At Lee's IEP meeting he was reprimanded about previously fighting with Jamie despite being punished for it at the time of the incident. Whilst physical fighting was against the school rules, my observations showed that on many occasions it was ignored by the adults present at the time. For Jamie and Lee however it appeared to be a case of those with special needs having to always be model students.

Isolation
Whilst Jamie and Lee appeared to be the "in-betweens", they were at times subject to exclusion through isolation. Over time the physical separation and subsequent isolation of them through the presence of the teacher aide in the classroom, meant a routine was established. Even when the teacher aide was not there this practice continued, unless adults pro-actively included them. (I will discuss the role and the presence of the teacher aide in more depth in the next chapter).

During my interview with Heather, a class teacher, she talked about students being excluded when the teacher aide was not present. She appeared to place the responsibility for their inclusion back onto the regular students:

You know, it's daft because the kids just sit there in the afternoon, and I've found it is only towards the end of the year that other students like Lorraine, volunteered to help Jamie (Fieldnotes: Interview).

One of the difficulties that was highlighted for Jamie was the small number of other male students in his class as the year progressed. By the end of the year there were only seven other "regular" male students in his class. The teacher aide commented about this and how she did not think the students could see past his disability despite his "acceptance".
Jill: Jamie, unfortunately there aren't enough males in 3BR to pick and choose from really, having friends in class. Yeah, sad really. He's accepted as him you know being in the class and I think he's been accepted as a kid with a disability, but not as you know, just a kid, which he is, you know he loves his weetbix and loves lots of sugar on it (laughs) like every other kid as he said in his speech.

Me: So do you think the kids can't see past that disability in his case?

Jill: Yeah, I don't think they can. He's got the most warm caring lovely, he's just wonderful (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This supports the assertion that these students were "in-betweens", that is, on one level they were accepted for being different but on another level, not as another classmate. The discourse of silence that prevailed on a school wide level appeared to accentuate this especially for older students in the school. Jamie and Lee associated with a group of girls at lunchtime and were often hassled by older students. The outcome was that Jamie and Lee no longer sat with the same group of girls during break time as the year progressed. The inclusion of Jamie and Lee into a mainstream class on a full-time basis was new to the school that year and so the older students in the school were not only used to a discourse of silence, but had become accustomed to the segregation for the most part of special needs students. Over time I observed a shift during lunchbreaks and Jamie and Lee became increasingly isolated as they associated more with the students from the attached units.

**Lack Of Awareness/Difference**

Whilst students had the opportunity to learn about physical disabilities through the Health curriculum, they were not told anything about Jamie's or Lee's disability (except that which Jamie himself told them in his speech), nor those of other mainstreamed students with intellectual disabilities in their class. This led to most students interviewed either being misinformed or having little idea about their differences:

Me: Do you know anything about Jamie's disability?

Rose: His, isn't it his brain?

Amelia: Yeah. I think it's his brain and his, head and all that, did he have a car crash or something?

This was not to say that Jamie's speech did not have some impact because Margaret told me:
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Margaret: Mm-mm, not much (laughs)
Me: Okay.
Margaret: Really. (pause) He sort of explained it in his speech; he did a speech about it, Jamie.
(Fieldnotes: Interview)

Although misconceptions had occurred as a result of the silence surrounding intellectual disability, familiarity, (merely by the physical inclusion of these students on a day-to-day basis), had enlightened some students' views and led them to realise that in most ways these students were not very different from themselves.

Lorraine: It's just like Jamie and Lee are a lot slower than us. It's not like, there's anything wrong with them or anything,
Jenny: Yeah not like when you first see them at the start of the year like I mean goodness they're so different, but after you've like seen them for you know, you see them every day, you just...
Lorraine: And they can read and write and everything so it's
Jenny: That's right, I just see them as just like, a person like us, you know they're just like a little bit different, but once you see them every day they don't really look, much, different to us, like you know just like
Margaret: You just sort of get used to them and what they're like, and
Jenny: Yeah that's right and you just sort of accept it really. (pause) (Fieldnotes: Interview).

In conclusion this chapter has demonstrated the importance of contextual factors for understanding meanings of inclusion. It has shown that whilst change is possible through individual agency and day-to-day practices in a mainstream setting, the fostering of a theoretical framework throughout the school which focuses on an individualistic, deficit-model approach under the name of special education, serves only to hinder inclusion and ignores the contextual constraints. Additionally, the current philosophical ideology that pervades the school is diametrically opposed to any notions of inclusion. This in turn provides confusion and conflicting messages to all school members. Students from the units continue to be excluded and the students with disabilities enrolled as regular students are constructed as pseudo-members in the classroom, or "in-betweens" by their classmates.
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This chapter investigates the ways in which inclusive practices were interpreted and received through the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. How useful was the curriculum as a vehicle for promoting inclusion and an inclusive curriculum? What impact did the contradictory messages at the state level have at the class level? Did the claims of the Framework, such as flexibility of programmes to meet all learners’ needs, occur in practice and what significance did this have for students with disabilities?

The first section in this chapter addresses issues of diversity in relation to the NZCF. This incorporates culture, gender, class and other perceived differences especially disability. Following on from this, pedagogical practices will be discussed in relation to the NZCF and inclusive practices. By the use of the term pedagogy, I mean that which is taught from the NZCF that demonstrates an inclusive curriculum and how the NZCF assists the teachers to teach in an inclusive way.

ISSUES OF DIVERSITY

Inclusive education is about addressing issues of diversity (Skrtic, 1995). Whilst this thesis focuses on diversity in relation specifically to students with disabilities, it is recognised that inclusion is about addressing the needs of all students and their perceived differences. The New Zealand Curriculum Statements provide a framework, (especially in relation to culture and gender), for schools to do this. This section considers the ways in which Westside High School deals with issues of diversity on a day-to-day basis at the school in relation to the curriculum. It demonstrates that meeting the rhetoric of the Framework is difficult for schools within a wider political climate of individualism and without ongoing state support in relation to funding and professional development. Despite this many teachers act as curriculum decision-makers in working towards addressing issues of diversity as best they can through the curriculum.

Culture

At a school-wide level the school took its commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi seriously and sought to integrate biculturalism into the school
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ethos. The powhiri was framed as the "important occasion at the beginning of the year" and preparation was undertaken accordingly. This was one of the first formal occasions at the start of the year for incoming Year Nine students and was open to parents as well. Throughout the year other school-wide occasions occurred including the Whanau Sports Day for all students and the school's Maori cultural group. The school had a system of vertical groupings across class levels for bi-weekly tutor groups with every two tutor groups comprising one whanau group. Over 20 different nationalities of students were enrolled and the school promoted a policy that incorporated both biculturalism and multiculturalism into their curriculum. The Principal explained the school's perspective over this issue:

We do recognise and address that in our charter; our obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi and we place a high priority on the work that we do through Hemi and the Maori community and we involve him whenever there are Maori issues or discipline issues or any kind of issues. He's really closely involved in the whole process and that's very important for the school. I mean the powhiri at the beginning of the year is THE important occasion at the beginning of the year and always welcome people who are coming into the school for any significance with a powhiri- and recognise that whole dimension of what we do. At the same time I think you can also be multicultural within a bicultural sort of philosophy in that we have over 20 different nationalities of students enrolled in this school and we've got to recognise that as well and we're not... Within a bicultural philosophy we have a multicultural community and we have to acknowledge and meet the needs of all those cultures in the community. So both (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The ways in which some class teachers attempted to address cultural diversity through the curriculum was by reflection on the language and examples they used in written form in their classes and challenging students taken-for-granted ways of looking at the world. In one example Heather, a class teacher, explained the implications for herself as a teacher with Somali students in her class:

It's very hard sometimes with the Somali students for example, to be really aware of their cultural issues. It's not the religious issues, the Moslem issues; I always talk about- I never use Christianity as the only example. I always talk about Mohammed. I talk about time, whenever I talk about time, I
talk about it as a construct, a cultural construct (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Despite awareness and examples of the curriculum used to promote diversity and inclusive education, at times the constraints facing the school, (which will be expounded in detail in the next chapter), hindered positive attitudes from staff who felt pressured at times by the number of students perceived as different in their classes. A member of the management team explained:

Over the last two years perhaps, we are getting a lot more kids in the our school who have special needs. In the past we’ve had the PD, the physically disabled, we’ve had students who are in the special needs unit. The thing we’ve had a huge growth in over the last 12 or 18 months is ESOL students or NESB (non-English speaking background) students which they are now called. But we’ve had a lot of non-English speaking students and also fee paying students coming into the school. So that is also putting pressure on staff. How do I handle "I’ve got physically disabled, I’ve got those with special learning needs, I’ve got those with English as a second language, how do I cope with all of these people in my classes?

We’re trying to reassure them it will only be done where it’s sensible and where there is assistance given, but also the more mainstreaming from the unit the more staff there will be, for the staff from the unit to work with the kids in the mainstream who need special help as well. So it’s a sort of a trade-off (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Addressing Differences

In practice I was to observe many incidents in which from my perspective there appeared to be a mismatch between teachers’ and students' understandings, due to differences in culture, social class or gender. Teachers at times appeared to be inconsistent with their decisions, especially when reprimanding students who belonged to marginalised groups. Whilst in-depth analysis of these variables are beyond the focus of this thesis, (as they could all in themselves be separate theses), it is important for my study to note that inclusive education incorporates all areas of difference in its definition. Whilst the focus here is on disability or special needs the rights
of other groups must not be forgotten when understanding meanings of inclusion.

Disability

The ways in which issues surrounding disability were addressed by the school were at times contradictory and created confusing messages. Explicit education on disability occurred in relation to physical disabilities. In the Year Nine Health curriculum a lesson was assigned to physical disabilities. The lesson was held in the physically disabled unit and provided a vehicle for both students from the unit and regular students to interact and learn more about each other. The students from the regular class were able to try out the communication boards and ask questions. This was done in an open way that removed the silence surrounding physical disability for the regular students:

A woman introduced herself as the Occupational Therapist and explained that the students used different ways of communicating via boards or machines. She introduced the staff and the students introduced themselves either through speech or by communication board. She said that the students in the unit had a brain but may have problems getting their fingers to point and so they used other means. She said the students should talk with them but may need to give them time to respond. She demonstrated a voice-operated Macraw. The students introduced themselves also. The students were given a sheet to complete by moving around the room and asking questions of the students or staff (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This curriculum lesson had the potential to demystify the differences between the two groups and subsequent observational data demonstrated increased interaction between Michael and Raymond and their classmates as regular students used their communication boards to interact with them.

This vignette provided a real example of the opportunities that the curriculum was able to provide in enhancing the inclusion of students with physical disabilities. However it was thwarted by the segregatory setting in which the lesson occurred and had the potential to send covert messages to students about where students with physical disabilities "belonged".
This separation and privileging of physical disabilities over intellectual disabilities served to mystify and silence issues surrounding learning and other intellectual disabilities. When I asked the Health teacher how the topics were selected and if intellectual disabilities were covered at a higher level, I was told that the selection of topics had "historically evolved" within the school and only physical disabilities were incorporated into the curriculum.

The omission of intellectual disabilities in the curriculum was something noted by both Jamie’s and Lee’s parents and something they thought required addressing. Jamie’s mother said:

They’ve got the avenue for more education in the Health syllabus. I think the Health section that Jamie has already done barely touched on intellectual disabilities but touched a lot on physical or family. ... They just never looked at intellectual disabilities. I think it might be too hard (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The HOD of the LRC had quite a different perspective on this. He thought that disability should not be given prominence, nor should there be any discussion about the purpose of the units or the students with mainstream staff or students. When asked if he had talked with mainstream teachers prior to students from the LRC being mainstreamed into classes he said:

No it’s not something that we’ve discussed with them, it’s not something we’ve openly discussed with them. At the very beginning of the year when they’re included in the orientation programme those students were there and it is a case I agree with you of coming and going, but I would actually like not to draw attention to the fact that they are coming and going but to accept it as a part of normal part of school operations and school procedure because there are kids in classes coming and going for music, coming and going for guidance, coming and going for other things and rather than draw attention to the fact that they are "different", I would rather that the class got used to the fact that they might come and go sometimes (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This functionalist approach makes the assumption that mainstreaming can be normalised like music lessons. However, unlike music lessons a functionalist view fails to account for the connection between mainstreaming and the stigmatization of the unit and those enrolled in it.
In summary, this section has identified the inconsistencies with which issues of diversity were addressed at Westside High School on a day-to-day basis. The rhetoric in the curriculum documents were not easily transferred into practice although examples of individual agency were evident when teachers acted as the curriculum decision makers in their own classrooms. More commonly though, were continued exclusionary practices through teachers' lack of understanding.

**PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES**

This section discusses pedagogical practices in relation to an inclusive curriculum and the NZCF. I will start by focusing on what is taught in relation to social development and the curriculum and what implications this has for practice. Then I will explore the inclusivity of the essential skills in the NZCF.

**Social Development**

The usefulness of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework in relation to social development, particularly for those who were different, was problematic in practice. Inclusion centres on a student's membership as a classmate and having a sense of belonging (Schonrr, 1990). This has links with the Health and Physical Education curriculum statement that focuses on the well-being of individuals. Relationships with other people, according to Strand Three within the document, states:

*Strand C: Relationships with Other People:*
Learning in this strand focuses on students and their relationships with other people. Students examine effective relationships in the classrooms, schools, whanau, and the wider community during play, recreation, sport, work, and cultural events. They consider how they influence the well-being of other people and how the attitudes, values, actions, and needs of other people influence them (*Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum*, p. 10).

In practice this raises issues surrounding the social development of students in high schools and whose responsibility this is. If students are being isolated by their peers does the school have a role in facilitating change and aiding their inclusion? Can a school enhance their students' well-being if
students lack skill or ignore some of their students' social development? Was the curriculum being used by teachers to achieve this?

My findings suggest that due to the compartmentalising of subject areas this was a particularly difficult area for mainstream school staff and one in which there was a considerable level of ignorance and lack of skill. As an example, Jamie came to the attention of the management of the school after an incident in the playground and as a result had become isolated in the playground. Prue told the guidance counsellor:

Well I've seen Jamie in the playground and he is just wandering around on his own and I was thinking we really need to do something (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

After the incident the parents advocated for the school to implement a strategy called Circle of Friends, a way of including children with disabilities and facilitating interaction with their peers. This strategy has often been used successfully in inclusive education circles overseas (Forest and Pearpoint, 1997). Whilst some staff in the school were open to integrating this strategy in the Health curriculum others displayed some resistance:

The other thing the HOD of Health said was that she is worried that the circle of kids might do it to get him in trouble.

Prue, the resource teacher who was to be part of the implementation process displayed nervousness about her lack of skill:

I suppose I am worried that if I don't do it well it will be a lost opportunity. I thought even about trying it in the homeroom first, especially because those kids in the unit regularly have no friends and I have to go to someone and say "hey how about being so and so's friend today" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This suggests that social development was an issue that required a school-wide approach. Despite the interest taken in the Circle of Friends concept by management staff it never eventuated. Whilst the Health curriculum provided one avenue for these issues to be brought out in the open, the way secondary schools are structured means that any action through the curriculum could be only piecemeal in its approach.
Essential Skills

The Essential Skills in the NZCF are listed in the document as follows: communication skills, numeracy skills, information skills, problem-solving skills, self-management and competitive skills, social and co-operative skills, physical skills and work and study skills. Inclusion supports pedagogical practices that promote interaction between all students and provide opportunities for all to be included in the classroom irrespective of (dis)ability. These are achieved mostly through group work and strategies such as cooperative learning. Students take responsibility for teaching and learning together, rather than knowledge being transmitted through the teacher. In this way all class members share in the ownership of the curriculum, rather than only the teacher. This approach links well with some of the essential skills embedded in the national curriculum. According to the Framework document:

In planning learning programmes, schools need to ensure that all students have the opportunity to develop the full range of the essential skills to the best of their ability.... A number of the essential skills may be developed through group activities. Furthermore, many of the skills will enable individuals to operate more effectively in group situations. Students will learn to work in co-operative ways, and to participate confidently in a competitive environment. The curriculum will challenge all students to succeed to the best of their ability. Individual students will develop the essential skills to different degrees and at different rates (1993, p. 17).

In the next section I will focus on the way the essential skills matched pedagogical practices within the school in relation to how the curriculum was presented, explained and whether teaching styles were inclusive (rather than the actual content of what was being taught). I begin with ownership of the knowledge in terms of how it was transmitted and the impact this had on students in relation to an inclusive curriculum.

Ownership/Confusion Modelled

Two indicators of ownership of the curriculum was the degree of choice and flexibility students were given in terms of topics of study and the level of co-operative rather than individualised school work. During student
interviews I was told that they "don't really get choices" but they could recount one time in Social Studies when they were able to choose their own topic. The students thought that choice would provide greater relevance to each class and their interests:

Me: Do you think that would make a difference, like say, I don't how it would work but say at the beginning of the year, the teacher said you know "there's fifteen topics on the board and you've got to decide which ten you're going to do" and the class voted which ten, do you think that would be better?
Lorraine: Choose the most interesting ones for that class
Me: Yeah
Jenny: That's right 'cos each class likes different things,
Lorraine: Yeah there's lots of like, Polynesians in the class you could do about that and then they'd have lots of information and stuff.
Jenny: That's right, and it w- you know try and make it interesting (Fieldnotes: Interview).

My observational data suggested that vast amounts of time was spent by the students copying school work from the board. Science and Physical Education/Health were the exceptions. This way of learning was restrictive for those who were unable to write fast enough to keep up. I was told by Jill, the teacher aide, that the thing she thought constrained her teacher aiding besides attitudes was the lack of flexibility in relation to learning styles. She said:

Attitudes and unwillingness to change or to adapt to a new student who has different styles of learning to the norm, you know, who doesn't learn best by writing down screeds of stuff from the board, doing lots of experiments (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This view was supported by students who also saw this as a learning constraint. One teacher was named by most of the students as one of their "worst" teachers. The common reason given was the low level of participation allowed by the students and the amount of time spent copying from the board. When discussing this I asked if copying from the board was what they usually did:

Rose: Yes
Amelia: Yes
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rose: we have so much
amelia: that's that's stupid because you don't learn nothing from that.
rose: we had the whole whiteboard you know that big whiteboard full of work to do, and it's like we had to get this done by this time and, this day.
(fieldnotes: interview).

in general, students also wanted more input into class lessons and highlighted minimal student involvement in class lessons as another reason for not liking the same teacher. class discussion was seen as a way of doing this:

jenny: i think it would be quite cool if we had like i don't know say a period, you know, even if it was just a couple of times a week to like, express our opinions about stuff that had been happening like around that school or like even, you know, in the news and stuff, 'cos i, 'cos people are always talking about like something major happened they're always talking about it but the teachers never give us like any time to like actually talk about it, like in class, to hear what everyone else thinks about it.

lorraine:
and like you're all divided into your own little groups at lunchtime you don't see everybody in the class.

jenny: that's right and you sort of talk, you talk in amongst your group that's as far as it goes, actually it would be good to like hear other people's opinion like you know, some other people who don't really talk much you know, think of their opinion, and stuff (fieldnotes: interview).

these particular students were not only relating to class discussion as a way of learning, but were also engaging in a discourse of inclusion by seeing it as a way of including others and having the opportunity to interact more with their classmates.

teaching styles- group work

the absence of group work and co-operative learning strategies was also very evident from observational data. classes were mostly organised based on traditional secondary school approaches using individualistic approaches or pair work. all students said they preferred working in groups but this did not happen often.
Kirsten: I think it would be more interesting if we worked in groups and everything.
Debra: It would be more interesting if we worked more in groups and was more active doing stuff.
Jenny: I think I like working, I like doing group work more than doing work just by myself.
Jenny: I don’t like doing work by myself ’cos I (laugh) well (laugh)
Lorraine: Sort of get through it more and you can ...
Jenny: Yeah you can sort of I don’t know it just seems more funner eh, than having to work by yourself.
(Fieldnotes: Interview).

In Science, one of the exceptions, the students worked in a science lab and often worked in groups of four. However, for the students with disabilities this often involved them working in a group together with their teacher aides. On one occasion when the class had to give presentations in groups, Donald and Jane presented with Jamie and Lee; and Michael and Raymond were in a group with their two teacher aides.

Health Life skills was one of the few classes which were structured differently. At the start of the year the students were able to negotiate their own rules for that class with the teacher. Students liked the way they were able to work in groups in this class and voice their opinions:

Lorraine: So was um life skills when we got to work in groups ...
Jenny: That’s right yeah
Margaret: Yeah
Jenny: Life skills it was good, it yeah that was cool ’cos you yeah you sort of got, to work in groups and we got to share you know us- opinions and you know write down nice things about everybody and stuff, that’s really cool getting like positive things back from you know other people which was really cool. So yeah (Fieldnotes: Interview).

In relation to delivery of the curriculum the ways in which teachers defined their own teaching styles differed and could be categorised into teachers’ lecturing from the front of the room, students’ copying from the board, pair work, whole class discussions, or working in groups of three or four. Bill, a teacher who adopted a lecture-type style, defined his way of teaching by using a discourse of individualism whereby all responsibility for learning
was placed onto the students and if they chose to "slack around" after he has spoken to them then they would "miss out". Interestingly, this teacher was also cited by the students as one of their worst teachers. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

To summarise, the curriculum documents appeared to be of little assistance to teachers for adopting inclusive pedagogical practices. Traditional secondary school practices were maintained that centred on: ignoring the social aspects of the curriculum; providing little student choice or ownership of their own learning; and a dominance of individualised seat work prevailed. In the following section my findings address these questions: How did the Curriculum Framework allow ease of adaptation for particular groups (that is, students with disabilities) in mainstream classes? How was this happening and by whom? What role did the NZCF play in providing guidelines for the use of IEPs?

FLEXIBILITY/ADAPTABLEITY OF THE NZCF

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework purports to be sufficiently flexible to respond to all learners' needs. This has particular resonance for the inclusion and education of students with disabilities. Such a curriculum, it is proposed, would enable teachers and schools to design programmes to match all learners' needs. When I asked the class teachers whether they made any modifications or adaptations to their lessons for individual students as part of their practice, I was again given contradictory responses. Either class teachers did not use the curriculum statements in this way or if they did it seemed to be done in an informal manner. A typical response was:

Bruce: On the run usually, on the fly usually yeah I guess. It would be nice to do some different separate lessons and some group work and stuff like that but you know, ... but I think the practicalities aren't possible in the classroom (Fieldnotes: Interview).

The exception was Gary, another class teacher who made adaptations to the curriculum all the time, but went on to say that a lot of the time it was done on the spot:
Me: Do you ever make modifications for some students?

Gary: Yep definitely, that happens all the time. I mean in a class of 25 kids they're all individuals, to expect them all to perform or achieve at the same level is unrealistic and those modifications work in all sorts of ways. ... And a lot of that happens informally, it's not something that you sit down and plan but if you can see a kid's really struggling with something you've given them in class, you know that if you leave them to struggle they'll switch off and then you'll get behaviours that you don't want to see. The alternative is to give them one to one time and that's a limited option in a class of 25 (Fieldnotes: Interview).

It appeared that for some teachers, adaptations were not part of their everyday experience when designing their lesson plan for delivery of the curriculum.

In addition, there was no talk of any adaptations of the curriculum being made for students who were mainstreamed but who also had resource teachers. I asked the resource teachers about this and whether they had been asked by class teachers to modify any lessons. Neither resource teacher interviewed had been asked to make modifications for their students, nor had they been given copies of mainstream classwork despite their requests. Betty said:

when I put the kids into a mainstream class, I have a form that lets them know, who the child is, who their resource teacher is, so its either Prue, Jeff or myself and I ask them for a copy of any work that they'll be covering that slot, so I can do something like that but no-one's ever given me a copy of the work. So I think well I'm not prepared to chase them up (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Betty then went on to say that she would be happy to modify lessons or to work with the teacher, but there was no time because the slot was half over\(^1\) by the time she got to meet with the teacher. So on the one hand, she was saying she would happily do it if teachers came to her but on the other she was suggesting that time constraints would prevent it from happening anyway. In contrast, the other resource teacher interviewed, Prue, was unaware of the purported flexibility of the New Zealand Curriculum

---

\(^1\) The yearly timetable was divided into 6 slots, based on a three term school year.
Framework documents in relation to designing appropriate programmes for individual learners.

When I asked Betty if she thought there was an expectation by some teachers that students should cope the best they could without the need for teachers to make modifications, she seemed uncertain:

I think so and as long as you're quiet you don't have to do much, That could be, I haven't really seen that actually, I haven't really seen that but with some of the kids I guess that for the time that it takes for you to find out that there's a problem that must have been going on for a matter of a couple of months or something, which I think is a long time for that to happen ... (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Interestingly, by Betty suggesting that if there was a problem, it could be months before it would come to her attention, she was suggesting implicitly that there was not an expectation within the school that modifications of the curriculum when applicable would be made. Furthermore Betty went on to say that she saw it as more important to gain access for the student into the class first, and then curriculum issues could be addressed: "I think you have to sort of negotiate with the teacher, get the child into the class, then see what the situation is". Prue also had needed to negotiate access for students into the mainstream.

Whilst Prue was able to recount a situation where one teacher had modified curriculum material herself, generally she had not received feedback from teachers except where she had been asked to take responsibility for the delivery of the curriculum for a particular student:

Prue: So no they've not come back and the few times that I've gone to teachers and said well where are they at, what concerns have you got or how can I help, one teacher suggested that maybe I write up all these music notes and terms and work through with them with the child.

Me: But that's a shift though I mean that's saying "you do it" isn't it?

Prue: Yeah.

(Fieldnotes: Interview).
Furthermore, it appeared that some teachers not only did not adapt the curriculum in any way, but expected the students to keep up with everyone else regardless:

One part of it Prue asked Jill if she thought the boys were being mainstreamed too much and Jill said no it was really good for them socially. The main problem according to Jill seems to be that the boys are doing the work but are slower than the rest of the class to get notes from the board written down and examples done of different concepts. The sheets from the teachers were generally not saying there were any problems except organisation issues for Lee. (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

On a day to day basis during my observations I was not to hear about curriculum adaptations being made by teachers either, except the one teacher to whom Prue had referred. Attendance at an IEP for Jamie only saw talk of adaptations representing photocopying material in advance (to speed up copying from the board by Jamie and Lee because it was perceived by the teacher aide that they were too slow) and responsibility being placed onto the parent by supplying textbooks for home use.

Any other adaptations of the curriculum that were being done, appeared to be the result of the teacher aide taking it on herself to do so. During our interview Jill, (the teacher aide) explained:

Jill: I have done in tests for writing the answers, questions maybe on the board or on a sheet of paper and I'll write down an answer leaving out key words and gaps, maybe the first letter of the word and they'll fill it in. I do that quite often and it keeps them up to pace with the rest of the class or they don't lag behind and they get through more work and it's achievable and almost like a game, to read through it so it's not boring writing out sentence after sentence, it's writing down those key words.

Me: And is that something you've taken on yourself ...
Jill: Yeah.
Me: or is that something someone's asked you to do?
Jill: No, I've done that by myself, yep.
(*Fieldnotes: Participant Observations*).
The Year Nine Dean also confirmed that for the other students being mainstreamed, adaptations were often not being done in mainstreamed classes:

I think a lot of the time with mainstreaming the resources aren’t adapted to the kids’ needs and the kids whilst I know for a fact all the kids in here, all the special needs kids perhaps apart from Donald, their behaviour in the classroom situation is appropriate, their social skills are appropriate so they are not a behaviour concern. But what is a concern is what they are learning and that they are learning at an appropriate rate for them. Sometimes the material isn’t adapted in the least for them and they struggle. They struggle to keep up with the work and they struggle conceptually and perceptually, they don’t really understand what is going on. I think a lot of the time that is the case. I think ‘The Model’ is a good way of ensuring that. *(Fieldnotes: Interview)*.

The Dean’s solution to this issue was "the Model" that he was promoting at a school level, which was discussed in chapter five and to which I will come back in chapter eight.

All parents interviewed also told me that none of the the school work in regular classes was being adapted for their children. A typical response when asked about this was "... none of Jamie’s stuff has been adapted. He doesn’t always copy everything off the board and we wondered if they have to do that?" One of the implications of lack of modification for some students was that they were disadvantaged and parents were unable to help them at home:

Yeah, but you know there was one instance where Jamie hadn’t answered a couple of questions and the next day they were being tested on it but he didn’t have the questions written down. We couldn’t help him do the answers and so he couldn’t answer the questions. I don’t think it should be that hard for a teacher just to have an outline or a photocopy if there is a lot of written work, even a simplified outline *(Fieldnotes: Interview)*.

My own observation data confirmed that despite the assertion that the NZCF was flexible enough for teachers to design programmes tailored to meet the needs of all learners, it was not being used by teachers for this purpose. This suggests that either the teachers were unaware of its flexibility or the document did not live up to its claims.
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Individual Education Plan Process

The confusing messages in the NZCF in relation to the utility of IEPs confounded practices at Westside High School and IEPs continued to be used in different ways by different groups of people.

IEP Attendance

The attendance of parents and students at the meetings differed. IEPs in the LRC were based on discourses of expertism and often attended only by special education teachers and teacher aides because there was a perception by unit staff that parents did not want to participate due to lack of interest. This was in direct contrast to the PDU unit staff who thought parental input was invaluable and parents were welcomed at IEP sessions as well as specialists. Furthermore students were usually included in the process. In the mainstream, Jamie and Lee and their parents were included in the IEP meetings held throughout the year (although Jamie was not asked to attend the first IEP meeting held at the start of the year).

In contrast to this discrepancy between sites a common theme at all IEP meetings was the lack of presence of any mainstream class teachers. This raised the tendency for staff's confusion as to the purpose of the IEP document in a number of ways. If mainstream teachers were not going to be present then would they use the document? How would the IEP be integrated for classroom use with the existing curriculum? How would the class teachers understand the perspectives of parents if teachers did not attend the meetings? Who controlled the IEP and the students' inclusion?

One parent's comments reflected the feeling of other parents when asked about the IEP process:

Yeah, IEPs I thought were infrequent. It would have been good to have them a little bit more often but only if you could get teachers there as well. That would be one recommendation. Somewhere along the line, whether it be an IEP or not, it would be really beneficial to meet with the teachers, collectively for an hour. (Fieldnotes: Interview).
Parents thought that the presence of the teachers at the IEP meeting would have broken down barriers and enabled the teachers to understand the parent perspectives. The result in the case of Jamie and Lee in the first year was that whilst IEP meetings were undertaken, the parents did not receive a written-up IEP document. Neither did the class teachers and this raises the question as to the purpose of the meetings held and demonstrates that the IEP was not followed through to the class level.

The IEP model being adopted was reminiscent of previous special education practice under a mainstreaming discourse where control of the student was retained by the unit in which they were enrolled. Now with students in the mainstream on a fulltime basis and conflicting guidelines from the policy makers as to the role of IEPs in mainstream classrooms for teachers, who were also teaching to the NZCF, previous special education practices were being drawn on regardless. This is not surprising considering that mainstream teachers were omitted from the process. Moreover this also meant that responsibility for mainstreamed students was open to question and negotiation rather than being perceived as automatically the role of the class teacher.

**WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?**

"There is nothing written down as to who does what" (Resource teacher)

This section addresses the issue of responsibility in relation to students with disabilities in mainstream classes. What is the role of the teacher aide in this setting? How do different viewpoints converge or differ?

**The Role Of The Teacher Aide.**

This sub-theme addressed the role of the teacher aide, who took responsibility for the delivery of the curriculum to students with disabilities in mainstream classes and the ways in which the teacher aides' presence enhanced or hindered interactions between students with and without disabilities. What happened when the teacher aide was not present? These findings represent the perspectives of class teachers, teacher aides, students and parents.
Teachers' Perspectives On Role Of Teacher Aide

The issue of who is responsible for the delivery of the curriculum for the student with disabilities in the mainstream class is not only influenced by the presence of a teacher aide in the room but also in how the teachers define their role. The way teachers defined the role of the teacher aide varied considerably. Several of the teachers saw the teacher aide as an interpreter, although Bill differentiated between intellectual and physical disability, with the role of the teacher aide for the latter group being seen as a physical helper.

In contrast Bruce's response was conflictual. Initially he said that he thought the role of the teacher aide was to keep students on task but conceded that other students needed to be kept more on task and then he shifted his focus to the teacher aide's role in terms of assisting the student with the mechanics and style of writing:

I had more trouble with other kids in 3BR, some kids, but the teacher aide is really good because the kids like Jamie and Lee did need a little bit more help with getting the work done, neatness, tidying up, setting out and showing things to do and that I see as really important because they do need a little bit of extra help. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

In relation to the issue of how the teacher aide should work in with the class teacher and student in his classroom and the responsibility of the class teacher, Bill thought that rather than the class teacher having input into the process, the resource teacher should be defining the role of the teacher aide in the classroom and he should be able to teach as though they are not there. He proposed a discriminatory "one method fits all" approach:

I, my belief is that it is the job of people of such units too, should be defining what the teacher aide should be doing in the classroom. I see my role as teaching as though they are not there in a way and that I give everybody the same instructions and so on and once I've set the class working on something and any student at all who needs help gets the same amount of time and explanation and so on. If it's the person with the disability that's fine, but it also seems to me that the teacher aide can most likely explain or repeat the things I've been saying anyway and therefore I probably shouldn't need to spend much time with the disabled
student at least as long as that teacher aide is there which isn't every period. (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

In contrast Gary was the only teacher interviewed who took responsibility for the student and defined the teacher aide as an aid to the teacher. Gary recognised that the students with disabilities might need further clarification with regard to instructions, but this was constrained by the amount of time he had available as their teacher and therefore it could be facilitated through the teacher aide.

Probably almost as an interpreter for those kids, to take the directions, the instructions that the rest of the class gets and to translate something meaningful for those kids, because often, the messages don't, well not often but not always, the messages connect and that's when it's important that someone's there to assist I think because if you've got 25-28 kids in the class, and you know if Jamie's one of those, there's only a certain amount of time that you can spend, so having someone else there to support him when he thinks "what I am meant to be doing" or "I don't understand what I'm meant to do" and that's not only assistance for him, immediate assistance for him, but it's assistance for me, in that I'm not constantly thinking I must get back to him because, to check that he knows what to do. (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

Although Gary was also relying on the teacher aide to interpret on his behalf, unlike Bill, he did not have an expectation that the teaching could be left in the hands of the teacher aide. In practice during my observations, Gary would set instructions for the class and then move around the class and check on each student's progress including those with a teacher aide assigned.

Both resource teachers placed a lot of importance on the role of the teacher aides. Betty saw them as the "the lifeline for some kids" and Prue defined their role in terms of the individual needs of the student they were aiding, in respect of constructions of normality:

> It is there to let that student be seen as normal as possible, like their peers, and to what extent that would be would depend on the child. So if it was that they needed to remind the child to stop and think about what they needed to do next, or whether it was to the point that notes needed to be finished off because the child was slower than the others, it's just encouraging, prompting,
helping that child as much as possible to be normal, just like the rest of their peers in their classroom. Some, it happened not so much with Lee and Jamie to this point but sometimes it is, you know, changing the work slightly or things like that. That should really be negotiated differently, that's not what teacher aides should be expected to do (Fieldnotes: Interview).

On one hand, Prue was very clear that the teacher aide should not be expected to modify or adapt the school work but, on the other in her own practice she seemed to treat the aide as a teacher:

Yeah the teacher aide and I would meet quite regularly and I would actually rely on her because I wasn’t, - I didn’t actually have time to go into the classroom to see for myself so it was her feedback that we built on to work things from there (Fieldnotes: Interview).

A further sub-theme to this was the ways in which teachers' perceptions were influenced if they saw the presence of the student with a disability as being only temporary.

**Who’s Responsible If Their Presence Is Only Temporary?**

According to Prue the resource teacher, there was a perception by class teachers that the students with disabilities were only a temporary presence in the mainstream classes until the schoolwork became too "academic" (envisaged as at the senior secondary level) and that at that time students would be withdrawn back into segregated units. Prue recounted that one of the teachers had told her:

When they get to the 5th form or the 6th form they're not going to be in any of our classes are they and that really shocked me... They think they're going to go back to the unit but the students don't belong to the unit. So even though there is a feeling, yeah I think there is quite a good feeling that mainstreaming or inclusive education is something to foster within reason and I even think that myself. ... Yeah they think it is going to run away once students get to a point where they've got to do "academic" stuff and that's something that needs looking at (Fieldnotes: Interview).

If the students were perceived as only temporary then this perception could be extrapolated to the teacher aide. This might help to explain the lack of
consistency between teachers in terms of their expectations of Jill, the teacher aide. Jill also found this in practice. I asked her how she was responsible for the students she aided in the classroom and was told:

Jill: Ultimately the responsibility lies with the teacher. It depends on the class that, from class to class and from teacher to teacher how much responsibility we have. In some classes we are responsible for everything um but um...

Me: How does that happen?

Jill: I think teachers' fear or lack of understanding, not wanting to get to know the student or get to know how to work best with the student, yeah.

Me: So you mean in some situations, you're seen as being with them and so it's left up to you and so therefore the teacher really doesn't have to do anything.

Jill: Yeah, yeah, "Jill is in class today I won't have to talk to so and so, I won't have to help out so and so". yeah. For so long the teachers would talk directly to me, some of them would. So I would just look at the student and say "what do you think"? (both laugh ) Or "how are you going"? Yeah but, yeah in some classes I have more responsibility than others, yeah for the learning. Even now in this late stage in the year (Fieldnotes: Interview).

So it appeared that lack of understanding of disability on the part of the teacher saw more responsibility being placed onto the teacher aide. In addition, how much responsibility was placed on Jill differed between classes, suggesting no consistent school wide policy. Furthermore it appeared that in practice, Jill was taking on the role of teacher in most classes:

Me Are there other ways that you help them with their schoolwork besides copying from the board and reading instructions?

Jill: We often, if there's a passage that you read through, we read through together and we'll talk about each point that comes up, just so that I know that there's a bit of understanding there or I expand on it a bit more, or relate it to something that they've done or they know.

Me: So there are some situations where you are taking on a teaching role, do you think?

Jill: Well, maybe.

Me: It sounds like it.
Jill: Yeah. I quite enjoy that part of it when you get a bit of discussion going and just see where they’re at and their understanding and learning of it and how much prior knowledge they have. And just, yeah and when the light goes on they’re “yeah right” and they’re able to explain it all back to you, it’s rewarding (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

Jill also suggested she would help students access the curriculum at a level appropriate to them as part of her role:

My role, primarily it’s teacher aide for Jamie and Lee, to help them try and access the information that’s given in class as easily as possible and at a level that’s appropriate for them. Just to sort of jolly them along and motivate them a bit, um my other duties ... *pause* ... blend in with the class and not to single out. You know I am saying all this stuff and in practice it’s totally different, you know not to really single out a student but to help everyone. By doing that then hopefully foster I don’t know, friendship, or helping out. (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

This supports her previous assertion that adaptations to the curriculum in terms of what her students should be learning were being made by her. The theory/practice mismatch to which Jill alluded, with regard to students being singled out was also supported by observational data, although with some exceptions. In most classes in which I observed, the teacher aides from both areas of the school sat next to the students they were aiding, thus preventing interaction with their peers. A description from my fieldnotes of an art class provides a typical example:

All of the class are sitting up to benches that are in a U-shape. At the table opposite me is Raymond and two teacher aides from the PDU, Jill (another teacher aide) and Jamie. I watch as the two teacher aides hold Raymond’s hand briefly and help him paint and then from then on I see one teacher aide doing all the painting and Raymond sitting there watching. One teacher aide disappears and does not return.

Jill is also doing some of Jamie’s for him but later I notice that Jamie is working on it himself. He points the brush at Jill, as if to dab her with paint and she grins at Jamie. All of these people: Jamie and Raymond and their teacher aides are seated at a long desk which is quite separate from the other students’ tables. No-
one talks with them when I am watching, apart from their teacher aides. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

This example, like many others occurred when other students were working on something and chatting with their classmates at the same time. By adults being constantly positioned next to these students chances for interaction and social development were hindered for not only these students but also their classmates. This served to maintain a discourse of silence and ignorance and construct these students as disconnected from their peers.

**Students' View Of The Teacher Aide**

The regular students had their own construction of the teacher aides' role. The teacher aide was perceived as having little authority over them and this was highlighted by the ways in which students did not change their behaviour in the presence of aides, as they did with class teachers. Teacher aides had no power to reprimand either students they were aiding or regular students in the classroom according to management staff, although in practice teacher aides did appear to take responsibility for the behaviour of the students they were aiding.

The regular students who were interviewed remarked on this contradiction and indicated displeasure at the way some teacher aides failed to allow students with special needs "some free space if the rest of the class wasn't working". Whilst they saw the teacher aide's role as helping the students with disabilities by keeping them on task, they did not think there should be different expectations placed on them and were annoyed by teacher aides if they prevented or reprimanded their student from interacting with them. This suggests these students were adopting a liberal-egalitarian discourse. Michael was only mainstreamed for Science and so the amount of actual time that was available for interaction with his classmates was very limited. The teacher aides wheeled Michael and Raymond to the classes and so were ever present. It seemed that for the students when they did try and engage Michael or Raymond in friendly ways they were often hindered by the teacher aide.
In the following example they, talked about Jocelyn, a teacher aide from the physically disabled unit:

Debra: I really hate that one with Michael and Raymond, that old one, Jocelyn.
Kirsten: Yeah Jocelyn.
Cathy: Yeah.
Debra: Michael will be laughing at us because we go like that to him (indicates a gesture with her hand).
Kirsten: And he'll try and do it back.
Debra: And he'll be laughing and she'll go "stop that stupid noise" and all this and she's off...
Lucy: And if you go past Michael and say "Michael" he'll laugh and he'll say it and Jocelyn will go "be quiet Michael." (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Whilst observational data showed that the teacher aides did encourage interaction during group work in Science, it appeared to be allowable only on a work related basis. In my fieldnotes I wrote:

There were lots of interactions between students with and without disabilities during this class. The teacher aides with Raymond and Michael talked with students and helped them communicate with Raymond and Michael. Everyone was looking in each other's microscopes as they found something (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

What appeared to be hindered by the presence and actions of the teacher aides in these instances were the informal banter and negotiations for shared understanding and meanings that allow the construction of friendships between students on an ongoing basis in the classroom.

The close attention given to some students by teacher aides meant it was more likely that they were left to be responsible for them rather than the teacher. This raised issues about training of teacher aides in relation to the rhetoric of inclusion in the curriculum.

Teacher Aide Training

There was no training undertaken for teacher aides in the LRC and whilst there was some occurring in the PDU, lack of funding meant that little time had been allocated for such professional development. For those students in
the mainstream full-time there was no time allowed for teacher aide training nor were they being overseen.

We talked about the teacher aides. Prue said "we really need to be able to meet and it seems like Peter and Gavin will need more adaptations than what Jamie and Lee have needed but when that will be done is a problem. We have one hour a week to meet but it has to be administration only because of all the forms that we have to complete for SES".

"So is anyone monitoring the teacher aides in the mainstream" I ask?

"No there is no hours to do that" replies Prue.

(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

In relation to the Curriculum Framework Jill told me she had been given no training whatsoever, yet she was adapting Jamie's and Lee's programmes as best she could.

"No-One's Responsible For Him".

Another way of understanding who was taking responsibility for students with disabilities in the mainstream classroom was to see what happened when the teacher aide was absent. The parents provided the greatest insight into this through the school work that came home: "As long as he's got the aide to supervise, otherwise nothing would be going down on paper. The aide has to write everything" (Fieldnotes: Interview).

All parents said that if the teacher aide was absent then either nothing was written down or school work was incomplete. If work was completed it was because another teacher aide had helped. I asked a parent what happened when the teacher aide wasn't present:

I think the main difference was that it was less clear what the homework was or what they were actually doing. Jamie himself seemed to cope very well with that. He never said anything about Jill not being there or whatever, um I think Jocelyn helped Jamie a lot in Science. I think there is more evidence of doing, you know of getting more done when they were both together.

"When there was no teacher aide there Jamie didn't always finish things and he'd only have half of it written down or something like that" said Jamie's mother.
"Yes there is nothing in place to make sure he knows what’s happening if there is no teacher aide there" said Jamie’s father. "Apart from Science because Jocelyn fills in, Michael’s teacher aide is it, in science, so science is the only thing he had" replied Jamie’s father (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Moreover it was noticed by parents that a lot of the school work done by their children throughout the year was not marked.

My observations coincided with the views of the parents in that if the teacher aide was not present the student was left to his/her own devices. One day during social studies:

The class was looking at multi-racial societies today and focused on Hitler and the Jews. I sat next to Jamie at the front of the room (the teacher aide wasn’t there) and watched him draw the heading (which they had been asked to copy down) using stencils. Jamie never got finished because he spent so long doing this and no-one checked on him. It appeared no modifications were made and no-one was responsible when the teacher aide wasn’t there. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

These findings add credence to the proposition that class teachers were not taking responsibility for the students with teacher aides in their classrooms but rather that role was being undertaken by the teacher aides.

In summary, this section has shown that class teachers leave the responsibility for the education of students with special needs to the teacher aides in their classrooms. When the teacher aide is not present, it appears that no-one takes responsibility for the student’s learning. This next section addresses the low expectations placed on students with special needs in relation to the curriculum and how it differs from regular students. This raises questions of professional development for mainstream teachers to be able to teach ALL students in their classes.

**LOWER EXPECTATIONS**

Expectations of students with special needs in relation to school work and the curriculum appeared to be at times less than other students and based on a lay discourse of ignorance. This was evident in both the mainstream and in the units.
Lee had been moved during Year Nine into a streamed "low ability" class as a way of separating him from Jamie. After being moved behaviour difficulties occurred and when I spoke with his mother about the transition to the other class she told me:

Lee's been picking on Grant who is a Year Nine student but also has a disability. So he knows where the weaknesses are, you see. Don't pick on anyone that's bigger than you or tougher than you, but anyway and I sort of thought, oh wracked my brains and I sort of thought, well perhaps it's because he is not getting a good role model behaviourally in the classroom and I thought I need to do something about this. So I phoned his teacher aide and she said "well" she said "she doesn't believe that it was, that he's reacting any differently to what a lot of the other kids in the classroom are doing" and she said "it's really difficult because, okay he might not have good role models behaviourally, but academically he's doing really well". Like she said, "he's not hesitating to put his hand up and respond to questions" and that's given him good self-esteem. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

I was later told by his resource teacher that Lee was doing better academically than any of his classmates which suggests that maybe the school work was not challenging enough and Lee was displaying frustration as a result. The resource teacher told me she thought that "the teachers find it hard to get past the disability."

In both units the curriculum appeared to follow traditional special education models. In the PDU in one of the classes there were 10 desks facing the wall with a student's name on each. Cellotaped to each desk were individualised goals. One student's goals read:

*My goal - to help Mum with the cleaning and to do my subtractions in Maths.*

Michael's goal was "to go to New York and play a named sport." *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*

Star charts were used as a reward system for students also in this unit.

I noticed a star chart on Michael's desk. It said that if he got 13 stars in a week he would get a merit card, "To get a star he had to be sensible and not laugh inappropriately in class". *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*
This form of behaviour modification was not used in the mainstream classes for regular students. In the latter case it meant that when Michael was in mainstream classes with 3BR and the other students in the class laughed, he was reprimanded for joining in. This created different rules for different students and the potential for exclusion.

In the other unit (LRC) the teacher aide discussed in the staffroom one day how the homeroom group were going to Technology with Bruce "but there are no computers so I don’t know how he will do it and they don’t think they will have them for a couple of terms". This suggested that it was not seen as important for the homeroom class to have the same access to resources as other classes.

In summary, these examples suggest that not only were there lower expectations placed on these students than their peers, but also more emphasis was being placed on social/behavioural success for these students, than academic success. It appeared that this was largely the result of lack of knowledge and understanding about each student's special needs and the curriculum.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The apparent lack of skill raises the issue of professional development for mainstream class teachers. If teachers are given a Framework that promotes an inclusive curriculum without professional development to support inclusive practices in terms of curriculum delivery, then it is not surprising that teachers continued to use traditional secondary school ways of teaching. None of the class teachers interviewed had had any formal training in inclusive education.

Without professional training in catering for all of the students in their classrooms, including those with special needs, the only knowledge teachers were able to draw on was previous practical experience of working with students with disabilities. For some teachers this was none, for others it only involved personal encounters, whilst for others it was practical experience from previous schools. The following example demonstrates how it was for most teachers.
Not long after I had started participant observations at the school in the mainstream I attended a science lesson with the Year Nine class. All of the students sat at long benches that formed a quadrangular shape around the perimeter of the classroom. I sat next to several regular students. I wrote in my fieldnotes:

Once the roll is called the teacher walks around the room handing out the science book. She hands one to me and says quietly with her hand to her mouth, "Do you need to be with your boys?" "No, no" I reply a bit taken back. She continues "no training in this, you're on the seat of your pants" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Her comments about "your boys" and disclosure about lack of training referred to Jamie and Lee who were sitting on the opposite side of the room.

It appeared that the amount of previous practical experience or training class teachers had encountered with students with disabilities reflected their inclusiveness. The teachers who had had the most experience were generally the most open to their inclusion and the most accepting of these students in their classroom. This appeared to be the teachers of the practical subjects, which is not surprising when historically students who had been mainstreamed in the past at the school were more likely to be enrolled in these classes. This also appeared to be consistent with curriculum statement documents.

Gary had not only had lots of practical experience teaching students with disabilities in the past but had also undertaken a professional development course that related directly to the NZCF implementation process in his subject area. He had a philosophy about teaching styles that saw the curriculum as a way of negotiating open learning opportunities for students with a focus on being student centred.

Other schools I've worked at, the first school that I worked at had a policy of mainstreaming disabled students, that was students with intellectual disabilities as well as students with physical disabilities and often the workshops are, it is easier to place those students in those areas because, they can achieve things perhaps more easily than some of the more academic areas. So, yes I have had some experience of working with children with disabilities. (Fieldnotes: Interview).
In contrast those who had had little previous professional experience of disability (lay discourse) demonstrated the most ignorance. When talking with Heather informally one day about Jamie and Lee I was told:

I think the honeymoon period is over and you know in regard to Jamie I don't know what I can teach him that will be valuable for him for life. He just has no comprehension. They remind me of performing animals like pigs on hind legs that have been given all the instructions for a very long time. They are hopeless without a teacher aide " (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Bill, another teacher with little experience, said:

I don't recall having any other disabled students with disabilities before this year, or was it last year? I'm trying to think. I had a student from the Physical Disability Department in a wheelchair in Computer Studies last year in the 6th form, who had a teacher aide with him now and then. I think that was the first student who wasn't normally abled that I'd had. No, so I haven't had much experience (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Bill had tried very hard to have Jamie and Lee removed from his class to the LRC when they were first included in his class at the start of the year, on the basis that they were not "able" enough. But testing undertaken by their resource teacher showed the contrary and they were reinstated in the classroom.

There was a general acknowledgement by teachers of lack of knowledge and training about students with special needs. Whilst at first glance it appeared that this could be remedied by professional development, what also became apparent in the findings was that class teachers did not recognise the skills they already had as teachers to be able to teach special needs students. Teachers adopted a separatist model by assuming that to teach students with disabilities required very different teacher training.

Outside advocacy agencies also saw this as an issue in relation to the education of students with disabilities in regular classes:

You know they've been unwilling to change their teaching styles and their behaviours to accommodate the needs of those who are I think are a growing population. Um, because I don't think our teaching systems and styles and things are keeping up with the
demand and the values of today, and I think it's quite scary you know. I think it's probably why you know the teaching ... we as teachers, it's tough, it's a tough number (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Despite this sort of initial apprehension of some teachers to the inclusion of Jamie and Lee in all Year Nine classes, the teacher aide thought their presence had seen a change in the attitudes of all teachers as the year progressed:

Jill: Although a few of the teachers at the beginning of the year were really apprehensive about having Jamie and Lee in their classes but I think there has been an attitude change throughout the year by most. Although attitudes have changed I suppose by all, yeah (Fieldnotes: Interview).

In summary, if class teachers are left to form judgements about disability and difference or personal experience rather than as part of their pre-service training or through ongoing professional development courses, then those judgements are going to be affected by their experience, be it positive or negative. If, as in the case of most of these teachers, that experience is limited and disability is not openly talked about at the school level or beyond, then it follows that they are unlikely to openly discuss it with their students. As a result those students are left to make their own judgements based on misinformation and hence educational opportunities are lost.

In conclusion, this chapter has demonstrated that the inconsistencies in relation to inclusion apparent in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, were being followed through to the classroom level. The confounding messages that were apparent at the state policy level were being reflected at the class level as staff lack the training and professional development to implement the NZCF in an inclusive way. The stated claim that the Framework was sufficiently flexible to be modified to meet the needs of all learners was not the reality in practice. Rather the traditional models of secondary school practice continued to be utilised because staff were not used to having students with special needs in their regular classes; had not had any training in how to do it; and were still operating within a segregatory model. Consequently, class teachers often expected less from these students, did not see them as their responsibility and relied instead on the teacher aide to teach them. This reflected the policymakers' "unstated"
intentions that the NZCF was never meant for all learners anyway. I will return to this assertion in greater depth in my discussion chapter.
This chapter investigates the barriers to inclusion at Westside High School at a school-wide level. It focuses on the constraints at the school level, firstly in terms of the school structure, the conflict between the units and current exclusionary practices that occur for the school community. It shows that much-needed professional development in relation to inclusive practices remains focused on a traditional separate special education approach at the school and beyond. This perpetuates the separation of special education from general education and the legitimation of exclusionary practices.

WELCOMING REPUTATION

Whilst Westside High School’s openness to difference and diversity was a positive attribute it could also be interpreted as a constraint for the school. A school trying to cling to an liberal-egalitarian philosophy within a context of educational marketisation was faced with not only philosophical confusion but also fiscal constraints in its attempt to compete in a contestable environment. I was told by a key staff member that the school had the "perception of being a caring school and so therefore some students who have bigger needs than normal will go here because it’s seen as a caring school rather than perhaps some of the neighbouring schools" (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Other schools in high socio-economic areas with no serious financial concerns and high enrolment figures were often able to choose which students they enrolled in their schools which meant that those who were perceived as being "less able" or "difficult" were rejected by such schools. In contrast, Westside High School was open to diversity and accepted such students. I was told that often students who were excluded from other schools during the school year would be given a second chance by Westside High School. Jamie’s enrolment for example, had not been readily accepted by his local high school (in a high socio-economic area) and his parents had shifted to this area specifically so he could attend the school. The number of students new to the school who were being enrolled by the At-risk Committee had also increased despite lack of funding for the students. Prue, the resource teacher, told me about two new students who were to be enrolled into regular classes the following year under the same conditions as Jamie and Lee:
They are enrolled, they were enrolled straight into the mainstream, presumably by their parents, yeah they'd have to be. Now the understanding is that yep, we'll pick up, the At-risk Committee will pick up the students that come in with the same circumstances and yet two of them have been identified as labelled disability for next year but there is also another, quite a list, about 10 or 12 kids who have been identified by their Deans as at-risk, new third formers. So how the few hours the At-risk Committee pick them up as well as trying to work with third and fourth formers academically struggling in the mainstream I'm not sure....word is getting around that we're doing a good thing, that's why the two new ones are coming in (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This highlights the differences between schools and the exclusionary nature of other schools and their non-acceptance of all students in their local neighbourhood since the policy change to de-zoning. The potential danger of such practices for schools who are receptive to difference, especially schools who are under threat through falling rolls due to lack of resources, is an over loading of students with special needs.

The implications of this practice for Westside High School, from the point of view of some staff, was a hesitancy to commit to introducing any new programmes that were targetted at individual students because of the danger that there would be a flood of requests from "other needy students" wanting the same thing. When discussion occurred about introducing a Circle of Friends for Jamie, one class teacher had commented to the resource teacher that "they'll all be wanting it" and it would create a "backwash". (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

**DIVERSITY ISSUES**

Issues of diversity confront the complexity of notions and meanings of inclusion. Inclusion is not just about one group of students, in this case those with disabilities, being included. It is not possible to include this group and ignore other marginalised groups within the school. Inclusive education is about the recognition and inclusion of all of those who are marginalised because they are perceived to be different. The vision for inclusive education under a rights discourse is that all students have the right to be included.
Therefore the introduction of a model in the school which was purported to be about inclusion but underpinned by a traditional theoretical framework of special education, did very little to address existing issues of marginalisation or oppression for other differences such as ethnicity, gender or social class. In addition, the way the education system was continually being forced to operate within a quasi-educational market meant the school was constrained by lack of resources. The school needed to attract students for a roll increase to be eligible for more funding. Funding acquired through the enrolment of international students only helped to alleviate the amount required to balance the annual accounts. This meant that rather than providing extra funding for the school, the school was not able to supplement existing programmes to meet those diverse needs.

**Ethnicity**

The ramifications of lack of funding was that English as Second or Other Language (ESOL) students were often placed in classes in which the teachers could not understand them and language barriers hindered their inclusion. I was told by a class teacher:

> You wouldn't recognise the class as I have students now from Education International [School for international students], fee paying students and some of them can't speak very good English and I have trouble understanding them which is really hard but someone has to take Japanese now and so they came to me. Also some parents want them mainstreamed and I have one girl who I feel as though I am letting her down because I don't understand her. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

International students would often arrive during the year which would also create problems between them and existing students. The class teacher told me "the other students who had been there for a while found that really hard to accept and it was hard to mix the groups so we had to try and play games to mix the groups which they, yeah at times they sort of came around too" *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*
Social Class

Other issues such as a mismatch of social class also arose between students and teachers. Some teachers would make assumptions based on middle-class values. For example, some teachers assumed that all students had the cultural capital to attend the opera, had parents who purchased and read magazines such as the Listener and adopted middle-class values towards behaviour and conformity. Conversely, some students noticed differences between the teachers and themselves and as a result would "act out" or resist in the classes taken by these teachers. This lack of a shared understanding was especially noticeable with one of the long-term relievers. The students would ridicule her by pretending they had attended a cultural event that she might mention until she realised that they had been tricking her. One day one of the students commented to me about the clothes this teacher wore:

Debra tells me that she saw a skivvy like Ms Drummond wears with flowers around the collar the other day and it cost $65.00. 'Imagine spending that just on a skivvy' says Debra?' Her reaction was one of disbelief that anyone would be able to spend money like that on a skivvy, suggesting different expectations in relation to financial or socio-economic factors. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

Gender

Gender imbalances in areas of the school also did not seem to be addressed. An example is the school had a full time male guidance counsellor, whereas a woman guidance counsellor came in only two days a week. This failed to take account of female students' disquiet about the "unfairness" of it, or the fact that the majority of students who saw the counsellor (according to him) were female. When I asked about the guidance counsellor Rose, one of the students responded:

Rose: Well I think they should have a lady one.
Amelia: Yeah.
Me: I thought there was one that come in a couple of days a week?
Rose: But I think they should have one like, permanently.
Amelia: Yeah but they don't, they don't have her, they don't have her anymore.
Rose: Because Mr Hurley (guidance counsellor) we can't actually say what we like, you know what girls think of a thing.
Amelia: Yeah 'cos
Rose: There was one of my mates Skye and she wrote this paper, putting the name, class and your phone number, if you want to, agree with having a lady counsellor, yeah and she had about a few pages full of it. (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

I include these examples to provide a snapshot of issues that involved diversity as a way of signposting the existence of such occurrences. As previously outlined, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss them in depth. Nevertheless it is important to make mention of other groups as a way of recognising that disability was only one of the perceived differences within the school subject to exclusionary practices. Moreover many of the exclusionary practices that hindered students with disabilities in the school were also applicable to others with perceived differences.

**STIGMA EQUALS EXCLUSION**

Another barrier to inclusion at the secondary school was the categorisation and labelling of students. Once in place a label appeared to remain with them throughout their schooling. They became targets for blame, from staff which often led to self-fulfilling prophecies. The way this occurred was usually as a result of previous school experiences and labelling that carried over to Westside High School. Records from previous schools were accessed by the guidance counsellor particularly for students deemed at-risk. This meant a negative deficit approach was perpetuated in practice and students were not able to enter the school with a "clean slate".

This became apparent through the ways in which teachers spoke amongst themselves or to me about the Year Nine students who were in their first year at the school. Often judgements were made about a student, based on their previous school history. The Year Nine Dean would ask previous schools about the behavioural traits of newly-enrolled students. An example of the way stigma was perpetuated was the treatment of Adam.
Adam was a student in 3BR who had previously been enrolled in a residential institution. He was allocated teacher aide hours for the first school term on that basis. In classes he worked faster than other students and would finish before them. This issue did not appear to ever be addressed, and in the second term, when his funding ran out, arguments escalated between him and Donald (another "at-risk" student from 3BR who was constantly in trouble). Yet Adam was the one who was shifted to another class. Later I was told that he had been suspended for verbally insulting a teacher in the playground and by the end of the year he had been permanently removed from the school. I discussed his removal with his teacher aide during an observation at the school.

I asked Jill why Adam had been removed from the school and she said that he had been indefinitely suspended and that the father had refused to come down to the school and discuss it. I asked about his teacher aide hours and Jill said he did not have any this term. I said he gave me the impression he was bright and was bored and she agreed and added that he then annoyed other people. Jill said that it was harder to teacher aide Jamie and Lee than him because Adam just needed 6 months of challenging work and someone keeping an eye on him and he would be fine. Jill said she had done some tests with him but no-one wanted to know. I asked why was that and did she think it was because of where he had come from and a label he had bought with him. She said "most definitely that's why it is." *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*

On a school level, not only were the units stigmatised by students, but also any classes perceived as being different from the norm. This meant that alternative classes set up for students who would not sit external examinations were a stigma for not only the students in these classes, but also their teachers. The organisational structure of classes within secondary schools with its single focus on external examination results, meant that those who were deemed not capable of passing those examinationss were the subject of stigmatisation. I discussed the prospects of the Year Eleven students from the alternative English class for the following year with Prue, their current teacher:

"So do they have like an alternative Year 12 English class next year" I ask?
"Yes they do" replies Prue. "And do they not want to be in it?" I ask.
"Yep that's right" Prue replied.
"So it has the same stigma as the class they're in now?" I ask.
"Yeah it does. It's quite good though because it's more structured and they work to a 6th form certificate for it," she replied.
(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation)

So although the teacher recognised the stigma attached to the alternative class she was teaching, she did not question the continued existence of alternative classes.

Normality

Inclusion was often constructed in terms of assimilation and notions of normality, in that if you could conform then there was a greater chance of being included. Secondary school structures are based on the premise of normality and non-involvement of difference. Assumptions were made that did not take account of special needs students or students whose English is not their first language. During orientation it was assumed that students would be able to read direction signs and understand them. Additionally, students were expected to understand that they move from class to class for their lessons and were expected to be able to find their way without help. Normality was regulated within the school through routine and conformity. Students and staff responded to bells for shifting classes and timetables were in place that served to constrain those within the school. Class rules were placed on all classroom walls and managing student behaviour and maintaining conformity were the issues in the school. A behaviour management programme was operating within the school based on a deficit model of self-blame that put the responsibility back onto the student. A class teacher who had been at the school for many years told me:

And I think not having anybody but themselves to, if they really seriously think about it, they are always being reminded that it is their responsibility to behave and to learn and if they don't do that, they are less likely to throw that blame on someone else and give up or think they have some excuse for not trying. It takes away that option. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

One of the aims of the units within the school was to partially assimilate students into the mainstream. The traditional model of physically disabled
units has been founded on a rehabilitation model whereby students had access to physiotherapists, occupational therapists and speech and language therapists. This model was based on a discourse of normalcy, whereby the PDU was marketed as a one-stop-shop providing all of the facilities required to enhance the chances of physically disabled students becoming more able-bodied and therefore more "normal". The involvement of parents or caregivers from the PDU in the mainstream appeared to occur only if their child participated in something that could be defined within the realms of "normality" or, in the case of Raymond, publically recognised sporting results beyond the school. In Raymond's case his parents were asked to attend the main school prize-giving where Raymond received an award. William, Raymond's father, stated that if it had not been for their son's sporting achievements their involvement "otherwise would probably be more confined to the unit". This was consistent with other parents' comments which suggested that all of their contact with the school was only with the unit.

The shift to "the model" could also be defined in terms of normalising students from the Work Experience unit for the mainstream. Based on a readiness model practices were undertaken such as examination practice and a shift to students being taught by several teachers in the unit in an attempt to mimic the mainstream. Prue stated:

The homeroom has apparently worked a lot better this year in that, instead of just having one teacher like they have in the past, they've actually had three different teachers so they're starting to be more normalised if you like and the other two staff see that as a real positive compared to last year. (*Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*).

It was also not surprising that the students who were allowed to go to the mainstream were often defined by mainstream teachers as less disruptive than the regular students because the unit students had learned to conform.
CONFLICT BETWEEN THE UNITS

A conflict seemed evident between the two units in the way each defined its meaning of inclusion in relation to discourses used, shifting power dynamics and the historical and current practices adopted in both the units and the mainstream. Marie appeared to want to maintain the status quo and was resisting the changes occurring as a result of the model and new special education policies. The changes appeared to facilitate a crisis in relation to what counted as legitimate professional knowledge, a shift in the power base within the special education area of the school resulting in contestability, and a challenge to traditional hierarchies of disability.

Legitimate Professional Knowledge

Previously Marie had been perceived as the expert in the school in relation to special needs and had had the power to define and legitimate the meanings of inclusion within the school. The recent changes in management staff and arrival of a new HOD for the LRC had shifted the power dynamics leaving Marie feeling ignored and distraught. After calling in to see her one day to make a time for an interview I wrote in my fieldnotes about our conversation:

Marie said that this concept of "shared decision-making" is just a joke, it just does not happen. She said they don't want to hear anything that she's got to say, they don't ask her for her input, about anything. She seems quite distressed, she's worked for the last five (weeks) day and night, weekends, trying to get everything organised. Very unhappy, very close to tears, I thought... (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

The arrival of the new HOD of the LRC (with his proposal for the model) also appeared to be a challenge to the PDU's professional knowledge that had become the taken-for-granted meanings of inclusion within the school. I was told by her that her unit had been "practising inclusion for many years". I wrote myself a memo after visiting her one day:

She feels that Jeff from the LRC came in with the model and with George presented it as this wonderful new thing and it was what she was doing anyway. She said it was portrayed as this new thing but actually it was what she had already been doing. And a lot of
her ideas they copied, and took from her. And she said that - I mean some of the things they're doing she doesn't agree with. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

To exacerbate the situation between the units, policy changes within the area of special education meant that the shift to increased mainstreaming for special needs students was being supported by the rhetoric of the new policy and hence supporting the changes being made by the LRC.

Marie had engaged in a hegemonic discourse in the past to legitimate her professional knowledge within the school and this was now being challenged by the introduction of the "blurring of the edges". She attempted to re-establish her power through promoting her own constructions of inclusion within the school and by criticising the model and the practices of the LRC. She cited the mainstream teachers as not being happy with the LRC students in their classes because unlike the PDU, which put students in classes only with teacher aides, the teachers of LRC students were not getting any support.

Marie said there's grumblings amongst the mainstream teachers, and they say things to Marie like "well, your students are fine but those LRC kids are driving us mad", and that they're not happy but, that they won't say so, because it's seen that - it's not p.c. to say that it's not working, they don't feel that they can say that they're not doing the job that they should, or that they're having problems (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

She justified her own definition of inclusion by purporting a greater need for resources required in her unit than the LRC. She asserted that if teacher aide hours were minimal then students would not be able to go to the mainstream at all because the hours they received would be taken up by adult assistance for toileting. On one occasion Marie told me that the Principal had no understanding of what was happening:

Marie told me he doesn't understand the help that the students require, and that you cannot compare them to the students in the LRC, because there's toileting issues and other much more intensive adult help required. She added that if they're only going to get five hours teacher aiding a week, then the students can't even do a subject (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).
Marie also legitimated her stand in regard to students going to the mainstream only if there were sufficient teacher aide hours to allow it, by criticising the practices of the LRC. She spoke of Jeff's anxiety about his students not getting ORS funding and the prospect of these students losing their section 9 agreements. She stated that by allowing students into the mainstream without teacher aide support, Jeff had created the situation himself "because he has put those students into the mainstream unsupported, so he has shown that they don't need section 9 agreements".

Marie undermined Jeff's professional knowledge in regard to decisions he made about agreeing to meet parents' wishes about mainstreaming. Whilst she acknowledged understanding parents' wishes for their children to be mainstreamed she utilised a discourse of expertism to suggest that the decision to comply with such wishes was "naive". She indicated that Jeff had demonstrated "no understanding" and had "promised too much which he now had to carry through". She asserted that Jamie and Lee were a problem for the management of the school because they had accepted their enrolment without putting anything in place:

Marie talked about those disability labelled kids, and that the parents had asked for them to be mainstreamed, and that it was actually "the Principal that accepted these students into the school, but nothing has been put in place, and now there are some concerns about it. But because the Principal has accepted those kids into the school, it's his responsibility to make sure that their needs and education are met. So he's kind of got himself into a bind in that of course, they're worried about it, but he's accepted it on those terms so it's now his problem" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

The apparent shift in the power base that had occurred in the mainstream in relation to the special education area of the school towards Jeff and his model, undermined the power that Marie had enjoyed previously and resulted in a degree of resistance by her. She felt marginalised in that the plight of her unit with the new changes in Special Education 2000 were perceived as of less a concern than the LRC by management staff. Furthermore Marie's decision for the PDU to maintain its own administration away from the mainstream and act separately from the rest of the school possibly also increased her own isolation from the rest of the school.
Additionally, the way in which it was possible for Jeff to be employed as both HOD of the LRC and Year Nine Dean served to undermine her position as HOD of the PDU. His position provided him not only with access to the mainstream but also made him part of it which was not something that Marie enjoyed. This meant that he had more power within the school to promote his students into the mainstream. Marie expressed her disapproval of the dual roles Jeff undertook. She thought it was a mistake and "not fair" that he was "devaluing his responsibilities in his unit".

In contrast Jeff, from the LRC was either unaware of the tension that the other HOD felt in relation to the changes occurring or was not saying. He always spoke very highly of the programme in the PDU and said that the unit had a "very very good reputation." If he was unaware of the tension, this could have been due to his newness to the school and his lack of interaction with the other unit. Also within his role as Dean in the mainstream he was able to interact with the management staff of the school regularly and have influence into school-wide practices. Possibly Marie did not have the same opportunities in which to do this.

The extent to which the changing power dynamics were also related to gender was difficult to ascertain as it was not explicit nor the focus of this study, but cannot be ignored as possibly a significant contributing factor. I would speculate that recent changes in staff had also seen hierarchial changes in relation to gender balance within the power structure of the school. Whereas before there had been a female principal and Marie as HOD of the PDU and a male as HOD of the WE, now there was Marie and two males in the roles of Principal and HOD of the LRC.

**Contestability**

In practice the physical siting of the two units in the school was symbolic of the way they interacted with each other. They were at both ends of the school and I never saw staff of one unit situated in the other unit. A staff member from one unit who had been at the school for several years told me that she had only ever been over to the other unit about four times since she had been at the school.
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It appeared that the outcome of the shifting power dynamics between the two units was lack of collaboration, isolation from each other and a playing out of the power dynamics through the mainstream. Marie indicated that placements in the mainstream were contested between the two units. Therefore the placement of students from the LRC undermined her chance of getting students from the PDU into the mainstream because teachers felt stressed about the number of special needs students they had and hence became resistant to having students from her unit in their classes as well. Marie adopted a utilitarian philosophy of meeting the needs of the majority and proposed as a solution a quota system based on categories:

She thinks there should be a ballot system for kids and every kid should be eligible to go to a class where appropriate and when the draw of each different type is filled (ESOL, PDU, LRC, able) then it should be closed and kids have to go to another class. (Field notes: Interview).

Separation of the units meant they did not share resources or expertise. Prue, the resource teacher, told me she thought it was a "history thing" and that the two units "work completely independently. They have their funding and they go with that. We don't have our funding, as such, we just have a budget like every other department has a budget" (Field notes: Participant Observation). There was also no collaboration in terms of teacher aide training between units. Teacher aides in the PDU met once a week with Marie and she undertook training sessions for them and yet no training was given to the teacher aides who came under the umbrella of the model or from the LRC.

Specialist facilities could be accessed only if a student was enrolled into the PDU. This meant that despite students under the model requiring speech and language therapy they could not access the therapists within the same school. This had been the result of previous state policy and section nine agreements held with SES. Students not enrolled in the PDU needing specialist support were required to access support within the community. One student who had both physical and intellectual disabilities had been previously enrolled in the PDU but was transferred to the LRC homeroom because of her "behaviour". Betty, the resource teacher explained:
Alicia the girl who came from the PDU has a physical disability but she also has a learning problem or learning deficit, or she's got hydrocephalus which means her brain's damaged and it's quite significantly smaller than normal so she was on the funny line on the middle. But because she's over here she can't get any help for her physical disability which I found quite bizarre, because I tried to get help for her last year. She needed a new splint for her hand but I had to go. I would have had to put a referral in, it would have gone to a committee and it would have been given resource teacher hours and a resource teacher would have come and worked with Alicia here. No a resource teacher would have trained a teacher aide to work with Alicia here. So to me its "Alicia needs a splint in her arm, can't she just walk across and see the physiotherapist"? But I could see their point of view, so why can't anyone just pop in? I mean you've got to have a referral process, but there was no leeway for somebody who came under both umbrellas. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

When this occurred, she was no longer able to access the therapist support she had previously received.

It also appeared to be the case that the separation between both units was not without its contradictions as collaboration occurred on occasions. An example of this was Marie's initial involvement with the At-risk Committee. She helped the Committee to write a job description for Prue's position. However this had occurred before the model was actually implemented and so the power dynamics at that time may have been quite different from the time of my study. It was also the first year that Jeff was at the school.

Hierarchies Of Disability

A theme that had implications for the conflict between the units which was elucidated, (especially during the period of policy changes with the introduction of Special Education 2000), was a challenge to traditional hierarchies of disability. Attached units had historically been based on categories of disability, and this had arguably led to a hierarchy in the field of disability that saw physical disability given higher status than intellectual disability. This proposition was confirmed when interviewing support agencies about the proposed changes in Special Education 2000. It was felt by some agencies that the new policy focused more on intellectual disabilities,
yet those with physical disabilities still seemed to get the most funding allocated to them.

The physical needs of people, of students to be participating, in terms of adapting the curriculum and things like that. There's a lot of support that's still needed for children with physical disabilities who may not have any intellectual disability, and we're concerned that's perhaps not going to come through with the new process. *(Fieldnotes: Interview with Outside Agency Representative).*

This attitude was also apparent within the school, and may help to explain some of the resistance to the changes displayed by Marie, as Head of the PDU. If her area of disability had been privileged within the field of special education, then not only were the changes challenging her expertise as a professional, but also her place within the disability field.

Yeah but if you're looking at students, IH students or students with an intellectual disability in a unit for that particular group, probably a lot of your programme is very social and you're looking at doing things in a social atmosphere together. We have children who have an interest sometimes in Languages, sometimes in Science at a range of different levels. We're not trying to meet the same goals, we're trying to get those kids out there as much as we can in the classrooms. They're in here for remedial work and catch up time. So it's not easy, you can't do things in an orchestrated sort of way, it's not the same, do you know what I'm saying, it's not the same *(Fieldnotes: Participant Interview).*

Marie, in this example, is positioning her students in quite a different way from the students in the LRC. She appears to be suggesting that her students should be taken more seriously in relation to academic areas in the mainstream, and does not appear to have the same expectations for the LRC students.

**TEACHER AIDE STATUS**

The ways in which the school was structured meant that the teacher aides were given low status in the mainstream, in terms of interactions with the other students. They had no power to reprimand students and were not allowed to use the behaviour management system within the school, either with the students they were aiding or the other students. This created
constraints for Jill, especially when the teacher left the room and the
students would test Jill’s patience by breaking the rules. She explained:

Yeah, yeah it does like in 3TW I’ve been left in the class with say
half the class at times and they’ve got work set for them and they’re good kids and they’ll get on with it but they’ll go, they’ll just test you out and try you and they’ll say ‘I’m going to go and
thump so and so, Jill won’t do anything” and I’ll just shoot them
a glare and they get up and they saunter over to the student and
I’ll just look at them and they’ll go "Arh just kidding" and they’ll
go and sit back down (both laugh). But they’ve never done
anything that’s been really nasty and horrible when I’ve sort of
been left in charge, but if they did it would be really difficult I
suppose and the teacher would. I haven’t really been put in the
position where I’ve had to ... (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Teacher aides, historically, had been attached to units, and the full-time
placement of Jamie and Lee in the mainstream had implications for Jill’s
sense of belonging at the school.

Well teacher aides in the mainstream are pretty new, well I don’t
think they knew how to really take me. I didn’t really fit
anywhere in the school. I wasn’t attached to the LRC. Everybody
thinks I still am and if there’s a phone call that comes to the
school for me, they’ll put it through to the LRC but of course I’m
not there to take the phone call. Yeah, I don’t know, I didn’t have
one place where I knew I was really, sort of belonged to, although
the LRC is there (Fieldnotes: Interview).

It appeared that Jill’s expectation was that she should assume her place was
in one of the units. By challenging the taken-for-granted notion that teacher
aides belonged in units within the school, in her role as teacher aide in the
mainstream Jill found herself not having any space she was able to call her
own. For example, she had no place to keep her things and was not given a
pigeonhole in the main staffroom.

COMMUNICATION

Whilst there appeared to be quite disparate experiences for the parents in
my study, depending on the area of the school in which their child was
enrolled, communication as an issue was a common theme with all of
them. Parents were generally happy with the openness and approachability
of the school staff but lack of communication was a common theme for all parents, especially in relation to school work and what their children were actually doing at school. Whilst all students had communication books, it was only rarely that these were completed by classroom teachers. The entries in these books from teacher aides consisted of reminders about things the students are to bring to class, rather than feedback about how their children were getting on. I wrote in my fieldnotes "the book for communicating only has things in it like 'money required for photo, new exercise book required'. There is nothing about Michael's progress or well-being".

Michael's mother also commented:

We don't get a lot of feedback sometimes and I think "what's that" or about what he does in a day. We've got those teacher aides, but I'm not actually sure who goes with him a lot of the time. I actually said to him the other day with the list, "show me who you go with", but I don't think that person's on a list. That's one week [referring to the communication book]. That's not proper communication for a week is it? And I didn't see the photo to know if it was any good to buy, so I didn't order one obviously. That wasn't a very good week that week. Not much that week (flips through the book) "Do question 4 for homework. I mean that's not much communication for a whole week is it"? (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Homework was a constant concern for the Williams family, particularly as they were unsure as to what was required of their child. Neither Jamie's nor Lee's families received IEPs for their entire first year of high school. Having said this, all the parents I interviewed said that they could have been more proactive in this area, and had not sought out information as much as they could have. Furthermore, if they did contact the school then the response was immediate and positive. Conversely, to add to the complexity of communication between home and school was appreciated, whilst the swift response of the school to perceived "problems" or "concerns", Lee's mother thought that more was expected of Lee than would be the case of other students, and she was at times contacted unnecessarily. There was acknowledgement by the management, on a school-wide basis that communication with parents was an area in which the the school needed to improve.
At times there appeared to be mismatches between school and home with a lack of shared understandings that undermined parent knowledge and expertise about their own children. This was consistent with the positivist discourse of expertism in which the school engaged. When Jamie and Lee were both enrolled into the school, Lee’s mother had requested that the two boys not be enrolled in the same classes, whilst Jamie’s parents did not have a preference. The school decided to enrol them both in the same class because they could then share teacher aide hours and Jill could aide both of them at the same time. The way Jamie and Lee subsequently became constructed with a shared identity had repercussions for their own relationship, and problems arose between the two boys at school. The school responded by shifting Lee into another class in the second term, and this resulted in acting out behaviour on the part of Lee that could be constructed as resistance to being moved.

Jamie’s and Lee’s parents were surprised at the lack of expertise by the class teachers, especially in relation to knowledge about disability and modification to the curriculum. "I suppose the main thing reflecting on last year that hasn’t worked so well and I suppose was more evident when the boys split because the teacher aide not being there for so long, yeah there wasn’t any adaptations made to the programme" (Fieldnotes: Interview).

They demonstrated a rights discourse in relation to advocating for their children and about their disability. The parents supplied the school with videos about inclusion, spoke to the school about the possibility of introducing a Circle of Friends, and, with Jamie, used the opportunity during class speeches in English to tell the other students about his labelled disability. In spite of this, the lack of knowledge on the part of classroom teachers meant that Jamie’s and Lee’s social development was not addressed, and the parents’ desire for the curriculum to be adapted by class teachers, when applicable, rarely occurred. Hence the teacher aides remained the main communicators between the parent and the school.

The parents from the PDU, in contrast, adopted a charity discourse in that they were grateful for everything the school did for their children and appeared to accept without question decisions made by the PDU. Both sets of parents had expressed a desire for as much mainstreaming as possible for
their children but had been told that "this is not the way it works here" and it was not possible because of lack of funding and teacher aide hours. William, a parent, told me "I know that Marie’s got Raymond’s best interests at heart and, but then again she has no say on what the school gets" (Fieldnotes: Interview). In addition, the parents had been led to believe that their children were vulnerable in the mainstream and required constant supervision in order to be kept safe. Neither family was aware that Jamie and Lee were included as regular students into the mainstream.

TRADITIONAL SECONDARY SCHOOL STRUCTURE

The mainstream’s foundation in traditional secondary school structures created barriers to inclusion. The changes occurring in the way the previous Work Experience unit operated in the school were at times hindered by the ways in which the mainstream functioned. In some cases it was not in the interests of the mainstream to support changes to the way the units had operated. In the Physical Education (P. E.) department, for example, students had attended this class from the unit as a group and the department was allocated a number of hours to teach these students. Mike explained how unsuccessful this had been but expressed his reluctance to raise this issue, because he thought that there may be a danger of upsetting fellow departmental members:

So it’s been an absolute nightmare. It just hasn’t worked which has initiated me to say look "this LRC class is just a joke" and I’ve almost upset my fellow department members because we are tight as far as hours go, like we’ve got three full-timers but if I say this class is a waste of time all of a sudden there are three or four hours that are gone from my department, that you know. So I said "no it’s not working" and I had to agree there is better use of the hours so we’re looking at mainstreaming ... (Fieldnotes: Interview).

So by mainstreaming the unit students it also meant jeopardising those hours for the P.E. department. Staff hours were insecure in light of the right-wing state, and therefore this move could potentially jeopardise full-time staffing positions.

Furthermore, the timetable became increasingly difficult for unit staff to reconcile when mainstreaming students, and I was told by both Heads of
Department that it was a "nightmare" for them. Constant timetable changes also meant that resource teachers would track down mainstream teachers too late for the inclusion of students into extra-curricular classes in the mainstream.

Physical Settings

Structural constraints within the school in relation to physical environment were also barriers to inclusive practices. Lack of resources meant that the resource teacher had no designated space in which to work, and students from the PDU were unable to access upstairs teaching rooms because there was no lift. One of the main teaching blocks was missing ramps in two entrances and so students had to go to the other end of the building to gain entry, and then wheel all the way back. This often meant that they were late for class. Another constraint arose when there was talk of a new computer suite in the school, and the proposal was to install the suite in an upstairs classroom block, with little consideration given to issues of access by those from the PDU.

Marie said that access for her students into the school buildings is a nightmare. They cannot go into any of the classes in the top floors and so she has to place her students where she can. They are discussing the new computer suite and the suggestion was that they leave the old suite of computers in K block downstairs and put the new suite in the room next to that and she said "No. Can you please put it up stairs because then you will have one set upstairs and one downstairs." The reason she said this was it would then leave classroom space that her students could access. She said "the staff looked like they wondered what I was going on about and the person who had the room upstairs said to me 'but I like my room' which I could understand but I was thinking of my students" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

According to the HOD of the PDU access for her students was an ongoing issue in the mainstream. Year Twelves had been refused entry to level twelve assembly, on the grounds that they took up too much space.

The siting of the units in the school also provided messages to the rest of the school about their importance and, symbolically, their historical exclusion. By being sited at opposite ends of the school they reflected the
way the model had been described to me as a "blurring of the edges". The two units remained at the edge of the mainstream area.

LACK OF TRAINING/SKILL KNOWLEDGE

Lack of knowledge and skills in teaching students with special needs appeared to be a huge constraint within the mainstream of the school. Class teachers either had none or very little pre-service training in special needs or disability. They relied on the unit staff within the school. The privileging of the unit staff as the experts within the school in this area had led to non-involvement of class teachers and, as previously shown, a lack of responsibility on their part for the special needs students in their classes. They were able to separate their role as a class teacher from the special education teachers, and hence were removed from the responsibility for students defined under this umbrella. Prue, the resource teacher, told me:

they see them as problems. Anybody who's different. I sort of feel that it's a negative reaction, 'oh god it's another problem that I don't want to know about', I've got enough students in my classroom that are all different now, I don't want anybody else.' And it is also because secondary teachers are not geared up to teach people who are different, there's still many that think and act that way and this whole things been dumped on them (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

One of the management staff, who was also a class teacher, told me during an interview:

I know that I'm going to having children with a labelled disability, in that group, and my plea at the moment is 'hey I'm not a Special Needs teacher'. I've always been, a teacher who has been able to relate to kids who find maths difficult, so beginning my teaching career we would talk about slow learners in mathematics but we're not talking about the same sort of thing here. Because it's not just imparting the mathematics to them it's the behavioural issues as well, it's all of those sorts of things. It's the fact that math, the maths curriculum now is very, dominated by words because there's a big thrust to have things done in in context, and and one of the things I'm determined with that fifth form is that, when they're fifteen and sixteen that I teach them age-appropriate mathematics. ... But there is nothing in place for these kids and that's a really big gap I think we've sort of, looked at them in Year
Nin and Ten and said "yeah we can cope with these kids" but as I said, the children with labelled disability have every right to be in our school, but by God it makes your job hard. And I'm not looking forward to that aspect of it. I have no problem with having Jamie and Lee in my class next year, but how I'm going to manage them I don't know (Fieldnotes: Interview).

This meant that class teachers were left uninformed, and had to rely on the traditional models of special education knowledge available to them from the unit staff.

The discourse of silence that surrounded Jamie's and Lee's initial placements into all mainstream classes meant that class teachers were never given the opportunity to be exposed to a demystification of their labelled disability, and had only a lay discourse on which to draw. I was told:

information isn't getting to us for starters. You know, what are the physical constraints of someone with a labelled disability? ... you know, and the fact that nothing was given to us (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

As a result, Jamie's and Lee's inclusion was done in a piecemeal way, and no planning had been done either on a school-wide basis or for the future years ahead. Naivety resulted in mis-interpretations by mainstream staff when dealing with students who were either non-verbal or whom they had difficulty in understanding. The class teachers and students were told, by a teacher aide, that Raymond pointed to "yes" or "no" on the communication board attached to his wheelchair with his right arm. Raymond, from my observations, had great difficulty in doing this and would put his head in the air to the right, in what I interpreted as an attempt move his arm to either the right or left. At other times he would look straight down. When interviewing his family 12 months after he had been at the school I was told that this was the way he communicated and raising his head in the air to the right was "yes" and looking straight down was "no".

I was told by another parent that she felt that her son became an easy target for blame because others found him difficult to understand and he lacked skills in explaining himself when incidents occurred at the school. This would suggest that professional development was required not only in areas of the curriculum but also in demystification of labelled disabilities.
Moreover a discourse of silence served only to perpetuate existing exclusionary practices.

**RESISTANCE TO INCLUSION**

Overt and covert resistance to inclusion in the mainstream by staff was also a barrier. A lay discourse that manifested in ignorance, fear and lack of education about disability and difference by teachers with the least experience in these areas, appeared to result in their resistance to inclusion, either through their actions or in the opinions they expressed. Change often creates resistance, and the introduction of "the model" was no exception. Apprehension about its upcoming introduction was evident when talking with Jeff, the Year Nine Dean the previous year:

Jeff told them that most teachers were keen about next year but some would be somewhat resistant. Bill showed them his proposal and explained that Jamie and Lee would come under the At-risk Committee. Jeff said he thought that it would be easier at Westside High school as it was a small school. The biggest job was convincing some of the teachers that it would work. *Fieldnotes: Participant Observation*.

Lack of skills and understanding continued to perpetuate a lay discourse regarding disability and difference within the school, with some teachers. Heather, one of the class teachers who had little professional experience with disability, was unable to envisage inclusive practices at work:

It's not possible to be inclusive. I think it's just natural justice that they should all be there and I try my hardest but I am simply not trained to be inclusive. The kids don't have a naturally inclusive attitude either. *Fieldnotes: Interview*.

Her comments about lack of training, and her assumptions about other students as being unable to be naturally inclusive, demonstrate the importance of professional development for confidence to meet diversity in the mainstream classroom.

Contradictions also occurred at times between staff in relation to the inclusion of students and the results that students with disabilities were achieving. In music, the teacher had provided feedback to the resource
teacher that Lee's presence in the class was a waste of time. Yet Jill, the
teacher aide, said the results of the latest test the class had done indicated
that Lee had done very well. In another example, the Maths teacher showed
considerable resistance to the inclusion of Jamie and Lee at the start of the
year. The class, 3BR, was divided during Mathematics time into two groups,
one called an extension class for "slow-track maths" work. According to
their resource teacher, the class teacher did not think they should be in the
regular maths class but would not place them in the low track group either,
because they were already getting assistance from a teacher aide. His
solution to this was that they be withdrawn into the unit for Maths (to
which they had no affiliation). In my fieldnotes I wrote:

According to Prue the maths teacher is setting up a slow track
maths group to be taken by him with about 8 students from 3BR.
He does not think that Jamie and Lee should be in it because they
are already getting help from a teacher aide. Prue said she tried to
explain that the teacher aide brings them up to speed but they only
have her in the mornings and 2 maths classes are in the afternoon
so they would be better in that class. (Fieldnotes: Participant
Observation).

During this time they were still with the "regular class", but when I arrived
one day to observe in the class, I was told by the teacher that their placement
was only temporary:

Jamie and Lee were not there at this stage when I was talking to
the teacher and I assumed they must be next door with the other
part of the class. I said to him "well I'll go next door" after he said I
could stay and he said "the boys are in here in this class but Lee,
Jamie and Donald are only here for today because they are going to
go to the resource room during maths time so you can stay for
today" (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

I spoke about this with the resource teacher and teacher aide after class:

I sat with Jill and Prue came over and I asked her about Jamie and
Lee and Donald going to the resource room for Maths and she said
yes that was right, they would go for all their classes. I asked why
was this and Prue said that the Maths teacher had said that the
other students complained that Jamie and Lee were holding them
back and the students didn't feel they could move on until the
boys had done their work. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).
This appeared to be a contradiction because on the one hand the teacher was saying that Jamie and Lee could not keep up and yet on the other he refused to allow them to go in the "low track" Maths class. It also appeared as though he had legitimated his decision for their removal, by deflecting it away from himself on to complaints from other students. At no time did I hear any of these types of comments from students during my observation period. At a later date during Jamie’s IEP meeting when Maths was discussed I asked about Jamie’s placement:

Prue showed Jamie's parents a Maths test she’d given Jamie which showed that his "Maths is fine as far as his mental Maths goes" (or basic facts) Prue said.
I asked for clarification about whether Jamie was still in the Maths class and which one?
Prue said that he was in the non-extension one.
I said "well the Maths teacher had told me that the boys were going to be withdrawn."
Prue said that had been only for a day and the test she’d done showed that they certainly should be in that class. She said she’d offered to help the boys in the afternoon when Jill the teacher aide wouldn't be there and had been told by the Maths teacher that she wasn't wanted (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

My interpretation of this incident is that this teacher, due to his fear and ignorance of disability, was apprehensive about their inclusion into his classroom. This particular teacher had taught at the school for many years in an environment in which students with intellectual disabilities had been segregated mostly on a full-time basis into a unit. It was therefore a new experience for him, and his resistance to inclusion was also a resistance to change. Whilst the management staff in the school were keen to introduce the model, they were also mindful of not upsetting mainstream staff.

The issue of education about special needs, or the lack of it for staff and students, raises issues surrounding the curriculum, and expectations of inclusive practices. It demonstrates that the practices in this school reflected the ambiguity that surrounded the Curriculum Framework in relation to rhetoric and intention, and lack of convergence across subject areas.

In summary, the continued practices, actions and the conflicting ways in which meanings of inclusion were defined within the school created philosophical confusion for its inhabitants. At a contextual level,
segregatory practice continued, as students were separated either completely from the mainstream or included on a part-time basis only. Lack of cohesion occurred between units, and conflicting messages were sent to staff and students within the mainstream of the school. Privileged knowledge remained in the hands of a few, and struggle arose as a re/presenting of that knowledge occurred amidst changing power dynamics.

In conclusion, this chapter has investigated the barriers to inclusion at Westside High School in relation to the wider context at the school level. It focuses on the constraints at the school level, firstly in terms of the school structure, the conflict between the units and current exclusionary practices that occur for the school community. Much needed professional development in relation to inclusive practices remains based on a traditional separate special education approach within the school. This perpetuates the separation of special education from general education and the legitimation of exclusionary practices.
This chapter investigates the barriers to inclusion for Westside High School in relation to the wider context beyond the school. It investigates the ways in which the school is trapped by the current implementation of state policies underpinned by market discourses, despite trying to hold onto traditional social democratic principles. Contestability, and lack of resources and funding, further hinder inclusion at the school. Inclusive practices are impeded by outside pressures from the state which has seen the school and their support agencies become commodities in an educational marketplace. Finally, at the macro-level the chapter demonstrates that the contradictory discourses evident at the school and community levels are a reflection of those being posited by the state itself.

The complexity within the school was augmented by a competing discourse beyond the school that increasingly impinged upon the traditional philosophy on which the school had been founded. Whilst the school attempted to uphold an liberal-egalitarian discourse based on what was perceived to be the best practices for meeting the needs of the most disadvantaged, they were simultaneously being expected to shift towards a more market-based approach to education. This shift included a move to utilitarianism whereby allocation of funding from the state was now based on a supply-led, rather than the traditional social democratic needs demand-led approach. This meant that schools were funded to meet the needs of the majority of students, rather than the most disadvantaged. Furthermore, the school itself was now increasingly expected to compete, as one of many, for scarce resources in the educational market. Based on the premise of "sink or swim", the staff at the school found themselves trapped by state policy that increasingly diverged from social democratic principles, particularly that of inclusive education.

**MANAGERIALISM**

Through continual changes in Ministerial requirements, the school was expected to work increasingly within a discourse of managerialism. This had impact at both management and classroom level. Positions of responsibility became redefined as management units and those who held them had increasingly greater administrative workloads. The school charter
became outdated, and was replaced by a business-like strategic plan with operational plans, quality control documents and a process of self-management and review. All staff were required to have performance management agreements, with mandatory goal setting for each staff member based on measurable outcomes. I was told by a Head of Department:

You're doing huge rafts of administration, professional - I do the performance management for the department. So it's my job to do attestations. I should have added that, attestations for new teachers. I have to sit in classrooms and do self-reviews every year, goal setting for every teacher and, to do that I have to have relief and to have relief you have to set work and there's the continuity. It's just crazy stuff (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This upsurge in surveillance and measurable accountability strategies meant that staff positions became more contestable, administrative workloads increased and, arguably, teaching as a professional undertaking was undermined.

RESOURCING

The state shift to a liberal-utilitarian philosophy for a poor school such as Westside High school had far-reaching consequences in terms of resources. Many of the contextual barriers to inclusive practices that the school encountered could be related back to the resource shortages that occurred as a result of this shift.

Funding Allocations

Westside High School's primary operational funding grant from the state was based on their school roll, irrespective of need or proportion of students at-risk. They were in an unusual predicament, in that the reversal of a falling roll that had occurred over the last few years meant the school was placed in a difficult situation, in relation to funding. Senior students attracted more funding and staffing from the Ministry than did junior students. With the recovering school roll at the junior level, this meant that the school had more students in their junior school than at the senior level. Malcolm (a member of the management team) explained:
We are trying to run a school with a small number of senior students who are not earning the same amount of staffing that you would get, but still run a viable senior programme in the school. Last year for example we had one seventh form class which had 17 kids in it, that was the biggest one we had and yet seventh forms are funded and staffed on a one to seventeen ratio so we only actually had one class that broke even. Every other class was under seventeen and had to be subsidised from somewhere else (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

As a result, and because the school had seen a rapid increase in their school roll over the previous two years, they had become, according to Malcolm, "an unbalanced school in lots of ways" (Fieldnotes: Interview). If the school's roll had continued to fall then the school would have qualified for financial assistance. Malcolm blamed the funding system.

Our real problem areas are in working with an inflexible Ministry of Education funding system and the unresponsiveness of that to our sort of unique situation in the school. We are really severely constrained in lots of ways because of that (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This placed the school in a spiral of decline from which it was extremely difficult to recover, because of the lack of resourcing. As the school tried to recover from a deficit situation, they were hindered from doing so, because as part of the educational market, they were required to continue to be competitive and attract enrolments. In order to do this, however, they were forced into subsidising small senior classes from elsewhere. Malcolm discussed the bind this put the school in:

Now if we didn’t run those classes we wouldn’t have a senior school and we’d lose enrolments and so you go into a negative spin. Whereas if you go to a school, opposite type of school, an "academic" type of school, you’d probably find they had a considerable number of senior classes with 18, 19, 20, 22 kids in it. You know if you have a class with 22 kids in it, you can run a class with 12 kids in it and you’re still breaking even" (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The lack of resourcing and the managerial model that pervaded the school meant that large amounts of time and energy were required to address the funding issue. The school was financially in debt and had to constantly battle to get resources often from contested pools outside the school. The
school was in a low to middle SES area which often created difficulties in gaining adequate support from a community which did not have the skills:

Some of our families are unable to support us, in many ways, because they don't have the skills to or they're not in the space to, rather than lack of willingness. I think you know, all of our parents want the best for their kids, most of our parents, ninety-nine percent, but many of them just don't know how to go about it (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Other ways in which the lack of community support manifested were low levels of community fundraising, difficulty for the school when collecting school fees, and recovering costs for materials required for practical subjects. Funding available from community trusts was highly contested and the school had come to rely on international school fees to balance the annual budgets and, according to the Principal, "provide a basic education" for the students enrolled within the school.

The shortage of funds had far-reaching effects for the daily operations of the school and meanings of inclusion. Forced into operating on a supply-led basis, the school staff were constantly required to cut their annual budgets. The use of resources was prioritised on the basis of legal obligations of maintenance, rather than need. Resource teacher hours, classroom resources and textbooks had to take second place to school property maintenance projects such as painting. The Principal stated:

Principal: You spend so much of your time trying to scrape together what you have to have. So there are competing interests for the dollar as well.

Me: Within the school do you mean or ...?

Principal: Yes, I've been saying to staff we've got to start putting reserves aside for buildings- money commitments which we haven't been able to do for the last two years which is terrible. And next year I'm going to have to start looking at putting $15-20,000.00 aside and people say 'what about my classroom materials, surely textbooks are more important for kids than painting buildings.' Well they are but you can't be exclusive, you've got to paint buildings. We've got a legal responsibility to, to maintain. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).
Staff Retention

Staff positions within the school were also affected. Uncertainty surrounded their positions, and the school favoured the hiring of part-time staff and long-term relievers rather than permanent staff, in case the jobs of the latter had to be dis-established. This resulted in tension between the two factions, and problems in staff retention:

Prue explained that the staff are categorised into permanent staff and long term relievers and the roll dictates the number of permanent staff. This is why schools hire long term relievers because then if the roll drops they can get rid of them first *(Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).*

A Board of Trustees representative told me that loss of staff also resulted from lack of adequate resources:

Staff, we’ve lost staff with perhaps not having positions, I mean I know in the last few years there have been times when the staff have left because, there’s been, had to be a cut down in the particular number of hours that that say the Geography department, the History department, or the English department and so obviously we’ve lost, we have lost staff. People have chosen to get something that’s a bit more secure and more permanent. And we’ve had to retrench staff *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

A significant proportion - 25% - of the staff had exited the school in the previous year. For those who were permanent staff, the lack of funding and the shift to an accountability focus jeopardised their core role as teachers. A Head of Department told me

it’s got to be well funded, well planned, the methodology has to be appropriate. It just can’t be a tick in a box to satisfy the NEGs and the NAGs because it is part of your requirements for ERO. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

The time spent on meeting administrative and funding requirements also constrained staff in their planning time for teaching, and hindered inclusive practices.
Curriculum Breadth

Resourcing also had implications for the breadth of the curriculum on offer in the school. In the mainstream, in some subject areas composite classes were offered at senior levels. This meant that, in some cases, three class levels were taught in one class because

that's the only way we can offer that breadth of the curriculum. If we have very small numbers, we combine them which then impacts on teacher workload because you're delivering two courses in one time slot. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Moreover other programmes were also jeopardised as a result of the resourcing issue. A Head of Department told me:

It affects everyone in the school because not only is it breadth of courses at senior level but it's also remedial courses further down the school, it's all those things, it's the whole picture. Everything we can offer comes back to how many staff do we have and what balance of staff do we then have. I mean those management decisions probably get easy to make the more staff that you have. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Curriculum consolidation meant that despite teachers taking one class, they had to prepare for a number of learning levels, and this constrained the amount of non-contact time they had available. Arguably, students with special needs were low priority when teachers lacked the time and skills they needed to be able to modify the curriculum where necessary, and also were able to rely on the "experts" from the unit to do it for them.

Unfortunately the resource teachers were also hindered by these constraints. Prue told me "a lot more could have been done for Jamie and Lee last year but we did not have the resources to do it - there was no time set aside." Hence modification to the curriculum did not occur, unless the teacher aide did it at the time, and this was also problematic. Teacher aide hours were sparse and did not always cover every class for a subject. This meant students got part-time assistance and lack of continuity.

When Jamie and Lee first started high school the number of hours allocated to each of them for teacher aide assistance was combined, so that a teacher
aide could be with them full-time during the transition phase. This strategy meant that they were then required to be in the same class. It seems likely, retrospectively, that if they had been allocated more teacher aide hours, there would have been no need for them to be in the same class and the problems that arose later, and which led to Lee being shifted from the class after the first term, probably would not have occurred. The Williams family later said that if there had been more teacher aide hours available at the start they would have been more assertive about Jamie and Lee being in separate classes.

Limited teacher aide hours also limited the amount of time students from the Physically Disabled Unit were able to spend in the mainstream, which led to greater segregation and exclusion. Marie explained it as follows:

Yes, we try to get what we can for our students and it has to be appropriate for their needs as a result of their IEP meeting. I think that the biggest issue, I would have every child out in the mainstream all the time if I felt that that is where they should be. The biggest hindrance is teacher aide hours or support time to get them out there and in some instances enough space in classrooms and we compete with everybody else for classroom space (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Other factors that hindered inclusive practices in the school as a result of the state fostering a liberal utilitarian ideology were the ways in which student enrolments were contested between schools, as well as concerns about public image, and community attitudes.

CONTESTABILITY BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Placements

Placements in local schools had become contested not only for students wanting to enrol in either high socio-economic status areas or single sex state schools, (over recent years there had been an increase in demand for places in these schools), but they had also become contestable between schools. Schools such as those with greater access to resources were able to "poach" students from lower socio-economic areas. This applied specifically
to those schools who had enrolment policies based on academic success. One of the local boys' schools took academically high-achieving students from the area in which Westside High School was situated. The implications of this, according to one teacher, was "Westside High School has more girls than boys because Petersville School for Girls works on a ballot system, but Murrayford Boys' High School takes the best students, and so this means that the girls are generally smarter than the boys and there are more of them" (Fieldnotes: Interview). This consumer-orientated approach to education meant that schools were reluctant to collaborate with other schools, and any sharing was done informally on a teacher-by-teacher basis.

Image Concern

The contestable nature of education in this climate meant that public image was of paramount importance, and the school management was left feeling extremely vulnerable. The school's quick response to perceived problems had become a survival strategy that the school had become adept at using in a bid to extinguish their negative public image. Malcolm used the metaphor of surfing to describe what it was like for him as a manager in the school.

It's a bit like riding a wave, a bit like surfing. I always thought that being here in my job is a bit like surfing. I'm on top of a wave and it's great fun and I haven't actually been surfing but I've watched people but you're on top of the wave and it's great fun but it can all come crashing down on you damn easily, you know, a bit fragile, or you're vulnerable. And one of the things, we are vulnerable. If something bad happens here it will have a huge effect on the school whereas there are other schools around town if something bad happens people will say "oh dear, goodness me it's happened to that school." But people will still be queuing up to go there. A crisis of some kind can really, shatter, rattle the foundations of this place (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Moreover, the funding shortage faced by the school presented a conundrum for him, in terms of the school's public image. In order to prevent further negative public perceptions about the school, and to attract enrolments, Malcolm was forced to present the school in the best light possible in the marketplace. To do this, he was unable to complain too loudly about the shortages in resources that the state was providing for the school, because of a fear of reprisals from consumers in terms of enrolments. Malcolm explained it as follows from:
So there’s a bit of a political battle going on there. So you’re playing those sorts of battles and I can’t go out into the public and say “hey our funding is wrong, we’re a poor school, we don’t have any resources. It’s not a battle that’s going to win us any enrolments. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Despite the constant battle and the belief by some school staff that the public perception was "grossly unfair", there seemed to be an acceptance by the school members that they would not attract the top academic students. Instead it was believed that they were more likely, because of their caring image, to continue to attract more and more students with special needs and students who were rejected from their local neighbourhood school.

STATE LEVEL POLICY CHANGES

During my data collection period, the first stages of Special Education 2000 were introduced to the school. The initial impact of the policy implementation at the school level centred around much discussion about the continued financial viability of the units in the school. Furthermore information dissemination from the Ministry was sparse and rather than school staff embracing the policy rhetoric which held that it was a positive shift to inclusive education, staff and families were left feeling very uncertain about the changes, and the implications for them and the school:

We talked about the changes under Special Education 2000 and Prue thinks that the school will get less funding for the units and they will have to change. "Do you think all the kids in the Work Experience unit will be high needs?" I ask.

"No way, a lot of them aren't high needs. Do you realise that we only get teacher aide hours for Louise, Barbara and John. John's hours have been cut so he's got to go home at lunch time" says Prue (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Only three students in the LRC had been given Ongoing Resourcing System (ORS) funding from the Ministry. Previously, all of these students had section nine agreements and while they may not have had teacher aide funding, they did attract special needs funding for the unit. This was now in question, and the ORS funding did not necessarily have any connection
with attached units, as in the case of Jamie and Lee. Malcolm thought the way the units had been funded in the past was going to change next year because basically the whole role of attached units is going to change and their whole existence is on the line. The amount of funding that we will have I think will actually be less than existed before. There's the whole question of kids that are on section 9 agreements because they gave the kids the right to special education arrangements until they are 20 and will they be rolled over or will they be scrapped and what are the implications of that? *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

Concern and speculation was also raised as to whether the school would be able to continue with the model without jeopardising unit staff positions. Prue said:

> But it's also tricky too because we want to keep that resource teacher thing going in the school but you don't want your unit to close down otherwise there's two staff in jeopardy of jobs there, because there's two full-time staff in the unit and those staff- it's their good grace that's helping the At-risk Committee out. So it's political *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

The school had been told that the number of teacher aide hours for which they qualify in the following year would be less than currently. Malcolm believed it would also have big implications for the mainstreaming of physically disabled students in the future, which is not surprising, given Marie's requirement of teacher aide support for each mainstreamed student. The Special Education Grant was not seen as extra funding into the school at that time, even though they had just received a $3000.00 increase because their decile rating had been reviewed and lowered. It was perceived by staff as merely bulk funding for teacher aides for the non-ORS students in the school, and hence perceived as creating no added benefits to the school. Malcolm explained that:

> our Special Education Grant has increased around about $11,000.00 to 12,000.00 which is a reflection of us moving from a decile X school to a decile X school. ... We've been bulk funded basically to pay for teacher aides of non-ORS kids and that's what that increase will be used for and I've budgeted for that increase. The amount of the increase is reasonably within 20% I guess of what we think we will need to pay for our teacher aides *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*
Status Quo

It also became clear over time, and with the transitional introduction of the Special Education 2000 policy by the government, that it was in the interests of units to maintain the status quo and not let it be seen that students could cope in the mainstream, especially without support. With the success of the model in terms of students being mainstreamed, achieving well and not requiring teacher aide support, the threat to staff jobs became a reality. Of the 24 students enrolled in the LRC unit, only three were entitled to Ongoing Resource Funding, leaving the school to support the remaining 21 students with a $24,000 Special Education Grant, which put the unit staff jobs in serious jeopardy. In contrast, in the PDU where students were never mainstreamed without teacher aides and spent most of their time in the unit, only three of the 24 students enrolled did not qualify for ORS funding. So the PDU was in effect being rewarded (unlike the LRC) under the Special Education 2000 policy for past segregation and exclusion of their students in the unit from the mainstream.

Contestable

The outside agencies supporting the school were either agents of the state, (and therefore completely state funded) or charity organisations which received some funding from the state either directly or through a community funding pool. Whilst the outside agencies were perceived by the school as supportive, the way in which most of them defined the situation was that they were constrained in the service they could give to schools in relation to supporting inclusive practices. This was because of differentiated support from the state, under a system that was highly contestable. Moreover, they were also hindered by the ideological shift towards liberal-utilitarianism. One of the state-funded agency representatives told me:

I think, well it is going to become more competitive down the track. I mean like sort of SES operates very much like a business, and like we operate to make money here, but I don't know where it all goes... I know it's gonna be tough, because other people could actually come in, other groups could set up, and are starting to do this and not even use SES, like Nelson is doing very much that. (Fieldnotes: Interview).
Another agency representative explained "there's a big emphasis for us on keeping the correct statistics and all our, everything that we do, because we're set up like a business unit now, everything we do is measured as an output" (Fieldnotes: Interview). In addition, as I was told by a representative of a charity-based agency, shifts to managerialism had become apparent for them in their operations also:

There's quite a lot of accountability, there was a big exercise a couple of years ago, looking at effectiveness measures. It was very interesting, and it came back with something that was quite different from what they began with. So that's constantly changing, and reporting requirements change at least twice a year. (Fieldnotes: Interview).

A shift to contestable funding meant that schools could become the providers of support services, using funding directly from the state, and agencies then had to compete with schools to provide services. This had huge implications, especially for one state agency, Special Education Services, who had been both funder and provider previously to schools. A discussion between myself and a representative focused on what the changes would mean for the organisation:

We talked about the recent changes of SES to a model of strands rather than areas and he said that they were not getting any information from the Ministry and sometimes when they came to renew contracts the Ministry informed that they were no longer to do certain areas. He said he realised that families and schools viewed the organisation in a bad light and he could understand this because they could not offer the same services that they had been able to in the past and ... people blamed them not realising that it was beyond their control (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

These changes created a lack of funds and exacerbated an already poor public image for this agency. Restructuring was another strategy by the state that served to hinder the service that state agencies were able to provide. Staff were shifted to newly-created positions, which meant Westside High School would no longer be able to contact the person who had previously provided liaison with their school. The guidance counsellor at Westside High School told me:
With the Special Education Service they've limited quite a lot what they do help with. Early days when I was at Clydesville, say 10 years ago, we'd have a psychologist that would come out to the school quite quickly and they would actually work with the students that are in the school.... Nowadays it seems to be quite limited as to what they are contracted to do and it does take quite a while to get some service. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

Some services that had previously been provided were wound down, and replaced with a system of user pays. An example of this was that one agency, where previously a school visit had been part of the support offered to parents during a section nine agreement process, now had to advise parents to contact a charity organisation or pay for those services themselves:

It's very difficult particularly when you're doing a section nine. I always used to like to go and see the classroom and school situation and know what we were recommending for this young person. Increasingly I've had to say to parents 'look, these are the people and these organisations, these are the phone numbers. You go and have a look, you can come back and discuss it with me.' I no longer have the time to be able to go with them. It's a big decision, particularly *with* those transition phases from kindergarten, pre-school to school, from primary to secondary, or primary to intermediate. It's a big decision there. Unfortunately, more and more the parents have to make those choices, a lot more on their own and unsupported, from what I once was able to do. It's a loss *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

In contrast several other state agencies had no shortage of funding: "we've been quite envied by a lot of other services ... because we're seen to be quite elitist in some ways". It is difficult to ascertain the reason for the disparity between state support for agencies and I can only speculate on this. One possibility is that those who were well resourced seemed to be in areas that catered for the general school population rather than special education specifically and worked in areas where issues had become highly politicised, such as behaviour difficulties and youth suicide. If this is the case, this would be consistent with the assumption in the education sector that priority be given to general education over special education.
Charity Model

The shift to a charity model by the state also had implications for charity based support agencies. The latter group appeared to be providing greater support to schools, parents and students and taking up work that had previously been done by state agencies. This included providing services for support in, for example, areas such as advocating, counselling and group education. I was told by a charity-based disability advocacy service that other charity-based agencies "like the City Mission, Open Home, Barnardos, were all concerned about the amount that government are withdrawing and expecting the community to pick up and just how difficult it is. And it's the same for us in the disability area."

According to my participants, state funding levels for charity organisations were decreasing and this meant that they were increasingly expected to fund themselves through endowments and community donations:

I think you know each year, the amount of funding that the government feels they want the community to take more responsibility so they allow that more and more (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Furthermore, charity organisations were also forced to enter the market place and compete for contracts and resources, as do other state funded agencies. The competition was becoming more and more difficult each year and, as a result, one large charity organisation had hired a full-time marketing team. The shift to a business model meant that the charity organisations had to be accountable to their governing bodies, and to operate within budgetary guidelines:

We have to account for no funding, yeah if we see someone for nothing, there has to be a very good reason for that and that has to be documented. It is not okay to just say "well they couldn't afford to pay," like we used to be able to do (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The assumption that support agencies can operate successfully in this way was problematic, because the client base comprised those who could least afford it.
Yeah, but one of the difficulties is that most of the clients that we get are on low incomes ... and so the user pays thing people just won't access the services 'cos they won't have the money *(Fieldnotes: Interviews).*

**COLLEGES OF EDUCATION**

The other institutions that impacted on the ways in which the teaching staff in the school understood meanings of inclusion were the Colleges of Education, where a significant number of teachers had received their training.

**Special Education Model**

The shift to mainstreaming and inclusion in schools, especially at the secondary school level, did not appear to be accounted for by mainstream teacher training provision. Colleges of Education were still based on traditional separatist models, despite token changes in some programmes to include knowledge of special needs and disability. The amount of time given to such areas was minimal within the main programme and required students to select this area as a speciality if they were to receive more in-depth training. A separate teacher training system in special education continued to operate during my data collection period. This meant that existing teachers could apply to take a year off, to do a diploma in a behaviourally-focused special needs programme over a one-year period. They were then qualified to be special needs teachers.

At one institution teachers could enrol to do certificates in inclusive education, but they were for a less intensive time period, and in terms of qualifications, were a lesser credential than the Diploma in Special Needs which was also on offer. The differences in length of time and qualification status continued to send messages to trainees about which diploma was more valued. I was told that the inclusive education course was something teachers could choose to do as part of their professional development, as something "extra on top" of their existing qualification. This continued to perpetuate the message that special education was separate and something that could be added later on. It failed to position an inclusive education component as inherent and critical for the training of *all* teachers in
mainstream schools. In effect, it maintained the status quo, despite the name change to inclusive education.

**STATE LEVEL INFLUENCES**

**Secondary school structure**

The influence of the state, especially in terms of ideology, had a far reaching impact on the ways in which the school operated on a day-to-day basis. The continuation of the traditional functionalist structure of secondary schools, albeit under the new guise of managerialism, took no account of the 1990 law changes in education in relation to special needs students. The shift to mainstreaming that had occurred at the time, and the right for all students to attend state schools, had seen an influx of students not previously catered for in the regular state school sector. The composition of students in special schools had also changed with many who had previously gone to special schools now enrolling in regular settings. According to the state representative, increased numbers of students in regular schools had occurred because

there was also an increase in the number of children coming into schools with multiple disabilities, that hadn't been involved in a special school at all. I have had a lot of special school principals say to me, "eight years ago we didn't have any of these children in our school. Now all the children that were coming to our schools eight years ago are now in regular schools, and we've got these children with multiple disabilities" (*Fieldnotes: Interview*).

Historically, students with special needs had been enrolled into attached units at secondary level, and this had served to maintain the status quo for secondary schools, and required little change on their part. The result of this was structural barriers to inclusive practices in the mainstream, such as difficulty for students in their transition from primary school, timetable inflexibility, a compartmentalisation of learning, and alienation for all incoming students.

The transition to high school from primary school was particularly difficult for many students, including students with special needs. Many students
found it very different from primary or intermediate school. I discussed this aspect with Prue, the resource teacher, one day:

They just go from class to class and I think a lot of kids are really lost when they come here, they don't belong anywhere or to anyone, said Prue (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

The way the timetable was divided up produced a very compartmentalised programme whereby students travelled from class to class at least six times a day, without any home base as they had experienced at primary school. The College of Education representative spoke of the need for a review of secondary schooling:

... it's not like a primary school where the teacher can make it a sort of home, a base. You can't do that in secondary so the whole structure of secondary schools makes it much harder, it really does so I think that we do need to have a good look at secondary schools (Fieldnotes: Interview).

Secondary school did little to enhance a sense of belonging because students had no space to call their own, and they had to carry their bags around with them all day. This set the scene for students' alienation.

**Individual Education Plans**

There was also difficulty with the Individual Education Plan (IEP) system at secondary school level. The system had been devised under a special education model that had, as a minimum, the following people involved: outside specialists, parents, a class teacher and a teacher aide. This system could not so easily be adopted at a secondary school level, due to the number of class teachers whom students would encounter in their school year. This encouraged a system whereby a resource teacher would take responsibility for the disabled student's IEP and therefore relieve class teachers of responsibility for those students in relation to their learning programme. Whilst the difficulty of implementing IEPs was acknowledged at the state level by representatives nothing had been done to address it. An official told me:

Looking at the area of disability in secondary settings is particularly interesting because in fact, it's the one area that in terms of the
primary school setting it’s much much easier to run an inclusive approach in a regular classroom with one teacher or maybe two teachers, but when the student actually hits the secondary and has to start to move around, it becomes quite difficult when you’re dealing with 10 separate teachers all having to do an IEP. *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

**Utilitarian Philosophy**

The contradictory discourses that were evident at the school and community levels were a reflection of those being espoused by the state. On the one hand, a shift to a "world-class inclusive education system" was being purported, and on the other a shift to the marketisation of education was being implemented. These competing discourses were both promoted simultaneously, which suggested that the rhetoric of the former was used as to legitimate the latter.

At one level, education had been redefined in business terms, in which schools and outside agencies were expected to compete against each other, and to remain viable within a market climate. On another level, the state was implementing a policy that proposed to "achieve a world class inclusive education system that provides learning opportunities of equal quality to all children and school students"*(Special Education Policy Guidelines, 1999).* The *Special Education 2000* policy was being heralded as the answer to the problems that had become inherent in the area of special education. Moreover a system was purported that would see resources spread more equitably and regular schools would be supported to include and mainstream students as much as possible.

However, underpinning this new policy was a clear ideology of utilitarianism that, in practice, saw the state devolve more responsibility onto individual schools and do nothing to challenge the existing structures that led to exclusionary practices. The state sought to minimise its involvement in special education support, but, in alignment with New Right ideology, provided a safety net through ORS funding for those with the "highest needs". This had been determined at one percent of the total school population (see chapter 5A) irrespective of actual need or previous special need categorisation. All schools were put into clusters under the RTLB scheme and given a Special Education Grant to use for the "moderate
needs” bracket of special needs students who did not qualify for high or very high needs funding. This policy was based on the premise that schools would take responsibility for all the students in their local neighbourhood area, irrespective of the students’ disabilities (Davies, p. 4 See Appendix Number 18).

The state representative response was:

What we really want is for all schools to take responsibility for all of the children, rather than saying "that child over there has got special needs and not our responsibility, they’re actually the Ministry’s or SES’s”. What we are really saying is "all of the children enrolled in your school are your responsibility. Our role is in fact to give you the resourcing to meet the needs of all students". We want to get away from schools saying these students are the Ministry’s responsibility because they have special needs and that’s an interesting paradigm. Some schools are still very, very indifferent about coming into these areas. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

The problem with this premise was that some schools had disproportionate numbers of special needs students, as in the case of Westside High School, whilst other schools, potentially, had very few. Moreover, there was nothing in the special education policy that would change this. The devolution of responsibility onto schools meant that the Ministry was powerless to enforce its policy intention. Hence the status quo was maintained, except that schools without larger numbers of special needs students (usually those in high SES areas) benefitted more than those with large numbers of special needs students.

In addition, the usefulness of the IEP as a classroom planning document now came into question. Under the policy, it was a requirement for funding purposes, and was used to determine the level of need. One difference from the way it had been used in the past was the shift in ideology being posited by the state. Rather than schools writing IEPs based on learning needs as in the past, the Ministry was now saying that schools needed to shift to a supply-led approach. A representative explained the process:

We ask the fund-holder to go through an IEP with each student, and then to determine from that, what each student needs and then what their total resourcing will be. That was the process that
we expected to occur. What we never intended and certainly didn't want was the average amounts of funding that were allocated to fundholders being used as a bench-mark for what each child should get.

A child with high needs was going to get six thousand dollars, of funding, if they were in a regular classroom, was a nonsense because not all the children with high needs in a regular classroom needed teacher aide funding. Some students might have needed therapy, some might have needed alternative care, some might have needed just a specialist teacher coming in once a week to support the teacher and the student.

But what's actually happened is people have got locked in to saying "this child has got six thousand dollars worth of funding, therefore that's the minimum that they can have", and therefore the children, all the children have currently got fifteen thousand dollars worth of teacher aide funding have got a drop to say that this child here has six thousand, and we're saying "funding goes to the fund-holder, you ignore what each student has generated, it's irrelevant to the argument, schools need to try and match their IEP according to that amount of funding you've got". We never intended to release funding details other than our agreement with the fund-holder, as to the basis on which they've got their funds (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

In other words, the Ministerial official was saying that the intention behind the funding allocation had been misunderstood by the public. It was not to be based on an individual entitlement per student but an average amount per student that fundholders (usually SES) would then have to distribute amongst those who had IEPs. The expectation was that some students would receive more, and some would receive less, of the average amount. Because the funding details had been released to the media, the public perception was that each child would be entitled to the average amount of funding allocated.

By suggesting that schools should try to match their IEP to the amount of funding they got, this meant that IEPs were not to be based on what the student could do, or required help with, but must be written on the basis of available funding. This had the potential to lead to exclusionary practices and to render parents powerless, because IEP meetings could result in the marginalisation of the actual needs of the child, and could focus instead on the amount of funding available.
Despite the rhetoric of inclusiveness, the state policy continued to legitimate the existence of segregated units and schools under the guise of parent "choice" (Creel, 1996). With the changes in funding allocations, especially for students perceived as having "moderate needs", and the bulk funding of the SEG grant to individual schools, any support the parents had previously been able to get from SES was also being dissipated. Responsibility had been devolved to individual schools which meant that should the school choose to maintain a unit, and segregate a child on the basis of lack of resources, there was little the parents could do except withdraw their child from the school and try to find an enrolment in a more inclusive setting. This suggests that parent "choice" was nothing but rhetoric, and a farce.

Another constraint with the new state policy that hindered meanings of inclusion was the notion of "double dipping". The school's understanding was that students were not defined in terms of multiple disabilities/special needs but categorised into one area for funding purposes. This meant that students receiving ORS funding were not able to access any other funding. For example, there was a funding category specifically for behavioural issues but the school staff told me that those receiving ORS funding were not able to apply, even if behaviour issues should present themselves. This would be considered "double dipping", I was told. This suggests that funding was based more on category than need. In relation to section nine agreements between parents and the state, a ministerial representative told me:

If we keep with the present Act, section nines are likely to be redefined in terms of support for students with high and very high needs. This still remains a central government responsibility, whether it's the Ongoing Resourcing Scheme, severe behaviour area or the significant speech and communication area. The government needs to be assured that it's getting value for money. Agreements need to be signed with the parents for those sort of students. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

In relation to those students who held section nine agreements but had not qualified for Ongoing Resourcing funding, I was told:

We will probably say that if the school or cluster wants to keep a particular type of facility, like a special class or an experience unit, then the cluster will make that decision itself. It will decide the criteria and entry requirements. The cluster may decide that it
wants to keep an agreement with parents going. *(Fieldnotes: Interviews).*

This statement from a ministerial official is in direct contradiction to the Education Act outlined in chapter 5A.

**The Role of the Teacher Aide**

One area at the time that did not appear to be addressed in the changes to special education was the role of the teacher aide. The ways in which teacher aides operated in classrooms, their lack of skill and status, and the often exclusionary practices that occurred as a result of their presence, all failed to be an integral component of the policy changes. The College of Education representative commented "I think teacher aides can be a real inhibitor to true inclusion because they're attached to the kid instead of, well the class has to be set up in such a way that the groups will accept the kid" *(Fieldnotes: Interview).*

This lack of attention to the role of the teacher aide in the policy changes served to maintain the status quo at the school level, in relation to teacher aides being "attached at the hip" to their assigned students, and the number of hours allocated to them determined how much mainstreaming occurred for some students. By perpetuating the construction of the teacher aides in relation to hours for particular students, not only did it follow an individualistic approach but it made those students vulnerable to learned helplessness, and to exclusionary practice through segregation on the basis of lack of resources.

Whilst much of the rhetoric of the proposed changes represented inclusive practices, the Ministry was constrained to follow them through to ensure that policy guidelines were occurring in practice. An example of this was the acknowledgement by the Ministry that professional development was a priority for teachers at pre- and in-services levels, but I was told by a representative:

Well, one of the difficulties that we've got is technically the Colleges of Education are independent institutions. It's actually quite difficult for central government to actually influence and say "this is what we want. This is what we want all trainees to
come out with for example, six month’s training in special education or special needs”, we can’t do that. We can influence and can cajole and plead (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This meant that the state officials were, in effect, deflecting responsibility away from themselves, and onto Colleges of Education, to change the Colleges’ practice in relation to training in the area of special needs.

This is not surprising when special education is understood within the wider context of general education. As at the school level, special education in teacher education continued to be seen as separate and was marginalised as being of lesser importance by general educationalists at the Ministry. When specifically discussing special education, I was told by a representative that

the enormous difficulty, challenge facing the system - 85% of Maori students are in the mainstream schools, not in any kind of special provision, and those students are very disproportionately represented amongst the underachievers and that’s an enormous challenge for the system. So those broader kind of equity issues are in a sense, now this sounds dreadful but if you look at it from a global system point of view, in many ways in terms of prioritising we really have to give a lot of emphasis to those sort of issues (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

This marginalises disability, and places it in a contestable position against other marginalised groups.

Lastly, the Ministry itself was also constrained, both by the speed of implementation, and the way in which Ministry staff had to devise a policy, for which the key principles had already been devised by Cabinet and Treasury. Staff were continually required to check back with these groups and ask "Is this meeting those key principles?" as the Special Education 2000 policy was developed. This placed them in a difficult position at times, in relation to information dissemination with the public, especially when changes were made or when ideas were still being developed. I was told by a Ministry representative:

Last year when the first road show [was done] ... we were unable to spell out many details. I knew the direction and I also knew that Cabinet was giving us some very clear principles to proceed.
We were quite definitely muzzled, because Cabinet hadn't specifically agreed to implement the policy. Treasury would say, 'Cabinet said 'I agree in principle to that, subject to this, this and this', and you can't say that until, you're called back in November' and so we were stuck with a situation which said we are going to trial the application form but we've got no guarantees at the end of the process what's going to happen in 1998. (Fieldnotes: Interviews).

Furthermore the Ministry were constrained by the key principles they had been given by Cabinet, that were to underpin the policy (outlined in chapter 5A). This served only to hinder inclusion, because these principles were premised on the state being responsible only for students with the highest needs. The status quo of segregation was maintained by allowing the attached unit and special school option to be retained within the brief of the policy. Rather than adopt an inclusive education system that had the potential to be world-class, the state had provided schools with a new policy that did little to challenge existing practice, and was another form of utilitarianism.

In conclusion this chapter has investigated the barriers to inclusion at Westside High School in relation to the wider context at the school level and beyond. It has demonstrated the ways in which the school is trapped by the current implementation of state policies underpinned by market discourses, despite trying to hold onto traditional social democratic principles. Contestability, lack of resources and funding further hindered inclusion at the school. Inclusive practices were impeded by outside pressures from the state, which has seen the school and their support agencies become commodities in an educational marketplace. Finally, at the macro-level this chapter demonstrated that the contradictory discourses evident at the school, and community levels are a reflection of those that continue to be posited by the state.
My discussion chapter will be presented through a series of themes that emerged from my findings. Whereas the preceding findings chapters were organised in relation to the research questions posed in the study, this chapter brings together all of the themes that emerged from my data and transverses all of the findings. In this way, I will be able to explore the convergences, as well as the divergences, between different groups in their understandings of meanings of inclusion.

In terms of format and for reasons of practicality I will present each major theme separately. This will provide an understanding of the complexity within themes, despite its somewhat artificial nature. By this I mean that, in reality, all themes overlapped with each other and therefore they cannot be seen as discrete entities. To account for this, I will make cross-references to other themes as a way of drawing together common threads and the theorising of my findings. This will serve to confirm that meanings of inclusion can be understood only by taking into account contextual factors, and by examining the theoretical frameworks that underpin them.

The themes that emerged from my data were either directly related to my findings or the methodological research process. Six findings themes that emerged from the eight headings in my data analysis were as follows: Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability; Privileged Knowledge; Blurring The Edges; Power Struggles; Maintaining Normality; and Excluding The Included. In addition, the methodological themes that emerged from the data that had implications for me during the research process were: Positionality, Rapport/acceptance, Gate-keeping and Reciprocity. In this chapter I will address each one in turn.

In the first section of this chapter I will discuss the themes that emerged from my findings. The first one, Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability, addresses the contextual factors that had overarching effects on the school and their daily operations. It encapsulated the nature and impact of change in political philosophy over the last decade, in the highest echelons of the state.
WALKING THE TIGHTROPE: ISSUES OF CONTESTABILITY

According to Mitchell, "contestability is an economic term that is used to describe an environment in which an organisation maintains an efficient and needs-driven operation through being exposed to actual or potential competition" (1996, p. 68). To explain why I have chosen to use this concept in relation to the situation at Westside High School, it is important to understand the economic theory behind the term. According to Codd (1993) the theoretical framework underpinning the concept of contestability is instrumentalism. He states that this is a

form of political rationality in which ends and means are separated. Once the ends or objectives are determined, it is merely a contingent matter to ascertain the most effective or efficient means of reaching those ends. We decide on our destination, and then it is simply a technical matter as to how we reach it (1993, p. 167).

This instrumentalist approach means that outcomes become the key focus, and important aspects of the process are marginalised as irrelevant. Codd (1993) states that instrumentalism distorts and destroys educational purposes when "the means are constitutive of the ends. How we reach our objectives will in itself give substance and meaning to those objectives" (p. 167). If the "ends" are forcing schools to adopt a competitive model, (one based on scarce resources in the education market), then only those schools that can compete successfully will remain in the market place, and "unsuccessful" schools will close. Under such a model, the intricacies and complex consequences of the process of the "means" are ignored. Moreover, this has far reaching consequences for social movements such as inclusion.

The legitimation crisis that had occurred for the state, which resulted in a shift to utilitarianism, also saw a similar move to contestability. For students with disabilities this manifested as a hegemonic discourse of "common sense". The latter was evident in the way the exclusion of students with disabilities was justified by Ministry of Education representatives, in relation to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000 (SE2000) policies. Whilst the stated policy rhetoric of both the NZCF and the SE2000 policies suggested a convergence with inclusive education frameworks, both failed to take account of the
underlying political shift to utilitarianism by the state. This shift meant that rather than equity being given priority over choice as a primary social good, choice had become the preferred good. Philosophically, outcomes focused on meeting the needs of the majority, rather than the most disadvantaged (Rawls, 1972). As my findings suggest, this led to the continued exclusion of students with disabilities.

Furthermore, the state was implementing such a shift by imposing a discourse of managerialism onto schools whilst simultaneously promoting the economic marketisation of education. This meant continued state control fiscally, but greater responsibility for administration was devolved to individual schools. The state’s focus on outcomes meant a devolving of responsibility for the process of accountability onto schools (Codd, 1999).

To add to the complexity, the state continued to operate within a functionalist paradigm, and the policies introduced served in many ways to retain the status quo. This was especially apparent in regard to issues of equity, which remained unaddressed: reproduced disparities between the wealth of schools; and students with disabilities continuing to be legitimately excluded through segregation, as I demonstrated in my previous findings chapter, about barriers to inclusion.

In relation to educational policy, the shifts in the general sector were also mirrored in the special education area. This promoted the continuation of an individual focus within a context of managerialism and marketisation. Traditional functionalist discourses that constructed disability as an individual deficit (as outlined by Fulcher (1989) in Chapter 2) were maintained, and the different assumptions underlying mainstreaming as opposed to inclusion were never questioned. Instead, a change in the name of the policy appeared to suffice, without changes to practice.

Despite previous public opposition to contestability in special education service provisions during consultation processes in the 1980s, the Special Education 2000 policy was introduced with contestability as an underlying goal. A shift to minimal government intervention, (as was consistent with a liberal-utilitarian philosophy), saw the introduction of a policy that took a minimalist safety net approach for those with special needs. This meant the state would maintain fiscal responsibility for those categorised as high or
very high needs to a minimal level, and the remainder of students with special needs would become the responsibility of schools.

In terms of stakeholders' understandings of meanings of inclusion, variance between stated policy and intended policy led to much confusion and contradiction, not only across sectors but also within the same sectors of the community. Moreover, the change in ideology led to huge constraints for Westside High School and their supporting agencies. The latter group were being expected to shift to a charity model, whereby those groups who had previously been supported by state agencies were now having to increasingly rely on endowment and community support.

Philosophically, Westside High school attempted to hold on to egalitarian theoretical frameworks within an increasingly pervasive utilitarian ideology. However, this shift to contestability constrained the options available to the school, due to the permeation of underlying utilitarian principles. According to Ivory (1993), the underlying principles of contestability are: minimal government intervention; choice; education as a commodity; devolution; consumer/provider contract, and competition. The implications for Westside High School of each of these principles are discussed as follows.

Minimal government intervention had placed responsibility back onto individual schools, while fiscal control remained with the central state (Codd, 1999). Schools in low socio-economic status areas had to try to compete with those in high socio-economic status areas. The market was left to determine the outcome, and therefore those schools in low socioeconomic status areas were inevitably caught in a spiral of decline. This had resonance with Westside High School, which was not only trying to recover from a falling roll, but also remain financially viable. According to Ivory, (1993) unless active redistribution of resourcing occurred between poor and wealthy schools, inequitable outcomes were the result.

In relation to consumer choice, according to Ivory choice is not necessarily provided under contestability. As discussed by many of the reports, fiscal constraints do not allow for the provision of real choice between segregated or mainstreamed education for many parents. Rural and
understaffed areas often do not have a choice of staff or the nature of services; in fact they may not have any to 'choose' from. It is also unclear as to who gets to choose, as can be seen in the concerns for potential conflict between Boards, parents and staff (1993, p. 25).

Another factor was the ability of high socio-economic schools to raise funds privately. Research by Gordon (1993) indicated that there was a polarisation of resource bases between high and low socio-economic schools, due to the differences in their ability to draw on fund-raising from within the school's community. She has predicted that ultimately such a differentiation will mean that high socioeconomic status schools will be able to choose their students. So what choices do schools have, (particularly those in low socioeconomic areas), when trying to operate under a discourse of "contestability"? Mitchell (1996) states that:

    schools were responding to the competitive situation in which they found themselves by: (a) overtly marketing themselves, (b) not responding to or avoiding decisions which they judge their local market would find unacceptable, (c) making political responses which seek to change the rules of terms on which they compete, and (d) networking and cooperating with other schools (p. 66).

As my findings chapter on "Barriers to Inclusion: within the school" demonstrated, all these outlined strategies were taken up by Westside High School in a bid to compete in the educational marketplace. Overseas marketing trips for international students (refer to Chapter 8), shrouds of silence over incidents, or quick responses to parental concerns (refer to Chapter 8) were but some of the ways in which the school responded to minimise risk and enhance their position within the market.

In relation to individuals promoting discourses of choice, according to Olssen:

    running schools of choice will structure admission processes to avoid undesirable students, giving the schools rather than the consumers the ultimate choice (1997, p. 398).

In the case of students with disabilities, this can mean removing them from the regular setting to segregated units, or refusing their entry altogether. In
the case of Westside High School, whilst refusal was a limited option due to their tenuous position in the marketplace, segregation into units continued to be a reality.

With education reconstructed as a commodity, it is no longer perceived as a public good, but rather as a commodity that individuals acquire and consume. Schools, like businesses, must compete in the market by selling their services to their clients (Mitchell, 1996). In an economic environment such as this, some schools must ultimately fail. Schools with falling rolls, such as Westside High School, have to act very carefully to avoid roll decline, which may lead to state intervention, and closure.

Another principle outlined by Ivory is the consumer-provider contract. This principle underlies contestability of services, in which there is an imposed division placed between those who hold the funding and those who provide the service. This has been done to prevent "provider capture", and occurred in relation to Special Education Services in the SE2000 policy, despite previous public opposition. Furthermore, Ivory identifies contestability of services and the mainstreaming policy as problematic due to lack of definitions and clarity over who "chooses" the services, that is, the caregivers, the Boards, the principal, the staff or even the child (1993, p. 26). Such an ideology has the potential to create a climate in which everything becomes contested, not only within the school itself but between schools.

The final principle of contestability, according to Ivory, is competition. The ways in which Westside High School received funding under the state model of self-management was based on student enrolments and, according to Angus, is symbolic of students' transformation into "walking vouchers" (1993, p. 18). Competition has encouraged schools to try to enrol students whom they would usually not attract, by offering specialisation programmes such as gifted education, classes for students with English as a second language, or by attracting fee-paying students from overseas. In the case of Westside High School, their welcoming of students with disabilities meant they were likely to become a magnet school for this group. Being a magnet school becomes problematic when schools are under-resourced and are unable to meet the demands of that specialisation, as, for example, when
professional teacher development is required to include these students in mainstream classes.

This is especially common in low socio-economic schools which lack adequate funding. Under a contestability discourse, a lack of success with such programmes, or an inability to establish them in the first place, becomes the fault of the individual school, regardless of its circumstances. Conversely, if schools in high socio-economic status areas offer such programmes with success, and boost their student enrolments at the expense of schools in lower socioeconomic status areas, the latter are blamed for their lack of success. Thrupp suggests that under this ideology the popularity of schools is directly correlated with its performance. Teachers and principals of unpopular schools are "held accountable for the spiral of decline because they have not responded to their situation sufficiently to boost the reputation of the schools and hence the size of their student intakes" (1995, pp. 45-46).

According to Codd, the educational reforms since Tomorrow's Schools have fostered "a climate of harmful competition among schools, promoting unfair degrees of parental choice, exacerbating inequalities between communities, and promoting disparities in resources for special needs and teacher support" (1993, p. 166). Competition has led to all areas within the education sector becoming contestable, not only between schools but within schools, and at all levels. In the case of Westside High School, competition had led them into a financial spiral of decline from which it was extremely difficult to recover. Furthermore, these funding shortages impacted on funding allocations, staff retention, time availability, curriculum options, agency support, teacher aide hours and hence inclusive practices. The market-like environment in which the school found itself was exclusionary in nature, and ran counter to the context necessary for inclusive education.

In summary, a climate of contestability had been fostered by the state within the education sector, with far-reaching consequences for meanings of inclusion at the school level. The contextual factors that had been imposed on the school placed staff in a position that can be likened to walking a tightrope. These contextual factors, (of minimal government intervention; consumer choice; education as a commodity; devolution; consumer/provider contract and competition), constrained their shift to
inclusive education not only on a practical basis, but also on a philosophical level.

**PRIVILEGED KNOWLEDGE**

The second theme that transversed my findings related to which knowledge became privileged, and how this occurred. Contextually, the shift by the state to utilitarianism was evident through its policies, in particular the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF). The ramifications of this were that, arguably, the simultaneous promotion of an inclusive curriculum was nothing more than a legitimation exercise by the state.

The hegemonic discourse of an inclusive curriculum apparent in the Framework documents created difficulties for implementation at the school level. Whilst an inclusive philosophy was stated, responsibility had been devolved to schools for implementing the curriculum framework, but no training or professional development was done, to ensure that the curriculum was inclusive. This seems hardly surprising when the intention by the state under a utilitarian discourse (as proposed by Rawls, 1972) is to meet the needs of the majority, rather than all, or the most disadvantaged. The school responded to the state’s confusing messages by drawing on traditional ways of knowing particularly in relation to students with disabilities - that is, the positivist theoretical framework of special education (Skrtic, 1991). A traditional approach maintained the status quo, which served both the interests of the existing secondary school structure, and the shift to utilitarianism by the state.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework rhetoric appeared to support an inclusive approach to teaching and learning through its stated curriculum. My findings suggest that, in actuality, this inclusiveness is inconsistent throughout the curriculum statements, and the focus is on a general educationalist approach to the curriculum that continues to keep special education separate. I would argue that this approach has been adopted by the state as a way of appearing to meet the egalitarian demands of the teaching profession and school communities. Teacher input in relation to inclusiveness in initial drafts of curriculum statements is evident in their egalitarian approach.
As discussed in my introduction chapter, recent policy development has shifted away from drawing on educational theory and "provider capture" by teachers, to a process in which state policy has become a response to political bargaining between different competing groups (Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard & Henry, 1997). The policy of the national curriculum appears to be no exception. Over time, as each learning area has been drafted and gazetted, the focus has implicitly shifted to a more utilitarian approach.

Attempts to retain values of inclusiveness and equality of opportunity for students with special needs appear to have slowly been eroded, in more recently gazetted statements. Whilst the more recent draft curricula often provide more inclusive language than those previously gazetted, the final versions can look quite different from the original. The first social studies curriculum draft statement is a case in point. Once this was released, a public outcry by a right-wing national business lobby group, the Education Forum, resulted in a re-writing of the draft document. In the new version, it is notable that the section called "Inclusive Perspectives" for students with disability has been completely removed. The influence of such lobby groups over recent times serves only to reinforce the neo-liberal direction the state has taken in the last decade.

My assertion that there is a mismatch of values underpinning the NZCF is further substantiated by my findings of the initial intentions behind the Framework. Following a utilitarian agenda, it seemed apparent that the NZCF was intended to provide a national curriculum for the majority rather than all students, despite the rhetoric of being tailored to meet individual needs. Within this rhetoric there was a covert assumption that students with special needs would continue to be catered for by special education teachers rather than the mainstream class teacher.

This was especially apparent through the continued promotion by the state of Individual Education Plans for students with special needs. On the one hand the NZCF was purporting a flexibility for class teachers to be able to design programmes for all learners, but on the other, this concept did not appear to include those who had IEPs. Rather, the IEP would continue to be utilised for these students, thus maintaining an expectation that some students would require a separate programme. As in the past, this strategy culminated in the development of separate curricula for special and general
education. This had served not only to exclude students with special needs, but also to individualise students' learning through the use of a deficit discourse (Pugach & Warger, 1996).

According to Pugach & Warger (1996) the curriculum has posed the biggest problems for many students with disabilities. It is often as a result of their "failure" in the curriculum that they are labelled as disabled, and subsequently directed into special education. Whilst there has been criticism of the general education curriculum from within the special education community, the criticisms have largely focused on the merits of individualisation. By this, I mean that the solutions posed by the special education sector have been based largely on the premise that education programmes should be tailored for individual students, which has underpinned the use of IEPs. This approach mirrors that of the proponents of neo-liberalism, and moves away from the values that have historically underpinned general education. Pugach and Warger state:

Indeed, this is a departure from the group orientation in general education, which holds that education is a public good and that there is a set of knowledge and skills that should be held in common by all children (1996, p. 8).

In addition, there is doubt as to whether, in practice, an individualised curriculum has been adequately provided for within special education. Wessan, Deno et al. (1989) assert:

Individually tailored programs of instruction that have been developed for students with mild disabilities and carried out in resource room programs have been remarkably similar to one another (1989 et. al, cited in Pugach & Warger, 1996, pp. 8-9).

In practice the segregation of students and the focus on separate programmes has shifted responsibility away from the class teacher and labelled the child as the "problem". Furthermore it is

this individualized, deficit approach to the identification and remediation of all disabilities that has dominated special education and has tended to characterize nearly all of its programs and practices, focusing attention on individual students and not on the curriculum. It is also this mind-set that has, for all practical purposes, kept special education out of the curriculum debates (Pugach & Warger, 1996, p. 9).
Furthermore, whilst IEPs have given parents opportunities for input into their child's education, it can also be seen as a legitimation exercise by the state to give the appearance of meeting their obligations to parents of special needs students, whilst simultaneously placing responsibility back onto schools for their implementation. It is notable that, because the IEP is not a legal document, there is no redress available for parents from the state, in the case of lack of curriculum delivery to their children.

In practice, at Westside High School, the conflicting messages by the state in regard to students with disablility resulted in the status quo being maintained. Students with disabilities continued to have separate education learning goals that were controlled by the special education units within the school, and mainstream teachers were omitted from the IEP process. This meant responsibility for the learning of these students continued to be controlled by special educators rather than their mainstream teachers. Furthermore, class teachers' lack of presence at IEP meetings served to place more responsibility on to the teacher aides, who provided the link between the mainstream and the unit.

The focus on conformity within the school and the dominance of behavioural approaches, both in the mainstream and within the units in the school, potentially had an impact on the acceptance of such practices in terms of the curriculum. It is possible that the behaviour management system that was standardised across all classes of the school, further allowed acceptance and privileging of special education instructional practices from the units into the mainstream. This is because both were underpinned by positivist ideologies. If the school staff had come to accept disciplinary approaches based on behaviourist techniques, then the perpetuation of further such approaches in relation to instructional practices by the special education unit staff, were possibly less likely to be challenged. In addition, acceptance of such approaches also had the potential to add to the perceived lack of ability by mainstream teachers to teach students with special needs.

To recap, the development of the NZCF had failed to include those with special needs in the political process of its development, and therefore they were not really catered for in the documents when schools undertook to implement it. In practice, contradictory messages provided by the state had served to not only provide teachers with unclear and inconsistent messages
about expectations regarding an inclusive curriculum, but also had focused attention away from attending to the curriculum needs of disability and special needs students.

Furthermore, the state has been able to transfer its responsibility for matching the rhetoric of inclusion to practice by devolving that responsibility onto individual schools, under the self-management ethos of Tomorrow's Schools. Whilst schools must abide by the national curriculum, the responsibility and accountability for its implementation becomes the role of individual schools. In other words, schools were left to devise their own inclusive curriculum delivery guidelines.

With few guidelines and limited resources, this approach, not surprisingly, resulted in much confusion for individuals and groups regarding the definition of an inclusive curriculum. As a result, either a discourse of silence was apparent, or an inclusive curriculum was defined in terms of the general school population, by those connected with the school.

Moreover, the state's intention was that the curriculum was not meant for all students. Arguably, this was the reason that little training or professional development had been provided to mainstream class teachers during either pre- or in-service training, about the implementation of the new curriculum for students with disabilities. Adaptations were not made to the curriculum by class teachers for these students, and there appeared to be little awareness that the teachers were able to do this with the curriculum. As in the past, education about disability remained separate in the domain of special education.

Stainback and Stainback have argued that special and regular students are not two different types of students, and therefore do not require different instructional methods. Moreover, they note that regular education "has a history of being reluctant to meet the needs of all students" (p.110), and pointed out that "discrimination can be sanctioned when some students are excluded" (1984, cited in Brown, 1996, p. 143).

The separation of mainstream and special education was replicated in the mainstream classrooms, in which, as a result of lack of understanding and
skill, class teachers often expected less from special needs students, did not see these students as their own responsibility, and relied instead on the teacher aide to teach them. This was further substantiated by the lack of interaction and communication between class teachers and parents of students with disabilities.

The school response to this apparent lack of knowledge and skill in teaching to difference led teachers to draw on traditional ways of knowing, especially for students with disabilities. School-wide in-service training for teaching mainstreamed students included utilising a traditional special education curriculum. The unit staff, resource teachers and teacher aides, all following a special education approach, made decisions about the learning objectives and goals for students with disabilities. This practice served to maintain the status quo, despite the mainstreaming of more and more students, because students were still perceived to belong to the units rather than to the mainstream classrooms. The state’s interests continued to be preserved because whilst the appearance was given to parents that their children were being given more and more in terms of access to the mainstream, the existing secondary school structures remained unchanged. According to Radical Humanists like Kiel (1995), this type of approach only serves to reproduce a functionalist paradigm and the status quo.

In summary, the introduction of a new national curriculum promoting an inclusive curriculum, but with an underlying philosophy of utilitarianism that did not include ALL students, resulted in Westside High School ultimately maintaining the status quo. Whilst students with disabilities were increasingly located in the mainstream, lack of knowledge and understandings of an inclusive curriculum resulted in a re-shift of traditional special education ways of knowing into the mainstream.

**BLURRING THE EDGES**

The theme of Blurring the Edges is a participant-generated code that relates to practice in the high school. It describes the proposed merger of the attached units at the school with the mainstream. By moving students from the LRC into the mainstream, and students from the mainstream into the LRC for remediation, it was perceived that a blurring of the two areas would occur. This was the school’s way of addressing a changing ideology by the
state in relation to special education, and its purported shift to inclusion through the SE2000 policy. However, despite the appearance of a shift to a recognition discourse by the state as a way of meeting individual differences, in reality the SE2000 policy was underpinned by an individualised construction of disability. According to Davis (1995) this approach maintains and legitimates notions of normality and conformity. Furthermore the policy continued to foster a positivist framework that relied on diagnosis and intervention procedures which were based on a deficit model. These constructions of disability continued to be replicated at the school level, in which both units maintained a positivist approach to disability and inclusion. "The model" not only continued to segregate students but also, as Skrtic (1995a) suggests, acted as a stabilizing device for the mainstream by the removal and containment of the "most recalcitrant students".

The lack of clear direction from the state in relation to inclusion and inclusive practices meant that, as did the NZCF, the school drew on its existing store of knowledge in relation to special education. This resulted in a reclaiming of special education traditional ways of knowing - (as described in Chapter 2), that is, behaviourism into the mainstream. Practices focused on individual deficit approaches which undermined the inclusive intentions of the model, because it meant that focus was placed on individual students only, rather than also addressing contextual barriers that continued to perpetuate exclusionary practices.

The discourses of professionalism that were evident in the new SE2000 policy, which followed a traditionally functionalist paradigm, were also reflected within the school. The school engaged in a discourse of expertism and the special education staff became constructed as the experts in the school by the management staff and members of the Board of Trustees. According to Troyna & Vincent (1996), the 'ideology of expertism' "as operationalized by special education professionals draws on a definition of equality ... [in that] its primary concerns are issues of resourcing and access" (p. 136).

This was particularly evident, in that the model did nothing to address existing issues of marginalisation, and continued segregation led to further stigmatisation. Not only were those enrolled in the unit subject to exclusion, but the introduction of the model extended this exclusion to
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those who were being withdrawn from the mainstream into the unit. Furthermore, the blurring of the edges model introduced into the mainstream of the school continued to be specific to only one of the units in the school, and this led to tension between the units.

The reclaiming of traditional notions of positivism were used to give the appearance of greater inclusion, but the status quo was maintained and the existing secondary school structure was retained. As encapsulated in the term "blurring of the edges", the model introduced into the school blended practices between existing structures, while ignoring underlying theoretical frameworks or core assumptions. The implication of this was that blurring the edges was nothing more than a re/construction of mainstreaming. The purported shift to inclusion had failed to incorporate key philosophical components that demarcated it from mainstreaming. Skrtic (1995a) has called this approach "naive pragmatism", in which only special education models, practices, and tools are challenged, while the theories and assumptions that stand behind them are not explicitly criticised.

In summary, the result of blurring the edges was that the separation of special and general education evident at the state level was being reproduced at the school level. Whilst there was a blurring of some aspects of the mainstream and the unit in relation to student placements, the two areas of the school remained discrete and responsibilities and expertise were still clearly demarcated between the two units.

**POWER STRUGGLES**

The theme of power struggles refers to the tension between the two units within the school and the resultant shift in power that occurred. Within the school the blurring of the edges model imposed and legitimated a shifting ideology of expertism (as discussed by Troyna & Vincent, 1996) into the mainstream. "The model" created a power struggle between the two units for privilege over special education knowledge in the mainstream. The outcome was tension between the units and conflicting messages to those in the mainstream, because whilst practices of each unit differed, underlying theoretical frameworks were the same.
Historically the students in the Intellectually Disabled Unit (IDU) had been segregated from the mainstream on almost a full-time basis. This meant that the unit had acted in isolation from the rest of the school. In contrast the Physically Disabled Unit had mainstreamed students and thus had been regarded as the authority in terms of special education within the mainstream. This was consistent with historical hierarchies of disability, in that, in the field of disability, those with physical disabilities had been privileged over those with intellectual disabilities. Furthermore, this had been reflected in state policy, under which those with physical disabilities were provided with more specialist assistance than those perceived to have intellectual disabilities.

The change of staff, and the introduction of the model, meant that the status of the newly-named LRC became greater than that of the PDU in the mainstream. This was evident in the way the Head of the Department of the LRC also held a high-status position in the mainstream and the LRC became more apparent as another department within the school. Whilst the position of the PDU remained the same in the school, the blurring of the edges model for the LRC had succeeded in removing the isolation that had previously occurred. In the eyes of the management of the school, the status of the LRC appeared to have been promoted above that of the PDU. Whereas the PDU had to compete for placements, the LRC, through holding dual roles within the school, was able to cross the boundaries and be part of the mainstream decision-making processes.

The model also created a power struggle between the two units for privilege over special education knowledge in the mainstream. The At-risk Committee within the school provided the special educators from the LRC with the power to promote their knowledge in the mainstream. This was perceived to be to the detriment of the Head of Department of the PDU. The traditional ways in which "inclusion" and "mainstreaming" had been defined by the PDU were challenged, as they were redefined under the terms of the model. This created a legitimation crisis for the PDU, and discontent on the part of the HOD.

The outcome was tension and contestability between the units. Lack of collaboration occurred as each sector sought to privilege its ways of knowing
in relation to inclusive practices. The HOD of the PDU tried to re-establish her power within the special education area of the school by criticising the model, and promoting her own constructions of inclusion within the wider school. She centralised and maintained control of mainstreamed students from her unit by ensuring mainstream teachers, teacher aides and parents negotiated the curriculum through her. This served to keep each group separate, and enhanced and maintained her power.

The power struggle that occurred between units led to conflicting messages being given to those in the mainstream because, whilst practices of each unit differed, underlying theoretical frameworks were the same. Both units continued to promote traditional special education behaviourist frameworks, albeit one was more explicit than the other. Whereas the PDU had engaged in what critical theorists have termed hegemonic discourses in the past, that reflected collaboration, to legitimate its knowledge within the school, the LRC utilised a traditional discourse of professionalism. Despite their apparent differences, professionals in both areas engaged in what has been coined "pigeonholing". Skrtic (1995) explains that this is a process

in which the professional matches a presumed client need to one of the standard practices in his or her repertoire. Given adequate discretionary space ... there is room for some adjustment, but when clients have needs that fall on the margins or outside the professional's repertoire of standard practices, they must be either forced artificially into one of the available practices or be sent to a different specialist, one who presumably has the appropriate standard practices (p. 200).

The latter was evident in the PDU through the employment of specialist staff, whereas standardised behaviourist techniques were utilised in both units to teach all students. Furthermore, this process of pigeonholing was also evident in the mainstream under the model. In summary, this section has drawn attention to the power struggles that occurred between the two units within the school and the confusion that resulted within the mainstream in relation to the privileging of knowledge.
MAINTAINING NORMALITY

My findings also raised questions about the role of conformity in maintaining discourses of normality within the school. Mechanisms such as compartmentalisation, rules, regulations, timetables and routines were enlisted as a way of ensuring normalised behaviour not only by students, but staff and parents or caregivers as well. It is perceived under a functionalist paradigm that this enables society to operate in a stable and consensus way.

As Tomlinson (1985) has suggested within the school environment, those who did not conform did not match constructions of normality and were subsequently categorised and segregated from the mainstream. Inclusion was often confused with assimilation, in which readiness models were perpetuated on the premise that if students conformed, they were then more likely to be mainstreamed. Constructions of difference and recognition were not accounted for in this model, and the role of the units was to normalise students, as much as possible, to fit into the traditional secondary school structure.

The blurring of the edges model served to maintain constructions of normality by not only retaining a mainstreaming model rather than an inclusive one, but also by removing those who did not conform in the mainstream. This was one of the functions of the At-risk Committee, because the focus of the programme had become more about behaviour issues and meeting academic needs, and less about inclusive practices. Furthermore, it appeared that despite some students succeeding academically when placed in the mainstream, their place in the units was retained without question. This served to maintain the units and the status quo. In this way, the unit continued to act as a deterrent against resistance for those still in the mainstream. Tomlinson (1985) has linked inability or unwillingness to be normalised into the school system with an expansion of special education:

The expansion can largely be accounted for by the number of children who have no physical or sensory handicap, but who are educationally defined as being incapable of participating or unwilling to participate in what is currently defined as the 'normal curriculum'... (p. 158).
EXCLUDING THE INCLUDED

The final theme that emerged across my findings was the exclusion of the included. Similar to findings by Fulcher, (1989), despite good intentions for inclusion by key people within the school, the prevalence of market and lay discourses resulted in mostly exclusionary practices occurring. Meanings of inclusion at the school were hindered not only by a number of contextual factors, but also the paradigm in which the school operated. Thus exclusion continued at all levels. Ideologies of utilitarianism and the privileging of contestability by the state meant inclusive education at the school level had to occur in a context in which the school was struggling to deal with more pressing contextual constraints for the school itself. Lack of understanding and skill on the part of the teachers meant that the school responded by reclaiming traditional frameworks, which ultimately served to maintain the status quo. Whilst in practice this increased inclusive practices at some levels, it failed to question the exclusionary context in which it was operating. By engaging in a functionalist paradigm, the school was unable to make the theoretical and philosophical shift that, according to radical humanists like Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Hassard, 1993 is required for democratic transformative approaches, such as inclusive education to occur.

The contextual factors of contestability were to have huge implications for the meanings of inclusion at the school level and beyond. Recent government policies and the shift to utilitarianism had served to maintain the status quo by funding and encouraging the continued segregation of students with disabilities in special units and schools, under the guise of parental "choice". This was despite recognition by a state official that not only was this a more expensive option, but also, segregation was not in alignment with international trends.

The constraints placed on the school by the shift to utilitarianism in the form of marketisation and managerialism served to exacerbate exclusion within the school. Issues of inclusion became marginalised, and took second place to the funding and resource shortages that threatened the school's existence, as school staff worked to maintain the status quo. Not surprisingly, the same philosophies were promoted by state agencies, but
they too found themselves constrained by the marketisation of state policy, and less able to support schools.

Furthermore, Westside High School was imbued with a traditional secondary school structure, which meant that the school continued to operate within a functionalist paradigm and within a positivist framework. As was the case with state policy, special and general education were separated and practices of segregation had become normalised within the school culture. The everyday presence and practices of the attached units influenced participants' understandings of inclusion and segregation became part of their taken-for-granted meanings. Furthermore, by drawing on a positivist framework for day-to-day practices, the school engaged in a medical discourse that resulted in a deficit approach and further exclusion.

The privileging of special education staff as the experts (in a similar way to that discussed by Troyna & Vincent, 1996) in the mainstream also reinforced a positivist approach, and ensured that the context was not questioned. Thus it had been possible for mainstreaming to be redefined, by the special education sector in the school, as inclusion. The lack of skill and understanding of disability that was evident in the mainstream of the school hindered inclusive practices, as staff relied instead on special education staff to take responsibility for special needs students. In this way, the school was able to continue to function as it always had, despite the mainstreaming of some students and the introduction of the model. Nevertheless, misunderstanding and ignorance as a result of lack of teachers' skill and the continued engagement with lay discourses, meant there were levels of resistance to the changes that the model had brought to the school. Additionally, students with special needs often had lower or different rules or expectations placed on them within the school, than did other students. This led to exclusionary practice through resentment by classmates.

Despite the structural barriers within and beyond the school, which I have outlined, evidence of individual agency leading to inclusive practices also occurred. Not only were the management staff especially welcoming of students with special needs, but also individual class teachers and students adopted egalitarian principles and displayed inclusive intentions at different times. Parents' expectations of inclusion appeared to be linked to contextual
constraints in that those who were enrolled in the unit had fewer expectations for inclusion than those who were fully mainstreamed.

Unfortunately, examples of inclusive practices, in terms of my working definitions were sparse. The mainstream school continued to operate mainly within a framework of contradiction, as school staff struggled with the conflicting messages they were simultaneously receiving from the special education areas of the school and the state, as it promoted further shifts towards managerialism in the educational sector. The overarching emphasis from the units was on gaining access to the mainstream and placements into classrooms. This is problematic in that inclusion is not about presence alone, but also participation and acceptance by others, particularly by the students' classmates (Ryba, 1995; Schnorr, 1990).

By ignoring issues of collaboration, participation, and belonging inherent to inclusion and inclusive practices (Stainback, Stainback & Ayres, 1996) the school engaged in a discourse of silence. This had the greatest impact on the students as they were left to negotiate their own meanings of inclusion with each other. Moreover, the silence over disability and other perceived differences, plus the continued presence of the units, meant that students were left with only lay discourses to draw on. This led to much misconception and whilst students with disabilities in the mainstream classes were not overtly excluded, many students adopted a charity discourse towards them. Other students, (without labels as such), were less fortunate and were subjected to daily exclusion by their classmates.

In summary, this section has highlighted the need to address not only micro-level interactions and practices when understanding inclusive and exclusionary practices, but also the context within which they occur. Furthermore, the exclusionary practices that continued to exist in the school, despite the inclusive intentions of management and the increased presence of unit students into the mainstream through the introduction of the model, demonstrates the inability for inclusion to occur within the bounds of a positivist framework under a functionalist paradigm. An "inclusive" model that addresses and changes educational models, practices and tools, but which fails to reflect on and question its own theoretical assumptions and metasuppositions, is set to fail (Skrtic, 1995a). Also, the context in which schools operate has an overarching influence and places
constraints on the things that school staff can do. This is not to say that individuals do not have agency and cannot be inclusive in their practices. But as Ballard (1999) so pertinently points out, inclusive education extends beyond the school, and is hindered by an exclusionary society.

METHODOLOGICAL THEMES

In this section I will discuss my emerging themes in relation to methodology. A number of issues arose for me during the data collection phase. Whilst qualitative researchers are not prescriptive and reflect on many varied areas of the research process, for me these were the issues of relevance because they were grounded in my data (Bogdan & Taylor, 1984). During my analysis when coding, I sorted all data that related to my method under one heading called Methodology. At a later time I coded this data for sensitising concepts and themes. The following themes emerged from the data: positionality, rapport/acceptance, gate-keeping and reciprocity. I will address each one in turn.

Positionality

My formal position as researcher was framed in terms of my information sheet when first negotiating access with my participants. This suggested for example for the teachers, that as the researcher it would involve me

doing some observations at school in your classroom, in the playground and any other place within the school grounds that the students may be at. "Doing some observations" means that while I am present I will do whatever anyone else is doing, watch, chat about what is going on (if this is not disruptive), and write up notes on what I have learned after I have left. (Teacher information sheet - see Appendix Number 2)

In practice my involvement as a participant observer changed depending on the context, my aims at the time and over time. When I first undertook interviews at agency sites and at the school before I started my participant observations, I was very much the researcher and a very nervous one at that. When at the school undertaking participant observations I tried to do what my information sheet had outlined. I followed students and sat next to them in classes and asked questions and chatted when appropriate. If they
copied work off the board then I did so as well. I chose not to actually do the school work because I was reminded of the situation that Jones (1991) had found herself in, (when helping students with school work and the following expectation that she would continue to do this for them), during an incident early into my research. I was still gaining rapport with the students and sat in a class one day in front of several female students. They were copying from the board and so was I. The writing was difficult to read but I was able to decipher it and finished before the students in the class. The two girls kept asking me what different words were and so I responded and ended up giving them my notes to copy. In later observations I found I would be asked how to do the school work and realised that if I was to position myself in this way I would potentially be perceived as a helper and aligned with the teacher rather than as a student. This had immediate ramifications for my perceived power in the classroom and their openness and trust in me. I felt it was important not to be positioned as a helper/teacher or be seen as someone who might be checking up on them.

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) discuss this issue and state that researchers have to decide what their role is and be aware if they become the "helper in the classroom" as the second adult, then the students will perceive them this way (p. 82). They also state that whilst there is a need to balance participation and observation, ultimately it is what you feel the most comfortable with that dictates how you behave (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). Despite my attempts to be clear about not being there as a "helper," initially I was often positioned this way by students and staff alike. I would often be asked who was I there "to look after". As the participants were used to having adults in classes as teacher aides this was not really surprising, and was something that took time to dispel.

I saw gaining student trust as the most important issue for me and I was aware that this was something I would need to constantly re-negotiate. I found this was hindered on occasions when teachers would try and position me with them. In one subject, the class had a relieving teacher for eight weeks. This teacher one day set some homework for the class and turned and looked at the teacher aide and then at me and at the same time said to the class "I have two witnesses here." The teacher aide commented to me after class about me being a witness. This left me feeling very uneasy at
being positioned with the relieving teacher as though I was there to keep a check on the students for her. This particular teacher from the outset had made it very clear that her expectation was that I would assist her to manage the class despite her awareness that I was a university student. The first time I met her I was waiting with 3BR, (standing next to Jill, the teacher aide), to go into the hall for level assembly:

Jill and I stood behind 3BR and as we reached the steps there was a woman standing there who I didn't know. She asked Jill and I who we were, were we with 3BR and were we teacher aides in the class. Jill said she was and I said I was a university student. She said that she had relieved the class the day before and "they did the usual Year Nine silly pranks and changed their names so I wouldn't know who they were. The only thing that saved it was the Year Nine Dean came in." She then added "I want you two to help me manage the class today." Jill nodded, indicating she agreed and I said "I'm sorry but I can't do that." She then ignored me. She told Jill that she wanted her to tell her if the students gave the wrong names (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation).

This type of situation created somewhat of a dilemma for me at times as although I wanted to gain the trust and confidence of the students I did not wish to do it at the expense of losing the rapport or trust of the class teacher. I tried to be strategic in the way I interacted with students and staff at the same time. I did not always succeed in doing this and found that when I went to the school less often my appearance could create a distraction to the students. I would arrive to be met with a wonderfully warm greeting from groups of students especially members of the Year Nine class.

On the times that I arrived for a class during school time my entry into the classroom would be met with a vocal response from the class. The potential impact this had on some of the teachers was not something that I really considered until on one occasion a teacher asked to speak to me after class about the influence my presence was having on the class. The teacher, Heather said

"Well when you appear, you're a like a star to them. They trust you, you're like a counsellor for them. ... That's only because I listen to what they say" I replied. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation)
After some discussion and offering to sit away from the students or withdraw from the class altogether it transpired that the main issue for the teacher was one of discipline. She told me:

I really need you to reprimand them, and say "be quiet". ... you know a lot of them haven't done anything all year, like Debra, I got her first piece of work the other day and the IDU kids are leaping ahead and the others are just starting to respond and your presence detracts from that and discipline becomes an issue again. (Fieldnotes: Participant Observation)

After this incident I withdrew from that particular class as I was not willing to position myself with the teacher and reprimand students. At a later time when this class teacher agreed to be interviewed we discussed this incident and she told me that at that time she "did not realise that those kids are better behaved for me than nearly all of their other teachers" and this seemed to reassure her. I felt as though she had been embarrassed that the students had been noisy that particular day in front of me, in case I was judging her. This reflection on her part made me realise that despite my assumption that teachers had got used to my presence in the classroom and did not feel threatened by it, it was something I had to be mindful of at all times. In the case of this particular teacher I had overlooked that she had not been around when I had gained rapport with the students because she had had extended leave early in the year.

When I positioned myself with the students, it was very difficult at the same time to also position myself with the teachers, although when I shadowed the resource teacher I did just that and consequently never built up the level of rapport with the students in the Year Eleven class that I had gained with the Year Nine students. So I developed different positions at different times depending on my goals and how comfortable I felt in the context I was in.

One thing that did make a difference with the teachers was providing them with the opportunity to be interviewed. Conducting interviews with this group not only provided them with the opportunity to have their say and clarify issues, but also, hopefully, was a way of them seeing that I was not a threat. On reflection in the future I would interview teachers at a much earlier point in the research and this would provide the chance to establish
greater rapport and provide reassurance to the teachers. Despite this one incident, on the whole I felt accepted by the students and all of the staff with whom I interacted.

Rapport/Being accepted

Students

As a "middle-aged" Pakeha woman I was aware when I entered the field that gaining acceptance by the students was going to be the difficult task. Biklen (1999) talks about the power differentials when researching youth and the unusual position it places the researcher in because we were once members ourselves of this group and have an understanding based on memories but can never again be in their position. Biklen goes on to say that our past in terms of our own youth becomes important because as ethnographers our memories constrain the way we behave as researchers and serve to authenticate our privileged positions. For me this helps to explain why I was drawn to the "cool" group because as a youth I would not have mixed with those who were quiet and conforming. It also explains why I watched some students more than others. This certainly was the case as I was drawn to watching those who overtly resisted, rather than those who appeared to conform quietly. I also felt that my relationship and rapport with students from working class backgrounds occurred as a result of my own background. I was able to position myself with them based on my past experiences of feeling the mismatch between working class students like myself and middle class teachers. This meant I felt I could discern behaviours that others might not be able to do so easily.

I believe my acceptance by 3BR was based on me always trying to not pass judgements on students when chatting to them especially when they told me things I may not approve of as an adult. I also spent much time just listening. According to Glesne and Peshkin "you promote rapport by the interest you show in what your respondents say." (1992, p. 79). An indicator I felt of my acceptance was when during Health class one day we had to write "warm fuzzies" to all the class (see Appendix Number 19). Everyone sat in a big circle and had a piece of paper with their own name on it. Everyone passed their piece of paper to the next person and they wrote a
warm fuzzy (a positive comment) on it and then passed it to the next person who did the same. In this way everyone had returned to them a piece of paper with positive comments from all their classmates on it. It also meant that you were able to see what others had written before they passed it on to you. I joined in the activity and after the class the teacher aide commented to me that she was disappointed that the class saw me "as a friend, cool and funny" whereas they saw her only as "helpful". Other indicators for me of my acceptance were the warm welcomes I received whenever I arrived at the school and the way lots of students always asked me to sit next to them during classes.

Teachers

The way teachers positioned me with them made me feel accepted. I went to the staffroom at morning tea when observing and joined in with staff, had a drink and chatted to people around me. I was asked about my research and I explained it to those interested. During my time observing I would participate in conversations about topics that arose especially in relation to special education. As noted later under "reciprocity" I was asked my advice about different issues in relation particularly to university courses. Class teachers appeared happy for me to join in during their classes and I was often asked questions about what I thought in relation to the curriculum topic under discussion with other classmates. I participated in all group activities and was asked to join in during physical education classes, which I did, although I drew the line at Fat Mat, (a game where you run around the gymnasium whilst students try and hit you with a tennis ball and to reach home base you have to dive head on onto huge fat mats)!

Parents

Gaining rapport with parents differed depending on the contact I had with them. As previously outlined in my introduction chapter, I met Jamie's and Lee's parents prior to gaining access at Westside High School and so gaining rapport with them was much easier than with Raymond's and Michael's parents. Both Jamie's and Lee's parents rang me throughout my data collection or vice versa as a way of keeping me informed of their experiences at school when I was not there. In the latter situation I took care
to chat to them on the phone first initially, then I followed this up again sometime later before requesting an interview. When meeting with them I tried to ensure that they were comfortable with being interviewed and offered alternative meeting times if they desired. All parents agreed to be interviewed at the time. By this time I knew all their children through the school and so was able to gain rapport by discussing them and making reference to my own children.

Overall my role changed constantly with the parents, students and teachers over time. I was positioned in the following different roles, quite apart from researcher: teacher, helper, student, advocate, expert, counsellor, friend, peer, and colleague. This posed difficulties for me at times when others treated me differently from a researcher. I reflected and constantly worried about not becoming too involved throughout my data collection phase. However, this was something I felt I had little control over as I got to know some of my participants well and spent extensive periods of time with them.

**Gatekeeping**

I experienced gate keeping in different ways in my study. According to Taylor & Bogdan (1998) "participant observers usually gain access to organizations by requesting permission from those in charge. These persons are usually referred to as *gatekeepers*" (p.29). The management at the school served as my main gatekeepers in terms of having to gain access from them to undertake my study at the school. The Deputy Principal also acted in this role when negotiating on my behalf for entry into classrooms. I had to rely on him to present my research to prospective participants and hope they would agree to participate.

I felt fortunate in the way I was treated by the school community. When I negotiated access with the Principal I was told by him that I was most "welcome" and should "feel like a staff member". This was extended to using the staff carpark (which I chose not to do), staffroom and a pigeon hole in the staffroom. The only times I felt hindered in any way by gatekeeping at the school was firstly when trying to negotiate a student from 3BR as a participant and secondly when trying to get access into the
Physically Disabled Unit. In the first instance I approached the Dean of Year Nine about this student participating in my study but was told that due to certain circumstances it was not a good idea. So I left it at that.

In relation to accessing the Physically Disabled Unit, the HOD arranged my access into the unit by appointment only. I tried several times throughout the year to organise a formal interview with her but was told that it did not suit her at that time. I felt as though I had been drawn into the school politics because of my greater involvement with the other unit in the school. As Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state, close associations with some will close off associations with others and there is a need to constantly renegotiate access and rapport (p. 99). I persevered with this person and went back to her at a later date and tried to renegotiate an interview. After discussion she agreed to be interviewed and for a while I noticed a shift in the way I was subsequently positioned. Despite this, I continued to receive mixed messages from her. On some occasions I would call in just to organise a time to see her or undertake an observation and she would sit me in her office and want to talk right away and would vent her frustrations to me. At other pre-arranged times she would be unavailable and so I felt that I had to constantly re-negotiate rapport with her. When I asked to do an observation in the unit she agreed but made me feel as though a morning would be the maximum time I could spend in there.

The effect of the gatekeeping that occurred was that my access to one unit was far more open than the other. This meant that I spent greater periods of time in one unit than the other. The impact this may have had on the data I was able to collect and the way I was positioned by staff within the school can only be a source of speculation. It did mean that I was unable to provide balance in terms of amount of time spent in each unit and that I gained a perspective of the PDU more from the outside than from within.

Reciprocity

Glesne and Peshkin draw on Glaser's definition to explain reciprocity as "the exchange of favors and commitments, the building of a sense of mutual identification and feeling of community" (Glaser (1982) cited in Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 122). They go on to say:
As research participants willingly open up their lives to researchers - giving time, sharing intimate stories, and frequently including them in both public and private events and activities - researchers become ambivalent, alternately overjoyed with the data they are gathering, and worried by their perceived inability to reciprocate adequately. .... Researchers do not want to view people as means to ends of their choosing. Nonetheless, in noncollaborative qualitative work, they invariably cultivate relationships in order to gather data to meet their own ends. In the process, researchers reciprocate in a variety of ways, but whether what they give equals what they receive is difficult, if not impossible to determine (1992, p. 122).

For me reciprocity occurred in different ways and to varying extents with different groups. The level of my reciprocity differed depending in a large part on my involvement with particular groups. I have separated them into the following four groups: families, staff, students, and agency representatives.

Families

I felt the most indebted to all of the families who allowed me to enter their lives and that of their children, but in particular to the two families who had agreed to me following their children through the first year of high school and hence provided me with the mechanisms to implement my study. I remained in constant contact with the two families over my data collection period and have continued to do so subsequently. When I had not been at the school for some time, I would phone and ask how things were going and in return they would contact me on occasion to inform me of happenings at school.

I also attended Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings with both families and if asked by teaching staff would offer suggestions for inclusive practices. Before my study began I had met the parents several times at planning meetings regarding high school placements. As noted in my introduction chapter I had acted as a support person for one family when visiting prospective high schools. During these meetings, (attended by at times four families), the concept of a Circle of Friends had been discussed. Keenness had been expressed by all of these families for the introduction of this model for their children, but it was not followed through at this time. At a later
date at the school in term two, one family asked me to go with them and discuss the introduction of a Circle of Friends model (Forest & Pearpoint, 1997) with the school. I saw this as an excellent way to reciprocate but was mindful that it was important for the school to take ownership of such a concept. I also did not want to ever position myself as "the expert" with either the families or the school staff.

As Glesne and Peshkin explain:

As a researcher, you are a curious student who comes to learn from and with research participants. You do not come as an expert or authority. If you are so perceived, then your respondents will not feel encouraged to be as forthcoming as they can be. As a learner, you are expected to listen; as an expert or authority, you are expected to talk (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 36).

I found this difficult at times though because they often positioned me this way and wanted me to lead it. An example of this was early on when the Circle of Friends was first discussed by the Williams family. This family had more practical knowledge of the model than I did, having attended a workshop by Forest & Pearpoint, the leading proponents some years beforehand. Despite this they were unsure of how to proceed and wanted me to discuss it with the school staff because they told me they were parents and it was better for professionals to talk with professionals. I suggested we work on it together and tried to be ever mindful of checking back with them at each stage in the process to ensure it was what they and Jamie wanted. We discussed it together with Jamie at length and as a starting point I used a MAP format (Forest & Pearpoint, 1997) to understand what he wanted.

We went to the school together to discuss the concept with the Deputy Principal. I also discussed it with Jamie's resource teacher and we worked on it and wrote a lesson plan for the implementation of Circle of Friends for the school. Later I attended At-risk Committee meetings on behalf of the parents to explain the model to staff. The resource teacher and I met with the guidance counsellor to explain the way the lesson could be organised.

On the advice of one of my supervisors, I took care to be very explicit about my role in terms of acting only as a resource person for the parents and school. I made it clear I would be unable to participate in facilitating any such programme into the school. At a later date I offered to help Lee's
family in a similar way to Jamie's when they raised the possibility of also introducing a Circle of Friends programme within the school.

In this way I was able to reciprocate the gift these families had given me but I was always mindful that it would only ever be a token gesture. Hence I believe my reciprocity commitment extends far beyond this current study. I will try to always provide support to these families, should they seek it in the future. This is not just motivated by indebtedness but rather a genuine caring and interest for what happens to these families in the future. I hope that in this small way I can attempt to fulfil my obligation of reciprocity.

For the other two families with whom I had much less contact and who had only become part of my study later in the piece, my level of reciprocation has been much less apparent. I have spoken with them several times on the phone and interviewed them in their own homes. I provided a medium for them to be able to discuss their concerns about their children. Often conversations would flow over after the tape recorder had been turned off, and in a very small way I hope this was a way of reciprocating and being a sounding board for these people. I have provided all parents with a report of my main findings (see Appendix Number 20) and offered to support or advocate for any of them in the future.

Staff

My commitment to reciprocity, in regard to the school, as with the families, is something that I see as ongoing in the future. During my time at the school, I made myself available to talk with staff if requested and made resources available. This included discussions and advice about university courses with several staff members. As stated previously, I worked with teachers in relation to the Circle of Friends, attended At-Risk Committee and IEP meetings and gave my advice when asked for. An association developed between the resource teacher and myself and we often discussed work related resources. For example, I helped her devise an IEP form to use in the school. I made myself available as a sounding board and tried to minimise any nervousness she may have had about me "looking over her shoulder" when shadowing her.
I attempted at all times, (and felt at times I had succeeded), to be part of the school as an "insider" rather than the "detached researcher". At the completion of my data collection period I was asked to be the mediator between families and school and took part in a feedback meeting arranged by the school, (after discussion between myself, the resource teacher and the deputy principal), with the four sets of families I had known prior to my study. Other ways I tried to reciprocate the school was through offering to do some unpaid work for them after my data collection period. The school was part of a Ministry initiative and required some survey work to be done. I offered to do this for the school as a form of reciprocity but it was a requirement that it only be undertaken by a staff member of the school. I have kept the school informed of my progress throughout different stages of my thesis and negotiated with the school ways to disseminate my findings (see Appendix Number 21 for summary report distributed to all stakeholders).

Students

To reciprocate the students' participation in my study directly has been one of the hardest things to achieve. At the start of my study I had intended having a reunion feedback session at the end of my study with the Year Nine class to discuss my findings with them. However on a morning tea visit to the school six months after my data collection had finished, I was very disappointed to find that most of the original Year Nine class were no longer at the school and hence I am left feeling as though I have not really fulfilled my obligation in this area. When reflecting on my data, I can see that I was a "listening ear" for students. During my time in the field I tried not to make judgements about them nor make negative comments to them. I was told by Heather, a teacher on one occasion that the students "trust you, you're like a counsellor for them." I tried to be positive and encourage them in what they did. I hope that this has proven to be a way, (though admittedly very limited), of reciprocation to the students for participating in my study.

Agency Representatives

My other participants, representatives from agencies, I interviewed in their official roles. This meant that my contact with these people was of a very limited nature and limited to an interview situation. I never discussed any
form of feedback during access negotiations but have distributed a summary report to all of my participants.

To recap, this section has provided a discussion of the issues in the field that emerged from the data in relation to my methodology. This included issues of positionality in terms of my changing position in the field; my experience of establishing rapport and acceptance with my participants, the impact gatekeeping had on my research and issues of reciprocity in relation to all groups of participants.

In summary, this chapter has provided a discussion of the themes that emerged from my findings and methodology. This has involved exploring meanings of inclusion in relation to contextual factors such as contestability, constructs of normality and traditional ways of knowing. Furthermore, the impact of these factors has emerged in my findings in relation to issues of power, and discourses of inclusion and exclusion. In this chapter, I have attempted to highlight the complexity of my findings and the interconnectness between themes. I argue for an alternative theoretical framework that undertakes meaningful research. In the final section I discuss the methodological themes of positionality, rapport, gatekeeping and reciprocity that emerged when undertaking this study.
The final chapter of this thesis will utilise the qualitative research technique of reflexivity to reflect on what can be learned from my findings, their implications and possibilities for the way forward. Whilst my findings chapters have provided a critical analysis of people's lives in relation to the curriculum and inclusive education at both micro- and macro-levels, the following sections will reflect upon my understandings and perspectives from my position as the researcher.

In the first section of this chapter I will reflect on my study holistically in order to advance the way in which this thesis contributes to the field of education. I will discuss the impact of utilising an alternative framework, both theoretically and methodologically, for gaining greater understanding of the issues surrounding traditionally-held views in the area of special education. Next I will discuss the implications of my study for the future. Finally I will consider the following questions: What does this mean for inclusion and where to from here? What possibilities are there for the way forward?

**WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM MY STUDY**

The following section discusses how this thesis contributes to the field of education, especially in relation to the New Zealand context. By reflecting on my study as a whole, I will demonstrate its uniqueness in relation to the findings generated from the data, as well as the value of the methodology I have utilised.

**Qualitative Methodology**

Much research in the special education area has been undertaken in the past "on the disabled" rather than "with disabled people" (Oliver, 1990). This was largely due to the use of techniques that were underpinned by a medicalised deficit approach. Behaviourist research undertaken from an "objective" perspective often became more important than the participants, and much focus was placed on diagnosis and intervention, followed by replication of studies. These approaches have often failed to improve, or aid understanding of, the lives of those being researched (Brisenden, 1998). Techniques such as surveys and questionnaires have given much insight into areas concerning disability, but because they are usually based on
responses from large groups of people, they fail to provide an indepth understanding of a specific issue or situation. According to Bogdan & Lutfiyya (1996):

The domination of quantitative research in special education has not served the field well. Our criticism is not so much with the value of the quantitative paradigm as with its monolithic place in the field of special education. Historical, philosophical, as well as sociological and anthropological field research - that is, qualitative research - has been neglected, restricting the field's search for understanding to methods that address only a narrow part of the human experience and take the assumptions of special education for granted..." (p. 229).

In contrast, the use of a qualitative research methodology has provided the medium with which to enter the lives of a particular group of people over long and intense periods of time, to enable an understanding of what life is like for these people (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). It has provided the means for me to experience that which the participants experience, or as close as is possible, on a daily basis. By understanding their lives in this way, we are in a better position to recommend change that is meaningful for the participants, rather than only what is perceived as meaningful by the "objective" researcher.

Often functionalist research makes claims of generalisability but this research demonstrates that generalisability can be only on a somewhat superficial level, because the circumstances within and across each setting differ over time. This indepth study shows the complexity of school life, and demonstrates that each research location is unique to the participants and interactions within it. That is not to say that the identification of meanings of inclusion and barriers to inclusion for this group of people in this study, will not be similiar for others in similar circumstances.

The Importance of Epistemology

By drawing on a social constructionist epistemology in this study, I have been able to focus on my participants' perspectives in a search for the meaning they construct of their lives. I have developed an understanding of the way different stakeholders in the education sector construct meanings in relation to policies both as stated, intended and interpreted. Examination of
my participants' perspectives has served to expose the divergence in people's understandings and raise my awareness of the complexities involved around the concept of inclusion.

I have come to the conclusion that understanding inclusion and inclusive practices requires a shift away from positivist knowledge that focuses on notions of truth and objectivity. I believe it is only through holding a worldview that moves away from a functionalist paradigm which legitimates concepts of normality and deviance, that we can understand the way people with disabilities have been excluded in our society. This study has demonstrated that inclusion is a social construct subject to change, depending on the way that it is defined and by whom. Moreover a social constructionist epistemology challenges the taken-for-granted assumptions that the state reinforces through our schools in the form of ideology.

**Micro-Macro Integration**

Traditionally many studies have failed to take a holistic view by concentrating either on only a macro- or a micro-approach. Like Ritzer (1990), I have challenged the notion that it is not possible to merge the two into one study, by drawing on macro- and micro-theoretical perspectives that are based on the same epistemology. Interpretivism and radical humanism, both underpinned by a social constructionist epistemology have allowed me to do this. In this way, it has been possible to study the introduction of policy from the state level through to its implementation at the grassroots level. This has provided an understanding of the same policies as stated, intended, interpreted and received.

**Indepth Analysis**

In terms of breadth, this study has made connections between all sectors involved in the life of one school from parents, students, teachers, management staff, support agencies, government agencies, to policy analysts or representatives of the state. As a result, the number of participants is large and the number of people interviewed in connection with one setting substantial.
More importantly, the study has drawn together the actors interconnected within a whole system and has taken account of their interactions and relationships with each other. This approach has highlighted the importance of contextual factors and the need to take a holistic view in any research undertaking. Such an approach has identified the complexity of a school undergoing change, and the ways in which this change is resisted at every level, within and beyond the school. The study links the constraints on the school to the wider society, and the ways in which the status quo is maintained, in spite of the appearance of change.

**The Interconnection between Inclusion and Curriculum**

In terms of the substantive areas of inclusion and curriculum, the study has provided valuable insight into their interconnectedness, especially at the secondary school level. Little research about inclusion has been undertaken in New Zealand schools, especially at the secondary school level. A study of inclusion and curriculum at the secondary school level is especially important at this time, for a number of reasons. Firstly, in relation to inclusion, the statutory law change to the Education Act in 1989 means that more and more children with disabilities are being enrolled into regular schools in New Zealand.

Secondly, the implications of the changes to the Act are only now taking effect for secondary schools as those children who started regular schools in 1989 at the age of five, approach secondary school age. Until now, secondary schools have had to make the least amount of changes to their school-wide practices in relation to inclusion. It was therefore relatively unusual for a secondary school to attempt to change the current practice by agreeing to enrol students with special needs as regular students. By Westside High School agreeing to do so, and allowing me to witness the process, this study has provided insight into a period of transition. Such insight allowed an understanding of the changes as they occurred in all sectors; and highlighted the barriers that prevented inclusion from occurring successfully.

Thirdly, by drawing connections between the new national curriculum and its rhetoric of inclusion, and the real-life experiences at a school in the application of these policies, the study has been able to compare state policy with grassroots practice. This has enabled the new curriculum to be
critiqued in a way that has not been undertaken before. By taking some of
the values purported to be present in the curriculum framework, and
putting them under scrutiny in relation to their ease of practice, this study
has demonstrated the divergence and disconnections between the major
actors in the education system.

In summary, in this section I have reflected on that which can be learned
from this thesis, and how it contributes to the field of education. This study
has demonstrated the usefulness of a qualitative approach for providing an
indepth understanding of inclusion for different groups of people.
Furthermore, it has shown that a social constructionist epistemology is able
to provide the means for understanding the interconnections between
inclusion and the national curriculum at both macro- and micro-levels. As
a result, my findings have highlighted firstly, the complexities of secondary
school life; secondly, the failings of special education, and thirdly, the
contradictions to which schools are being constantly exposed by the state. In
this way, the study has made an important contribution to the field of
education, particularly in relation to special education and inclusive
practices in New Zealand.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND**

In the following section I will reflect on what I have learned in terms of the
implications that my study may have for myself, my participants, other
groups including researchers, and future research possibilities. I will also
review and reflect on inclusion at both the societal and individual levels.
This will provide the necessary framework for me to be able to make
alternative suggestions that may serve to open a pathway for the way
forward.

My aim when I started this thesis was to understand and explore an
inclusive setting so that others could develop similar situations and
environments that would include all people. What I found was a complex
situation, complicated by contextual factors beyond the control of the setting,
that despite the best intentions of individuals within it, served to hinder
inclusion and to maintain a traditional model of exclusion. Over the time I
have been involved in this in-depth study, I have attempted to understand
which factors needed to change and why best intentions alone were not enough.

I hope that by revealing the pitfalls and barriers that people encountered, they and others in similar schooling contexts can move forward and avoid such problems in the future. Whilst seemingly negative in many respects, this thesis provides us with the hope of change. It is encouraging that despite all of the barriers beyond the control of Westside High School, they were still willing to venture along the path of change towards a more inclusive environment for their community. As highlighted in my findings, change was a risk for the school when constantly faced with resourcing concerns and image problems. In spite of these barriers, many school staff attempted to be more inclusive in their practice.

**Societal level**

**Values**

Reflections on inclusive education at a societal level immediately alert us to the issue that inclusive education cannot be separated from societal attitudes and the exclusionary practices that occur within it. This calls into question the type of society we have and the political climate in which we want to live. For inclusive education to be addressed at the societal level, I believe consistency is required in the philosophical and theoretical frameworks in which the state operates. Social justice principles that underpin values of inclusive education are also required at a state level. These values need to be based on a philosophy that heralds the importance of both distributive and recognition discourses and fairness for all, rather than utilitarian ideologies.

**Maintaining The Status Quo**

Another implication of my study is that the rhetoric of inclusion and inclusive education purported by the state are only that, and are utilised to legitimate and maintain the status quo. I have challenged the use of the term "inclusion" as a synonym for mainstreaming, and exposed it as a strategy for resistance to change, as used by those in special education. I have shown that mainstreaming is nothing more than another form of assimilation, because unlike inclusion it fails to recognise difference and address discrimination and oppression. Special education is problematic in nature. As long as special education is maintained as a separate entity in our
schooling system, (such as in the case of Westside High School), students will continue to be segregated and excluded. I support the assertions that special education has acted as a safety valve for the removal of "unwanted" students from the mainstream. As long as this "valve" exists the practice will continue, and mainstream teachers will fail to take responsibility for these students.

**Divergence Across Policies**

In relation to the Special Education 2000 policy, this thesis has shown the impracticability of having a policy that purports a shift to a world-class inclusive education system based only on funding provisions. Whilst the funding allocations are determined by individuals' difficulties in accessing the curriculum, no formalised integration with the NZCF has ever been made. Instead the policy appears to have been implemented on the premise that the national curriculum already provided an inclusive curriculum. The findings of my thesis challenge such a presupposition, and demonstrate instead that the development of the national curriculum was premised on an inclusive curriculum that catered for some groups only.

**School level**

**Paradigmatic Shift**

I believe that if inclusive practices are ever to become a reality, it requires, as Skrtic has noted, more than models, practice and tools to be challenged in our schools. The theoretical frameworks and metasuppositions, on which schools are founded, will need to be reflected on and challenged over time. As long as our schools and society continue to privilege functionalists' ways of knowing, inclusion and inclusive practices are not possible, (under such a paradigm). Such a paradigm focuses only on consensus and maintaining the status quo and serves to both ignore, and exacerbate, exclusionary practices.

This research has shown that continued exclusion for students with disabilities is a result of lack of skill, as well as of managerialism, and other state-led changes to the ways in which schools and support agencies function. The traditional focus of special educators on access resulted in enhanced social interaction, but did little to ensure participation or membership in the classroom. The discourses of silence due to teacher ignorance also resulted in further exclusion.
Whilst inclusion appears elusive, and seemingly only possible under a model of social reconstructionism, my findings demonstrate that inclusive practices can and do occur at an individual level. Individuals can use their agency to enhance the potential for transformative approaches. It is to this that I now turn.

**Individual Agency**

Individual agency can make a difference to the daily lives of those who are perceived to be different. In this study, some staff within the school demonstrated inclusivity through compassion and understanding for their students and reflexivity in their practices. Students constructed naive ways of including each other, albeit using a charity model. Perhaps, with education, altruistic tendencies within individuals can be redirected in ways that would see the current construction of disability not as an individual deficit but as a disabling barrier to inclusion. Thought of in this way, it can be seen that the seeds are in place for transformation to occur and education has the potential to be a key change agent.

In summary, the implications of my thesis suggest that change is possible at both an individual and societal level. But it is an ongoing struggle, and only possible when we learn to challenge the current models by peeling back the layers (in terms of Skrtic's (1995) model) of contemporary practices and tools, as well as the assumptions, theories and metaphysical suppositions that reinforce our current belief systems. Only then can we embrace a transformative approach that will see a shift closer towards an inclusive education system.

**THE WAY FORWARD...**

My thesis has served to question the NZCF and inclusion from policy through to practice, raising a number of issues for those who seek a way forward. Whilst it is beyond the scope of the thesis to present solutions, in this section I will outline a number of issues that have emerged from this study, as a way of laying down the foundation for moving closer towards more inclusive practices in our schools. In a bid to link policy to practice, I will begin by discussing the NZCF and SE2000 in relation to our current
secondary school structure; then I will look at possibilities for change in
teacher provision, school-wide and classroom practices.

Secondary School Structure

As previously stated, the number of children with disabilities who have
attended their local state primary school in New Zealand as regular students
over recent years is increasing. These children are now moving on to
secondary school level. What will this mean for regular secondary schools
in the future and the traditional ways in which they are structured? My
thesis has served to challenge the structure of our schools at this level and
the outdated expectation that students need to fit the system, or be excluded.
This challenge is further supported by New Zealand's increasing rates of
suspensions, suggesting a growing mismatch between existing structures
and the changing needs of our upcoming youth (Ministry of Education,
1999b).

The traditional ways in which we have generally viewed curricula also
require reviewing. A focus only on outcomes such as grades and test results
tends to ignore the processes of learning, and the importance of that which
really counts in people's daily lives. For some reason, we think it is
acceptable in our society arbitrarily to segregate people on the basis of their
lack of perceived ability. Have we forgotten that feelings of belonging, being
accepted and respected for who we are, are all prerequisites to successful
learning? It is the right of all to be accepted in our schools and in the wider
society as equal citizens. The traditional structures of our secondary schools
which continue to legitimate the existence of attached units within them,
fail to converge with these prerequisites for an inclusive education, as
defined in this study.

Curriculum Review

When linking this to my findings in relation to the national curriculum in
our secondary schools, it is apparent that the claims of the NZCF to offer an
inclusive curriculum are incorrect, which suggests a need for a state-level
review of the policy. This could include a review of the inconsistencies
across curriculum statements, the utilitarian philosophical ideology on
which it is underpinned, and the inadequacy of the document to provide
classroom teachers with strategies for inclusive practices.
Special Education Policy

The introduction of a special education policy based on the continued segregation of some of our youth, has served only to perpetuate discrimination through the legitimation of the status quo. The policy, therefore, has done little to provide a shift towards a world-class inclusive education system. We must question the policy as it stands, and the motivations behind it. Genuine attempts by the state towards a more inclusive education system require a holistic and integrated approach across policy development in the education sector.

Serious questions need to be raised as to the responsibility the state has for the direction it sets for society and the values upheld as being important. The state cannot foster a regime of utilitarianism, and simultaneously provide our schooling community with inclusive policies, because inclusion then becomes merely rhetoric. For inclusion to advance, as a society we need to make a commitment to acceptance for all our citizens, and a pledge to combat all forms of discrimination and oppression. A review of the NZCF has the potential to change practices on a day-to-day basis for teachers if inclusive practices are valued. Inclusive practices can be advanced through adopting social constructions of difference that define disability in relation to the disabling barriers in our society, rather than in relation to an individual deficit.

Teachers' Professional Development and Education

Within schools, people need to be able to adopt reflexive practices that allow them to challenge their taken-for-granted understandings and the assumptions of the paradigm in which they are operating. Ongoing in-service professional development for current teachers could assist in the implementation of reflective practices at a school-wide level. This education would focus on the social reconstructionist model of reflexivity, (as defined in Chapter 2), whereby teachers would be taught to not only see reflective practice as a mechanism for improving their own practices, but as a way of reflecting "outwardly at the social conditions in which these practices are situated" (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1991, p. 8).

Additionally, the adoption of a philosophy of inclusive education as an integral part of all pre-service teacher training would encourage education
to be understood as a right for all, rather than only for those who conform and fit the criteria of normality. Care needs to be taken however, of the ways in which providers of teacher training and professional development take up this challenge. Whilst this study has shown the exclusion that occurred within a school where the education of difference remained under a shroud of silence, Minow (1994) draws our attention to the dilemma of difference. She warns us of the danger of further exclusion for those who are already stigmatised, when embracing concepts of difference. If we focus on people’s individual differences and set them apart as someone "special" or "different" we open up the possibility of stigmatising them even further.

Minow (1994) offers several alternative strategies to overcome this dilemma, including:

Reframing social experience to transcend the difference dilemma means challenging the presumption that either one is the same or one is different, either one is normal or one is not. A related strategy is to expand the definition of who is the same or who is different, thus challenging the exclusionary uses of difference (p. 95).

In other words, a social reconstructionist approach would not only challenge the existence of such binaries, for example, as different and same, but they would no longer be part of our psyche. Alternatively, Minow suggests that the definition of difference could be extended to deter marginalisation. Either suggestion requires us, as educators, to shift our focus away from the different person and on to an emphasis on the construction of difference.

Classroom teachers in secondary schools, therefore, require in-service training and ongoing professional development that provides them with the philosophical understanding of social constructionism. Such an understanding would enable teachers to challenge their own constructions of disability and the impact of these constructions on their actions as teachers. In regard to practical skills for developing a curriculum that is reflective and inclusive of all students, teachers also require ongoing education in the implementation of an inclusive curriculum.

This does not mean adopting a formulaic approach, as has traditionally been the case with special education practitioners. Furthermore the way inclusive
education is taught, both as a part of professional development and pre-
service education is vitally important. It is imperative that the construction
of such knowledge does not become a mere replication of professional
discourses of expertism, whereby legitimate knowledge is transmitted from
expert to learner. Instead what is required is a model of teacher reflexivity
based on a social constructionist view of knowledge construction. In this
way, according to Zeichner (1994), it would be recognised "that the
generation of knowledge about good teaching is not the exclusive property
of colleges, universities, and research and development centres, a
recognition that teachers have theories too, that can contribute to a codified
knowledge base for teaching" (p. 10).

In this way teachers would be able to embrace a critical pedagogy, which
would not only allow them to constantly reflect on their practices in
relation to all of their students, but also presume a transformative approach
to teaching the curriculum. This change would help to provide teachers
with strategies on which to draw, thus allowing them to construct an
inclusive curriculum for all of their students.

School-wide and Classroom Practices

Whilst an understanding and acceptance of inclusive education principles
by the teaching profession will enhance the way forward towards inclusion,
this does not mean its adoption will be easy. Many issues that have been
raised as a result of the findings of this thesis will still need addressing.
Policy initiatives will need to be linked to classroom practice. What will
inclusion of all students in our secondary schools mean for the individual
classroom teacher? What issues will have to be considered and resolved?
How will teachers be supported on a day-to-day basis to meet all learners'
needs? How can class teachers best be supported in a more inclusive
environment? How can teachers work together to provide not only an
inclusive curriculum in their school but a collaborative supportive network
for teachers? How will teachers work with the increasing number of
children with disabilities who enter regular classes? These and many other
questions will arise and need to be worked through by all sectors within the
education system as they shift towards a more inclusive system.
Finally, at a societal level, we need to remember that we cannot expect our children to learn and grow and develop as holistic adults if they are rejected by their schools, segregated from their classmates, or restricted in their future options by current placements. Our lives are about constructing meaning through interaction. That being the case, how can we ever expect our children to learn to construct meaning and understanding with those who are different if they never get to associate with them? On a societal level we should ask ourselves what sort of society do we have that allows the rejection of people when they are still children?

In conclusion this chapter has discussed the ways in which the thesis contributes to the field of education. It has outlined the impact of utilising an alternative framework, both theoretically and methodologically, for gaining a greater understanding of the issues surrounding traditionally-held views in the area of special education. This thesis has considered the divergence that is apparent between inclusive policies on the one hand and national curriculum policy on the other, at both the state and classroom levels. The implication of this thesis is that it poses a challenge to both the status quo and the direction set by the state. It argues for a review of current policies and a paradigmatic shift at all levels in order to move closer towards an inclusive education system. The thesis offers both philosophical and practical suggestions for the way forward, namely changes in: the ways in which the state values its citizens; reconstruction of the way our secondary schools are structured; teacher provision that includes an inclusive approach; and changes to our day-to-day school-wide and classroom practices.

Finally, I have offered a way forward for inclusion and inclusive practices in the future. I have demonstrated that systemic change is required at all levels, as is a challenge to the construction of difference. A re-evaluation and transformation of the values held within our education system are required, not only to foster an environment of caring and acceptance but also to promote the extinction of oppression and discrimination.
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Working with “At Risk” Students

Our working definition of “at risk” includes students who are struggling with classroom learning and students who have unacceptable behaviours in the classroom. Most educators are aware of the strong relationship between poor behaviour and low achievement. Therefore, whatever helps one area is likely to help the other.

The following general comments are intended to act as pointers towards possible solutions for students who have academic and/or behaviour problems.

Remember - all children are different. (Even laboratory rats are different from one another!)

1. Ensure the work the student has been asked to do is in fact achievable. This of course implies that not all students do the same work each lesson - not an easy concept for some of us to accept. Does it sound unfair? Is it fair to ensure that some students fail when you could ensure that nearly all achieve something?

One system I have found useful is to structure a lesson with the same basic introductory and summary activities for all students. The middle portion of the lesson can consist of (for example) three activities related to the lesson objectives. The first activity is one that all students can do, some of them with ease. The second activity will take many or most students further, but some will not complete it and some may not even begin it. The third activity is an extension activity for the high-achieving, self-motivated students who may well explore it further in their own time.

2. Use practice activities to enhance critical skills. What are the critical skills for your subject? Which are most critical? These are crucial questions, and as educators we need to know the answers.

For ideas on practice, refer to the handout from last year, “Using Practice to Enhance Learning”. See me if you would like a copy.

3. Analyse the content of what you are teaching. Do students need to practice a production skill or a discrimination? Do the activities you have set up match the need?

For instance, if I ask students to write paragraphs but haven’t taught them the difference between a good paragraph and a bad one, how will they know whether they are doing it right? In general it makes sense to teach discrimination before response (production).

4. You can analyse the content of what you teach further. Break it up into its component skills or discriminations and teach them in small steps. It’s a bit of work, but once the students have adjusted to the shorter, quicker tasks, the students can move through the
component skills relatively quickly. If they don't, you will be able to see exactly which skill or area they are having trouble with. Then you can use practice activities to build performance.

5. Develop a teaching sequence based on a set of concrete (as concrete as possible) examples. I have found that running through a series of examples with a student is easier, faster, more effective than explaining a concept, and gives them greater confidence.

E.g. "This is the topic sentence for paragraph one... Paragraph 1 is about...

This is the topic sentence for paragraph 2... Paragraph 2 is about...

This is the topic sentence for Paragraph 3... Paragraph 3 is about..."

This is particularly effective for non-academic students, or students with language difficulties. Middle-achieving students often seem to have a clear idea by the third example, able students sometimes only require one.

6. Try the 'Model, Lead and Test' approach. This is particularly good when you are trying to teach them how to apply a rule of some kind. First show the student(s) how to respond. Then get them to do it with you. Finally get them to do it without you. (NB give them a clear cue as to when they should respond).

You can use this approach to check they've grasped what you were trying to teach them in the example sequence.

7. Try to include a range of activities so that (ideally) every student gets to perform a skill in which they feel confident. It is true that this can make students feel better. The reason that this is so important is that if they don't have enough good feelings about your class, they may well develop bad feelings instead. Anxiety, the fear of failure, and the accompanying fear of humiliation can build up as involuntary, conditioned reactions over a period of time - and you and the student may never see the process. Avoidance behaviour is often a response to an anxiety reaction. Examples of avoidance can be dithering, fidgeting, stalling, failure to bring the right equipment, inattention and truancy.

8. As a consequence of 7. above, aim for a ratio of at least three rewards for every negative comment you may have to make. A smile, a laugh, a tick, a word of sincere praise, a greeting, a moment to talk about the student's life as if their concerns matter, a question showing genuine interest - all these things can be just as effective as the well-known jellybean effect. The bottom line is, kids will go a long way with you if they suspect you like them. Try to foster this suspicion.

May 1997
University of Canterbury
Department of Education

The Inclusion of Students with Disabilities and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework at the Secondary School Level.

Would you be interested in participating in the Inclusion at Secondary School Study?

The Inclusion at Secondary School Study has two main aims. The first aim is to describe how students with disabilities are being included in a secondary school setting and what barriers exist towards a model of inclusion for them, the teachers and the school itself. The second aim is to find out what impact the NZ Curriculum Framework is having in relation to inclusion for this group.

Participation in the study means:
* Getting to know some children with disabilities in some of the different places they spend time in at school. This would involve me doing some observations at school in your classroom, in the playground and any other place within the school grounds that the students may be at. "Doing some observations" means that while I am present I will do whatever anyone else is doing, watch, chat about what is going on (if this is not disruptive), and write up notes on what I have learned after I have left.

* Some interviews with some key people in these student's lives. These interviews would be about one hour long. The kinds of people I would want to interview include yourself, other school staff, children with disabilities and parents. Each interview would be taped and typed up. When I interview people I will ask them to tell me what things they think are helping or hindering the inclusion of these students at school. All interviewees will be given a copy of their transcripts to review, make amendments and withdraw if they desire.

* Confidentiality is very important. To make sure that confidentiality is preserved, the identity of participants and places will not be made public. When interviews and notes from observations are typed up, pseudonyms will be used. If this study is published, pseudonyms for people and places will continue to be used.

The Inclusion at Secondary School Study is being carried out as part of my doctorate study. My name is Shirley Hulston (phone number 366-7001, Ext 8213) and my Supervisors are Missy Morton (ph. 364-2271) and Alison Gilmore (ph. 364-2259). Please call if you have any questions about participating in the project. The Inclusion at Secondary School Study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee.
University of Canterbury

Department of Education

The Inclusion of Students with Disabilities and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework at the Secondary School Level.

Consent Form for Parent

I have read and understood the description of the inclusion of Students with Disabilities and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework at the Secondary School Level Study. On this basis I agree to my child participating in the study, including interviews about my child's inclusion with teachers and other school staff. I also agree to be interviewed. I consent to publication of the results of the study with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved. I understand also that I may withdraw my consent at any time, including withdrawal of any information I have provided.

__________________________
Name of child

__________________________
Your name and relationship to child

__________________________  _____________
Signature                        Date
COVER STORY

ADDRESSES 12 POINTS IN DIFFERING DEPTH
DEPENDENT ON THE AUDIENCE.

1. WHO YOU ARE.
2. WHAT YOU ARE DOING.
3. WHY YOU ARE DOING IT.
4. WHAT YOU WILL DO WITH THE RESULTS.
5. HOW THE STUDY SITE AND PARTICIPANTS WERE SELECTED.
6. ANY POSSIBLE RISKS AS WELL AS BENEFITS TO THE PARTICIPANTS
7. THE PROMISE OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY TO
   PARTICIPANTS AND SITE.
8. HOW OFTEN YOU WOULD LIKE TO OBSERVE OR HOPE TO MEET FOR
   INTERVIEWS.
9. HOW LONG YOU EXPECT THAT DAY'S SESSION TO LAST.
10 REQUESTS TO RECORD OBSERVATION AND WORDS (BY NOTES,
    TAPING OR VIDEOTAPING).
11 CLARIFICATION THAT YOU ARE PRESENT NOT TO JUDGE OR
    EVALUATE, BUT TO UNDERSTAND.
12 CLARIFICATION THAT THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS
   TO YOUR QUESTIONS, AND THAT THEY ARE THE EXPERTS AND
   TEACHERS.
IntA3/ COVER STORY/ MINISTRY
ADDRESSES 12 POINTS IN DifferING DEPTH
DEPENDENT ON THE AUDIENCE.

1. WHO YOU ARE.
Shirley Hulston PHD student in Education Department
Supervisor- Alison Gilmore

2. WHAT YOU ARE DOING.
Doctorate on NZ Curriculum Framework at secondary school level
particularly in relation to students with disabilities.

3. WHY YOU ARE DOING IT.
I am doing this because the Framework document promotes inclusive
practices for students with disabilities and I am interested in the
perspectives of stakeholders (particularly the Ministry, the curriculum
writers and any other people that were involved in the process of putting
the framework together) in order to understand what their intentions were
behind the NZ Curriculum Framework for its application particularly for
students with disabilities and what they mean by terms like 'inclusive
curriculum'. No research has been done in this area.

4. WHAT YOU WILL DO WITH THE RESULTS.
I will use the results as part of my doctorate research which will endeavour
to portray the perspectives of all those parties that have been involved in
the process.

5. HOW THE STUDY SITE AND PARTICIPANTS WERE SELECTED.
Contact through Alison.

6. ANY POSSIBLE RISKS AS WELL AS BENEFITS TO THE PARTICIPANTS
The benefit is that it will give them a voice to outline the purposes, aims
and hopes of the document for practice. The risk maybe that you wish to
retrack a comment which would of course be your right.

7. THE PROMISE OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY TO
PARTICIPANTS AND SITE.
Confidentiality and anonymity is assured if you desire.

8. HOW OFTEN YOU WOULD LIKE TO OBSERVE OR HOPE TO MEET FOR
INTERVIEWS.
I envisage approximately a one hour interview, but would hope that it
would be okay to contact you again in the future should I require
clarification on any point raised.

9. HOW LONG YOU EXPECT THAT DAY'S SESSION TO LAST.

10 REQUESTS TO RECORD OBSERVATION AND WORDS (BY NOTES,
TAPE OR VIDEOTAPE).
It you are agreeable I would like to tape the interview so I can listen to what
you are saying without having to take notes.
If you want me to send you a copy of the transcript for any amendments
that you may wish to make I will do so happily.

11 CLARIFICATION THAT YOU ARE PRESENT NOT TO JUDGE OR
EVALUATE, BUT TO UNDERSTAND.

12 CLARIFICATION THAT THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS
TO YOUR QUESTIONS, AND THAT THEY ARE THE EXPERTS AND
TEACHERS.
COVER STORY FOR MINISTRY
Shirley Hulston PHD student in Education Department
Supervisor- Alison Gilmore- Contact through Alison.

Doctorate on NZ Curriculum Framework at secondary school level particularly in relation to students with disabilities.

I am doing this because the Framework document promotes inclusive practices for students with disabilities and I am interested perspectives of stakeholders (particularly the Ministry, the curriculum writers and any other people that were involved in the process of putting the framework together) in order to understand what their intentions were behind the NZ Curriculum Framework for its application particularly for students with disabilities and what they mean by terms like 'inclusive curriculum'.

I will use the results as part of my doctorate research which will endeavour to portray the perspectives of all those parties that have been involved in the process.

The benefit is that it will give them a voice to outline the purposes, aims and hopes of the document for practice.
The risk maybe that you wish to retrak a comment which would of course be your right.

Confidentiality and anonymity is assured if you desire.

I envisage approximately a one hour interview, but would hope that it would be okay to contact you again in the future should I require clarification on any point raised.

It you are agreeable I would like to tape the interview so I can listen to what you are saying without having to take notes.

If you want me to send you a copy of the transcript for any amendments that you may wish to make I will do so happily.
The following represents an example of the guide used during interviews with some of the stakeholders.

INCLUSION
Meaning of terms such as inclusion, inclusive practices, inclusive education to individuals or the organisation being represented.

INCLUSIVE CURRICULUM
Definitions/meanings of an inclusive curriculum to individuals or the organisation being represented.

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN INCLUSIVE CURRICULUM AND THE NZCF
Background to policy documents
Development
Intentions of policy in relation to inclusive curriculum
Role of IEPs
Implementation possibilities

SE2000 POLICY
Background
Development
Intentions behind policy
Different policy components

BARRIERS/SUPPORT
To 'inclusive practices' in relation to the Curriculum Framework?
School-wide barriers and outside support

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF SCHOOLS
For implementing an inclusive curriculum
Appeal procedures for parents

ROLE OF SEGREGATED SETTINGS WITHIN AN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION SYSTEM
Under NZCF and/or SE2000
Factors to consider regarding most significant codes and where to focus first are as follows.

1. I plan on starting my interviews with teachers very soon and so a lot of the questions that have arisen from the data can be addressed in this way.

2. I also plan on interviewing students. I am thinking of interviewing groups of students at a time (this means students with disabilities but also classmates) and am hesitant to do this until there is a very strong trust between myself and the students concerned. I have established good rapport with the third form class and some of them do trust me already but this needs further nurturing. I have to judge when the time is right very carefully and I do not think it is yet. I need to continue spending time with them or my positioning as an insider will be lost.

3. There is still a lot of official things about the school that I do not know (like the official hierarchy, types of committees, responsibilities etc) and until I find out about these I am unable to understand how the formal and informal structure of the school works.

4. Either Jamie or Lee will be moved to another class at the next time slot and I need to plan what I will do in reaction to this move. Do I move also which will make it obvious I am shadowing him and undo all the effort I have put into not making this known?

5. I have consent for two students from the PDU and have not followed it up yet. I have spent no time in the PDU so far.

6. I have parents to meet (re: PDU students) and have negotiated interviews with Jamie and Lee’s parents. These need to be done soon.

7. Donald has been referred to YES which means the opportunity has presented itself to maybe see supporting services in practice. Should I negotiate for Donald to become a participant? Problematic because it could change the dynamics of the class because he will tell everyone and it could also blow my position in the class. Can I just talk to YES and the school about him? Ethical issues to think about here.
sensitising codes/emerging themes

power/status/hierarchies/roles
collaboration between school/home
exclusion/isolation/part-time member
belonging/acceptance/insiders/outiders
teacher compassion/understanding
difference/less expectation-ignorance?
stigmatization
discourses/typologies
disability construct
gender construct
shared identity (emerging theme)
inclusive practices
rules/routine/regulation/control/conformity
student resistance
mismatches between students/teachers understandings/interests
teacher positioning for control (I think I took this out)
conflict (between units)
'the model'/two-way interchange/the stakes?
policy & structural support/constraints
  (a) structural constraints at the school level
  (b) structural supports at the school level
  (c) structural constraints outside the school level
  (d) structural supports outside the school level
theoretical philosophy of school
barriers of social class/ethnicity
official curriculum/school work/what counts as knowledge?
Teaching styles

*social relationships/students/teachers
I found this too broad and so I broke the codes under this heading into existing concepts.
Concepts Defined

1  *power/status/hierarchies/roles*

The concepts of roles, status, and hierarchies all fit under the emerging theme of power relations. This heading is about people's official and unofficial roles at the school, the status different people have, how the school hierarchy works and how the participants define their own roles. It is also about how people negotiate power, how they hold onto it and over whom?

There is also a connection to the philosophy underpinning school practice because not only are those in power in a better position to drive their own philosophy, but those who try to resist the underlying philosophy may end up with less power.

2  *collaboration between school/home*

I called this collaboration between home and school, but I think that it is equally about communication between the two groups. How much input do parents get about their children's education, what consultation is there and how much are they kept informed? What are parents views of their experiences with the school and that of their child's. What changes would parents like to see?

It is also about power and how it is negotiated between parents and the school. How much gatekeeping occurs by the school through lack of information, communication or directives to parents that enhance the school's level of power?

3  *exclusion*

*isolation/part-time member*

This concept of exclusion is a theme in itself and is about not belonging. It includes both macro and micro data. There are structural constraints like lack of support for teachers (from external sources) that hinders inclusion. There is also internal structural elements - school organisation and practices that allow this to happen, like isolation and being a part-time member of the class. On a micro level participants talk in ways that represent an exclusionary discourse.

4  *belonging/acceptance/insiders/outiders*

This concept is about the way students negotiate acceptance with one another, or challenge each other, how it occurs, the way some students seem
to be insiders whilst others are outsiders and how this seems to occur. This overlaps with discourses and typologies where students construct labels for each other. It is also about belonging and the way students share experiences with one another.

5 *teacher compassion/understanding*

This is about teacher practice which demonstrates compassion for students' opinions or needs. It is about the way teachers are able to reflect on their own practices.

6 *difference/less expectation - ignorance?*

This is not the best of headings. It is about the way teachers adopt different rules and have lower expectations for kids with disabilities. Maybe I should call it ignorance? It is also about the impact it has and the way it is perceived by the other students.

7 *stigmatization*

This is based on practices and discourses used in the school, that stigmatize settings and specific students. It is also about the messages that it gives different students about themselves or others. In addition it is about the way labels, once given are perpetuated in discourse and practice.

8 *discourses/typologies*

This is about the use of language and the way different participants talk about different things, the way they label other groups and the meaning placed on educational jargon, like mainstreaming and inclusion.

9 *disability construct*

This is about the way "disability" is constructed by different participants, its categorisation and its usage.

10 *gender construct*

This is about the way gender is constructed through practices, like lunchtime activities and discourses that adopt gender stereotypic roles. It is also about issues that arise that are gender related.
11 **shared identity (emerging theme)**
This is an emerging theme that developed early about the way Jamie and Lee were seen as one and referred to as 'the boys' rather than as individuals. This was constructed by parents, teachers, school management and the structure of school practices.

12 **inclusive practices**
This is about the practices and discourses that occur which promote inclusion and enhance difference and acceptance between student-student and teacher-teacher.

13 **rules/routine/regulation/control/conformity**
These concepts of rules, regulation and routines are about emerging themes of control and conformity. It includes the way the students are regulated by routine, timetables, school organisation and school structure. All of the participants are controlled by rules and students are punished for breaking them. It also overlaps with the *theoretical philosophy of the school* because the way the school is structured and the way behaviour is managed reflects its theoretical philosophy and what the school sees as important.

14 **student resistance**
This concept is about the way students resist regulation, rules and control and is linked to conformity. It could also be about acceptance from peers and the way students gain agency for themselves through this resistance.

15 **mismatches between students/teachers understandings/interests**
Sometimes mismatches occur between students and teachers in the way each interprets what is happening in a particular context or when negotiating for shared meaning. Students perceive unfair practices at times or mismatches occur between the two groups with students' understanding of teacher knowledge or different interests emerge. Mismatches of gender, social class and ethnicity at times appear to reveal inconsistencies of teacher practices for minority groups. I think this is about pedagogy and may go with teaching styles.

16 **teacher positioning for control (I think I took this out)**
This is the way teachers' position for control and the strategies they use to obtain that control. I think this is assumed by me though rather than a teacher actually saying it, so I need to revisit this one.
17 conflict (between units)
A conflict seems evident between the two units in the way it defines its role within the wider school, discourses used, practices adopted in the unit and in the mainstream. There is contestability for placement into the mainstream.

18 'the model'/two-way interchange/the stakes?
The model is new and seems to carry with it high stakes for some participants. It outlines what the model is, and the perceived impact it will have on the school as a whole. This overlaps with power relations and number 17 conflict between units.

19 policy & structural support/constraints
The constraints and support available within the school are largely impacted by the outside support available and imposing constraints of state policy. Although there is a connection, at this stage I need to separate them out so as to highlight them, the impact it has within the school before making wider connections outside the school.
I have broken them into four areas:
(a) structural constraints at the school level
This is about the structural constraints within the school and impact it has on day to day interactions and decisions.
(b) structural supports at the school level
This is about the structural supports within the school that enhances the process and outcomes of school life for its participants.
(c) structural constraints outside the school
This is about the impact state policy has on the support that the school has to draw on and the constraints that the school are faced with as a result of policy and state ideology.
(d) structural supports outside the school
This is about the support the school are able to draw on to enhance the experiences of all participants.

20 theoretical philosophy of school
This is about what is valued in the school and the theoretical philosophies underpinning the policy directions and daily practices.
21 barriers of social class/ethnicity
This is about the mismatches that occur when students are interacting with teachers of a different ethnicity or social class. It is also about the middle class approach of secondary schools and the mismatch that occurs for minority students.

22 social relationships/students/teachers
I broke this heading down into more specific concepts as it was too broad.

23 official curriculum/school work/what counts as knowledge?
The theme is "what counts as knowledge" and involves the official curriculum documents, the delivered curriculum and what counts as school work. There is a connection with theoretical philosophy of the school and the official curriculum documents because this influences what counts as knowledge.

24 teaching styles
This is about pedagogy and the way the curriculum is taught and the teaching styles utilised.
Data Analysis: Coding/Further Refining of Social Relationships

All of the 24 sensitising concepts fitted under at least one of the seven headings fairly easily except for "social relationships" which I realised was too broad in itself and required further refining/re-coding into the more specific types of interactions that I had identified under people and relationships. Therefore I redefined the codes that had been under 'social relationships' under one of the 7 new broad headings. This was done as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitising Concept: Social Relationships</th>
<th>REFINING HEADINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A NO SHARED UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37B LOOKING OUT FOR EACH OTHER</td>
<td>acceptance of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37C SEEKING ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37D CURIOSITY</td>
<td>belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37E ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 INFORMING ON OTHERS</td>
<td>belonging/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT QUESTIONING OF OTHERS PLIGHT</td>
<td>belonging/in/outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 STUDENTS' VIEWS ON SEXUALITY</td>
<td>belonging/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 STUDENTS' VIEWS ON HOME ISSUES</td>
<td>belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 DIFFERENCE/DISPUTES BETWEEN TEACHERS</td>
<td>contestable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 STAFF CONNECTIONS</td>
<td>contestable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 TEACHER ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>construct of identities/difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the sensitising concept "Social Relationships" I had placed the following 13 codes written in block letters. Next to them I redefined each of the 13 codes under the new 7 headings.
refining analysis 7 broad headings

PEOPLE AND RELATIONSHIPS

POWER
This heading represents the power relationships within the school, who has power and over whom? What does status mean to the participants, who has it and what implication does this have for various actors? What roles do people play officially and unofficially? What happens when the hierarchy of power is challenged? It is also about the relationship that the school has with parents and what power parents are given. What role do parents think they play, what level of collaboration and power is apparent for them and how is that negotiated between them and the school?

subheadings
power/status/hierarchies/roles
collaboration between school/home

BELONGING
This heading is about the sense of belonging that people have within the school. What does it mean to belong? How is this negotiated between actors? Why are some participants seen as insiders and others as outsiders? What factors in the school encourage or discourage this sense of belonging? What does it mean to be excluded? How does this happen? What is the outcome for those participants?

subheadings
exclusion/isolation/part-time member
belonging/acceptance/insiders/outsiders
teacher compassion/understanding

CONSTRUCT OF IDENTITIES
This heading is about the way actors construct other actors' identities and labels. How are identities constructed and by whom? What discourses and typologies are used by the participants to construct labels and identities? What does it mean for the participants when they have previously been labelled or are labelled by those around them? How do structures in the school re-constitute
the construction of identities and labels? What implications are there for the participants in relation to how their identities are constructed?

subheadings
stigmatization
discourses/typologies
disability construct
gender issues
shared identity (emerging theme)
difference/less expectation

STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

ACCEPTANCE
This heading is about the practices that occur which promote inclusion and enhance acceptance, especially of difference. Why are some practices more inclusive than others and what are the features (in those practices) that enable acceptance?

subheadings
inclusive practices

CONFORMITY
This heading is about the practices and strategies used to ensure conformity. This includes rules, routine, regulation and control. Why is it necessary to conform and what does it mean for the participants to conform? Who sets the rules? Who conforms? Who doesn't? How do the actors resist conforming? What are the consequences for those who do not conform or for those who do not know the rules? What happens when there is inconsistency by those in authority and how do the actors perceive this? How do the participants negotiate control with their peers and with those with lower status? How do the structures of the school re-constitute conformity?

subheadings
rules/routine/regulation/control/conformity
student resistance
mismatches between students/teachers understandings/interests
teacher positioning for control
CONTESTABLE

This heading is about contestability and how every level within the school has been positioned so everything has become contested. This includes placements of students, social class, control of disability, theoretical paradigms and is person versus person, group against group or ideology versus ideology. What does this mean for the participants at the school? Why is it this way and in what ways do the participants perceive this happening and what impact do they think government policy has had on this outcome? What is it about the structure of this school that prevents a more collaborative model? What is it about the policy within the school that allows this approach?

How do the participants perceive contestability for the school, in relation to its neighbouring schools?

subheadings
conflict (between units)
'the model'/two-way interchange/the stakes?
policy & structural support/constraints
theoretical philosophy of school
barriers of social class

WHAT COUNTS AS KNOWLEDGE?

This heading looks at knowledge and who decides what counts and what is important and what is not. This includes comparisons between the official curriculum as outlined in the NZCF documents, what is taught in the classes as official school work (this includes exercises or worksheets etc given by the teacher) and what is taught as unofficial schoolwork. How do the participants perceive the curriculum? The way knowledge is taught is also included under this heading and the teaching styles that teachers use and the impact that has on the transmission of that knowledge. What does this mean for the participants?

subheadings
official curriculum/school work/what counts as knowledge?
teaching styles
POWER RELATIONS
PR1 power/status/hierarchies/roles
PR2 collaboration between school/home
PR3 structural constraints at the school level
PR4 structural constraints outside the school

1 power/status/hierarchies/roles
Power is about who gets to define the discourse of inclusion on a school wide basis, how is that presented and to whom? Who gets to implement their model, how is that negotiated and what strategies are used? How does that impact relationships between staff and students and parents? How is power used by other people, like the IOD of the PDU towards parents? How do models of professionalism empower or disempower participants? What relationships are negotiated between teachers and their aides? Who decides what counts as knowledge in the classroom— the teacher and/or the teacher aide? Who gets to decide which kids go to the mainstream? How is that negotiated? How do they choose? What philosophical ideology has the most power in the school context? How much power does policy have on the ground? What resistance is there by the powerless? How do they gain agency? How does acceptance and power cross cut between students? Who gets listened to in the school? How does the power of the management impinge on the class teachers? What strategies do they utilise to deal with this? How and where does ‘shared decision making’ fit, if at all?

2 collaboration between school/home
How do parents define inclusion for their child? How do they define the way the school interprets this meaning? Where do they negotiate shared meaning with the school and vice versa? Where is this meaning contested and how? What strategies do parents use to promote their discourse of inclusion for their child? What strategies do schools use to engage in shared meaning with the parents? What strategies do the school use to legitimate their discourse of inclusion? How does that change from site to site within the school? How do parents resist the school’s definition of the situation? How does access and gatekeeping impinge on the meaning of inclusion for families? What does the discourse of “choice” mean in relation to parents perceived power, as against the reality?

3 structural constraints at the school level
What constraints are placed on class teachers as a result of the hierarchy of power by management? How do those with power at the management level constrain those with less power? How does the hierarchy of power impact who class teachers have in their room and the perceived outcome for their teaching? How does positioning for power by staff impact students access to classes? It is also about who has the power to dictate things like timetables changes that mean that students in the units are unable to attend classes. Who has the power to say the way the school is organised and how are constraints that prevent inclusion dealt with at a school level?

4 structural constraints outside the school
This is about the power that the state has on the school and the constraints that result for the school in terms of implementing inclusive practices. It is about the school’s powerless under a market ideology and the impact for inclusiveness. It is about the outside services and how much power they have over the school and vice versa, how they are constrained in the help they can provide schools by the power of the dominant ideology.
EXCLUSION
EX1 isolation/part-time member
EX2 stigmatization/outsider
EX3 barriers of social class/ethnicity
EX4 structural constraints at the school level
EX5 structural constraints outside the school

1 isolation/part-time member
Under the heading of exclusion, isolation and part-time member can be defined in terms of the ways school practices of segregation exclude students from being included physically and socially. It is also about the way other students perceive and contest meanings of inclusion for these students. How can you be included if you're not there? How is segregation legitimized by those that purport a model of inclusion?

2 stigmatization/outsider
This is based on practices and discourses used in the school, that stigmatize settings and specific students and result in exclusion. How does this happen? Who gets to define this exclusionary discourse? What is the criteria for labels and how are they defined? How do participants interpret these practices? It is also about the messages that it gives different students about themselves or others. In addition it is about the way labels, once given are perpetuated in discourse and practice. How do people get labels? How do these things hinder the negotiation of a meaning for inclusion? How do some students become outsiders with their peers and what is it about what they do that hinders a sense of inclusion for this group? This overlaps with discourses and typologies where students construct labels for each other.

3 barriers of social class/ethnicity
How can minority groups negotiate meanings of inclusion when placed in an environment that represents a mismatch to their own culture or social class? What happens when students are interacting with teachers of a different ethnicity or social class and what are the exclusionary practices that result for those students.

4 structural constraints at the school level
This is about the structural constraints within the school and impact it has on day to day interactions and decisions that hinder inclusion. There are school organisation and practices that allow this to happen, like isolation and being a part-time member of the class. Who decides who is excluded and on what basis? How does lack of conformity impose on practices of exclusion?

5 structural constraints outside the school
This is about the impact state policy has on the support that the school has to draw on and the constraints that the school are faced with as a result of policy and state ideology. There are things like lack of support for teachers (from external sources) that hinders inclusion.
INCLUSION
IN1 belonging/acceptance/insiders
IN2 teacher compassion/understanding
IN3 inclusive practices
IN4 student resistance
IN5 structural supports at the school level
IN6 structural supports outside the school

1 belonging/acceptance/insiders
This concept is about the way students negotiate acceptance with one another that results in a shared meaning of inclusion. It is also about the way some students seem to be insiders and share a sense of belonging. How does this work? Why do some students share experiences with each other? How do teachers belong at this school? How do they negotiate acceptance with other teachers and the students? How are some parents accepted into the school and how is this negotiated?

2 teacher compassion/understanding
This is about teacher practice which demonstrates compassion for students’ opinions or needs that promote an inclusive environment. It is about the way teachers are able to reflect on their own practices and negotiate meanings of inclusion with their students. How does the compassion demonstrated by teachers impact their meanings of inclusion with other staff in the school? What impact does this have for the parents?

3 inclusive practices
This is about the practices and discourses that occur which promote shared meanings of inclusion and enhance difference and acceptance between student-student, student-teacher and teacher-teacher. It is also about the way the school adopts inclusive practices towards parents.

4 student resistance
How do students resist exclusion? What practices do they adopt to resist exclusionary practices, gain acceptance from their peers and gain agency for themselves in the process?

5 structural supports at the school level
This is about the structural supports within the school that enhance the negotiations for meanings for inclusion and inclusive practices for different groups.

6 structural supports outside the school
This is about the support the school are able to draw on to enhance the experiences of all participants or promote their own model of meaning (of inclusion).
CONSTRUCTS
STRUCT1 discourses/typologies
STRUCT2 disability construct
STRUCT3 gender construct
STRUCT4 shared identity theme
STRUCT5 stigmatization

1 discourses/typologies
This is about the use of language and the way different participants talk about different things, the way they label other groups and the meaning placed on educational jargon, like mainstreaming and inclusion, definitions of roles, i.e. t/as.

2 disability construct
This is about the way "disability" is constructed by different participants, its categorisation and its usage when negotiated meanings of inclusion.

3 gender construct
This is about the way gender is constructed through practices, like lunchtime activities and discourses that adopt gender stereotypic roles. It is also about issues that arise that are gender related and non-inclusionary.

4 shared identity theme
This is an emerging theme that developed early about the way Jamie and Lee were seen as one and referred to as 'the boys' rather than as individuals. This was constructed by parents, teachers, school management and the structure of school practices. It relates to meanings of inclusion because this is the way Jamie and Lee were defined under an inclusionary model. This ignored any notions of difference between the two boys.

5 stigmatization
This is the language used by different groups or individuals that resulted in labels or stigmatization that contributed to the construct of that individuals identity. How does language do this and who does it? Why do some labels "stick" more readily than others?
CONFORMITY

FORM1 rules/routine/regulation/control/conformity
FORM 2 student resistance
FORM 3 structural constraint at school level

1 rules/routine/regulation/control/conformity
Does inclusion mean the assimilation of everyone through rules and regulation? Can you only be included if you conform? Is conformity about normality? Is the dominant discourse of inclusion centred on notions of conformity that match the closest with notions of normality? Who defines the rules? How, if at all can you be included if you do not follow them? How do students with "special needs or at-risk" negotiate their way into discourses of conformity? What theoretical philosophy is important and who decides?

2 student resistance
What happens when students resist a discourse of conformity? Which students do this? How does relate to the way they negotiate shared meanings of inclusion?

3 structural constraint at school level
This is about that way the system constrains the way conformity is able to work at the school level, and how it is related to meanings of inclusion.
BLURRING THE EDGES
BE1 difference/less expectation - ignorance?
BE2 student resistance
BE3 'the model'+ conflict (between units)
BE4 structural constraints at the school level
BE5 structural supports at the school level
BE6 structural constraints/support outside the school

1 difference/less expectation - ignorance?
The impact of the changes in school structure that allow for students to be in mainstream classes that had not previously been there sets the scene for new situations for teachers. Teachers negotiate their meaning of inclusion with these students in different ways. Some teachers appear to adopt different rules and have lower expectations for kids with disabilities. How does this occur and for what students? Does the model the students belong to have an impact? How do the teachers perceive the presence of these "new" students in their classrooms? What is the impact in the classroom and how is it perceived by the other students? How does this affect the relationship between students?

2 student resistance
How do students who are part of the "blurring the edges" model resist exclusionary practices that occur as a result of the model? What other ways and why do students resist the models of inclusion and the meanings placed on them by certain areas of the school?

3 'the model'+ conflict (between units)
The model is new and seems to carry with it high stakes for some participants. It outlines what the model is, and the way it has become the dominant discourse in the school. A conflict seems evident between the two units in the way each defines its meaning of inclusion within the wider school, discourses of inclusion used, power relations between the two areas, practices adopted in the units and in the mainstream. Marie is resisting the discourse and this is about how she does this and her promotion of the existing model.

4 structural constraints at the school level
This is about the structural constraints within the school and impact it has on blurring the edges. It is about teachers lack of training, timetable constraints and other school wide issues like accessibility for all students.

5 structural supports at the school level
This is about the structural supports within the school that enhances the blurring of the edges and other shared meanings of inclusion.

6 structural constraints/support outside the school
This is about the impact state policy has on the support that the school has to draw on and the constraints that the school are faced with as a result of policy and state ideology. It is about the way things have changed during data collection and the uncertainty for the school in regard to Special Educ2000. The impact that this has had on shared meanings for inclusion and also the way the future for the model and meanings of inclusion are affected by outside policy decisions.
WHAT COUNTS AS KNOWLEDGE?

KN1 official curriculum/school work/what counts as knowledge?
KN2 pedagogy

1 official curriculum/school work/what counts as knowledge?
The theme is "what counts as knowledge" and involves the official curriculum documents, the delivered curriculum and what counts as school work. It is about the the way the class teacher interprets the rhetoric of the NZCF in relation to inclusion and inclusive practices? How do the teachers use the curriculum? What theory underpins school work?

2 pedagogy
This is about the way the curriculum is taught and the teaching styles utilised. What practices do teachers use to teach students with disabilities? How does the teacher aide work within the class? Who decides this and how are the students with disabilities included? How do teachers make adaptations for students? Who does this and for what students?

Sometimes mismatches occur between students and teachers in the way each interprets what is happening in a particular context or when negotiating for shared meanings of inclusion. Students perceive unfair practices at times or mismatches occur between the two groups with students' understanding of teacher knowledge or different interests emerge. Mismatches of gender, social class and ethnicity at times appear to reveal inconsistencies of teacher practices for minority groups.
CONTESTABILITY

TEST1 "model" + conflict (between units)
TEST2 structural constraints at the school level
TEST3 structural supports at the school level
TEST4 structural constraints outside the school
TEST5 structural supports outside the school

1"model" + conflict (between units)
This is about the way the two units contest for a dominant discourse of inclusion. There is contestability between them at different levels, like for placement into the mainstream.

2 structural constraints at the school level
This is about the way structural constraints within the school result in meanings of inclusion becoming contestable.

3 structural supports at the school level
This is about the way structural supports within the school enhances shared meanings of inclusion for participants.

4 structural constraints outside the school
This is about the impact state policy has on the support that the school has to draw on and the constraints that the school are faced with as a result of policy and state ideology in relation to contestability and inclusion.

5 structural supports outside the school
This is about the outside support the school are able to draw on to enhance the shared meanings of inclusion for participants.
State Definition of Mainstreaming as at May 1988

Mainstreaming is education in a regular school setting, but not necessarily in a regular classroom. Mainstreaming has three interrelated components. These are:
(a) locational mainstreaming - where a student is educated in a separate unit or in a separate class located within a regular school.
(b) social mainstreaming - where a student who is locationally mainstreamed can enjoy social interaction with the peer group in a variety of ways within a school setting; and
(c) functional mainstreaming - where a student spends some or all of the time in a regular classroom on the same programme as the class or on an adaptation of that programme.

Not all students at present in Special Education Services will be mainstreamed. It is neither possible or appropriate to close the special day schools immediately. In order to support mainstreaming the six residential schools will continue to enrol those students who require special assistance. Where the roll numbers, the location, and the function of private residential special schools justify it, these schools will continue to be supported as in the past (Supplement to the New Zealand Education Gazette, 2 May 1988).
The main features of the Statement of Intent 1991 were as follows:

- Special education resources and funding will be maintained at their present level.
- There will be different methods of providing resources for two groups of students: Those students with educational and social difficulties and those students with disabilities.
- Tagged and targeted funding will be available to schools to meet the learning needs of students with social and educational difficulties.
- The Special Education Service will be directly funded in 1992. After this its funding with social and educational difficulties will become progressively contestable.
- Attached units and itinerant teacher positions for students with educational and social difficulties will be disestablished as they become vacant and re-distributed as in-school support teachers.
- A programme of teacher development for pre-service, in-service and specialist training will be planned in conjunction with training providers.
- Parents of children with disabilities will continue to have the current choice of special schools, attached units or regular classes.
- The Special Education Service will establish resource centres which will provide support to students with disabilities who are in attached units or regular classes.
- A system will be established to allow special education resources to follow students as they move across sectors and between special and regular settings.
- Attached units for students with disabilities will remain in schools but itinerant teachers for students with disabilities will be managed by resource centres.
- Local health, welfare and education advisory committees will be established to co-ordinate services amongst the agencies.

(New Zealand Gazette, Vol 71, no.1, 28 January, 1992a)
Timetable for National Curriculum Statement's Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Draft(s)</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; physical education</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(anticipated dates are shown in italics.)

Source: (New Zealand Schools 98: 1999a, p. 69)
WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL POLICY

ATTACHED UNITS

RATIONALE

The school welcomes attached units not only for the learning opportunities they offer students with special needs but also because those units enrich the lives of all people involved in the school.

PURPOSE

1. To meet those aspects of the Charter relating to equal educational opportunity and the enhancement of students' learning.

2. To ensure that attached units are resourced, managed and staffed appropriately.

3. To ensure that staff and students in attached units have appropriate access to all facilities, resources and activities in the school.

4. To ensure that all school policies and procedures include and apply to the attached units and the staff and students working in them.

GUIDELINES

1. The school should ensure that all legal and other requirements relevant to this policy are met.

2. The school should ensure that any special funding provided for attached units is used for them and that, as well, the budget makes provision for the implementation of this policy.

3. The school should ensure that management committees of attached units are familiar with and follow all policy and procedural requirements for attached units.

4. Procedures should be established for the admission and guidance of students in attached units.

5. The school should ensure that all school facilities and resources are available, as appropriate, for staff and students in attached units.
6. The school should ensure that attached units provide the best learning opportunities possible for the students and that the programmes offered are monitored carefully.

Attached Units - P/2

7. The school should ensure that the equity provisions of the Charter and in school policies apply to all those involved in attached units.

CONCLUSION

The Board regards the school’s attached units as yet another positive aspect of the school as a learning centre for all students. Both the school and the Board will support and promote as energetically as they can the work of the attached units.

REVIEW

Annually by the Management Committee.
WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL

PHYSICAL DISABILITIES UNIT

RATIONALE:
This school recognises its role in the greater city area to provide appropriate quality education for students whose primary disability is a physical limitation, and where the student's educational performance would benefit from specialist services.

OBJECTIVES:
1 To ensure that procedures are in place for identifying and enrolling students.

2 To provide programmes of work appropriate to the needs of each individual student in collaboration with the student and his/her parents.

3 To provide for student's physical and care needs so that education may proceed.

4 To ensure special education resources allocated to the Physical Disabilities Unit, including specialist staff, equipment and funding are tagged and targeted for accountability purposes.

5 To ensure that the individual student's culture is an important component of their learning development.

6 To provide an environment that ensures that students are safe, secure and accepted.

7 To ensure that age appropriate regular educational settings in the school will be accessible and available to meet programme needs of physically disabled students.

8 To assist students to acquire personal autonomy, to have received effective preparation for a social lifestyle, and to acquire the appropriate living skills to ensure a satisfying adult life.

GUIDELINES:
1 To plan for the management committee to meet at least three times a year.

2 To prepare an Individual Educational Plan in association with the student, his/her family and other professionals at least once a year and to review the plan at least once a year.

3 To provide sufficient professional and support staff to ensure that care needs, educational needs are met in all settings.

4 To provide ongoing Staff Development training.
5 To provide support and professional guidance to mainstream staff in the school to ensure positive experiences and successful outcomes for all.

6 To maximise social interaction opportunities with same age peers, by ensuring student availability at interval / lunchtime and by assisting with access to school social and sporting events, peer support and school camps.

7 To provide opportunities for students to participate in or to trial job shadowing, work experience, educational activities, recreational and leisure activities in the community as part of their transition programme.

8 To liaise regularly with the various community agencies involved in the provision of services to students to minimise gaps or duplications and to ensure a smooth transition to a satisfying adult life.

9 To prepare and maintain timetables, inventories and budgets to ensure appropriate use of all resources and to maintain student programmes.

10 To maintain staffing to such a level that administration time allocation is possible.

**REVIEW**
Anually by the Management Committee.
WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL POLICY

STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

RATIONALE:

All students must be given the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential. Students identified as having "special needs" will receive assistance to enable this to occur.

The groups of special needs students identified are:

A  English as second language students
B  Adult students
C  Low socio-economic students
D  Highly academic students
E  Truants
F  Lower achievers
G  Ethnic minorities
H  Students with lack of home support
I  Students with Physical and Intellectual Disabilities
J  Students with Emotional Concerns.

GUIDELINES

A  ESOL Students

1. Students identified as needing assistance will be assessed, and the available ESOL time will be distributed accordingly.

2. Only students who want assistance will be given it.

3. Assistance will be mainly with assignments and some students will go on correspondence writing programmes.
4. It was stated that students with differing cultural backgrounds have different needs, and they should be on individual programmes.

5. Reader/Writer assistance will be available where appropriate resources.

B **Adult Students**

1. Management will have responsibility for adult students (H.O.D., Deans). They will contact them re changes in timetabled days, sports days, etc. They will provide a handbook for them and *supervise the space allocated for them to use*.

C **Low Socio Economic Students**

1. We can apply for assistance from various trusts including, Youth Foundations, Mayors Fund. The Principal liaises between students and this groups. Support can be available for uniform, stationery and school trips.

D **Highly Academic Students**

1. Departments provide extension programmes to cater for able students. They are encouraged and supported in this.

E **Truants**

1. The attendance system is targeting truants.

2. The Truancy Officer is available to assist.

F **Low Achievers**

1. Some departments have extension programmes to cater for less able students.

2. Subject teachers assist the deans in identifying low achievers.

3. Multi level studies are available at senior level.

4. Keeping junior classes small, assists low achievers in some classes.

5. Reading programmes are provided.

G **Ethnic Minorities**
1. We have a full time Te Atakura teacher.

2. The lawn in front of Block 20 is used as Marae.

3. The Board may employ a person to work with minority groups, especially ESOL (dependent on funding).

H Students with lack of Home Support

1. We have a well established Guidance system with Guidance Counsellors, Deans and Tutors and outside agencies.

I Students with Physical and Intellectual Disabilities

1. We have attached units for Physically and Intellectually Disabled Students where specialist programmes and services are provided to meet students academic and physical needs.

2. Some Teacher Aide funding is available through the school.

3. We have made environmental changes with ramps, and have an upgraded Unit for Physically Disabled students.

4. We have access to appropriate therapy.

5. We have relocated resources personal to enable access by disabled students.

J Students with Emotional Concerns

1. We have guidance staff and a guidance network.

2. We offer Anger Management courses.

3. We have access to SES (Special Education Services) and other Professional Agencies.

4. The school has a part time Chaplain.

5. We offer the Gain programme.

6. We have regular visits from a School Health nurse, and Family Planning Nurse and doctor.
WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL POLICY

EQUITY

RATIONALE -
Westside High School believes in:

1. Equality of opportunity and provision for all, regardless of their background or situation.

2. We believe schools have an important function in setting an example in matters of equity by the way they operate and by educating in this area.

PURPOSE
1. To implement a learning and teaching policy that does not discriminate on the basis of gender, ethnic origin, social or family background, religion, ability or disability or sexual orientation.

2. To provide a curriculum that is appropriate and accessible to all and enables them to experience a wide range of learning opportunities.

3. To provide resources to make equal access to the curriculum possible (within financial constraints).

4. To ensure that no group is discriminated against in curriculum content and that there is education in equity matters.

5. To promote acceptance and sensitivity to differences amongst all members of the school community.

6. To identify groups of disadvantaged students and strategies to assist them to gain equity.

7. To write and implement policy on role modelling.

8. To write and implement a policy on sexual harassment.

GUIDELINES

1. The staff personnel committee will be chaired by the Equal Opportunities Coordinator within the school and the rest of the membership be staff volunteers including staff from both special units attached to the school an ancillary staff representative and a Board of Trustees member.
2. Each year the Personnel Committee will review policy and monitor its implementation as well as write new policy as required.

3. All students will be encouraged to follow their best educational interests.

4. Both boys and girls will be encouraged in subjects where they have been poorly represented in the past.

5. Every effort will be made to present the curriculum in such a way that satisfies the choices of a maximum number of students.

6. Both students with learning difficulties and gifted students, will have support available to realise their potential.

7. Students of minority cultures and language will be given appropriate support.

8. Financially disadvantaged students will receive support enabling them to, benefit fully from the schools curriculum. Every effort will be made to enable students with physical disabilities to benefit fully from the schools programmes and activities.

9. School programmes will develop an understanding and respect for the rights of all, especially those who have some perceived difference.

10. All classes held at Westside High School shall be aware of and responsive to the educational needs of the community as contained in the charter.

11. Heads of Departments will be made aware of the need to consider equity issues when purchasing books and materials for classroom use.

Reviewed June 1995/Ref:Equity
A Model to Better Meet The Needs of "At Risk" Students at Westside High School.

"At Risk":
1. Students who have been assessed by SES as meeting the criteria for enrolment in the Learning Resource Centre.
2. Students who are achieving significantly below the level of their same age peers.
3. Students whose behaviour puts their learning, and/or the learning of others at risk.

ALL enrolled 3rd and 4th form students attached to form/class group with same age peers.
All enrolled students appear on class lists and have access to classes where appropriate and with appropriate support.
This would engender a sense of "belonging" and "inclusion".
This would ease the nightmare of negotiating "mainstreaming" into classes at the end of each slot.
This would enable better "long-term" planning.

A referral for enrolment in the Learning Resource Centre requiring a Section 9 agreement will be processed by the Learning Resource Centre Management Committee.

The "Learning Resource Centre" Management Committee.
To continue in its present role as laid down by school policy and Ministry requirements.

The "Learning Resource Centre" Staff.

There are separate bodies with separate function but the success of this model will depend on liaison, co-ordination and co-operation between them.

It requires the development of an "At Risk Team".

A referral for inclusion on the "At Risk" programme for non-Section 9 students can be made only by a Dean.

The referral goes to:

The "At Risk" Advisory Support Group.
To be made up of present "at risk" committee plus invited others.
To discuss referrals made to the programme of non-Section 9 students.
To oversee admissions and withdrawals to the programme.
To liaise with the Management Committee of the Experience Unit.
To develop Policies/Systems.
To report to Principal.

All students accepted onto the programme will be either:

Students with a Section 9 agreement and on the roll of the "Learning Resource Centre".

Non-Section 9 Students who have been referred to the Advisory Support Group by Deans.
Met the "at risk" criteria.
AND
Been accepted onto the programme by the Advisory Support Group.

ALL students accepted on the programme will be allocated a "Resource Teacher".
This teacher will be one of the team dealing with "at risk" students.

This teacher will:
1. Liaise closely with the students Dean.
2. Liaise with parents regarding the programme.
3. Liaise with other involved professionals.
4. Produce an I.E.P. for the student and ensure continual review.

All students will have the opportunity to attend mainstream classes where appropriate and with appropriate support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME ROOM 1</th>
<th>HOME ROOM 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Form 3 and 4 students irrespective of their level of attendance in mainstream classes.</td>
<td>Students with significant Social/Behaviour deficits:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-room and &quot;specialist&quot; programme to meet Curriculum Framework requirements.</td>
<td>Early Intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 5, 6, and 7 students who are attending limited mainstream classes and require access to the home-room programme.</td>
<td>In-class observe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Skills.</td>
<td>Behav.mod (in class.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Exp.</td>
<td>Last resort:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related off campus courses e.g. Star.</td>
<td>Withdrawal from class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with significant Academic Deficits.</td>
<td>Withdrawal from school (Y.E.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. Work, Precision Teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCING IN NEW ZEALAND

Tony Davies, Senior Policy Analyst, Ministry of Education

Special Education in New Zealand

Since the establishment of the state education system in 1877, there has been increasing acceptance of the right for all children to an education financed by the State. In the latter part of the nineteenth century, there was no state support for students with disabilities. Recognition of this inadequacy led to the establishment of four residential special schools.

By 1944, some schools and classes for children in hospitals, health camps special classes and Correspondence School classes were established for students who had difficulties in learning. There were also two day special schools for school students with an intellectual disability. Increasingly the provisions for students with special education needs were provided on regular school sites.

In 1989, the Education Act provided for the special education of persons under the age of 21 in schools, special schools, special classes or special clinics or from special services. Entitlement to full inclusion into the state education system of students with disabilities was ultimately achieved by 1 January, 1990.

The 1989 education reforms placed the governance responsibility with boards of trustees of each local school. This effectively requires each school board of trustees to provide for children with disabilities and special education needs. Section 8 of the Education Act, 1989 provided for equal rights to primary and secondary education for all students. It said "people who have special education needs (whether because of disability or otherwise) have the same rights to enroll and receive education at state schools as people who do not."

There is support among New Zealanders for the principle of including children with special education needs in regular settings. There is now recognition that including children with special education needs in regular class settings relies on the effective partnership between government and the school, the school and the community, the parent and teacher.

Special Education Resourcing in New Zealand

The balance in the allocation of resources to special education has also been changing over the last few years. There has been an increasing shift away from sole reliance on centrally funded provisions for direct services to individual students on the basis of a category of disability. Schools are now required to take more responsibility for coordinating services delivered by itinerant resource teachers, specialists, or by the provision of additional in-school staffing.

$188 million per annum is currently voted for special education. Most of the funding provides resources for approximately 17,500 (nearly 2.5%) school students. The Special
Education Service provides services for these students and for other students with special education needs.

Table 1: Components of Special Education Funding in 1996/67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PROVISION</th>
<th>MILLIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Service (includes $18.5m for early childhood)</td>
<td>$ 41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Secondary Schools*</td>
<td>$ 64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Special Schools</td>
<td>$ 17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Special Schools*</td>
<td>$ 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Health &amp; Welfare Settings</td>
<td>$ 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homai College</td>
<td>$ 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transport</td>
<td>$ 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Includes study awards, Correspondence School, teacher travel)</td>
<td>$ 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Grant (for the 1997 school year)</td>
<td>$ 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 188.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Special Education Discretionary Assistance (SEDA) funding (total = $31.6m)

Key Facts on Special Education Resourcing in New Zealand Schools

New Zealand currently has 700,000 students in the compulsory school sector, with over 2,790 state and state-integrated schools:

- Specialist Education Services is responsible for recommendations for enrolment in special education provision and resource allocation
- Around 19,130 students, or 3 percent of the total school population, were receiving some form of special education support as at 1 July 1995
- Special Education resourcing represented about 7 percent of the forecast expenditure on school education for the 1996/97 fiscal year
- Seventy-one percent of all New Zealand schools have at least one special education student
- About 65 percent of special education students (12,500 students) were enrolled in regular schools
- A further 21 percent (4,026 students) are in special classes attached to regular schools.
- The remaining 14 percent (2,606 students) attend special schools
- The number of special education students in regular classrooms increased by around 12 percent from 1994 to 1995
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Problem Definition
Since 1989, responsibility for managing special education resources has been shared between the Ministry of Education, Specialist Education Services and schools. This has resulted in some tensions between the policy goals of “self-managing schools” and the effective management of scarce resources. A better accommodation of these tensions and a basis for agreement on which students should receive special education is the focus of the Special Education 2000 policy development. However, there are inherent difficulties in attempting to provide equitably for a small population with diverse needs spread across the entire country.

These difficulties are compounded by the location and type of various special education facilities which in some instances no longer reflect current needs. Resources for children with special education needs have been hard won over the years, and families and schools have been loathe to relinquish existing services without guarantees that equally resourced alternative services will be provided in their place.

Special Education 2000
Special Education in New Zealand has been subject to a number of reviews over the last ten years. It was left to one side during the 1988/89 education sector reforms, essentially because of the complexities. In 1991, the Government published a Statement of Intent for Special Education in New Zealand. This was followed by a very intensive period of consultation through the Special Education Policy Implementation Team (SEPIT). This was followed by a report written by David Mitchell and Ken Ryba on resourcing students with special education needs according to an educational needs basis.

The National Advisory Committee on Special Education was established by the Minister of Education in 1995. This purpose of this committee was to provide comment on the policies being developed on special education and to develop special education guidelines (see Appendix). In 1995, the Ministry began further development work on special education. This resulted in a policy, now known as Special Education 2000.

The Special Education 2000 strategy was considered by the Government in December 1995. It accepted in principle the following key elements and strategy:
• there is a small group of students who need a high level of support if they are to participate in and benefit from the school programme;
• the term “high needs”, would be defined by the amount of additional resourcing the student needs in order to participate in and benefit from the school programme;
• there would be a guaranteed level of resourcing for individual students with high special education needs in a variety of school settings, including special schools, special education units attached to regular schools, and regular classes; and
• there will be a system of direct, formula-based funding (the Special Education Grant) to schools for students with ‘moderate’ special education needs.

The aims of the Special Education 2000 policy can be summarised as follows:
• to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for children with special education needs in the early childhood and school sectors;
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- to ensure there is a clear, consistent and predictable resourcing framework for special education; and
- to provide equitable resourcing for those with similar needs irrespective of school setting or geographic location.

Special Education 2000 provides a framework to achieve these aims by separating out the resource requirements of high needs students from those with more moderate needs.

Special Education 2000 policy has been developed in phases and will be implemented over some years. Phase One related to the Special Education Grant and Phase Two relates to students with high special education needs.

Special Education 2000 has two key aspects. Individually targeted resourcing to students with high or very high special education needs which remains a direct responsibility of the Government and school-based resourcing for students with moderate to high special education needs such as learning and behaviour difficulties.

Students with High or Very High Special Education Needs

The Ongoing Resourcing Scheme

The Ongoing Resourcing Scheme provides funding to support students with high and very high ongoing special education needs that are expected to continue throughout their school years. It is proposed that the scheme will cover four elements: additional teaching, paraprofessional (such as teacher aide, interpreter etc), specialist and therapy
support. Transport and equipment will continue to be centrally resourced and have not been included in the costings of the Ongoing Resourcing Scheme.

For 1998, there is no change to specialist support, therapy or specialist teachers. The only change which has been made is in the introduction of the paraprofessional component. This year, a total of $36m (this is an increase of $17m on what was spent in 1997) has been has been allocated on a formula basis to either Specialist Education Services or a school which has been accredited to hold funds.

A school or cluster of schools that has 20 or more students, can apply to be accredited to hold the funds for the paraprofessional component and purchase the services required for these students. This involves the fundholder in arranging an Individual Education Plan, agreeing with the parent and school on the appropriate level of resourcing. To date, 50 schools have been accredited as fundholders.

Next year, it is proposed to introduce the other elements of the Ongoing Resourcing Scheme. This will provide for the additional teaching, specialist and therapy support to go to all students in the scheme. The scheme has been funded on a per student average funding basis. There is an implicit assumption that all students do not require equal amounts of all four components. Instead, it is expected that fundholders will ensure that the right mix of additional teaching, paraprofessional, specialist and therapy support is provided to each student.

The scheme has to be designed to ensure that parent choice of education facility is maintained. It is designed so that the level of resourcing is approximately equivalent in whatever setting the parent/caregiver chooses (i.e. special school, attached special education unit or regular class setting). There is no intention of closing special schools or attached special education units unless they are no longer supported by enrolments.

Entry into the Ongoing Resourcing Scheme is through the verification process. An application form is made, and a panel of verifiers make a judgement on eligibility for the scheme, based on criteria agreed to by Government last year. The criteria broad headings are around the need:

- to totally adapt the curriculum;
- for specialist support; and
- one-to-one support in the class.

Opportunities exist for review and appeal of the decisions made by verifiers.

**Students with Severe Behaviour Difficulties**

A prototype programme for students with severe behaviour difficulties has been established in the Waikato SES district. This provides resourcing to help students whose behaviour endangers themselves, others, property or constantly stops them from fitting in with other students and from learning. The initiative also provides liaison with the home and appropriate community agencies.

This initiative will help schools:
- involve parents/caregivers in managing students with behaviour difficulties;
- manage crisis situations relating to individual students;
• significantly reduce inappropriate behaviour of the targeted students and enable them to achieve sound learning outcomes in the long-term;
• co-ordinate support across non-education government and non-government agencies; and
• develop strategies to reduce the number of students with severe behaviour difficulties.

There are two key elements:

*Behaviour Education Support Teams (BEST)* which provide in-school support for students with severe behaviour difficulties.

*Centres for Extra Support* this provides in-class and in-school support for short periods, and sometimes support for students off-site.

For students outside the Waikato, there is transition funding for the 1998 school year. This funding will reduce in subsequent years as the behaviour initiative is implemented outside the prototype regions. For those not involved in the prototype, there will be discretionary pool of funding for students with behaviour difficulties. This year, a total of $13m is available. This is an increase of over $6.0m on the previous year.

Currently Specialist Education Services holds the resourcing for this initiative. They determine on criteria published who should receive services from Behaviour Education Support Team or the Centre of Extra Support.

**Initiative for Students with Speech-Language Difficulties.**

This year additional resourcing is being provided to Specialist Education Services to help students with speech-language. There are two elements.

*Students with significant speech-language difficulties.*

This is primarily targeted to students in the first three years of schooling. It will provide an increase in speech-language therapy on average per student. Priority will be given to students with high needs who have motor speech difficulties, fluency disorders, voice/resonance disorders, language difficulties or significant language delay. This will enable these students to communicate more effectively and improve their literacy and numeracy skills.

*Students with moderate to high speech-language difficulties*

Over the next three years, a total of $1.5m each year has been set aside for a national training programme for teacher of students in Years 0 - 3. This is designed to provide professional development and support and guidance for students with moderate to high speech-language difficulties. This commences in Term 2 and will targeted this year to children in low decile schools.

Currently Specialist Education Services holds the resourcing for this initiative. They determine on criteria published who should receive services for speech-language.
Students with Moderate to High Special Education Needs

There are two key initiatives which are being implemented for students with moderate to high special education needs such as learning and behaviour difficulties. These are largely school-based and will be delivered on a formula basis. The two key initiatives are the Special Education Grant and Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour.

The Special Education Grant.

In 1997, schools received almost $14m as part of the first phase of Special Education 2000 to help students with moderate special education needs such as learning and behaviour difficulties. In 1998, this grant was increased to $29m. The Special Education Grant is allocated on a formula basis, according to the number of students on the school roll and the decile ranking of the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Decile Ranking</th>
<th>$ Per Student Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines on the use of the Special Education Grant have been distributed to all schools. This has asked that schools work with parents/caregivers on how this fund should be spent to meet the needs of individuals and groups of students with moderate to high special education needs.

This year, the Ministry of Education will be surveying all schools on the use of their grant. In addition, the Education Review Office will review each school’s use of the Special Education Grant as part of its regular programme.

Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour

The other area which is still in policy development concerns the establishment of Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour. These teachers will be school-based and will help students in Years 0 - 10 who have learning and behaviour difficulties. This areas is also being developed in the Waikato.

In the Waikato, 31 new positions have been added to the existing special education teaching positions such as guidance and learning unit teachers, resource teachers of special needs, experience teachers and teachers of special needs. Together all of these
teachers will to support teachers with students who have learning and/or behaviour difficulties. Methods of working may be modified to reflect the changing emphasis on working with students who have learning and or behaviour difficulties.

In the prototype, teachers have been assigned to schools and clusters of schools. The size of the clusters and the number of teachers placed in each cluster, will vary according to the schools' requirements, natural groupings and geographic and socio-economic factors. This year, the cluster will be responsible for determining which schools will host the placement of individual resource teachers: learning and behaviour. Teachers may be grouped together or individually based in one school.

The decision on how the services are to be provided are being made by the cluster of schools serviced.

Every school in the Waikato district has been included in a cluster. This includes some fairly remote schools in the Coromandel and Kawhia areas. One cluster of schools which crosses over some traditional geographic boundaries has also been established. This is a cluster for students who are in total immersion classes or attending a Kura Kaupapa Maori School.

*Training*

The Ministry of Education has developed a professional training course available to all current special education teachers and resource teachers learning and behaviour at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

This course has been specifically developed by a consortium of three universities (Auckland, Waikato and Victoria) to meet the learning and behaviour needs of students in the classroom. There are four papers, all offered at various locations throughout New Zealand. Each paper builds on the material from the preceding paper and focuses on professional practice, including providing services within appropriate cultural contexts. Managing a range of cases working with individuals, and working within classrooms and school systems using the knowledge and skills acquired, are also covered.

During the course, support will be provided by peers, supervision periods and through access to the lecturers to discuss any issues that might arise. The course participants are also supervised for practical work which will be undertaken as part of the teacher's normal work.

The course consists of block courses, partly run in holiday periods, or partially over weekends and occasionally over the school week. Teachers participating in the course will also be released for a half day per week during term time for study purposes.

The Ministry of Education will pay for the fees, course materials, overnight accommodation for block courses for teachers who qualify, and the lease of a computer for the duration of the two year study programme. This will enable participants to send assignments by e-mail, direct communication with tutors and university lecturers and to participate in study groups electronically. The internet will also be available for research.
Teachers will be expected to purchase text books, a insurance payment for the computer ($15 approximately), connection to the internet (approximately $35, plus $2.50 for each hour that is used).

**Early Childhood**

Another important part of Special Education 2000 is further funding for the early childhood sector. At the end of last year, the Government announced new funding of $19.5m over the next three years for children with special education needs in the early childhood sector. The funding will increase the average level of current services as well as increasing the total number of children able to receive services each year.

Paraprofessional support will increase from the beginning of 1998. This will provide young children with high needs with better access to early childhood centres. From July 1998, specialist services will increase, and will provide teaching, advice and support including speech-language therapy.

**Conclusion**

The implementation of Special Education 2000 is going to be challenging. The Government has also decided to implement the scheme gradually, to ensure that there is minimal disruption to children with special education needs. The implementation of Special Education 2000 will also be monitored and evaluated. This will enable the Government to fine tune the policy, so that together, parents, schools and the government can get it right together.
Next, write your name on your Warm Fuzzy Bag below. Now everyone passes their folder around the circle. Each time you receive someone else's folder, write one special thing that you like about them in their Warm Fuzzy Bag.

This Warm Fuzzy Bag
Belongs to Shirley

She is very kind and friendly.
She is kind and helpful.
She is my friend.
Caring
Friendly
Really nice
Helpful
To the class

You are cool.
Always helped with my work.
Really awesome caring.

Really awesome
teaches us

Happy birthday

You are my best friend.
FOCUS OF STUDY
The purpose of my study was to explore how the term inclusion is understood at different levels of the education system. I was interested in the links being made between policy and practice in relation to the curriculum and Special Education 2000. I did this by focusing on the inclusion of students with disabilities in a secondary school setting.

The way in which I defined inclusion centred on the right of all students to be able to attend their local school and to be in a regular class on a full-time basis. Once in a regular class, to be included would mean that they would not only participate in some way in all activities as do their classmates, but also would belong as a class member. With the help of the teacher, their differences would be accepted by their classmates.

I used a qualitative approach whereby I: observed at the school over a sixteen month period; analysed school and Ministry of Education documents; and I interviewed 46 people from different groups, including school staff, parents, students, local and national support agencies.

FINDINGS
I found a number of similarities and differences in inclusion between the statements in the policy documents (that is, the national curriculum and Special Education 2000), the intentions of the Ministry and practices in the school.

1. The first finding was the importance of the context in which the school found itself. The policies that had been introduced by the Ministry (on behalf of the government) were inconsistent and confusing in relation to inclusion. On the one hand, the policies seemed to show a shift to inclusion and on the other they encouraged exclusion to continue by telling schools that it was still okay to separate children with disabilities from their classmates, and to offer them a separate curriculum. This made it very difficult for the school to try and implement inclusive policies.

To add to the confusion the shift in government policy over recent years meant that the school did not receive enough funding, and had to follow a business model and compete with other schools for students. A similar thing was happening at the same time to a lot of the agencies that supported the school and this hindered the help they were able to give the school. This created a lot of uncertainty for the school and its staff and took up time, effort and resources, often at the expense of introducing inclusive practices.

2. The second theme related to the curriculum. In the national curriculum documents that the school uses, it says that schools should adopt an inclusive curriculum but it does not really tell them how to do this and neither the school nor the teachers had been given any training in how to go about it. Different curriculum areas were inconsistent in the way they talked about what an inclusive curriculum would look like and they
seemed to have been written for the majority of students rather than all (such as those with disabilities).

The continued use of IEPs was an example of this inconsistency. IEPs were kept for some students and yet the new curriculum was supposed to be flexible enough to allow class teachers to design programmes for all learners. The school reacted to all of this confusion by using the existing methods that had traditionally been used by the attached units in the school. This meant that the responsibility for the learning of students on IEPs stayed with the special educators in the school, rather than with the class teachers.

Due to the lack of knowledge and understanding, many class teachers, tended to rely on the teacher aide a lot in the classroom, and at times expected less from special needs students than from regular students. Ongoing communication between the school and parents of students with disabilities tended to be confined to teacher aides, unit or management staff rather than class teachers. This hindered opportunities for class teachers to gain understandings of special needs students from their parents' perspectives.

3.
The third theme related to mainstreaming practices in the high school that had occurred as Special Education 2000 was introduced. There was a variety of models in operation. Most students in the Physically Disabled Unit (PDU) were either frequently in the unit, or mainstreamed for some classes. The Learning Resource Centre (LRC) operated in a similar way except that more and more students were mainstreamed for greater lengths of time than had previously been the case, and some students from the mainstream went to the LRC for remedial lessons. Furthermore, several students who met the Ministry's section nine criteria had been enrolled (at the request of their parents) as regular students and did not attend any classes in the unit.

Unfortunately the new Special Education 2000 policy still focused on the individual student rather than on the context. In practice at the school, this meant that the continued existence of the units, which were supposedly undergoing a shift to inclusion, was never questioned. Despite the best intentions of school staff, this resulted in students who went to the units being labelled and excluded from their regular classmates.

4.
Another theme was the exclusion of the included. That is, despite important work done by key people within the school to include the special needs students, constraints were apparent for the school due to the financial context (as previously discussed). This meant that issues of inclusion often had to take second place to the funding and resource shortages that threatened the school's existence, as school staff worked to maintain the status quo. In addition, the confusing messages from the Ministry and the everyday presence and practices of the attached units influenced people's
understandings of what inclusion means. Segregation became part of the situation that they took for granted.

The confusion over issues around disability and difference meant that little open discussion occurred, especially with the students. This left the regular students lacking in understanding about these issues, and they had to try to figure things out for themselves. Whilst the regular students did not openly exclude the students with disabilities in their classes, they often treated them with pity, as being younger or at a very superficial level. This is not to suggest that no-one adopted inclusive practices, or that examples of inclusion did not occur. Not only was the management staff especially welcoming to students with special needs, along with the resource teachers, but also individual class teachers and students used an inclusive practices at different times.

**WHAT DO THE FINDINGS MEAN?**

- Terms such as inclusion and inclusive education have been used by the Ministry of Education as though they mean mainstreaming.

- As long as special education is maintained as a separate entity in our schooling system, (such as in the case of Westside High School), students will continue to be segregated and excluded.

- A shift to a world-class inclusive education system, such as that promoted in the Special Education 2000 policy cannot be based only on funding provisions. It must also be integrated with the the national curriculum.

- This thesis has shown that, despite the introduction of SE2000 policy, the exclusion of students with disabilities continued as a result of teachers’ lack of training. Traditional focus by special educators on educational access had resulted in enhanced social interaction, but did little to ensure participation or membership in the classroom.

- The lack of training on the part of the teachers in this study suggest that ongoing professional development is required, to ensure that existing teachers understand diversity within their classrooms. They also require practical skills in developing curricula in their schools, that are reflective and inclusive of all of their students. Furthermore, the philosophy of inclusive education needs to become an integral part of all pre-service teacher education.

- Whilst inclusion appears to be difficult to achieve, my findings demonstrate that inclusive practices can and do occur at an individual level.

- Finally, it must be remembered that ultimately inclusive education is not only an issue for our schools, but also for our society.
FOCUS OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to explore meanings of inclusion at different levels of the education system and to understand how these related to the policies of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000. I was interested in gaining the perspectives of participants at all levels of the state education system in relation to their understandings of inclusion and the subsequent connections that these had with the New Zealand Curriculum Framework policy. In the case of this study, connections were made between policy and practice by focusing on the inclusion of students with disabilities in a secondary school setting.

Definitions

I drew on the following working definitions of inclusion. The first focused on rights and access for all:

Inclusive education in New Zealand means that every student has the right to access the curriculum as a full-time member of an ordinary classroom alongside other students of similar chronological age. This position is non-exclusionary, emphasising a belief that 'the education of each student is equally important' (Biklen, 1987, p.i) and that no student should experience segregation on the basis of disability (Ballard, 1996, p. 34).

The second working definition I used went further than access, and focused not only on presence, but also on participation and acceptance by peers:

The aim of inclusive education is to create learning environments in which students naturally interact with one another through talking, sharing, and working together. Within these environments, differences are acknowledged and there is a sense of acceptance and valuing of people. The role of the teacher is to reinforce the community spirit within the classroom and to assist class members to become more cooperative and understanding of each other's individual characteristics. The school is part of the wider community, and it is through being a member of this community that skills can be acquired and friendships can emerge (Ryba, 1995, p. 54).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research sought to answer two broad questions:

(1) What do stakeholders understand about inclusion as it applies to students with disabilities and to the New Zealand Curriculum Framework?
(2) What are the implications of a policy of inclusion for practice?
METHOD

Through using an ethnographic qualitative methodology I was able to gain an in-depth understanding of the perspectives of participants at all levels within the state education system, particularly those directly involved within the school. This included participants from three different sectors of the community:

a) Westside High School community:
   (i) students
   (ii) school staff
   (iii) parents
(b) Representatives of the state;
(c) Representatives of school support agencies.

Data Collection

Data collection was undertaken in three ways: participant observations; in-depth qualitative interviews with stakeholders; and document analysis. I spent a period of sixteen months collecting data and this generated approximately 500 pages of participant observations, covering a period of five terms; and approximately 1000 pages of interview transcripts from participants.

I conducted 40 interviews, mostly with individuals, but some participants were interviewed in small groups. This resulted in a total of 46 people being interviewed. A breakdown of the number of interviews by group is as follows:
   National agencies (4);
   Local agencies (8);
   School staff (14);
   Students (13);
   and Parents (7).

Over my data collection period, I also collected two different sources of school information for document analysis: internal documents, and official school-wide documents.

Data Analysis

As it was a qualitative study, data analysis was an ongoing process throughout the research. I used a method of modified analytic induction as defined by Bogdan and Biklen (1998), which meant that the research followed an inductive rather than a deductive approach. My findings were derived from the data through examining the meaning of people's words and actions. My analysis entailed three distinct phases: discovery, coding and discounting data although there was a certain amount of overlap during the process.
My findings served to highlight the inconsistencies, contradictions and points of congruence between the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Special Education 2000, the intentions of the policy makers and classroom implementation. Six themes emerged from the findings:

- Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability;
- Privileged Knowledge; Blurring The Edges;
- Power Struggles;
- Maintaining Normality;
- and Excluding The Included.

Overall these themes demonstrated that a shift by the state to utilitarianism (that is, in part a focus away from meeting the needs of all, to meeting the needs of the majority) diverged from principles of inclusion that were simultaneously being promoted in the curriculum documents. The contradictions this posed and the influence the state had at the school level can not be overstated, as the school tried to reconcile the differences in traditionally-held values and the shift that was occurring. Not surprisingly, the outcome was that the conflicting messages being promoted at a state level were being replicated within the school. This unwittingly served to maintain the status quo because the only inclusion models the school had available to them were those based on traditional special educational ideologies. The result was a context of continued exclusion, that also permeated through to daily classroom practices.

Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability
Walking The Tightrope: issues of contestability, addressed the contextual factors that had overarching effects on the school and their daily operations. It encapsulated the nature and impact of change in political philosophy over the last decade, in the highest echelons of the state.

The stated policy rhetoric of both the NZCF and the SE2000 policies suggested a convergence with inclusive education frameworks, however my findings suggest that both policies failed to take account of the underlying political shift to utilitarianism by the state. This shift had meant that within the state schooling sector, notions of "choice" were being given greater priority over notions of equity. As a result, this led to the continued exclusion of students with disabilities.

The shift towards utilitarianism by the state also imposed a discourse of managerialism onto schools, whilst simultaneously promoting the economic marketisation of education. This meant continued state control fiscally, but greater responsibility for administration devolved to individual schools.
To add to the complexity, the paradigm that the state continued to operate within, (that is functionalism), saw the introduction of policies, that in respect to equity, only served to retain the status quo. By remaining unaddressed, the disparities between the wealth of schools continued to be reproduced and students with disabilities continued to be legitimately excluded through policies that explicitly supported segregation under the guise of parental "choice".

In terms of stakeholders' understandings of meanings of inclusion, differences between stated policy and intended policy led to much confusion and contradiction, not only across sectors but also within the same sectors of the community. Moreover, the change in ideology (to utilitarianism) led to huge constraints for Westside High School and their supporting agencies.

Philosophically, Westside High School attempted to hold on to egalitarian theoretical frameworks within an increasingly pervasive utilitarian ideology. However, the shift to contestability by the state, constrained the options available to the school, due to the permeation of underlying utilitarian principles. Competition, for example, had led the school into a financial spiral of decline from which it was extremely difficult to recover. Funding shortages impacted on funding allocations within the school, staff retention, time availability, curriculum options offered, agency support available, the allocation of teacher aide hours and hence inclusive practices. The market-like environment in which the school found itself was exclusionary in nature, and ran counter to the context necessary for the world-class inclusive education system purported under the SE2000 policy.

In summary, a climate of contestability had been fostered by the state within the education sector, with far-reaching consequences for meanings of inclusion at the school level. The contextual factors that had been imposed on the school placed staff in a position that can be likened to walking a tightrope. The promotion of utilitarian values by the state, (of minimal government intervention; consumer choice; education as a commodity; devolution; consumer/provider contract and competition), constrained the school's shift to inclusive education not only on a practical basis, but also on a philosophical level.

**Privileged Knowledge**
The second theme that transversed my findings related to which knowledge became privileged, and how this occurred. Contextually, the shift by the state to utilitarianism was also evident in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF). The ramifications of this were that, arguably, the simultaneous promotion of an inclusive curriculum was nothing more than a legitimation exercise by the state.
The rhetoric of an inclusive curriculum apparent in the Framework documents created difficulties for implementation at the school level. Whilst an inclusive philosophy was stated, responsibility had been devolved to schools for implementing the curriculum framework, but no training or professional development was done, to ensure that the curriculum was inclusive. The school responded to the state's confusing messages by drawing on traditional ways of knowing particularly in relation to students with disabilities - that is, the traditional model of special education. This traditional approach maintained the status quo, which served both the interests of the existing secondary school structure, and the shift to utilitarianism by the state.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework rhetoric appeared to support an inclusive approach to teaching and learning through its stated curriculum. My findings suggest that, in actuality, this inclusiveness was inconsistent throughout the curriculum statements, and the focus was on a general educationalist approach to the curriculum that continued to keep special education separate. This is further substantiated by my findings of the initial intentions behind the Framework. Following a utilitarian agenda, it seemed apparent that the NZCF was intended to provide a national curriculum for the majority rather than all students, despite the rhetoric of being tailored to meet individual needs. Within this rhetoric there was a covert assumption that students with special needs would continue to be catered for by special education teachers rather than the mainstream class teacher.

This was especially apparent through the continued promotion by the state of Individual Education Plans for students with special needs. On the one hand the NZCF was purporting a flexibility for class teachers to be able to design programmes for all learners, but on the other, this concept did not appear to include those who had IEPs. Rather, the IEP would continue to be utilised for these students, thus maintaining an expectation that some students would require a separate programme to that of the national curriculum.

In practice, at Westside High School, the conflicting messages by the state in regard to students with disability resulted in the status quo being maintained. Students with disabilities continued to have separate education learning goals that were controlled by the special education units within the school, and mainstream teachers were omitted from the IEP process. This meant responsibility for the learning of these students continued to be controlled by special educators rather than their mainstream teachers. Furthermore, class teachers' lack of presence at IEP meetings served to place more responsibility on to the teacher aides, who provided the link between the mainstream and the attached units.

The separation of mainstream and special education was replicated also in the mainstream classrooms, in which, as a result of lack of understanding and skill, class teachers often expected less from special needs students, did not see these
students as their own responsibility, and relied instead on the teacher aide to teach them. This was further substantiated by the lack of interaction and communication between class teachers and parents of students with disabilities.

The school response to this apparent lack of knowledge and skill in teaching diverse learners led classroom teachers to draw on traditional ways of knowing, especially for students with disabilities. School-wide in-service training for teaching mainstreamed students included utilising a traditional special education curriculum. The unit staff, resource teachers and teacher aides, all following a special education approach, made decisions about the learning objectives and goals for students with disabilities. This practice served to maintain the status quo, despite the mainstreaming of more and more students, because students were still perceived to belong to the units rather than to the mainstream classrooms. The state's interests continued to be preserved because whilst the appearance was given to parents that their children were being given more and more in terms of access to the mainstream, the existing exclusionary secondary school structures remained unchanged.

**Blurring The Edges**

The theme of Blurring the Edges was a participant-generated code that related to practices in the high school. It described the proposed merger of the attached units at the school with the mainstream. By moving students from the Learning Resource Centre (LRC) into the mainstream, and students from the mainstream into the LRC for remediation, it was perceived that a blurring of the two areas would occur. This was the school's way of addressing the changes by the state in relation to special education, and its purported shift to inclusion through the SE2000 policy.

Despite the appearance of a shift by the state however, towards recognising and celebrating individual differences, in reality the SE2000 policy was still underpinned by an individualised construction of disability. Furthermore the policy continued to foster mechanisms that relied on diagnosis and intervention procedures which were based on a deficit model. These constructions of disability continued to be replicated at the school level, in which both units maintained a positivist approach to disability and inclusion.

The lack of clear direction from the state in relation to inclusion and inclusive practices meant that, as with the NZCF, the school drew on its existing store of knowledge in relation to special education. This resulted in a reclaiming of special education traditional ways of knowing into the mainstream. Practices focused on individual deficit approaches which undermined the inclusive intentions of the model, because it meant that focus was placed on individual students only, rather than also addressing contextual barriers (such as the existence of the units) that continued to perpetuate exclusionary practices.
The traditional functionalist discourse of professionalism, (that is, the idea that those with specialist training in special education have greater expertise over the learning needs of students with special needs than those without), was not only evident in the new SE2000 policy, but also reflected within the school. In practice, the school engaged in a discourse of expertism and the special education staff became constructed as the experts in the school by the management staff and members of the Board of Trustees. This resulted in procedures that gave the appearance of greater inclusion, (in terms of some student presence in the mainstream) but the status quo was maintained (in relation to the continued operations of the unit) and the existing secondary school structure was retained. The implication of this was that blurring the edges was nothing more than a re/construction of mainstreaming.

Additionally, the "model" despite best intentions, did little to address existing issues of marginalisation, and continued segregation led to further stigmatisation. Not only were those enrolled in the unit subject to continued exclusion, but the introduction of the model extended this exclusion to those who were being withdrawn from the mainstream into the unit. Furthermore, the blurring of the edges model introduced into the mainstream of the school continued to be specific to only one of the units in the school, and this led to tension between the units.

In summary, the result of blurring the edges was that the separation of special and general education evident at the state level was being reproduced at the school level. Whilst there was a blurring of some aspects of the mainstream and the unit in relation to student placements, the two areas of the school remained discrete and responsibilities and expertise were still clearly demarcated between the two units.

**Power Struggles**
The theme of power struggles refers to the tension between the two units within the school and the resultant shift in power that occurred. Within the school the blurring of the edges model imposed and legitimated a shifting ideology of expertism into the mainstream. "The model" created a power struggle between the two units for privilege over special education knowledge in the mainstream. The outcome was tension between the units and conflicting messages to those in the mainstream, because whilst practices of each unit differed, underlying theoretical frameworks were the same.

The change of staff, and the introduction of the model, meant that the status of the newly-named LRC became greater than that of the Physically Disabled Unit (PDU) in the mainstream. This was evident in the way the Head of the Department of the LRC also held a high-status position in the mainstream and the LRC became more apparent as another department within the school. Whilst the position of the PDU remained the same in the school, the blurring of the edges model for the LRC had succeeded in removing the isolation that
had previously occurred. It appeared that under the new management structure, the status of the LRC had been promoted above that of the PDU. Whereas the PDU had to compete for placements, the LRC, through holding dual roles within the school, was able to cross the boundaries and be part of the mainstream decision-making processes.

The traditional ways in which "inclusion" and "mainstreaming" had been defined by the PDU were challenged, as they were redefined under the terms of the model. The outcome was tension and contestability between the units. Lack of collaboration occurred as each sector sought to privilege its own ways of knowing in relation to inclusive practices.

In summary, this section has drawn attention to the power dynamics that occurred between the two units within the school and the confusion that resulted for understandings meanings of inclusion within the mainstream.

Maintaining Normality
My findings also raised questions about the role of conformity in maintaining what was considered "normal" behaviour within the school. Secondary school structures such as compartmentalisation, rules, regulations, timetables and routines were enlisted as a way of ensuring normalised behaviour not only by students, but staff and parents or caregivers as well. It is perceived under a functionalist paradigm that this enables society to operate in a stable and consensus way.

However, inclusion was often confused with assimilation, in which readiness models were perpetuated on the premise that if students conformed, they were then more likely to be mainstreamed. Constructions of difference and recognition were not accounted for under this model, and one of the roles of the units were to normalise students, as much as possible, to fit into the traditional secondary school structure.

The blurring of the edges model also served to maintain constructions of normality by not only retaining a mainstreaming model rather than an inclusive one, but also by removing those who did not conform in the mainstream. Furthermore, it appeared that despite some students succeeding academically when placed in the mainstream, their place in the units was retained without question. This served to maintain the existence of the units and the status quo.

Excluding The Included.
The final theme that emerged across my findings was the exclusion of the included. Despite important work occurring by key people within the school, the prevalence of market and lay discourses continued to perpetuate exclusionary practices. Meanings of inclusion at the school were hindered not only by a number of contextual factors, but also the paradigm in which the
school operated. Thus exclusion continued at all levels. Ideologies of utilitarianism and the privileging of contestability by the state (as previously discussed) meant inclusive education at the school level had to occur in a context in which the school was struggling to deal with more pressing contextual constraints for the school itself. Lack of understanding and skill on the part of the teachers meant that the school responded by reclaiming traditional frameworks, which ultimately served to maintain the status quo. Whilst in practice this increased inclusive practices at some levels, it failed to question the exclusionary context in which it was operating. By engaging in a functionalist paradigm, the school was unable to make the theoretical and philosophical shift that is required for democratic transformative approaches, such as an inclusive education model, to occur.

The constraints placed on the school by the shift to utilitarianism in the form of marketisation and managerialism, (as previously outlined), served to exacerbate exclusion within the school. Issues of inclusion became marginalised, and took second place to the funding and resource shortages that threatened the school's existence, as school staff worked to maintain the status quo. The same philosophies pervaded state agencies, and they too found themselves constrained and less able to support schools.

A traditional secondary school structure, meant that Westside High School continued to separate special and general education (as did the state) and practices of segregation had become normalised within the school culture. The everyday presence and practices of the attached units influenced participants' understandings of inclusion and segregation became part of their taken-for-granted meanings. Thus it had been possible for mainstreaming to be redefined, by the special education sector in the school, as inclusion. The lack of skill and understanding of disability that was evident in the mainstream of the school hindered inclusive practices, as staff relied instead on special education staff to take responsibility for special needs students. In this way, the school was able to continue to function as it always had, despite the mainstreaming of some students and the introduction of the model. Nevertheless, misunderstanding and ignorance as a result of lack of teachers' skill and the continued engagement with lay discourses, meant there were levels of resistance to the changes that the model had brought to the school.

Despite the structural barriers within and beyond the school, which I have outlined, evidence of individual agency leading to inclusive practices also occurred. Not only were the management staff especially welcoming of students with special needs, but also individual class teachers and students adopted egalitarian principles and displayed inclusive intentions at different times. Parents' expectations of inclusion appeared to be linked to contextual constraints in that those who were enrolled in the unit had fewer expectations for inclusion than those who were fully mainstreamed.
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Unfortunately, the examples of inclusive practices, in terms of my working definitions were limited. The mainstream school continued to operate mainly within a framework of contradiction, as school staff struggled with the conflicting messages they were simultaneously receiving from the special education areas of the school and the state, as it promoted further shifts towards managerialism in the educational sector. The overarching emphasis from the units was on gaining access to the mainstream and placements into classrooms. This is problematic in that inclusion is not about presence alone, but also participation and acceptance by others, particularly, in this case, by the students' classmates.

By ignoring issues of collaboration, participation, and belonging inherent to inclusion and inclusive practices the school engaged in a discourse of silence. This had the greatest impact on the students as they were left to negotiate their own meanings of inclusion with each other. Moreover, the silence over disability and other perceived differences, plus the continued presence of the units, meant that students were left with only lay discourses to draw on. This led to much misconception and whilst students with disabilities in the mainstream classes were not overtly excluded, many students adopted a charity discourse towards them. Other students, (without labels as such), were less fortunate and were subjected to regular exclusion by their classmates.

Summary
In summary, this section has highlighted the need to address not only micro-level interactions and practices when understanding inclusive and exclusionary practices, but also the context within which they occur. Furthermore, the exclusionary practices that continued to exist in the school, despite the inclusive intentions of management and the increased presence of unit students into the mainstream through the introduction of the model, demonstrates the inability for inclusion to occur within the bounds of a traditional secondary school framework. Also, the context in which schools operate has an overarching influence and places constraints on the things that school staff can do. This is not to say that individuals do not have agency and cannot be inclusive in their practices. But inclusive education extends beyond the school, and is hindered by an exclusionary society.

IMPLICATIONS

• The rhetoric of inclusion and inclusive education by the state have been utilised to legitimate and maintain the status quo. The use of the term inclusion as a synonym for mainstreaming has been challenged and exposed as a resistance strategy to change, especially by those in special education.

• My findings raise the problematic nature of special education. As long as special education is maintained as a separate entity in our schooling system,
(such as in the case of Westside High School), students will continue to be segregated and excluded.

• In relation to the Special Education 2000 policy this thesis has shown that it is unworkable to have a policy that purports a shift to a world-class inclusive education system based only on funding provisions. Whilst the funding allocations are determined by an individual’s ability to access the curriculum, the implementation of SE2000 lacked formalised integration with the NZCF policy.

• The findings of this thesis challenge the presupposition that the NZCF already provided an inclusive curriculum, demonstrating instead that the development of the national curriculum was premised on an inclusive curriculum that only catered for some groups. This suggests a need for a state-level review of this policy.

• This thesis has shown that despite the introduction of SE2000 policy, continued exclusion for students with disabilities has occurred as a result of lack of skill, managerialism, and other state-led changes to the way schools and support agencies function. Traditional focus by special educators on access resulted in enhanced social interaction but did little to ensure participation or membership in the classroom. The discourses of silence due to teacher ignorance also resulted in further exclusion.

• Lack of skill by the teachers in this study suggest that ongoing professional development is required to ensure existing teachers understand diversity within their classrooms. They also require practical skills of how to go about developing curriculum in their schools that are reflective and inclusive of all of their students. This approach would embrace a critical pedagogy, whereby teachers would be able to constantly reflect on their practice in relation to all of their students and adopt a transformative approach to curriculum. Furthermore, the philosophy of inclusive education needs to become an integral part of all pre-service teacher training.

• Whilst inclusion appears elusive, and seemingly only possible under a model of school reform, my findings demonstrate that inclusive practices can and do occur at an individual level. Individuals can use their agency to enhance the potential for transformative approaches.

• Finally, it must be remembered that inclusive education is ultimately not only an issue for our schools, but also our society. Philosophical and theoretical frameworks underpinned by social justice rights discourses need to permeate all state policies in a consistent and meaningful way, if we are ever to realise the vision of inclusion in our schools.
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