

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED CHILDREN, WHO
WERE EDUCATED IN DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS, AS THEY
APPROACH OR AFTER THEY HAVE REACHED ADULTHOOD.

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

by

Arthur Senior Thornton

The Faculty of Education and Design, Brunel University

June 1990.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted Dr. B. K. Down for his assiduous help and constant support.

My thanks are also due to Professor N.D.C. Harris for his the helpful comments.

I am also grateful to the subjects of this study, their parents and the school staff to whom I made reference for their assistance.

In addition I would like to thank my wife for her proof reading and general forbearance during the writing up stage of this study.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the copyright of this dissertation rests with the author. This copy of the dissertation is supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that the copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the dissertation and no information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

ABSTRACT

This is a follow-up study of a group of young people who were pupils, or former pupils, of a special school for physically handicapped children. They were the subjects of an M.Phil. thesis submitted in 1986. The thirty-two members of the study group used for this research were chosen from the sample, of fifty three, who were the core group of the earlier piece of work, who have since then been educated in a variety of environments, including integrated educational situations. Particular attention is paid to the social consequences of physical disability and factors which seem to ameliorate or exacerbate the resultant impediments. A qualitative approach is used within the framework of a multiple case study format. However, because of the comparatively long time span from which material is available, in the case of many subjects periods of in excess of twenty years, it is possible to utilize a longitudinal perspective throughout most of the work. This is adopted in an effort to arrive at a holistic view of the situation of the young people involved. Their current situation is examined and the apparent effect on their life chances of the diverse settings in which they were educated is noted.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	Page 1
Chapter One - Literature and the background problems of physically disabled young people	Page 7
Introduction	
Background	
Social image	
Role assignment	
Deviance	
The influence of the school	
The family group	
Conclusion	
Chapter Two - Defining the term physical handicap	Page 40
Introduction	
The Social validity of the term	
Physical disability as a means of definition	
The influence of inorganic factors	
Movement towards a less rigid view of physical handicap	
The effect of labelling	
Conclusion	
Chapter Three - Methodology	Page 73
Introduction	
Selecting a suitable strategy	
The selection of the study group	
The collection of data	
Handling data	
Relevant methodological factors	
Conclusion	
Chapter Four - Parents and School enrolment....	Page 111
Introduction	
The options available	
Parental response to special education	
Factors which affected parents opinions of schools	
A retrospective view of parental opinion	
Conclusion	
Chapter Five - Familial reactions to the prospect of integrated education	Page 145
Introduction	
The integration process	

CONTENTS

Parental attitude	
Some important influences on parental opinion	
The children's attitude to integration	
Conclusion	
Chapter Six - Staff reactions to proposed integrated education	
.....	Page 181
Introduction	
Reactions of special school non-teaching staff	
Reactions of the special school teaching staff	
The attitudes of mainstream ancillary staff	
Early responses of mainstream teaching staff	
The mainstream teachers and the integration scheme	
Conclusion	
Chapter Seven - Integration in operation	Page 217
Introduction	
Integration at the infant school stage	
Integrated education at the junior school level	
Integration in the secondary schools	
Conclusion	
Chapter Eight - Parental assessment of the schooling provided	
.....	Page 250
Introduction	
The perceived degree of parental choice	
Retrospective views on the effectiveness of schooling	
Factors which were a source of bias	
Conclusion	
Chapter Nine - Life Chances	Page 284
Introduction	
Educational opportunities	
Opportunities for employment	
The influence of home background	
Other aspects of life chances	
Conclusion	
Chapter Ten - Conclusion	Page 323
Introduction	
The social implications of the educational category	
Integrated education	
Social status and life chances	
Social attainment	
Summary	
Personal enrichment	
Areas worthy of further research	

CONTENTS

Bibliography Page 351

APPENDICES

Appendix IPage 357
Table A - Acts of Parliament
Table B - Events worthy of note
Table C - Details of the children and young people
 from whom the study group was chosen
Table D - Further details of the children and young
 people from whom the study group was chosen
Table E - Summary of the physical disabilities of
 the study group
Table F -

Appendix IIPage 380
Summary of the personal details of each member of the
study group

Appendix III -Page 438
Sample interviews

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to provide answers to some of the more important questions that seemed to be raised, but left unanswered, by a recently completed dissertation (Thornton 1986). The research for that began early in 1979. Consequently by the time of writing I had accumulated ten years experience of research (part-time), eighteen years continuous experience running a special school for physically handicapped children and five years in mainstream education.

The subjects of this study are all former pupils of the special school where I worked. This study is concerned mainly with their adult lives. The earlier research concentrated largely on the period from their birth until the end of their primary education. It was particularly concerned with the involuntary acquisition of a social handicap by children who are physically disabled. The effects of this secondary handicap were examined and it was sought to establish the way by which it was acquired. Societal reaction to those who bore the secondary handicap was also discussed and the study

INTRODUCTION

showed that social attitudes created an impediment for the children concerned.

Further work on the topic is necessary for two main reasons. The first is that additional research was needed to explore topics raised within the original study. The second is that some of the material needed to effect this work was not available at the time when the study was completed. For instance, there was a great variety of combinations of integrated and segregated schooling provided for the study group. The effect of these various forms of education on the adult lives of a study group would be very difficult to predict before they had reached adulthood. Important factors affecting their life chances, such as success in the field of employment and their opportunities and abilities with regard to heterosexual relationships could not be easily or accurately judged during their schooldays. However, it is only by attention to matters of this nature, which are pivotal elements in the development of their social and personal lives, that their success with regard to societal acceptance can be judged.

The earlier study established the existence of inferior social status among the subjects. This was found to have been acquired by the fifty-three pupils

INTRODUCTION

and former pupils of a special school who were the subjects of that research. It could be said, therefore, that the current survey group had experienced this social handicap throughout most of their lives. However, its effect on their adult lives was yet to be examined.

The current research is focused on a selection of the subjects of the earlier multiple case study. It provides an opportunity to examine in more detail some of the ideas which were raised in the earlier piece of work. To this end it details the subsequent progress of thirty-two young people, a majority of the previous sample. The persistence of their secondary handicaps is examined, together with any restrictions they continue to impose. This study looks for evidence of this additional handicap affecting their life chances after most of them have reached adulthood.

The developmental progress of the subjects is examined, using snapshots of their situations from pre-school days until the present as a basic framework. The evaluation of their development is used to test the assumption, based on the findings of the original research, that the type of school they attended and its ethos, more than other considerations such as its curriculum, is an important influence on their life

INTRODUCTION

chances. Educational success can only be judged by the enrichment and assistance it has ultimately provided for the recipients. Therefore assessment of it based on data which is largely confined to the duration spanned by full-time education for the young people concerned is necessarily confined to the realms of hypothesis, theory and speculation, no matter how orthodox it may be or how eminent its source.

Material for this research was collected over a period in excess of ten years and documentary evidence from a period extending over the twenty-two years preceding the start of this study was used for reference. This longitudinal approach is intended to provide substance to the implied comparison between expectations and achievements. Such a comparison, contained in one study and executed by a major participant in the educational process involved, with ready access to relevant documentation, seems to be comparatively rare. Consideration of additional elements such as, location, time-span and time of execution in relation to changes in educational policy even suggest that it is unique.

This research also seeks a re-appraisal, in the light of subsequent experience, of both the special and

INTRODUCTION

mainstream education provided for the subjects, from parents and staff whose opinions had been solicited previously. Potentially valuable material, of this kind, is also now available in the form of the opinions of the former disabled pupils, who are subjects of the current research. For ethical reasons, connected with my previous professional responsibility towards them, and their ages, access to their views was previously rather limited. Their retrospective assessment of the schooling they received, helps to build a more holistic assessment of their common problems and the extent to which schooling answered their problems. It also adds considerably to the interest and value of the research.

In the earlier part of this study theories began to emerge and I became aware of the value of constructing a central thesis, or hypothesis. It seemed that this would provide a useful frame of reference during the organization and assessment of the large amount of varied data to be used. A form was decided upon, which was thought to be a sufficiently accurate reflection of emerging impressions but not so specific that it threatened to restrict the evolution of theory. It was as follows, "The social status of physically handicapped young people is reduced by the secondary handicaps which

INTRODUCTION

they are accorded. These handicaps are the result of the imposition of social identities which are inappropriate to their abilities and personal attributes. If the education provided for these young people is to be relevant to their needs the educators must accept this fact and equip them to deal with it as part of their preparation for adult life. To educate them in a segregated setting is, in this context, a negative influence on their life chances, since it tends to isolate them from the kind of social setting in which they are likely to develop the skills needed to cope with their social handicaps."

The validity of this hypothesis is a matter with which this thesis is concerned. The extent to which the experiences of the study group is consistent with the experiences of other groups of physically disabled people is beyond the compass of this piece of research, but the results may prove to be illuminating.

CHAPTER ONE

Chapter one

LITERATURE AND THE BACKGROUND PROBLEMS OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED YOUNG PEOPLE

INTRODUCTION

The study group chosen were former pupils of a special school. However, any examination of their personal development must be viewed against the whole background of their social situation and their skills and attainment should be judged within a much broader context than that which a school could provide. Accepting this does not ignore the important part that schools have played in the lives of these young people. Nevertheless it does suggest that it is more appropriate in this context to consider schools mainly as social institutions, rather than merely as establishments concerned primarily with formal education. Thus their obvious potential as agencies for either effecting social change or maintaining homeostasis according to current societal requirements is accentuated. This view is supported by some of the findings of the original study, in which subjects provided evidence of the importance of particular social phenomena. For example, they reported discrimination of a type, and on a scale, which indicated the operation of deviant sanctions. To

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

understand why this might be so I turned to the work of sociologists from whose works were derived some of the main constructs and models to be used in this study.

BACKGROUND

The works of labelling theorists such as Lemert (1950,1967), Becker (1963,1968,1970), Rubington and Weinberg (1971,,1973) and Goffman (1959, 1961,1963,1967,1969,1971,1974,1981) appeared to offer appropriate and informative explanations. In their works, departures from the norm, which are recognized by social groups, are examined and the social consequences for the individuals, or groups, involved are discussed in some detail. This body of work also outlines some of the concepts that are associated with this kind of social situation and the resultant difficulties which are likely to occur because of it, including persistent social problems. Much of the theoretical structure offered by work of this genre was very helpful in the interpretation of the material gathered for this study. Becker (1970), for example, outlines the approach associated with the Chicago school of sociology, thereby stressing the importance of interaction and its

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

connection with social problems and social control. Lemert (1967) examines the concept of social deviance and discusses the proposition that it is an integral part of social life rather than an infrequently occurring phenomenon. His work on this theme helps to interpret some of the difficulties which the subjects of this study reported that they experienced, such as discrimination. For instance, he indicates the extent to which this could reasonably be regarded as evidence of the operation of deviant sanctions and how pervasive would such a handicap be in their day-to-day lives.

SOCIAL IMAGE

The additional impediment imposed by society appears to be the result of misapprehension, about physically disabled young people. It takes the form of a special status accorded to the young people concerned. This apparently justifies a general devaluation of their actual levels of ability but does not appear to be based upon either knowledge of physical disability or experience of the attainment or characteristics of the disabled children in question. The status seems to be generated by societal acceptance of stereotyped image in

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

lieu of a realistic assessment of each disabled individual.

Attempts to delineate this general image, emphasized the existence of a multiple identity, in respect of the subjects of this study. Goffman (1963) explains this. He deals at length with the situation where "normal" and "abnormal" meet. He argues that those socially defined as abnormal are stigmatized and points out that this stigma is intimately associated with stereotype. This is, he argues, related to unconscious expectations and norms which act as arbiters in all encounters. The ways in which a stigmatized person can shore up his precarious social identity are also discussed. He subdivides identity into the character imputed to a person, by the community, and the character and attributes the person could be proved to possess. Thus he regards a person as having a "virtual identity", and an "actual identity". The existence of a virtual identity, which is ascribed by others has significant implications with regard to a community's level of expectations of the person to whom it is attributed.

During the course of researching the literature the idea that individuals vary in their ability to both

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

construct and maintain a favourable image, in respect of both virtual social identity and self concept, began to acquire added substance. Goffman (1969) explores the implication of image, including self image, in some detail. He discusses this in terms of contextually approved social attributes referring to it as "face". During an examination of interaction (Goffman 1961, 1967) he also refers to virtual social identity and draws attention to its importance in the calculative, game-like aspects of mutual dealings and face-to-face interaction, which are such an integral part of daily life. Later (Goffman 1971) he develops the theme of face-to-face interaction and hence emphasizes the importance of social image and its influence on the way social encounters are conducted. Subsequently Goffman extends his work on the interactional analysis of face-to-face communication to day-to-day conversations and verbal exchanges (Goffman 1981). Their obvious connection with information control is also emphasized. He insists that this form of communication should be looked at within an interactional framework and studied as part of the total physical, social, cultural and verbal environment in which it occurs. This notion

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

clearly underlines the importance which he places on the resultant social image or "face". Goffman's analysis and its emphasis on the significance of interaction and those elements which are likely to affect it provided a useful source of reference in connection with the interpretation of some of the material collected for this study.

The emphasis which Goffman places on social identity is mirrored in the work of many others. Lofland (1969) offers a view of the significance of interaction in this particular area. During the course of analysing social deviance, a subject of particular interest in the context of this piece of research, he notes the development of social identity as an integral part of the evolution of deviant status and examines this process from an interactionist standpoint.

ROLE ASSIGNMENT

Previous observations (Thornton 1986) suggested that the situational public is inclined to stereotype physically disabled young people and, as Hewitt and Newson (1970) point out, tend to pitch their expectations accordingly. The young people are thus cast

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

in specific roles and assigned certain appropriate characteristics, qualities and social functions. As previously observed there is a consequent tendency to regard them as people who are capable of only limited ability in most fields and, therefore, the rightful recipients of pity and charity.

This focuses attention on the importance of role in the matter of social context. Becker (1968) claims that societies owe their form to the social actions of people whose personalities are heavily influenced by their socially assigned roles. Goffman (1969) supports this view stating that role is the basic unit of socialization, pointing out that the scheduling of roles is an important theme of social organization. He claims that the influence of role is so powerful that the traditions of a specific role will lead an individual to give an impression that he may not be disposed to create. He further points out that it is typical for a person to be deeply committed to a role which he regularly performs. Another important social consideration, to which he draws attention, is the social categorization of the individual who is involved in taking on a role. Goffman (1974) also explains that

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

the re-categorization which attends the acceptance or assignment of a role affects first the person's social identity but, by way of this, ultimately affects his personal identity.

Cicourel (1973) pays close attention to everyday social interaction and examines the way in which it is assembled. His conclusions challenge some aspects of the concept of role and status. He argues that the way in which differing representations of actuality are generated suggests a much fuller explanation of non verbal and verbal communication exchanges are needed. The importance which he accords to non-verbal communication clearly implies that the physical limitation experienced by many members of the study group, which obviously limits or distorts body language, has direct social consequences. In addition to the questions that may be raised in connection with the concepts of role and status, Cicourel emphasizes the importance of physical factors with regard to social interaction and draws attention to the possible social implications of the type of physical disability experienced by members of the study group. In some cases their particular disabilities, exhibiting an obvious

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

deviation from the norm, have a negative effect on the level of expectation associated with the afflicted person at the outset of any encounter.

Lemert also (1950) discusses the connection between role and physical characteristics. He asserts that physical misfortunes such as disfigurement, invalidism and maiming arbitrarily impose role definitions and status on those afflicted. In this connection he explains that there are a limited number of roles available to any one individual. Anyone aspiring to a given role, he explains, will be restricted by the social definition of his pre-existing social status. Helle and Eisenstadt (1985) include an examination of the importance of role in their appraisal of modern approaches to the micro theory and the emerging trends towards macro-theoretical paradigms. They discuss the importance of role theory and assess its contribution to the shift away from the micro/macro dichotomy, placing an emphasis on the concept of "situation" in role theory and aspects of ethnomethodology such as the role of language, collective symbols and socio-cultural sources of emotional experience.

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

DEVIANCE

Most of the material, both from earlier work (Thornton 1986) and the pilot study which was conducted in connection with this research, concerning interaction between the study group and other members of society, suggested that the physically handicapped young people were subject to discrimination. Since one of the most common reasons for this is the application of deviant sanctions it prompted reference to the literature on deviancy.

Bibliographic research directed towards the general area of deviance reveals a widely held view that deviance is the creation of society. Becker (1970) claims that deviance is, in general the creation of the public imagination, and Freedman and Doob (1968) explain that a deviant characteristic can be defined as one that is not shared by the comparison group. An examination of the literature which considers deviance seems to lead inevitably to the concept of "labelling", a process which seems to be in many contexts an integral part of deviant sanctions. Early in his work Becker (1964) discusses the function of labelling in the process of deviancy, explaining that people attach the label of

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

deviant to others and thus confer deviant status. Rubington and Weinberg (1973) define social deviants as those who bear the deviant label. They explain that by the attachment of such a label a person can be "socially reconstituted" and explain that deviancy is not a biological fact or a behavioural characteristic but a matter of social definition. There are many instances, in those works which are concerned with deviancy, which indicate that physically disabled young people are regarded as deviants. Lemert (1950) offers a list of those who are typically regarded as deviants, being individually differentiated from others in their social groups. Included in this list is a child born with a congenital defect. In the same piece of work he refers to the socio-cultural limits which tend to exclude the physically disabled from full economic participation in society. Becker (1964) outlines the social status of some of the physically disabled members of society when he explains that the visibly handicapped are usually accorded only that level of "surface acceptance" required by "manners". This mere conformity with basic etiquette, he claims, severely curtails the social interaction in which they participate. Lemert (1967)

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

also draws attention to the social barriers concomitant with deviancy and claims that, in the case of those with a physical disability, they present a greater impediment than the curtailment of opportunity occasioned by the physical defect.

A review of some of the work on deviancy illustrates the high level of general acceptance that is accorded to the theory that deviant status has a marked effect on social interaction. One important cause of this is applied via the deviants themselves. Their actions in social situations and their responses to social contacts are clearly modified by the status which has been conferred on them. In some contexts their responses are more severely curtailed by this than the prime cause of the deviant status. Observations of this kind of effect introduce the concept of secondary deviation, that is additional deviant behaviour elicited in response to status or sanctions associated with the primary deviancy. Lemert (1967) discusses secondary deviation and categorises it as a response to societal reaction generated by the primary deviancy. He points out that it can be a form of defence, attack or merely an adaptation to the problems caused by the social consequences of

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

primary deviation. In this process, he points out, the original cause of deviant status may be overshadowed by the disapproval and isolating degradational reactions of society.

Much of the work on this subject emphasizes the operation of those powerful influences which spring from deviancy and the way in which they operate to modify and curtail the daily lives of those people assigned to deviant groups. Lemert (1967) claims that the lives and identity of secondary deviants are, to varying degrees, organized round the facts of deviance. Becker (1970) also holds the view that the deviant label is a major influence on the daily lives and life chances of individuals to whom it is attached. He explains that people tend to identify with names and categories attached to the current groups in which they participate. The influence of this process, he explains, extends to the fact that they tend to attach these labels to themselves, using them as a means of learning "who they are" and arriving at an appropriate pattern of behaviour. This proposition also finds accord in the work of Freedman and Doob (1968) who state that feelings of deviancy have important effects on people's

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

behaviour. In a similar vein there has existed, for some considerable time, a consensus that the social pressures engendered by inferior status exert an important influence on the community at large. According to Himes (1950) many physically disabled people say they find less problem in their handicap than other people do.

However, even accepting that the apparent special status which was accorded to the members of the core group was deviant status, it would be misleading to give the impression that it has, at all times, been a disadvantage. Deviant status may represent a serious impediment to many physically disadvantaged people, including members of the study group. However, it would be ignoring much evidence presented by the body of work, to which reference is currently being made, if deviance was to be regarded as merely a malignant social phenomenon. There are grounds for supposing that, in some instances, it could be of value in the social structure. For example, practical difficulties are overcome when disabled people are readily granted access to many places which are normally very restricted to others. One instance of this is their admission to the palace yard during the Changing of the Guard ceremony at

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

Buckingham Palace. Viewing this ceremony amid a crowd outside the place railings would be virtually impossible for many physically disabled people. Their access is clearly dependant upon privilege arising from the positive discrimination which is the result of the special status accorded to them. According to Rubington and Weinberg (1973) deviance may even play an important part in the maintenance of social stability.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE SCHOOL

The social significance of a young person's school, in respect of both the environment it provides and the social category it supports, is apparent in much of the work on deviancy and allied subjects. Reid (1981) reminds us that the school class is the first "other group" universally entered into in our society. Becker (1970) draws attention to the importance of schools in the operation of a system of social class and status and Frankenberg (1982), during his work on British society, regards school life as the operation of a micro society. Lambert and Bullock (1970) also see the school as a society and draw attention to the inter-relation of the constituent parts of community life in school. They

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

outline these in sociological terms and stress the social characteristics of the school rather than its educational significance. Evidence that the type of school, in terms of the broad categories acknowledged by society, can have a significant effect on the social status and ultimately the life chances of a young person can be found in the work of Booth and Swann (1987). They find indications that children and young people with special educational needs can derive a richer social life from their participation in mainstream education, even though adaptations to the system may be necessary to accommodate some individuals.

In view of this, it seems reasonable to suggest that there is social significance in the fact that the Education Act 1870, which established the principle of elementary education for all, appeared to omit those who were physically handicapped. Perhaps the act may even be seen as a formalization of deviant sanctions. Tomlinson (1982) explains that society required the schools to prepare an educated work force and the presence of disabled children in the schools was seen as an impediment in the execution of this brief. Burstyn (1986) asserts that we are still labouring under

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

disadvantages inherited from that era. She claims that our present concepts, definitions and institutions owe much to the technical revolution which took place two hundred years ago and she explains that they need to be re-conceptualized, re-formatted and restructured.

In the same piece of work, Burstyn also suggests that the reason for these shortcomings is largely the failure of educators to keep pace with the changing demands that society has made on the content of education and educational institutions. She also makes the point that, if current education is to be relevant to the present needs of society, reconstruction is inevitable. It may be relevant, in this context, to point out that the provision for the education of physically handicapped children, which seemed to be deliberately omitted from the 1870 Education Act, did not become an obligatory duty of local authorities until the enactment of the Education Act 1918, almost half a century later. Even so, until the advent of the Education Act (Handicapped Children) 1970, there was no compulsion to educate those children with severe learning difficulties (classified then as E.S.N.(S) and the provision of junior training centres, in lieu of schools, for this purpose was

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

entirely at the discretion of individual local education authorities. Consequently the access to education for some physically handicapped children, who were among the less able academically or more difficult to assess, was not always assured. On occasion, in the absence of articulate parents, school admission might have depended upon the opinion of a medical officer, whose skills or experience in the field of education may have been limited. Therefore a century was to pass before the "education for all" policy was extended to all those children who were handicapped by a physical disability.

Although the Education Act 1981 was welcomed by many people, who were committed to the reform of provision for those with special educational needs, including the restructuring of the school system, the opportunity for the introduction of integrated education had been available since the Education Act 1944. Section 8(2) of the act directed that "provision is made for any pupils who suffer from any disability of mind or body by providing in special schools or otherwise, special educational treatment". The inference of an emphasis on special schools which could be drawn from section eight is echoed in section 33(2) of the same act where it is

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

required that local authorities "shall so far as is practicable, provide for the education of pupils in whose case the disability is serious in special schools appropriate to that category". However, this section also allows some discretion on this point saying "where that is impractical, or where the disability is not serious the arrangements may be made for the giving of that education in any school".

An illustration of how some authorities took advantage of this, to a limited extent only, was the setting up of the first units for partially hearing children and the introduction of special classes. Both of these, Hegarty et al. (1981) report, were being organised in mainstream schools in 1947. During the sixties and the seventies the current educational provision, for those ascertained as handicapped, came to be regarded by an increasing number of people as an inadequate response in view of the latitude which education authorities were allowed.

A point of view, which was typical of this position, was illustrated in the work of Anderson (1971). She points to a change of attitudes needed on the part of local education authorities. Thus improvements and

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

reorganisation within mainstream schools is needed to allow them to cater for physically handicapped children. Later Anderson (1973) reports on a successful scheme concerned with the integration of a group of physically handicapped children into a mainstream school. During the execution of this programme a considerable amount of effort was focused on the host population of the school and their parents. This included work which occurred outside school hours and away from the school premises. Throughout Anderson's work there is an implicit recognition of the social significance of the problems which segregated education involves.

Some of her work (1973) might be seen as having limited application in other spheres of special education. It could be argued that conclusions were drawn before the initial "settling in period" was complete. Criticisms could also be levelled at her methodology since there was no control group, or an equivalent source of reference, even to assess the progress of the group in the short term. Nevertheless it is an important piece of work and it demonstrates the value of regarding the school as a social unit rather than solely as an educational institution, with the

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

truncated appreciation which that implies, if the nature of the problems connected with integrated education is to be realized.

Barton and Tomlinson (1981) also emphasise the importance of this aspect of the school during the process of reviewing findings on the nature of special education, when they draw attention to the social consequences of segregated education. The significance of this aspect underlines the fact that the problems engendered by integrated education cannot be adequately understood unless reference is made to a wider social infrastructure and attention is paid to generally accepted community values and social mores.

After the Department of Education and Science Report number 77 (1978), the Warnock Report, there was a clear case for the rationalization and restructuring of the field of education which served the needs of physically handicapped children. The Education Act 1981 ostensibly provided ample opportunity for adequate adjustment, but it is doubtful if this has been generally achieved. The ages of the study group rendered changes and developments in integrated education, which were initiated in the latter part of the nineteen eighties,

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

largely irrelevant with regard to their schooling. However, bearing in mind the widely held opinions concerning the value of integrated education, it is interesting to note some relatively recent views on the subject. For example, H.M.I. in their report to the select Committee (H.M.I. 1987) comment on the "lack of coherent L.E.A. policies" in this particular area of education. Bennett and Cass (1989) comment that "the potential for statements of educational need was great" but add that "this potential could not be realized because of financial constraints" and Tomlinson (1988) comments on the lack of resources provided for integrated education.

Booth and Swann (1987) examine the changes that have been spawned by the act and find a need for new strategies, including curriculum changes which "mirror" the place, in society, of physically disabled people. This suggests there are grounds for supposing that the educational establishment and the current basic infrastructure is not sufficiently responsive to the declared need for fundamental change. Such a tendency has been revealed in other areas where the current requirements of society required a new approach. For

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

example, Craft (1984) found in his review of the competency of educational policy, during the course of an investigation into the problems of cultural pluralism, the issues involved had been oversimplified. Financial priorities are obviously part of this problem. In addition to this, however, there is the difficulty of fitting a new approach to education into an existing, rather rigid infrastructure, in the face of firmly established practices. Tomlinson (1982) draws attention to the creation of professional ancillary groups who play a part in special education. She acknowledges their expertise and special areas of knowledge but points out that they have a vested interest in the expansion of special education, as it previously existed.

Chazan et al (1980) also find that the compartmentalized approach of these groups of people tends to limit their efficiency and reduce their potential. They draw attention to a lack of coordination between various groups and a dearth of detailed planning with regard to individual children. Given this background it is not unexpected that the facilities which many people looked for from the implementation of the Education Act 1981 have not yet occurred. During

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

this period Brennan (1987) finds that there are grounds for supposing that only very limited changes have occurred. His findings suggest that the widespread change in attitudes, which many people had hoped for is not yet forthcoming. This position is supported by other works such as that of Hodgson, Clunes-Ross and Hegarty (1984). They suggest that an alternative approach to education, including changes in curriculum, staffing and classroom methods, is needed if integrated education is to be successfully developed in mainstream schools. Also the work of Hinson (1987) directs attention to the need for alterations, such as a change of role for teachers in mainstream schools, and advocates that this should be allied to changes in the curriculum, pastoral care system and liaison facilities.

Tomlinson (1982) provides a deeper appreciation of the severity of the opposition to the further development of mainstream provision for children with special educational needs. She introduces a social perspective into her assessment of the situation, examining the structural relationships which have developed within the system and the wider society as a result of part of the mass educational system developing

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

separately from the rest. Continuing with this theme, she outlines the social situation of physically handicapped children, offering a wider view of the problems engendered by segregated schooling.

Some of the social implications of this are thrown into greater contrast when considered against the work of Glaser and Strauss (1971). They discuss the movement of individuals from one role to another and one degree of social status to another. Outlining the function of rites of passage they consider the implications of status passage, including the movement from childhood to adulthood, the movement from one part of the social hierarchy to another and change of social identity. They outline the implications of status passage and draw attention to the loss or gain of privilege associated with altered status, which results from status passage. This piece of work seemed to be particularly apposite to the social situation of members of the core group. Many of them reported difficulties which were not directly attributable to organic inefficiency but were apparently closely connected with acceptance.

Chazan et al (1980) assist the understanding of this situation by providing a broader picture of the problems

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

experienced by physically disabled children. Their work involves a review of the difficulties experienced by a group of 7,320 children, handicapped by physical disabilities of varying severity. It offers a frame of reference which is of considerable help in providing a realistic perspective with regard to the problems experienced by the young people who were subjects of this study. The work of Hegarty et al (1981) also furnishes useful background information, dealing with the practical problems that are entailed in the education of children with special needs. They also draw attention to the need to reconcile the aspirations of the movement for reform with the reality of the practical problems involved.

Attention is drawn to the finite resources available and, by implication, to the need for additional resources and restructuring if the aims of integrated education are to be largely achieved. They also point out that there is a considerable difference between the concept of integration which consists of "feeding out" pupils of special schools, on a part-time basis, to enhance what is basically special education, and integration which entails children being educated in

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

mainstream schools on a full-time basis. Their view of the integrated education they considered is that it has achieved only limited effectiveness and was, at times counter-productive. They suggest that many of those people concerned with organising or operating it fail to appreciate the broader implications it involves.

THE FAMILY GROUP

The literature dealing with children and young people, in respect of deviancy, emphasizes the potential importance of the family group in the life of a physically handicapped young person. The nuclear family and, depending upon factors such as regular contact with the disabled person, some of the extended family are affected by the deviant sanctions brought against the disabled member. Goffman (1963) explains that they are obliged to share some of the discredit which is accorded to the disabled person, pointing out that this is apportioned via the medium of a "courtesy stigma".

In addition to extrinsic pressures, such as those arising from stigmatization, the family group faces problems which are a direct result of the young person's physical incapacity. These difficulties fall into two

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

main categories, the mainly practical such as the provision of extra help and attention and the largely emotional. An example of the latter is the stressful adjustment parents undergo when trying to come to terms with the fact that their child is obviously outside the physical norm, which may engender feelings of guilt or rejection. Davis (1972) observes the way families deal with a physical handicap occurring within their own group. Some families of the more severely disabled, he reports, resort to such formulae as "there are others worse off" in an attempt to find a symbolic resting place. Goffman (1963) also agrees that the family is affected by the handicap of one sibling. He explains that the family group can play a significant part in the child's "moral career" by forming a capsule for the child and thus tending to attenuate some of the external pressures. This seems to have been common throughout the whole of the study group and especially evident during the children's early years. The influence of the family group is also emphasized by dealing with more general aspects of disabled young people's lives. The World Health Organizations's Manual of Terminology (1980b), implies that the family may even have a role in

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

establishing the child's handicap, when it draws attention to the fact that handicap is characterized by a discordance between an individual's actual performance or status and that which is expected of him by the groups of which he is a member.

The additional problems and demands which face the family of the physically disabled child generate extra stress. Baldwin (1977) compares a group of mothers of physically handicapped children with a group of mothers of able bodied children and finds that a greater proportion of the former wish to work and she concludes that the mothers of disabled children must feel a greater need to work. She also notes that approximately twenty per cent of the handicapped children's fathers are adversely affected by their children's handicaps. These claims find support in other works concerned with disabled children. Burton (1975) finds that twenty-six per cent of mothers and eleven per cent of fathers, of a group of children suffering from cystic fibrosis experience a feeling of isolation, due to community ignorance of their children's disease. Phillip and Duckworth (1982) outline the ambiguous situation of those related to stigmatized individuals. They explain

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

that during encounters with "normals" they can be required to be normal in the performance of their conventional social roles and yet different when their association with stigmatized individuals is manifested. They suggest that these parents carry an additional onerous burden in the form of their constant efforts to maintain a conventional parenthood and they note the stress as being apparent in three main areas, the physical burdens of care, the financial strain, and emotional and psychosomatic symptoms. It is ironic that members of the disabled young person's family, especially those in the nuclear family group who are most oppressed by the stress, may create additional stress for themselves and others by generating stressful encounters, in the place of daily social intercourse. As Goffman (1963) points out, the person with the courtesy stigma may cause both the normal and the stigmatized to feel uncomfortable, being always ready to carry a burden that is not his.

CONCLUSION

Many of the difficulties which are experienced by physically handicapped young people are clearly

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

demonstrated during the course of normal daily contacts. During such interaction even disinterested observers would, no doubt, be aware of disabilities such as an inability to walk, limited manipulative skills and communication problems caused by indistinct speech. Some difficulties such as restrictions on routine tasks like dressing, washing and a lack leisure opportunities are obvious after a little thought. However, other problems which are rooted in a wide framework of social mores and societal attitudes, though less apparent could present greater obstacles to disabled children's life chances. Both virtual social identity and self concept with regard to physically disabled children also seemed to become increasingly prominent considerations as the literature research progressed. Important though school may be to the social development of a child it is not the only site where limitations imposed by these obstacles operate. The physically handicapped young person's social encounters are affected by his/her own special status to such an extent that modified encounters become part of the routine of his/her daily life. Nevertheless the importance of the school is readily apparent. In common

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

with others Murphy (1979) sees the classroom as a centre of social learning.

The obvious significance of group affiliations, encountered during the course of the literature research concerned with deviancy, suggests that schooling has an important role in the deviant process. A denial of access to the local school, which is routinely accepted as a part of normal childhood, appears to be tantamount to publicly labelling the disabled child as deviant, and thereby endorsing or creating an inferior social status in respect of that child. One of the many ways that this will manifest itself will be through the medium of social interaction. Often the other people involved in this interaction are favourably disposed towards the young person concerned. In such a case they may offer assistance or special consideration, in other words, positive discrimination. However, any form of discrimination, positive or negative, is, in effect, evidence of the operation of deviant sanctions. The fact that community sanctions are prompted by the desire to assist does not lessen the negative impact which they will ultimately have on the social status of the young person to whom they are directed. This reduction of

CHAPTER ONE - BACKGROUND

status will, almost certainly constitute an impediment to the young person in question, during the course of his daily life.

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER TWO

DEFINING THE TERM "PHYSICAL HANDICAP"

INTRODUCTION

Since this piece of work will involve repeated references to physically handicapped young people it is necessary to offer some definition of "physical handicap", which could be applied to them. An obvious solution to this would be to adopt a definition such as the one offered by Harris (1971). He outlined the difference between impairment (the lack of part of or all of a limb, or having a defective limb, or organ or mechanisms of the body which stops or limits getting about, working or self care), a disability (the loss or reduction of functional ability) and a handicap (the disadvantage or restriction caused by disability). This would suffice where a mere indication of unspecified physical incapacity was needed, and, as such, will be of use as a quick reference for as Madge and Fassam (1982) point out the distinctions which Harris outlines are essentially uncontested.

However, this study is very much concerned with the details of the disadvantage and restrictions that

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

constitute the handicap, especially those components of the handicap which are not immediately apparent, such as the effects on social status, social interaction and identity. Therefore, in the current context, any serious interpretation of the term physical handicap must rise above the level of a shallow working definition and embrace that system of social structure and social mores which sets the parameters of daily life and transmits social pressures. These factors can have an important moulding effect on the personal identities of young people. Phillip and Duckworth (1982) conclude that the state of being handicapped owes much to existing societal values and is relative to other people. This chapter is an attempt to define physical handicap in a way that recognises the relevance of social factors and provides a useful frame of reference for recording and assessing data which is collected.

THE SOCIAL VALIDITY OF THE TERM

To assume, in this context, that the term "physically handicapped" refers to a reasonably clearly defined group would be, to some extent begging the question. However there is evidence for assuming that people who

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

are physically handicapped are generally regarded as members of a separate and undifferentiated group.

During a period of nine years I regularly conversed, on topics pertaining to physical disability and handicap, with members of the situational public and those whom Goffman (1963) refers to as "wise", in this instance people without physical handicap who were in regular contact with those who were physically handicapped and conversant with some of their problems and needs. The majority of these conversations were carefully noted in connection with data needed for some earlier work (Thornton 1986) and the present study. A review of the documented results of this is very revealing. The disabled people, who were the subjects of many of these conversations and collected comments, were almost invariably referred to as if they were a separate group, even if the respondents were members of the same nuclear family group. During a conversation about the determination shown by children who were affected by cerebral palsy one mother said, in praise of her son's recent progress, "We don't really know what they go through, we don't know what some of these things cost them do we?" Another mother commented, referring to some

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

of the restrictions she felt during conversations with her teenage son, "It's heartbreaking when you think they'll never be able to hop round and enjoy themselves like we did". This mode of reference was, in essence little different from that used by the situational public. When a member of staff at a special school was commended, by a casual acquaintance the compliment included the phrase "I couldn't work with them". Other indications of the fact that physically handicapped people are a distinct social group is to be found in the news media, as when "The Daily Telegraph", of the 23rd. of October 1981, in a summary of a report to the British Medical Association congress, referred to the chronically disabled as "the new lepers of society".

Indications of physically incapacitated people being accorded special group status, by society, is also to be found in the statutes which constitute the framework of the law and official governmental communications (see appendix I tables A and B). This is not entirely unexpected in view of the value placed upon personal characteristics by the courts. Goffman (1963) points out that personal identity is proved presumptively in courts of law, by evidence of similarities or differences in

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

personal characteristics. One piece of evidence for assuming physically handicapped people are regarded as a distinct social group is to be found in section 33(1) of the Education Act 1944 which directs that "the minister shall make regulations defining the several categories of pupils requiring special educational treatment". This is effectually establishing those categories, one of which was physically handicapped, and providing a legal basis for a socially defined category.

Other provisions of the same act tended to emphasize the special status that had been conferred on the disabled children by group membership. Section 38 directed that the normal school leaving age should not apply to them. They were not to leave until they had reached the age of sixteen whilst their contemporaries were allowed to leave at the age of fifteen. The physically disadvantaged children were now to be educated by "special methods", in the words of section 33 of the act, and be subject to modified regulations. Since the Education Act 1944 was regarded, at the time it was implemented, as a distinct improvement in educational opportunity, some of its provisions seem to be clear evidence of the validity of regarding

CHAPTER TWO-- DEFINING THE TERM

physically handicapped children as a distinct social group.

The Education Act 1944 is by no means the only piece of legislation or official publication which provides grounds for this supposition. Between 1851, when the "Cripples Home an Industrial Training Unit for Girls" was opened in Marylebone, London, and the Education Act 1981, physically disadvantaged children and young people have been regularly referred to in government documents and legislation (see appendix I tables A and B). During the latter part of this period especially, their group membership and special status has been further emphasized by articles in the press and endorsed by citing them as a disadvantaged group and a worthy focus for charity in connection with fund raising activities, carried out by community groups spanning a wide range of interests and a variety of social status.

The recognition that physically disabled young people form a distinct social group is, therefore, a longstanding tradition and the associated concept, that it is reasonable to regard disadvantaged children as members of separate groups, has been generally accepted, until well into the second half of this century. During

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

the 1966 International Conference of Special Educators, for instance, the recognition of more distinct categories of handicap was suggested. Probably the most powerful symbols of the differential social status of physically disabled children are the separate schools which the overwhelming majority of them have been expected to attend. However, even if the separate educational arrangements which were formerly, organized for them do not constitute a definite indication of this, they must have made a significant contribution towards the potency of the social label with which they are associated. Phillip and Duckworth (1982) point out that societal values are influenced by the institutional arrangements of society.

If the existence of this social category is to be presumed, then it seems reasonable to regard the study group as members of it, bearing in mind that all the members of the study group were either officially ascertained as "physically handicapped" (category "H" as was the current term) by their local education authority or recommended for enrolment at a school for physically handicapped children by the same body. The next logical step would then seem to be an attempt to establish the

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

common credentials and principal characteristics of the category, using the acquired detailed knowledge of the study group as a means of generating theory in this area.

PHYSICAL DISABILITY AS A MEANS OF DEFINITION

It is relevant to draw attention to the fact that, in terms of the London borough in which they live, the study group is a sample of a large section of the social category in question, that is those who have been officially recognized as group members via ascertainment as "category H" or recommendation for special education. Their eligibility for inclusion in this group may, at first sight, appear to be almost entirely dependent on their level of physical ability falling below an established norm, or level of attainment, because of organic malfunction or impairment. It might be difficult to achieve the establishment of the kind of physical norm needed for such a comparison, or the comprehensive examination needed to effect it. However, even allowing for the lack of precision in grading that might be thus caused, a survey of the physical attainments of the subjects of the study group casts some doubt upon the

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

dominance of physical ability, as a controlling factor.

The assumption that physical capability was of prime importance, with regard to the subjects of the study group being labelled as physically handicapped, is difficult to reconcile with some of the apparent discrepancies which exist within the study group. There seem to have been obvious inconsistencies, even in respect of the assessment of the handicapping effect of their physical disability. This was illustrated when four experienced teachers were questioned separately, concerning the appropriate classification of members of the study group. These questions were put to the teachers when the subjects were attending a primary special school. At this point the members of staff concerned had worked with them, in a class teaching situation, for at least six months. The number of pupils in each class varied between seven and eleven pupils. Each class contained at least one pupil who had been classified as "delicate". At that time this category ("J") was used for children whose main need was for close supervision and regular medication, typical conditions associated with this classification being asthma and epilepsy - the kind of disabilities often

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

encountered in mainstream schools before the implementation of the Education Act 1981. Those who had additional needs, such as physical help and special apparatus, were designated as "physically handicapped" (category "H"). Each of the teachers was asked if there was a child in her class who had been ascertained as "delicate" rather than physically handicapped. Three of them admitted they did not know. Two of them explained it was some time since they had occasion to look at the children's "S.E.2 s" (the current form used for medical assessment in connection with special school admission). The fourth teacher named two children but was correct only in one instance.

The teachers concerned seemed to be inclined to regard all the children in their classes as members of the same group, in spite of the very obvious wide variation in levels of disability. In the eyes of the teachers the level of their pupils' physical ability, which ranged from near "normal" to gross incapacitation, seemed to count for little, with regard to group membership, in comparison with the potency of the label which special school enrolment had conferred.

Such apparent confusion is not entirely unexpected

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

when some of the school placements, effected by the same local authority less than two years earlier, are considered. One child who had been classified as "delicate" was placed in the study school which was designated for physically handicapped children despite there being two schools for delicate children in close proximity to his home. During the same academic year as this placement I had been in contact with both schools, in connection with other proposed transfers. Information I obtained then and the size of the nominal rolls published by their respective local authorities indicated they had vacancies for additional day pupils and boarders. Both schools were used, previously and subsequently, by the child's home authority. Another pupil in the "delicate" category, who was a year and a half older, had been enrolled at a local mainstream school and was transferred to the study school at the age of eight. The records of his regular medical assessments revealed no deterioration in the renal malfunction which was stated to be his major physical disability and the only recent problem revealed by his school reports and records was a poor attendance record and several instances of truancy. Both children were

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

resident in the same local authority. Perhaps the reasons for such anomalous decisions are to be found in the nature of the assessment employed.

In this process, which was in operation until the implementation of the Education Act 1981, as many as three recommendations concerning a child's placement in a special school were provided. They were on forms "S.E.1", "S.E.2", and "S.E.3". These recommendations were then summarised, in form "S.E.4", to produce a final decision concerning the most appropriate placement for the child in question. Before the introduction of this system, at the end of 1977, the only standard form involved was the "4H.P.", a medical assessment. Under this system a child was designated as physically handicapped largely as the result of the assessment of one medical officer, especially if the child was below school age.

Under these circumstances objectivity, without the aid of precisely defined standards, may have been difficult to achieve, especially in view of the varied demands made on a medical officer responsible for similar assessments in respect of all the categories of handicap which were acknowledged at the time. This

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

difficulty may well have been exacerbated by lack of liaison with the other parties involved in the decision making process, a tendency of the other parties to prejudge the issue and the influence of the opinions of senior clinical colleagues who had been treating the child and monitoring his, or her, progress over a period of years. Unlike some other types of handicap, such as "E.S.N.(s)" which denoted slow learners, the classification of children as "physically handicapped" and "delicate" was almost entirely the prerogative of the medical officer. These circumstances, under which the assessments were executed, offer some explanation of the apparent inconsistencies they produced.

THE INFLUENCE OF INORGANIC FACTORS

Due consideration of some of the school admissions of the study group leaves much doubt about the physical assessment of the children concerned being the controlling factor in the selection of their educational placements, even if a large degree of inaccuracy is assumed. For instance, "D...", a pupil of the study school was admitted to a school for slow learners (E.S.N.(M) as the current term then was) for his

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

secondary education. This placement was commensurate with his recorded academic performance but it was effected without any improvement in his physical condition being noted, any special arrangements being made for his benefit, or any extra apparatus being provided, or requested.

Whilst D.... was attending the primary school for physically handicapped children another boy, "M...", a resident of the same borough, was attending a mainstream primary school. M... had also been assessed as "delicate" (category J). Like D.... his enrolment was preceded by a medical recommendation that his physical activities should be limited, but this suggested a much more severe restriction of physical activity than had been recommended for D.... In M...'s case close supervision was regarded as necessary to reduce the risk, even of very minor injury, to an abnormally low level.

If the medical classification of these two young people was accepted as an objective assessment in the spirit of the Ministry of Education Pamphlet Number 5, which defined the categories of handicap in 1946, then it would seem reasonable to assume that D...., the child

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

who needed less supervision, was placed in a special educational environment because he needed extra support to cater for other needs arising from his background. An appraisal of the backgrounds of these children clearly suggests that this is not so.

At the time of these school admissions M... lived with his parents, who were both unskilled and unemployed, in a council housing estate close to industrial development. His eldest sister had been adopted during the first few weeks of her life, one of the other three siblings was in the care of the local authority, at the time of his enrolment and he had been "in care" himself. During a preliminary meeting, concerned with M...'s transfer from a mainstream school to the special school an educational psychologist said of his mother and father, "they are very inadequate parents" and warned "they are going to need a lot of extra support". In contrast to this D...'s parents were owner-occupiers of a house on a private estate, where the complete family group lived together. His parents appeared to be supportive, his father had, apparently, declined to accept promotion on the grounds that the job offered would entail occasional absences from home,

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

which might affect the level of support he could offer D..... . Since it seems unlikely that social deprivation would elicit reduced support from the education authority concerned there is little in this comparison to suggest that the children's backgrounds prompted the apparent anomaly concerned with school admissions.

A comparison of the childhood needs and physical disabilities of the pupils attending the study school (see appendix II - summaries of personal details) casts doubts upon any suggestion that physical disability and organic inefficiency were the controlling factors with regard to school placements of physically disadvantaged children. Other examples of school admissions do little to dispel these doubts. For example, while the two children, D.... and M..., who were assessed as "delicate" were being educated in a school for physically handicapped children three other children, who were officially regarded as being subject to greater physical disadvantage, being classified as "physically handicapped", were being educated in a mainstream school.

Since the selection of special schools and the results of medical reviews do not seem to tally then the

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

medical assessments were clearly, for this purpose, of limited use. The value of an attempted objective assessment of the physical limitations, in the case of many members of the study group, appears to have had only a minor influence on the decision to admit them to a school for physically handicapped children, or label them as physically handicapped. These decisions were clearly effected according to a more complex picture of the children concerned. Therefore, other influences, previously touched on, such as societal values, social background, or even irrational prejudice, deserve serious consideration, as potentially important contributory factors, in the matter of the labelling process.

MOVEMENT TOWARDS A LESS RIGID VIEW OF PHYSICAL HANDICAP

With the seventies came the development of a more forceful expression of opinions that challenged the validity of the existing special educational categories and segregated education. This led to a change in the emphasis which the educational establishment gave to the role of the special school in the fabric of the education system. At this time awareness of social

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

responsibility had come to be regarded as a desirable part of the curriculum of most mainstream schools and the resultant "community services programmes" which mushroomed tended to encourage contacts with special schools, even if merely to use them as a focus of charity.

Simultaneously, as questions were being asked in the wake of work by people such as Anderson (1971 and 1973), special schools for physically handicapped children became aware of the sense of isolation which was associated with segregated education and began to seek contact with mainstream schools. The "Warnock Report" (1978), which proposed the concept of a "continuum of special educational need rather than discrete categories of handicap", spearheaded this reform trend when it was published in 1978. The committee of enquiry proposed "new conceptual framework in which special educational provision should be made".

This heralded the changes introduced by the Education Act 1981 when ascertainment by a medical officer, which entailed the formal categorization of some children as physically handicapped, officially ceased. Such a term was, thenceforth, to be used only for descriptive

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

purposes. After the implementation of this act there was to be a general assessment of children's ability and a recommendation concerning the children's educational requirements as a result of this. This new system was calculated to produce increased flexibility and thus greater opportunity for children such as the physically disadvantaged.

The success of this particular strategy is open to doubt. After the introduction of the Act children were still being admitted to the study school following recommendations that they were admitted to a specific category of school or even a named school. This fact, taken together with general descriptions such as "delicate" or "physically handicapped", could be said to categorize them just as effectively as the "4HP" ascertainment form of the sixties or the "S.E.2" medical assessment form of the seventies, notwithstanding the pronouncements of the Education Act 1981. In this connection it was interesting to note that the 1984 edition of the "Education Authorities Directory" still listed some special schools in a section labelled "physically handicapped".

During 1988 I enquired, in a mainstream school which

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

was designated to cater for the special educational needs of physically disabled children, about the enrolment of physically handicapped pupils since the implementation of the Act. The member of staff with special responsibility for children with special needs explained "Oh yes we have some physically handicapped kids but we call them children with special needs these days". He later referred to the children with special needs as "statemented children" (a reference to the statements concerning their needs required by the 1981 act). However, during a subsequent explanation of the organisation of his department he referred to them several time as "the physically handicapped" and twice as "the handicapped". I visited the secondary school which was principally involved in the integration scheme, during the same year. The head of department responsible for "special needs" anticipated the purpose of my visit, opining that I had "come mainly to talk about the physically handicapped children"

There are grounds for claiming that the attitude of the education establishment towards the physically disabled has evolved in concert with development in the mainstream sector of education. The implementation of

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

the Education Act 1944 eventually introduced the previously mentioned "4H.P.". This form represented a recommendation dominated, in the case of physically disabled children, by the assessment of an authorities' Medical Officer of Health. Before the advent of the nineteen seventies it was quite usual for the academic potential of the child involved to be assessed by the same examining medical officer, usually with the aid of a "W.I.S.C.".

This method was gradually replaced by the system referred to earlier, which employed three basic recommendations. The first was the opinion of the head teacher of the child's current school, where this was applicable, which was contained in the form S.E.1, the second a medical officer's recommendation was contained in the form S.E.2 and the third was an educational psychologist's assessment, which used form S.E.3. These three recommendations were then summarised on form S.E.4. The replacement system represented progress in the sense that it was the result of a much wider based, multi-disciplinary assessment. The changes prompted by the Education Act 1981 further advanced the process of assessment. Now it is possible for the physically

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

disadvantaged child's limitations and needs to be examined, discussed, documented and provided for within the mainstream system, without a recommendation that he, or she, is segregated from it, which is virtually what the S.E. forms were.

It is unlikely, however that the changes in the methods used for the categorization of physically handicapped children indicate a fundamental change in societal valuation of these young people. The new methods are more likely to be evidence of a modification of the methods used to implement existing rules, which apply to the system of status that has evolved in concert with the development of society, as Frankenberg (1982) points out anyone's opinion of who belongs to any particular category must relate to the rules for being "in" or "out" of that category. The alteration of the system may well be prompted by mere convenience or by society's more sophisticated self image, which developed in response to widely heralded technological advances and disseminated claims of progress. For instance, during the late forties, when the vast majority of the special schools for physically handicapped children were residential establishments,

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

admission to a special school might imply custodial care, especially for a severely handicapped child.

In this situation the largely unquestioned judgement of the medical officer, in response to other members of the community structure, which determined a child's removal from the mainstream system and enrolment at a special school, bore striking similarities to a committal procedure. Whereas the procedures connected with the completion of the "S.E." forms, including discussions with parents, were more in line with case conferences, which became common practice during the development of the social services during the sixties and the seventies.

Similarly the present emphasis on the provision of detailed information, to pupils' parents and the stress placed upon the importance of parental opinion is probably the result of recent trends towards the increased accountability of organisations and institutions, towards the individual. For instance, it bears more than a passing resemblance to the recent moves towards a more consumer orientated society, with the enactment of the Consumer Credit Act 1974, the Unfair Terms of Contract Act 1977, the Sale of Goods Act

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

1979 and the Consumer Protection Act 1986.

The methods of categorizing children have changed, in tune with societal development, but those children and young people subject to physical disadvantage are still labelled and accorded modified social status. Nevertheless as social development is signified by change in other aspects of life so it is reasonable to suppose there may have been some small changes in attitudes towards those who are physically disadvantaged. Such changes, though significant as a testament to evolutionary progress, are small. In terms of the inferior social status which is concomitant with disability, they have provided only minor improvements in the deviant status associated with physical disadvantage. Would it be reasonable to expect any more from what amounts to modifications of procedure and nomenclature? As Lofland (1969) points out, the concept of deviance remains highly general and highly abstract.

THE EFFECT OF LABELLING

An examination of the personal details of the young people who are subjects of this study (see summaries appendix II) reveals that over twelve per cent of them

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

of the study group) could, throughout the whole period of their school attendance, have been regarded as "normals" in virtually all of those situations in their daily lives, which were liable to be witnessed by the situational public. Their major disabilities include a heart defect, renal malfunction and epilepsy.

The labelling, which was a consequence of their admission to a special school, was the result of a wider, much more socially oriented view of them than could be defined by the narrow concept of organic incapacity and its concomitant difficulties. Their reports of day-to-day interaction, included expressions of disappointment and disillusionment. Their labels induced the situational public to virtually ignore obvious physical abilities of these young people and they were regarded as members of the same homogenous group as those of their schoolmates who were obviously severely limited in their physical capabilities.

There were indications, during the school careers of these young people, that the labels they had acquired would be enduring and might ultimately have a detrimental effect on their life chances. In the three comprehensive schools, into which members of the study

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

group were "integrated" there was evidence that both staff and pupils alike had accorded all the disabled pupils special status, irrespective of the degree of limitation of their disabilities, or even in absence of any knowledge of their disabilities. Material collected during informal conversations and interviews with school staff and the subjects of this study indicated that the integrated former special school pupils were exempt from many school rules and accepted practices. They were allowed to enter the school building at times when their classmates were excluded, allowed to use doors which were used only by staff, excused late marks if they did not arrive in time for registration and in at least one school they were exempt from sanctions if their homework was not handed in on time. Part of my professional duties, in connection with the implementation of an integration programme (referred to in the chapter "Integration in Operation") involved my working in a mainstream school for a period of a full academic year and my observations in that situation were in complete accord with these claims.

Some of these concessions were appropriate in individual instances, such as the case of a child who

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

arrived at school in a hire car, a "late mark" may not be appropriate if his hire car arrived late. It could also be appropriate for someone to be allowed to use a door providing direct access to his, or her, classroom from the car park, if that young person was a particularly slow mover and the usual route involved traversing a much greater distance. However these exemptions from rules and sanctions were applied to all the labelled children, irrespective of capabilities or needs and this appeared to find general accord throughout the school, even among those pupils whose parents were unhappy about integrated education.

During the course of working in a comprehensive school I noted many instances of the revised social standards that were applicable to the "disabled" pupils only. On one occasion a girl was reprimanded for the use of unacceptable language during an argument with a classmate and excused her behaviour by claiming that she lost her temper, claiming it was the fault of her classmate, explaining that he had grumbled that M..... (a member of the study group) was allowed to go through a preparation room on his way to a science laboratory (something which was forbidden to pupils on the grounds

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

of safety). Her classmate hotly denied this claiming "I only said he was lucky 'cos he could stay inside". She interjected quickly "There you are you see fancy calling poor M..... lucky". On another occasion a group of children reported a classmate to their form tutor for throwing snowballs at an "integrated" pupil and they were warmly commended for this action which, had it involved only the host school population, would have transgressed codes of accepted conduct.

Suspicious, thus generated, regarding the lasting effect of the label later proved to be well founded. One young woman, a member of the study group, had originally suffered from a congenital heart defect. After corrective surgery, at the age of twelve, she was transferred to a mainstream school. At the age of twenty she told of discrimination she had experienced a year earlier when she compared the responses elicited by herself and a school-friend of hers when they attended a preliminary interview for an office job. She said of the friend "He's got exactly the same qualifications as me and yet they passed him." She explained he's able-bodied" but pointed out "we had these tests, I got ninety-five per cent in one and a hundred per cent in

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

the other he got seventy-five per cent in one and eighty per cent in the other and he got a pass." She recalled the explanation she was given as "You've passed alright but I think you're a bit over-qualified for this job and I think you'd be better going to the M.S.C. (Manpower Services Commission scheme)". The young woman explained that such an attitude was quite common, commenting on another occasion, "If they know you're disabled they won't even give you a chance". At the time of the interview she was employed by the Metropolitan Police in a clerical capacity. Apparent restrictions on opportunities such as this seem to add substance to the World Health Organization's definition (1980a) that, handicaps are disadvantages preventing the fulfilment of roles that are normal (depending upon age, sex, and social and cultural factors).

CONCLUSION

There is little doubt that the term "physically handicapped" has a specific meaning in the field of education. Until the enactment of the Education Act 1981 being one of the official categories of handicap for which special education was deemed appropriate, its

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

validity was endorsed by act of parliament and ministerial regulation (see appendix I table B 1944 and 1945). An acceptance of general use and wide understanding of the term was also clear from its function as a descriptive label, which is still permissible (see appendix I table B 1978). The term was, and still is, used ostensibly to delineate a category solely on grounds of organic incompetency. However, if the term is accepted as such there is an inexplicably high number of anomalies and inconsistencies which are difficult to account for, even in the instance of highly unlikely scenarios such as widespread gross incompetency throughout large areas of the medical profession.

It is, therefore, clear that the group of children and young people to which the term refers is defined on a much wider basis than physical characteristics. A careful consideration of the study group, for instance, reveals a wide variety of physical disability and an equally wide variety of abilities, personal characteristics, personal attainment, home backgrounds and social backgrounds. Nevertheless they are largely considered by the situational public to be members of the same homogenous group, even though, at the time

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

categories had legal status, some of them were not classified as physically handicapped, but as delicate. The rare exceptions to this, in the case of the study group were reported to me as those situations when they were able to "pass" (as Goffman 1963 defines the term), in respect of both their physical disabilities and their attendance at a special school or other institution which provided special education.

The only thing that all these young people had in common was special school enrolment during childhood, in some cases for only a small part of the subject's education. This fact in itself appears to be enough to warrant a social label and a changed identity, in line with Goffman's assertion (1963) that the nature of an individual is generated by his group affiliations.

Special school admission embraces complex considerations and decisions, but the ultimate result entails the children concerned being designated as members of a social category, not merely an educational one. The views and reported experiences of the study group, collected over a period of more than ten years, when examined in some detail supported a general impression gained from comments about social

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

interaction, made by the parents and members of the study group during recent interviews. This was that children and young people perceived to be physically handicapped were regarded as being in a separate social category, a deviant group, by the situational public and that this perception of handicap depended upon the judgement that they would be unable to fulfil the expectations of role according to age, sex, social and family background.

Therefore the young person who is known to have been admitted to a special school or appears to have been unable to take advantage of mainstream education, because of physical impediment, will be automatically accorded deviant status. As Squibb (Barton and Tomlinson - 1981) points out a child who is "seen by a teacher as not being able to achieve normal educational goals within the normal educational experience may be defined as special". However some of those whose disabilities were slight and inconspicuous might, but for special school admission, have been accepted as members of the main social group. This calls to mind Tomlinson's assertion (1982) that special education provides more

CHAPTER TWO- DEFINING THE TERM

"problematic labels than any other part of the educational system".

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Some of the methods used for this study were adapted to take advantage of those factors which were only fully appreciated as the study progressed, such as the current attitudes of the respondents and the amount of information which was available on a specific topic. It is therefore true to say that, to a limited extent, the procedures employed were evolved during the course of the execution of the study. However, these changes were merely minor adjustments calculated to effect a more opportunistic approach. The research programme was largely composed of routines and techniques which had been decided upon at the outset and carefully selected before the main body of the work began.

THE LITERATURE

Much information was available from the literature on the subject of research methods which, though inappropriate to this study, provided useful background

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

material. Some of this furnished cautions about the particular line of attack which might be selected. This was the case with work by Knorr-Cetina and Cicourel (1981), which discusses both the micro and macro approaches to sociology and draws attention to the pitfalls in researching social problems. By implication the authors draw attention to the limitations of any one view of society as they discuss the shortcomings of both approaches, whilst indicating the important contribution that each can make. This work also emphasizes the value of material that may come from other, often neglected, sources such as evidence of the reflexive thoughts of those participating in social interaction and points out the importance of things such as conversational rules and the role of local conditions.

Other works used were more directly applicable to this study and, with regard to research methods, were written in a more instructive mode. They gave rise to much serious consideration. In this category was Tremblay's description of the "key informant technique" (Kroeber 1953). This was also the case with Burgess (1982, 1984a, 1984b, 1985), both in his work on research in education and research in a wider context. He

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

strongly recommends a very definite structure for any research, but he points out (Burgess 1982) that, to attempt to adhere rigidly to this format is to try to attain perfection. In the same work Honigman, enlarges upon techniques of non-probability judgement sampling, such as the opportunistic sampling referred to as "chunk sampling", which emphasizes the value of such things as, available records, informal conversations, remarks overheard and attending meetings connected with research subjects.

Lofland (1971) also offers considerable help, when he compares and contrasts qualitative and quantitative analysis pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches to research. He offers detailed descriptions of the methods used by observers who choose the qualitative approach and suggests efficient methods of collecting material for this, including detailed comments on participant observation. He recommends that field notes are kept and outlines a method of sorting the notes into "general clusters" as part of the process of creating files. This, he advocates, will tend to lend more flexibility to the classification of data. Bogdan and Taylor (1975) outline the "positive searches for

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

facts and causes through methods such as survey questionnaires, inventories and demographic analysis, which produce quantitative data". However, they emphasize that the method of the phenomenologist is to seek understanding through qualitative methods and, hence, to attempt to see the world as his subjects see it. Schartz and Jacobs (1979) also expand on some of the main advantages of qualitative methods.

Looking at the same kind of research Glaser and Strauss (1967) offer instruction with regard to research techniques, describing the method of generating grounded theory and outlining its connection with a qualitative approach to sociological research. They emphasise the importance of a continuous review of material collected and suggest this as a way to establish categories for the classification of collected data. Using this method, they explain it is necessary to look for categories to emerge from the data. They draw attention to the advantage that this approach offers, over the alternative, of imposing research categories externally. In common with some of the previously mentioned qualitative methods, the approach they advocated seemed to be particularly suitable for this piece of research.

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

It was, therefore a technique which I used. Material was collected throughout the course of this study, using various methods. In addition to this, the research drew on data concerning the subjects of the study, which had been collected during the seven years preceding the beginning of the current piece of work and this included documentary evidence which pre-dated the beginning of this study by more than twenty years.

Yin (1984) details the value of a qualitative approach, in the form of case studies, including multiple case studies. His work also seemed to offer a potentially valuable framework for this research. This was especially relevant in view of his comments on the suitability of case studies observation of a contemporary phenomenon. He explains that it could be operated within its real life context, not divorced from its context as a quantitative study, which focussed on a few variables, might tend to be. He stresses the value of care taken, with regard to the selection and interpretation of materials, suggesting that any final report should be limited to critical pieces of evidence. In addition he advocates a continuing re-appraisal of conclusions and re-writing of reports. For this purpose

he recommends the use of a micro-computer, a tool which was found particularly useful during the course of this study. Much of the approach which Yin outlines also offers distinct advantages, to anyone dealing with the large and varied amount of material which was available for this study. Yin points out that the unique strength which a case study offers the researcher is its ability to deal with a large body of evidence in a wide variety of forms.

THE SELECTION OF THE STUDY GROUP

This study is concerned with a sample of young people who were former pupils of a school for physically handicapped children, which was situated in a North London borough. They were educated in a variety of ways. Some attended special schools only. Others received special education at the nursery school stage only and the rest attended special schools and mainstream school in varying proportions. Details concerning one hundred and twenty-five young people were available from the earlier study which prompted this piece of work (see appendix I table C). They represented all those children who had been admitted to the study school during a

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

period of twenty-five years. From this list the sample of young people, on whom this study was to be based, was chosen. A pilot study was carried out and, during the course of this, their details were updated. This was to check their current status with regard to their availability for inclusion in the study group but it also provided useful background information for possible future reference. From this updated list the study group, of thirty-two was chosen.

The size of and the study group was influenced by two main factors. The first was connected with the vast amount of potentially useful detailed information which was obtainable with regard to most subjects. In these circumstances the number of subjects about whom it was a practical proposition for one person to attempt to construct a multiple case study was limited by the time available and the large amount of material which came readily to hand. Such a wide range of material was available to be collected in respect of each subject that the data handling alone promised to be very time consuming indeed. The second factor which affected the size of the group was that, within an attempt to leave more time for each individual subject by reducing the

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

number included, it was necessary to maintain a size which was viable in the context of a qualitative study such as this. As Lofland (1971) points out studies based on intensive interviewing have typically used between twenty and fifty interviews.

Careful examination revealed the number of young people who were suitable for inclusion in this group was limited if I was to avoid the compilation of an obviously biased group. Some of those about whom I had detailed information up to the age of sixteen, including school records and details of parental views, were no longer available for interview. Several no longer lived in the area and six had died, a circumstance which precluded the possibility of including any young men suffering from muscular dystrophy. In one instance only was selection impractical because of lack of cooperation. The father of one young woman explained that his wife was suffering from Parkinson's disease, at an advanced stage, and he was unable to find sufficient time for an interview.

Before I finalized the selection of the study group I decided on the minimum requirements, in connection with each subject. They included detailed background

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

information from the potential subject's childhood. As with other material collected, care was taken to select only data for which corroboration was available. Except in those instances where this could be reasonably regarded as fact, such as the claim of an increased angle of flexion of a limb in a report from a clinical examination where a goniometer would obviously be used, triangulation was regarded as necessary. An apparent statement of fact, for instance, would not usually be accepted as valid material unless it was corroborated by another person with access to the same information or by documentary evidence.

The exceptions to this occurred when there was additional evidence from the same source. For example opinions offered by the parents of a subject, with regard to a particular form of education, which were concomitant with their actions over a period of years and in accord with their documented statements which they had made separately during a comparable period. As Bott (1957) pointed out, "people re-interpret the past in the light of their present experience". Yin (1984) also cautioned that during the process of participant observation "informal manipulation can occur".

One source of such corroboration was the large body of documentary evidence which I had accumulated during the period which extended from the beginning of my previously mentioned study to the end of the pilot study for the current work. Other basic requirements for the members of the study group were detailed interviews with both the subject and at least one of his or her parents or adoptive parents. The data thus collected helped to substantiate some of the material used in the selection process.

THE STUDY GROUP

In line with the precursory study it was clearly necessary to use a study group which, in terms of physical disabilities, was broadly representative of those young people who had been pupils of the special school (see appendix I tables C and D). In view of this, after taking the aforementioned conditions into consideration, thirty-two children only were eligible for inclusion in the study group (see appendix II for summary of their personal details).

The group was chosen by their status with regard to the work about to be tackled, in the manner which

Honigman (Burgess 1982) suggests as a suitable form of non-probability sampling for ethnographic fieldwork and refers to as "judgement sampling". The ages of the subjects, of whom the group was composed, ranged from seventeen to twenty-seven years. The severity of their handicaps, using the term as outlined by Harris (1971), varied widely and were the result of many different forms of damage and disability (see appendix I table E for a summary of the effects of their physical disabilities).

One young woman was subject to a severe quadriplegia and seemed to be regarded as anarthric by all her regular contacts except her mother. Even her father and her brother needed translation, and had always done so, even for very basic communication. She was unable to attend to her own basic functions and daily living requirements, such as using a lavatory, washing, feeding herself, dressing or moving around on a level surface. Even when using a wheelchair she needed assistance to negotiate a spacious living room. Another subject was awaiting a heart-lung transplant and one of the other young men in the study group died during the time I was preparing the second draft of this piece of work.

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

In contrast two other people included in the group seemed to have experienced little, or no, difficulty in "passing", as Goffman (1963) defined the term, in many day to day situations where their disabilities were not known to the other participants. Other members of the group experienced varying degrees and types of difficulties concerned with daily life which bridged the gap between these two extremes. In addition to those members of the group who were limited by such conditions as quadriplegia, hemiplegia, diplegia and paraplegia, imposed by disabilities such as cerebral palsy and spina bifida, there were members of the study group who were subject to conditions which had more general effects on their daily lives. These included congenital heart disease and epilepsy.

Some of the group were subject to multiple handicaps. For example most of those who suffered from spina bifida were also subject to hydrocephalus, and disphasia and disarthria affected most of those young people in the group who were handicapped by cerebral palsy. The range of their physical limitation was almost matched by a correspondingly wide range of academic attainment within the group. One young man completed his education in a

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

school for E.S.N. (m) children and another was engaged in the final year of a B.A. course at the time he was interviewed.

The diversity of the study group was also reflected in their social backgrounds, including home circumstances. The social class of their families, as designated by the Registrar General's classification, spanned classes one to five, but there was a minority of subjects from classes one and two, in fact, only two families in social class one. The details of the subjects' home circumstances also covered a wide range of possibilities. Their homes were to be found both in private residential areas and council estates which contained some of the more disadvantaged residents of the London borough in which the study was conducted. Four of the subjects were members of single-parent families, the parents being an unmarried mother, a divorcee, and two widowers. The mother of another subject was dead and the subject had been deserted by her father. At the time of the interview she was living with adoptive parents.

Only a minority of the group were in regular employment but most of the rest were engaged in a

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

variety of full-time activities or part-time activities including full-time education at a polytechnic, further education, residential education courses specifically for the disabled, training schemes and regular attendance at a day centre.

The current occupations of the parents were similarly diverse. They included a company director, a skilled professional, unskilled labourers, craftsmen, career-women, housewives, invalids, two who were unemployed and a parent on bail awaiting trial on a criminal charge. This subsequently resulted in a prison sentence.

SELECTING A SUITABLE STRATEGY

After the methods used for the precursory study were examined for flaws and weaknesses and the differing requirements of the current research were noted, the problem of selecting a suitable methodological approach to the work in hand was addressed. Obviously there was an interdependence between the methods employed in this work and the composition of the study group. I attempted to take advantage the more widely accepted research methods that are in current use. For example I selected the work of Burgess as particularly applicable. The

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

approach he advocates pays particular attention to the context of the work and accentuates the possible sources of influence and distortion. In common with others he draws attention (Burgess 1984B) to the relevance of the age and experience of the researcher and the place of the research within his/her biography. He also draws attention to the possible influence of colleagues. Such comments served to emphasize the fact bias is unavoidable, and thus underlined the care needed during both the collection and analysis of data. In the same work Burgess points out that many studies are allied to previous research and that an indication of the findings of this should be stated as an essential part of the current study.

It was important, at this juncture, to be mindful of the particular requirements and limitations of the working situation in which the study was to be carried out. Special attention was paid to those methods which might allow the fullest use of the kind of data which was available. Thus it was hoped to minimize the potential weaknesses that were inherent in the work situation and the standpoint from which the work was approached. As Burgess (1984A) points out there is a

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

danger of bias and prior judgements in situations where observation may be affected by "feeling".

A consequence of focussing on the characteristics of the secondary impediments which had been found to handicap the young people during their schooldays was that the study developed a sociological bias. This was due to the emergence of some of the issues most closely associated with these handicaps, such as deviancy, stereotype, stigma and role assignment.

During the course of a search for background information and personal edification in these areas some of the literature associated with these topics provided instruction in respect of research techniques. For instance, Goffman (1974) writes about participant observation, outlining the way this technique operates and explaining some of its advantages, such as the fact that material can be continuously and informally collected.

I used this method of obtaining research material quite extensively especially in the earlier part of the data collection process. During this time my professional responsibilities included involvement in decision making processes concerned with the study

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

group. This necessitated my taking part in discussions which involved a variety of people including teachers, in both mainstream and special schools, members of the study group and their parents. The role that was thus allotted to me provided suitable opportunities for participant observation of which I took advantage. I was also able to make use of similar material, which was collected for the precursory study (Thornton 1986), but not used. My continuing connections also provided many more recent chances to operate the same technique. For example, I received invitations to social gatherings and pressure group meetings and my residence in the area served by the study school means that I participate in regular bona fide social interaction with study group members and their families.

I also decided to utilise the semi-structured interview as one of the main methods of collecting research material. This allowed the investigation of a pre-determined set of topics in each interview, whilst allowing enough flexibility to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities which were presented during the course of the process. For instance, access to an unexpectedly large amount of information was not

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

hampered by a rigid question structure. The technique also allowed for exchanges between the interviewer and interviewee which corresponded more nearly to social interaction and hence stimulated the information exchange and exploited personal relationships to this end.

It was apparent that, if I was to be able to satisfy the requirements of the detailed follow-up sought by this work, there seemed to be no viable alternative to the use of a qualitative method. Such a strategy would enable me to exploit the particular circumstances in which I was working. The holistic picture of the study group and their social situation, which I sought, was unlikely to be obtained through the medium of a quantitative approach for, as Bogdan and Taylor (1975) point out, "qualitative research strives for understanding" and "descriptive material is unlikely to be quantifiable". Therefore, after the completion of a pilot study, I began the current piece of work, using a qualitative approach, in multiple case form.

As Yin (1989) explains, in this mode individuals are regarded as "subunits" and "replication" of events or subjects' experiences are of major significance.

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

Therefore, the underlying rationale, he explains, differs from that of "sampling logics". I duly heeded his caution that this type of approach can often be beyond the resources of a single person and proceeded only after recollecting the large amount of material that was readily available to me. I was also sure that this approach would yield considerable dividends for, as Yin (1989) points out the appropriate view of cases studies is a "pluralistic" one and "each strategy can be used for all three purposes- exploratory, descriptive or explanatory".

The method decided upon, however, did not conform strictly to any one of the aforementioned strategies. The use of a longitudinal perspective was necessary if a holistic appreciation of the evolving problems of the subjects was to be obtained and the available data is to be used to best advantage.

THE COLLECTION OF DATA

Most of the interviews which took place were arranged during the course of social or semi-social contacts with the interviewees, or members of their family group. This was possible because of the reinforcement of social

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

bonds that was a fortunate consequence of a previous piece of work (Thornton 1986). Typical of the manner in which such arrangements were made occurred when I happened to meet the mother of one, who had just emerged from a supermarket. During the course of an exchange of pleasantries she asked me if I was "keeping busy". I explained that I was involved in another piece of work and asked if I might "cadge" some help from her and briefly outlined my need to arrange interviews, assuring her of confidentiality, "just like last time". She readily agreed to my request and asked, "Do you want to talk to F--- (her husband) and G----- (her son) as well?" When I indicated that I did, she gave me her telephone number and suggested I ring her home during the evening to finalize arrangements, saying, "He'll be in after seven". On another occasion the mother of another member of the group, having heard from G-----'s mother that I was interested in "talking to the parents of St M----'s pupils" (the study school), telephoned and volunteered to help. Reactions such as these and the fact that I was able to benefit from an opportunistic approach, because of previously developed contacts emphasized some of the advantages of the type of

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

extensive long term study, which Watson (1977) maintains field work should be.

I attempted, where possible, to interview both parents of each subject but I was unable to achieve this, largely because some of the fathers, in spite of a friendly response when we met, seemed to be reluctant to be interviewed in response to a formal request. Four fathers from two parent families were willing to be interviewed but expressed a wish to be interviewed with their wives, rather than separately, and although one of them dominated the interview the others tended to contribute in a somewhat passive way. Most of their contributions were in the form of nods of agreement. However, the other fathers whom I met chatted to me quite happily over a drink or a cup of tea, freely expressing opinions on the same topics which I would have introduced in an interview. With the exception of one man, who was particularly keen to ensure confidentiality and emphasised that this was a condition of his assent, they all readily agreed when I asked permission to cite their opinions in my work. In most cases they seemed to be flattered by my interest.

Finding that new material could be collected from

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

what was ostensibly socialising, rather than interviewing formally and sensing a certain amount of tension associated with the use of a tape recorder, I broadened my methods of collecting material. In most cases this initially entailed my accepting a cup of tea after the interview was concluded and stimulating conversation about the topics in which I was interested.

I often used my work on this study as a convenient conversational gambit for introducing topics to influence the direction of the conversation. In most cases it proved productive to arrange extra meetings, with the declared objective of collecting extra information on one particular point, and repeat the process. In effect every interviewee was interviewed at least twice, once using a semi-structured interview technique and at least once using an unstructured form of interview. I regarded these interviews as a particularly valuable source of research material. As Thompson (1978) points out "oral evidence" is rich and includes "social clues, the nuances of uncertainty, humour, or pretence, as well as the texture of the dialect".

At the outset of the study I had some qualms about

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

the possible discomfort that I might inadvertently cause by asking the parents to recall fears and disappointments which they had experienced during the earlier part of their children's lives. I was rather uneasy about the possibility of prompting the kind of introspection that might be engendered by my asking them to explain such things as their fears of the future and their attitudes to others. Once I began interviewing my misgivings about this topic began to fade quickly. For the most part the parents seemed to welcome the opportunity of talking freely with someone who was known to them but not an integral part of their community enclave. They seemed to regard me as someone whom they knew, from previous experience, they could trust and they probably derived some comfort or even therapeutic benefit from our encounters.

The material, from these interviews with the members of the group and their parents, was added to data, which had been collected in connection with the previously mentioned study. As Glaser and Strauss advise (1967), I took care not to overlook perfectly good documentary material, in this case details of such things as school reports, medical assessments and written communications

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

between parents and school. Information was also obtained from interviews with teachers from six schools. These particular schools were chosen because they had been involved in the education of members of the study group and currently employed staff who had taught them. Interviews were conducted with some of the staff of these schools who taught physically disabled pupils. Other teachers were also interviewed because they had taught members of the study group at various stages of their school careers. As with other interviews careful note was taken of any comments made outside the formal interview. In the case of teachers this usually involved a general staff-room discussion during morning break and lunch time, which provided opportunities for participant observation. Being conscious of the potential value of such opportunities, I further cultivated my connections with the schools and teaching staff in question, attending school productions and fund raising activities.

The semi-structured technique adopted was very similar for all categories of people (see appendix III for examples of transcripts of interviews). Previously prepared notes, which contained lists of important

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

topics and points of interest were used. The composition of these was not finalized until after a pilot study had been conducted with those members of the study group who had not been selected for inclusion in the study group.

These notes were not shown to the interviewee or discussed with him/her, beforehand. Before the interview began I was careful to assure the subject of confidentiality, explaining that whilst I intended to make full use of all the information I collected, care would be taken to see that the person from whom it came was not identified. However I pointed out the possibility of someone who read my eventual presentation making an accurate guess at the identity of the study group member to whom a particular piece of information referred. I suggested that this was more likely if the subject's background was well known to that person, including the subject's connection with me. This seemed to be little or no cause for concern for any of the interviewees.

The subject's permission to record the interview on tape was then sought. This being obtained I then switched on a tape recorder. Two machines were used and each was loaded with a ninety minute recording tape

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

allowing forty-five minutes continuous recording on each machine. This was done to avoid unnecessary interruption when the end of a tape was reached. The recorders were placed on the floor, usually under my chair or a table and operated by small foot switches under my feet and were activated by a slight pressure of the heel. Since the microphones were small and held in my hand, the recorders were reasonably unobtrusive. It seemed that in many, if not all, cases the interviewee either ignored the recorders, or spoke as if he/she, was unaware of them.

To the data thus collected, I added notes concerning relevant comments I had heard from the interviewee often immediately after an interview had been formally terminated. The material thus collected was then collated with that found by other means .

THE DATA

As mentioned previously, a very large body of material had been amassed, relating to the subjects of this research, before the study actually began. Much of this seemed to be potentially useful. For example, having worked, as head teacher at the study school, I

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

had access to carefully maintained files on the subjects of this study, including all the written communications between the school and the subjects' parents and copies of letters to the parents from other sources during a period in excess of sixteen years. In addition to this more formal documentation was a source of data such as opinions and facts recorded in assessments and reports, from people of a diversity of professional disciplines.

These dated back, through the schooldays of the survey subjects, to the early part of their lives. For instance, some of this documentation contained records of opinions expressed by parents of the group members, at intervals between the children's second and seventeenth birthdays. Much of this was available as a direct result of working with the same subjects during the course of their formal education, in both primary and secondary schools. This included work in both integrated and segregated educational settings.

My prolonged professional connection with the group led to social contacts, with both the subjects and their parents which continued long after any professional responsibility had ceased. Partly because I anticipated the beginning of this study, I carefully developed these

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

contacts, finding them a rich source of interesting material. In many instances I discovered that these prolonged personal contacts caused me to be cast in the role of confidant by the study group and their families. The material thus collected, and recorded in a log, was used to augment that which was obtained from formal interviews, newspaper reports and intelligence gathered from the group. Because of the quantity and the wide variety of the material that was being accumulated, about the relatively small number of thirty-two subjects, it soon became apparent that a qualitative approach, in the form of a multiple case study, had much to commend it.

HANDLING DATA

After the material for use in this study was collected, in most cases in the form of tape recordings or hand-written notes, it was incorporated into files as soon as reasonably possible. The files were created and stored on microcomputer disc. This allowed a much greater degree of flexibility in this matter than might otherwise have been available. For example, the manipulation of entries with reference to key words

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

ultimately proved to be important because the key words, after grouping and re-grouping, eventually indicated chapter headings. Regular review and subsequent sorting and reassignment of entries in files was also relatively easy. The use of the micro computer also allowed the use of strategies, such as any one entry to be included in several files and be assigned more than one key word. Such things were accomplished in a very short time and with relatively little effort. In this way it was comparatively little trouble to temporarily reorganize the files in a totally different way in order to consider large sections of the collected data from a particular standpoint. In order to facilitate the handling of some of the material I also used a database. This was particularly useful. For instance, after setting up a reasonably comprehensive record for each group member creating accurate summaries of given facets of their lives could be produced in a matter of a few seconds and all the information contained in the data base could be reorganized in a similar space of time. This facilitated a much more thorough review of the material than might otherwise have been possible.

Although the computer was very accessible to me,

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

being part of a home work-station, the ready availability of hard copy also proved to be very useful. It enabled me to carry copies of data files and text, after names and details had been put into encoded form, to be worked on in many informal situations, such as on holiday or when travelling. To do this with data stored by other conventional methods would have necessitated taking risks with the original material or investing a considerable amount of extra time and effort in copying it. Discovering possible benefits of using hard copy in this way prompted me to spend more time actually reading the files I had stored on disc. Methodically reading files when reviewing the data held, rather than relying on a device such as a search facility, ensured that I was kept in touch with the research material in detail. Occasionally this drew my attention to the presence of possibilities that might otherwise have been missed. This was clearly an integral part of the process of generating theory which was referred to in the section on strategy, earlier in this chapter.

RELEVANT METHODOLOGICAL FACTORS

The fact, that the collection of material for this

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

study was accomplished by more than one method and took place over a period in excess of ten years, obviously increased the range of the data that was available for use. It was also a distinct advantage with regard to the eventual quality of the data concerned. Obtaining information by interview alone is, as Deutscher (1973) points out, a method prone to subjectivity and bias, since its immediacy and anecdotal nature can encourage distortion of data. This particular strength of the study was probably enhanced by the extra corroboration which it provided. "Within method" methodological triangulation, defined by Burgess (1984A) as the use of the same method on different occasions helped to validate the material used. In most cases it was also endorsed in other ways. For many of the comments made during interviews, "between methods triangulation" and "time triangulation", as Burgess (1984A) uses the terms, were also used, when the material was compared with recorded statements which were made, by the respondents, in different circumstances or several years earlier, or contained in other documentary evidence such as their letters. In many instances more documentary evidence had been compiled in the form of records of reports by

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

people of other disciplines, such as medical officers and educational psychologists. This conformed with Burgess's (1984A) definition of "investigator triangulation".

The relationship which I developed with the group and their families during the course of my professional involvement with them, including the period of the previously mentioned study, had added to my detailed background knowledge of them. This offered the advantage of a familiarity with the kind of multiplicity of details, concerning the study group, their families and their environment, which Cicourel (1964) refers to as the "ethnographic context" and claims to be a source of valuable information.

My position in this context probably helped greatly with regard to the interpretation of the reactions of the people involved. It was also an obvious advantage in the matter of gaining of confidence with regard to some of the more sensitive areas on which the study impinged. It seems reasonable to suppose that the study group accorded me the status of an "outsider having inside knowledge", which Goffman (1964) refers to as "wise" when he gives the instances of "gentile employees in

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

delicatessens, straight bartenders in homosexual bars, prostitutes' maids, nurses and therapists". However, during the course of this work, it was necessary to be mindful of the potential weakness that the personal contact with the interviewees might engender. Lofland (1971) points out that the quality of interviewee and interviewer can affect the quality of the data being collected. He also draws attention to the fact that references to the researcher's perceptions tend to constrain the interviewee. I was conscious of the fact that, although I might have had the confidence and trust of the majority of the interviewees, which Douglas (1976) claims produces objective and detailed data, it was unlikely that many of them would regard me as a totally unbiased observer.

Some of the difficulties which are faced by researchers using qualitative methods created little or no problems. Gaining access to suitable subjects or gaining acceptance by the subjects, a matter which Bogdan and Taylor (1975) point out as important, presented little difficulty. Obviously this was not so with other problems inherent in the research process. Each interview is unique and subject to both extrinsic

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

and intrinsic influences, such as the physical conditions under which it is conducted, the background of the interviewee, the problem of mutual understanding and his/her, desire to impress.

It was also necessary to be mindful of the fact, that not all honest attempts at objective accounts are successful. Mistakes and the distortion of memory can lead to false representation of opinions or events. This is the kind of inaccuracy, which Douglas (1976) refers to as "convoluted forms of truth" and "data distortion". It also had to be remembered that, as Lofland (1971) warns, in an intensive interviewing approach the depth of the study is obtained by the sacrifice of breadth. Because of the existence of such factors it was necessary to exercise care and forethought during the collection of material, if competent observation, which Johnson (1978) commends as valuable, was to be attained.

CONCLUSION

Since access to a considerable amount of data is indispensable to a study such as this, an integral part of the work was the collection of material, which might be of use. This activity gave rise to the accumulation

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

of a very large amount of research material. The quality of this material, with respect to the work, depended as much on its aptness as on its accuracy. Data was only used after a careful and, at times, involved selection process. Much of the latter half of this study was spent in reviewing, assessing, re-assessing and reorganizing research material and then translating the resultant change of ideas into new data files, altered files and rewritten text. In effect this amounted to a long period of repetitive examining, conceptualizing, editing and re-writing. No doubt this was the kind of activity to which Glaser and Strauss (1967) were referring when they commended the "never ending process of generating theory".

Irrespective of the quality of basic factors such as the range, quantity and aptness of the data used and the efficiency of the research methods employed there are limitations to this study which are inescapable. Most obvious among these are probably the limitations which are inherent with any qualitative study. Some of these were discussed in the literature referred to earlier in this chapter, such as the potential pitfalls associated with the use of samples that are not statistically

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

defined. Consideration of this underscores the fact that the findings of this study are by no means freely applicable to other disabled young people in other social or geographical contexts. Any success that this research may achieve will be in the area of a deeper understanding of the situation and problems of a specific group of young men and women who attended special schools. Although this may contribute to a deeper appreciation of some of the issues raised, it would be a mistake to automatically presume that conclusions reached here could be extrapolated to other situations.

In addition there are limitations which are peculiar to this particular form of qualitative approach. For instance, although there was much to be gained from my close, extended, personal association with the study group and their families this was also a potential cause of bias. My extended contact with the group, and my previous professional contact with the subjects, obviously engendered an interest in their welfare. This raises the possibility of distortion of my view of the group's progress. My efforts to counter this may have resulted in my reporting being unnecessarily restricted,

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

in the pursuit of impartiality.

It was also necessary to recognize that I was looking at the young people, of whom the study group was composed, from a specific point of view. My personal interest, in the implications and effects of the particular socio-educational context which was an integral part of their early lives, was a potential source of distortion. It was, therefore, necessary to regularly review the work, with this in mind, and to constantly refer to literature which was concerned with a wider spectrum of both social and educational facets of life.

The fact that I had experience of a somewhat similar piece of work induced me to suppose that, after reference to relevant literature, I would be able to decide on a suitable methodology for this study at the outset. This proved to be true only in very broad terms. Several factors, which were known before the work commenced, indicated alterations in the methodology as the work progressed. For instance, the fact the the study group were older meant that they were being viewed in a different social context, and the fact that the data was handled totally on a micro-computer provided a

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

wider scope for data review and re-classification than I had previously experienced. I am sure, however, that another factor concerned with the alterations in methodology was a matter of the evolution of my technique. This was obviously one of the benefits of my previous experience and I am sure that, were I to begin a very similar piece of work again soon, there would be consequent changes.

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER FOUR
PARENTAL REACTIONS AND SCHOOL ENROLMENT

INTRODUCTION

In any study which seeks to assess or explain the effect of a particular type of schooling, or the effects of a particular school or group of schools, it is obviously unrealistic to consider the views of the pupils only. In this context the pupils' parents are clearly important and their attitudes are worthy of examination. They raise questions about factors which can be of much importance to the efficient operation of any school or educational system.

This is endorsed by the fact that throughout those professions involved in the current British educational system great value is placed upon parental views and the motivation which can be generated in the home. Recent educational schemes place particular stress on "cooperation with the home", seek to foster parental confidence, create channels for communication with parents and claim to respond to parental choice. This choice is, in fact, part of the governmental strategy for, as Sterne (1988) pointed out, the, then current,

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

Education Reform Bill was intended to make the schools become "more market orientated".

In order to fully appreciate the effect of the schooling offered to members of the study group it is, therefore, necessary to note the reactions of their parents. Thus it is possible to obtain a measure of the response of the familial group to which they belong rather than to merely document the reactions of the subjects.

THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE

The young people who were the subjects of this study were educated in a wide variety of ways but the methods used could be regarded as falling into two main categories, those which involved attendance at mainstream educational institutions and those that did not. Within these broad categories there was much diversity. Their schooling varied widely in respect of the proportions of each type of school which contributed to their education. This covered a wide spectrum of combinations from schooling solely within the mainstream sector to special education only. In addition there was much variation between the different social settings

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

which some of the schools represented. They included day schools, residential schools, a nursery unit in a special school, residential courses for the disabled, and a vocational special needs course at a tertiary college.

To fully appreciate any specific choice of school, or educational institution, the decision needs to be viewed in context, having regard to both the relative ability and status of the participants involved. If such a choice was wholly or partly made by parents it would be likely to be affected by basic factors of home background. The decision could be influenced by the ability of the parents to appreciate the advantages and disadvantages, both real and apparent, of the educational institution in question. The degree to which they were able to articulate their views, together with their ability to manipulate the situation would probably be another contributory factor, in the decision making process. Considerations such as these imply that the social status of the parents would also affect the degree of actual choice that the parents could exercise, as opposed to the range of options which might be, theoretically, available.

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

The time when this choice was made, both in respect of subject's biographical time and the historical time are of importance. For instance, it seems reasonable to suppose that, in the eyes of many parents, the views on education of a young person who was approaching the age of majority would be of greater import than those of another subject who had been recently admitted to a nursery class. During the course of recent years the importance of parental opinion, in the decision making process, has increased markedly. This is in stark contrast to some of the recommendations, to exclude children from mainstream education, that were recorded on the 4H.P. assessment forms of some members of the study group during the early seventies.

There was no evidence to be found, among the families of the study group, which indicated that those parents who encountered very limited, at times virtually non-existent, choice during the early part of their children's schooling had been since disabused of their early impressions, that the choice of school was largely imposed. They had not adjusted to the new emphasis on the importance of their opinions. Some of them expressed views on this subject, which suggested that they deeply

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

mistrusted some of the more liberal attitudes that recent developments had apparently engendered. Most of them clearly regarded the promised benefits of the Education Act 1981 with a degree of cynicism. One mother commented, "As far as I can see they're just saving money and I think they're being under-handed about it too, they're far too airy fairy."

During the course of reviewing the extent to which parents were able to choose their children's schooling, or the degree to which they took advantage of possibilities to do so, it became clear that they did not assess the suitability of a school on educational grounds alone. In the minds of many of the parents involved, there was major social advantage to be gained, for their children, from admission to mainstream schools and this view seemed to be widely held. As Jones (Barton and Tomlinson 1981) points out, one of the broad concerns behind the "mainstreaming movement" was the reduction of the presumed social isolation of the children and the stigma attached to some schools.

Children attending a special school are usually clearly labelled. They may be labelled as different because of the apparatus they use, such as a wheelchair,

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

a walking frame or callipers, in the same way as an elderly person, who experiences physical disability or someone recovering from injury or illness is automatically regarded as infirm. However the fact that they are assigned to a special educational category, shared by no other group, is also likely to be obvious. They may be differentiated from other members of their age group by their clothing, either the uniform of a special school or the absence of the uniform of an appropriate local mainstream school. It is also probable that they will be collected from home by special transport. In the case of many members of the study group this was a bright yellow vehicle bearing a large crest and the words "social services", in bold black letters. This special social status will also be inevitably reinforced by exclusion from various social activities, involving members of their community enclave, which are associated with childhood, such as school meals, school Christmas parties, extra mural activities and informal play situations. Members of the community, including the parents of children who are subject to physical disability, will be aware of this labelling and its modifying effect on the children's

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

social identity. It, therefore, seems reasonable to assume that they may feel constrained to avoid the detrimental categorization, by avoiding the type of schools with which it is associated, in respect of their own children.

Due consideration of the circumstances under which choices, such as those discussed in this chapter, were made suggests that the eventual placements, of the subjects of this study, in schools or other educational establishments, were not entirely governed by the children's level of physical ability or academic potential.

This proposition is substantiated by reference to some of the details of the study group. For instance, two subjects, at the age of eleven, exhibited signs of very similar levels of ability, both academically and physically. Both boys suffered from spina bifida and hydrocephalus. They were born in the same year and lived with their mothers, being part of single parent families, in rented accommodation in the same part of an outer London borough. They were both able to walk short distances indoors, with aids, but used a wheelchair for traversing longer distances, outdoors. Their reading

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

ages were assessed, during their eleventh years, as being within three months of each other and they both had the necessary manual dexterity to write fluently, play recorders tolerably well and be reasonably capable at archery. No special difficulties or outstanding talents were ever mentioned in any school reports during the time they attended the study school, where they both received regular annual reports of satisfactory academic progress and good conduct. However, when these boys, who were close friends out of school, began their secondary education, one was transferred to a comprehensive school and the other was transferred to a special school, at which there was no provision for integrated education. Their secondary education was completed in these schools.

A former schoolmate of theirs, who seemed to have much more need for special help, was educated in an integrated setting, whilst another boy, whose level of ability was such that he often found it easy to pass, in the sense that Goffman (1963) uses the term, was transferred to a special school. Hence a comparison between the young people of the study group who were assigned to establishments offering different levels of

special support is not a matter of comparing the progress of the lightly handicapped with the more severely handicapped, using the term handicap as defined by Harris (1971).

PARENTAL RESPONSE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION

The parents of the subjects in the study group were approached about a suitable school for their children whilst the children were still at the pre-school stage. The subject was broached with the majority of them before their children had reached their fourth birthday and the reactions thus elicited covered a comparatively wide range of possible responses. A minority, the parents of three subjects, were in favour of mainstream education for their children and regarded admission to a special school with varying degrees of reluctance.

The parents of one subject were unreservedly opposed to it and the recommendations of medical officers, educational psychologists and education officers did little to mollify them in this matter. There is no evidence to suppose that they presented their local education authority with an unconditional refusal. However comments they made to me, at the time of the

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

proposed admission, suggested that they felt they were not in a position to refuse. Later, when the subject was aged twenty-one, they confirmed this impression. The father explained, "At one time we were just a bit worried about turning down S----- (the study school) in case they eventually sent her to one of the other special schools". These parents were very consistent in their opposition to the idea. I noted that the objections, which were documented in the report which arose from an interview they had with a school medical officer, before their daughter's third birthday, were substantially the same as those they voiced when they approached me, with a request for her mainstream admission, during the child's sixth year. They reiterated the same views later, after the child's eleventh birthday.

The essence of their opposition to special education for their daughter, up to this point seemed to hinge on two main factors. The first, which they articulated with much emphasis was that "her consultant" who was "the best there is" thought she should go to a "normal school" because he said she had "done amazingly well" and would "benefit from the stimulation". The point they

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

raised as a secondary objection to special school placement was stated variously as, "She can compete with normal kids, there's not much wrong with her", "She's above this kind of school" or "Coming here (the special school) will give her a bad opinion of herself and other people a bad opinion too". These parents were interviewed more recently, when their daughter had reached the age of twenty-five. Although the emphasis of their objections had altered, they still firmly held the view that the special school placement had been unwise.

The other parents who originally expressed firm opposition to the suggestion of their children being admitted to a special school eventually agreed to the admissions, after some persuasion, but continued to have reservations about the wisdom of this decision. One mother who agreed with resignation remembered, "Well there didn't seem much option did there, there was no where else". Another parent recalled that he agreed to his son being transferred from a mainstream school to a special school only because he was in a vulnerable position with regard to opposing the transfer. He explained, "The only reason he had to go, really, was

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

they wouldn't have him down there (local primary school), wouldn't have him at any price, one fit and that was enough, they kept sending for us and writing letters about him being at risk and they sent him home more than once". He recalled, "They said he wasn't well, and there was nothing the matter with him when he got home, lucky I was off work with my back at the time or I don't know how we'd have managed". The father still seemed as if he felt he and his wife had been coerced into agreeing to his son's transfer. He added "If I'd known then what I know now I would have fought it".

In contrast the parents of three members of the study group were implacably opposed to their children being educated in an integrated educational setting. Throughout the whole of her son's primary school career the mother of one young man, who eventually received all his education in special schools, fiercely resisted all suggestions that her son should be educated anywhere but in a special school. Her husband, who was very active in his support of the special school his son attended, obviously agreed with her. When asked if she thought that a local school might be a suitable placement for her son she replied, "No I don't they wouldn't even

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

realize what his problems were, how could they?" Her comment with regard to the schools involved in an integration scheme which had been running for over five years in her home borough was, "I think they should be changed back a bit to what they were, it was the worst day's work anybody ever did when they closed S--- (the PH school which the subject attended). I'm glad he wasn't younger, I don't know what we'd have done if he had to go to C----" (integrated primary school).

The mother of another young man withdrew her son from the same integrated primary school and he eventually completed his education in another special school. Her explanation included a general comment about the school. She said, "I know it's supposed to educate the handicapped kids but it doesn't". She had apparently experienced some difficulty in persuading the head teacher that she was not satisfied with the school. She did not agree with the head teacher's methods, commenting, "She was told she would have to have the handicapped children there, she didn't really want them there". There was an indication of the mother's continuing resentment after her son had completed his secondary schooling.

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

The other set of parents who were firmly opposed to integrated education for their child, linked this objection to the particular disability that their son experienced. His mother commented, "I think in any case to integrate some children, especially those with speech problems just doesn't work". These parents clearly regarded a suitable school for their son as particularly important. They had been the subject of more than one article in local newspapers when they had, among other things, announced that they intended to sell their house and move into the area covered by another local education authority, in order to qualify for a school which they thought to be a more suitable secondary placement for their son than the one originally offered. The objections were centred, not on a proposed placement in a mainstream school, but on admission to a special school which they thought involved too much travelling. Their view was that the school of their choice was the only suitable placement. It was in the area of a neighbouring education authority and their son's journey school was considerably longer than the distance from their home to at least three comprehensive schools in their home education authority. Placement at one of

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

these schools, or at any mainstream was an alternative they did not even seriously consider.

The parents of eight members of the study group did not seek special education for their children but readily accepted it when it was offered. Offers to answer questions or discuss the matter elicited no noticeable reaction from the parents of two of the subjects. The other six sets of parents involved enquired about "the kind" of children who were admitted to the study school. As they frankly admitted later they were concerned lest their children had been placed with "the mentally handicapped", as they put it. Typical of their enquiries when they were asked for their views about the proposed placements was the question asked by one subject's father. He asked, "The children here are just disabled are they, they're not mentally handicapped, are they?" When these parents were assured that the school was intended to cater for children who were physically handicapped, to use the term that was then in current use, they were obviously relieved. Nevertheless, in common with the parents of other children in the group they exhibited a degree of resignation about their children's admission.

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

The parents of four other members of the study group at first refused the offer of their children's admission to a special school. In one case another proffered placement, in a similar but larger special school in a nearby borough, had already been refused. These parents were not fully convinced that their daughter's needs would be best served outside mainstream education either. Eventually they seemed to acquiesce to the study school placement in the spirit of people accepting the best of a range of unsatisfactory choices. This impression, which persisted during the period of their daughter's enrolment at the study school, was confirmed when I interviewed them fourteen years later.

Three of the other sets of parents who initially rejected the placement were of the opinion that their children's disabilities, whilst rendering a mainstream school placement unsuitable, were not severe enough to justify the children being placed in the school for physically handicapped children that was suggested. When invited to suggest a suitable alternative they were somewhat at a loss, even after considering the problem for a period of two weeks or more. The only really constructive comment from one of these parents was a

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

hesitant suggestion that a very small infant school which had a "good welfare assistant and dinner lady might be all right depending on what the staff were like". This did not conform with the, then current, borough policy. It was politely received but no action was taken as a result of it. Using the perspective of the educational climate of the eighties, it is difficult to imagine such a constructive comment being summarily dismissed. However, as Mills (1959) explains, an appreciation of a society needs the understanding of both "biography" and "history", and the range of their "intricate relations".

All those parents, who had initially refused study school placements, referred to their hesitation several times, in our conversations, during the course of their children's attendance at the school. These references were made, over a period of several years, in the variety of situations which characterized my interaction with the parents of the study group, including social functions. The opinions expressed were later confirmed during the course of at least two informal interviews.

The common factor which contributed to these refusals appeared to be that the people concerned had not come to

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

terms with the fact that their children were, judged by the people's own criteria, members of a deviant group. However they tacitly acknowledged, the existence of the group. On the occasion of his initial refusal one father commented, "A couple of years or so ago this would be called a home for crippled children (possible reference to boarding facilities which had previously been available) by most people, and he's (borough medical officer) suggesting we send her here". A mother commented, over four years after her child's admission, "Its hard enough to grasp they're not quite normal, but when you hear they've been put down for a handicapped school it really rubs it in".

The parents of these four subjects did not agree to their children's admission to a special school until after they had visited the school more than once and been invited to discuss the matter more thoroughly with both the medical officer and the educational psychologist who were responsible for giving advice with regard to the children's placements. Although subsequent informal discussions, in which we engaged during the children's stay at the school, suggested that they were satisfied with their children's progress and impressed

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

with the efforts of the school staff, my impression was that they were never entirely sure that their children had been suitably placed. Whenever, in the course of informal conversation, I asked if they thought their children might have benefited more from attending another school their invariable agreement was often hedged with reservations or implications of reservations as when one mother replied, "I am pleased with the school, she's done ever so well here, especially with Mrs. S----, but I don't know I sometimes wonder" or or the comment of another parent who said, "S----- did as well as possible for him and it was a very good school but, if he had gone to an ordinary school he might have got used to mixing with normal kids sooner and I think that would probably have been a good thing".

The parents of the remaining fourteen members of the study group agreed to their children being enrolled at a special school with some hesitation. I conversed with them at the time they made the decisions, or very shortly afterwards, and subsequently at regular intervals during their children's primary school careers.

Following this I also held conversations with them

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

during many informal relaxed situations which occurred in connection with the extra mural and social life of the study school. Later, during a purposeful search for information connected with some previous research (Thornton 1986), I collected material which could be used to correlate opinions and impressions accumulated more recently as a result of the current study. My impression was that their hesitation may have been partially the result of feelings of insecurity and vulnerability arising from the exposed position in which they found themselves. In most cases they were required to make decisions, about their children's future, which were connected with situations of which they, themselves, had no experience. Nevertheless I am sure that they were also influenced by the stigmatization that they sensed special school placement would entail. One father commented, about the special school admission, "We knew it had to be a handicapped school but it was terrible having to say yes". Another father compared the making of the decision to going to the dentist's saying, "You know you've got to but you keep putting it off" and a mother explained, "Its like giving in, you know you've got to but you can hardly bring

yourself to do it". With the exception of the parents of six members of the study group, who were either protagonists or antagonists in the matter of special education, the reaction of parents, to the finalization of their children's enrolment was predominantly one of resignation and relief. There was no evidence of more positive reactions such as achievement or satisfaction being associated with the decision.

FACTORS WHICH AFFECTED PARENT'S OPINIONS OF SCHOOLS

Some parents' comments about school enrolment indicated that they clearly saw the labelling effect of the special school and wanted to avoid it. One mother, commenting on the proposition to enrol her son in a special school nursery class, in order to assist his assimilation by a mainstream infants school when he reached the appropriate age, said, rather ruefully, "I know you're right when you talk about it helping him to get a good start at the infants school, but when he goes there they're bound to know he came here". At this point the subject's father added, "Everybody will, you couldn't pretend he didn't could you?" The parents of this boy agreed to the suggested placement after only a

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

few days, contacting the school and confirming their acceptance of the placement with prompting. However, like other parents, they clearly saw his admission as an unavoidable disadvantage connected with special education, to be balanced against advantages that were to be gained from it.

The remainder of the parents were clearly of the opinion that special education involved the acquisition of special social status but seemed to regard it as being of minor importance only. Their comments suggested two reasons for this. The first was they regarded the children's need for the special services and extra support that the special school offered as so vital as to render the social disadvantage insignificant. When asked about her attitude to her son's admission to a special school one mother said, "Well he's just got to come to some where like this, hasn't he, there's no way he'd manage at an ordinary school, it'd be silly to even think of it". The other reason that parents were not unduly perturbed about their children receiving special education appeared to be that they had already experienced social disadvantage, in the form of discrimination and did not see special school attendance

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

as exacerbating the situation to any appreciable extent. The mother of one girl said, of her daughter's admission, "She couldn't have coped at an ordinary school, coming here's been a life saver for her really". On another occasion the same mother said, "There's no getting away from A-----'s handicap, it used to annoy me the way people looked at her, and it still does if they seem as if they are looking down on her". She explained this by saying, "You know talk as if she's mentally handicapped or anything". The mother enlarged on her conclusions explaining, "While it still does upset me to a certain extent when I see them feeling sorry for her, I know it means they'd be kind to her and if we weren't here she'd need all the help she could get". This point of view was confined to the parents of those members of the study group whose disabilities were, in the opinion of their parents, both very obvious, even to a casual observer, and constituted gross handicaps to the disabled young people concerned.

A Retrospective View of Parental Opinion

Throughout the course of their children's schooling, the views of a number of parents of the study group have

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

been modified with regard to the relative values of special education and mainstream education. It would be naive to ignore the probability that the views of these people were not biased by the progress they presumed their children had made and the particular regime within which this had been achieved. Nevertheless, there were other factors which were liable to influence their opinions. For instance, throughout the seventies and into the eighties the call for integrated education began to gather strength and authority in the wake of the work of people such as Anderson (1971 and 1973) and Tomlinson (1982). This view of the appropriate education for children with special needs, was not only widespread but was acknowledged in official publications and governmental educational policy, for example, "The Warnock report" (1978) and the Education Act 1981.

The same trend was reflected in the opinions of the parents of the subjects of this research. It is difficult to be definite about the extent to which any one parent was a net contributor to this evolution of opinion in the study group or was influenced by the general movement towards a favourable view of integrated education. Nevertheless it seems reasonable to suppose

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

that, in line with the societal trend, the attention of some of the parents was by degrees focused more acutely on the possibilities which mainstream education might hold for their children.

However, the most potent sources of influence in respect of the parents' views, were undoubtedly from the micro social situation rather than the macro. One of the parents who was very definite about the need for mainstream schooling for his daughter, apparently based this opinion entirely on comments made to him by a consultant of whom he said, "He's the best there is and if he says it's the best thing then there's no arguing is there?" Other members of the group had been influenced, in their initial approach to their children's education, by people in less eminent positions.

The most common sources of advice, in this respect, appeared to be relatives, family friends and the parents of other disabled children. People who held positions of professional responsibility which suggested regular contact with the parents, or ready availability as would be the case with their general practitioner or members of the community health services such as health visitors

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

or nurses, were apparently consulted very little. The potency of the influence of some of the advice from family members or close friends probably depended on personal relationships and was at times vague. In some instances it came from unlikely sources but strongly affected many aspects of the subjects' lives. The suggestions of one orthopaedic consultant were constantly rejected, over a period of more than three years, by the parent of one member of the study group because it conflicted with the general advice that had been given by her late mother. The dominance of the views of the deceased grandparent was such that the consultant commented in a report, on one occasion, that he had been "frustrated once again by the voice from the grave".

There seemed to be a strong sense of group identity among parents of members of the study group, and a far stronger cohesive social tendency than was apparent among other parents' groups with which they might have been identified. They did not, for instance, seem to feel the same degree of affinity with those groups based at the other schools their children attended. Evidence of this, apart from the comments of the people

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

concerned, is that the parents of more than half of the group had retained contact with the parents of their children's former classmates at the study school (a primary school for disabled children) until this study began when most of the study group were in their twenties. There was no evidence of similar contact with parents of mainstream schools which the group had attended, in some cases for longer than they had been on roll at the study school. Probably because of this sense of group identity there seemed to be a regular exchange of ideas between the parents and the group seemed to foster mutual support.

The sense of group identity was formalized by the parents connected with the study school, who formed a mutual support society, which they referred to as the "club". This society continues to meet regularly, its declared aim is one of mutual support for the parents of disabled children and this is its main apparent function. The people involved, who are mainly the mothers of study group members, explained to me that, although it functions as a source of information exchange on practical matters, it is mainly a place where they can, as one woman put it "let off steam when

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

the world gets on top of them".

This sense of group identity, which seems to have been connected with acknowledgement of deviant status, seems to have been important in both the formation and consolidation of parental opinion. When discussing the suitability of various schools or the value of a particular type of education parents of the study group regularly referred to other members of the "club" in a general, at times vague, way as endorsement for their points of view. For instance, a mother who explained the need to pressure the education authority said, "You've got to keep at them, practically anybody in the 'club' will tell you that". When the opinions of other members, which were at variance with theirs, were cited they quoted the opinions in detail and were at pains to explain the reasons for the difference of opinion, either the different problems the other person faced or even the inappropriate attitude adopted. One mother mentioning, in passing, her difference of opinion with another club member, about a school in a neighbouring education authority, pointed out that, "They might find it all right because they live at the other side of the borough and we only have one car and J----- (husband)

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

uses it for work, I mean transport's no problem to them". Membership of this club not only fostered the formation of opinions, and probably implanted a bias, but also seemed to give the members a feeling of security which provided some of the confidence needed to express them.

Not all the effects of this group were necessarily beneficial to parents engaged in choosing a suitable school. The sense of group membership clearly did provide a general sense of security and solace to many parents, especially during periods of stress encompassing their children's problems. However, the very existence of the group, especially since it is formalized in the form of a club creates a potential disadvantage. Their obvious loyalty to this group is a possible source of alienation from other social contacts, since their commitment to it might prove to be a restriction. It may impinge on their daily social intercourse with members of their community enclave and, thus, further emphasize their sense of isolation in that context. In addition, as Parsons and Bales (1956) point out group membership involves shared expectations.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that the shared

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

expectations, a characteristic which is so common that Harris (1983) uses it to define the existence of a group, must eventually affect, or tend to affect, this group's view of their children's future. The most obvious indication of this was probably some of the unexpected trends, which seemed to develop within the study group, towards placing special emphasis on a specific aspect of their children's education. Parents questioned such things as the time spent by children travelling to school, the efficacy of horse riding as a therapy, the therapeutic value of swimming, or the suitability of one particular school for secondary placement. This was perfectly reasonable for parents of study group members to do. However it did seem more than mere coincidence that each topic, in turn, formed the basis of most parental comment, including the subjects of requested interviews and telephone conversations, for a period of weeks or months and that information received by one parent was subsequently cited by others. Group pressures such as these had an important effect on the opinions of the parents of some of the study group, including their assessment of the relative values of mainstream and special education.

CONCLUSION

It was clear, both from comments recorded when their children were very young and recent statements sought in connection with this study, that the overwhelming majority of parents in the study group were not in a position to make a reasoned choice about their children's education, when they were first asked to do so. In addition to any emotional pressure that considerations concerned with this decision might have engendered, such as forcing them to face the reality of their children's handicaps, they were at a disadvantage because of a deficiency of basic knowledge of the subject and lack of precedents to which they could refer. In most cases there was no fund of experience, of relatives or friends, on which they could draw and a paucity of role models in their community enclave.

Not only were these parents short of the necessary facts needed to make such a selection on behalf of their children but they were severely limited in the options which were available to them. They were, virtually presented with a decision that arose from a joint selection, on occasions a compromise, reached by a medical officer and an educational psychologist. After

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

the head teacher had been consulted with regard to availability of places, the parents were expected to endorse this decision.

Most of the study group parents felt the pressure in this situation. They recalled that much of it was occasioned by the fact that they were acutely aware of their own ignorance in the matter of special education. Although they were aware of the social disadvantage that special education threatened, the majority of them agreed largely to avoid continued stress. The majority of them, however, claimed that they were sure, at the time, that they had made the right decision, even if it was based largely on the advice of those professionally concerned with the child's school placement.

It was not until an official unit had been designated in the educational authority responsible for the study school that a mainstream school placement was routinely suggested to the parents of the study school. There is perhaps some evidence for the supposition that the professional team who were attempting to prompt parental decisions were influenced by the education authority's policy or facilities, in respect of the advice they gave the parents.

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

When the study group approached school age, in the days preceding the Education Act 1981, their parents were expected to automatically accept the school which was designated, for that category which a medical officer and an educational psychologist had decided was most appropriate to their child's physical condition and ability. At the time most of the study group were enrolled such a situation was probably not entirely unexpected. In the education authority area in which the study school was situated, following the introduction of comprehensive education in the early seventies, parents were notified, prior to the beginning of their children's secondary school education, that secondary school places would be allocated on the basis of the school catchment area, in which the child lived. Parents were informed that the possible exceptions to this policy would only be granted after formal application and for specific reasons only, such as on religious grounds, where a sibling was in attendance at a school, or parents' genuine desire for single sex education for their children. There was a clear implication that parental choice was largely out of the question.

However, the view then current was that each child

CHAPTER FOUR - PARENTS AND ENROLMENT

should attend his, or her, neighbourhood school for primary education. In many primary schools run by the same education authority primary school classes were being organized around community enclave membership, "neighbourhood grouping" was the term used. The theory was that children should be educated in their natural groups. The implication seemed to be that the neighbourhood connection on which the education authority placed such emphasis did not apply to these physically disabled children. Their natural place was, apparently, deemed to be with other disabled children, not with members of their community enclave.

This attitude towards the children seemed to be tantamount to inferring that, on being admitted to a special school, they had completed their progress towards deviancy by taking what Becker (1963) defines as the final step in the career of a deviant. They had moved into a deviant group.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHAPTER FIVE

THE REACTIONS TO INTEGRATED EDUCATION OF STUDY SUBJECTS AND THEIR PARENTS

INTRODUCTION

The prospect of integration produced a very wide range of reactions from the parents of the study group. I was able to collate comments and reactions of these parents, stated in a wide variety of circumstances, on various aspects of the subject. This enabled me to construct a model of changing opinions, hardening prejudices and developing attitudes over a period in excess of ten years.

Material collected at the beginning of this period provided a reasonably detailed reflection of their views on integrated education whilst it was a proposed future development by their local education authority and regarded merely as a possibility for their children. I was also able to regularly canvass their opinions as they evolved and the proposal developed into a definite scheme and eventually acquired a completion date.

In addition I was in a position to record the reactions and comments of children at several stages

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

during their preparation for integration. I noted relevant changes, in the views of the young people and compared them with those of their parents, between the introduction of the programme and its eventual implementation.

At the outset the prospect of transfer to a mainstream school was, in some cases, little more than vague future possibility, which represented a venture into the unfamiliar for the subjects of the study. During the later stages the same transfer was an impending change, into a situation of which they had then gained some experience.

In a similar way the attitudes of the teaching staff, in the mainstream host schools, could be traced as they developed. During the early stages their acceptance of the disabled children, as pupils, was to a large extent a matter of affirming educational principle. As the advent of the implementation of the integration scheme approached the children's transfers presented the prospect of an imminent change in working practices and involved practical problems of reorganization and adjustment. Therefore, the quality of the information and reaction, which the parents received from the school

staff, tended to vary over the period of the introduction of the scheme. This was obviously a potential source of influence on parental opinion.

THE INTEGRATION PROCESS

The transfer to mainstream education, in the case of those members of the study group who were integrated was effected by three main methods. The first concerned the placement of a child below the secondary transfer age. Following an assessment of a child which indicated that this was appropriate, the head teacher of the study school informally approached the head teacher of an appropriate mainstream school, often the local primary school of the child proposed for transfer. The feasibility of the child being transferred was discussed. If the suggestion met with a favourable reaction then the prospective class teacher was invited to visit the special school to meet the child and discuss his/her progress and problems with the current class teacher. In the case of general agreement about the suitability of the transfer then the education authority's permission was sought. Next the child's parents were invited to visit the mainstream school and

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

exchange views with the head teacher and class teacher at the study school. With their approval a series of preliminary visits, by the child involved, were arranged and the duration and frequency of these was adjusted until the child was attending the mainstream school for half a day each week. This continued until his, or her, eventual admission to the mainstream school. This pattern of integration was general for all those children integrated until 1974 when a special unit was opened, in a local comprehensive school, as part of an integration initiative.

The second type of transfer involved those members of the group who were moved into the comprehensive school unit. The same general pattern was used with the additional advantage of regular liaison between the schools, including a weekly visit from a teacher, on the comprehensive school staff who had special responsibility for the disabled children, after they had been integrated. This method of integration was largely superseded by the introduction of an integration programme in two local primary schools, an infant school which was specially adapted and a junior school which was purpose built to include a special unit for the

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

integration of physically handicapped children. When this was in operation the staged closure of the study school began as its pupils were transferred either to one of the two new units or, if the mainstream schools could not provide an appropriate placement, to a special school.

In all cases the measures were taken to make the parents aware of the possibility of such a transfer at least one academic year before the school staff envisaged that it might take place. This was done through the medium of annual reports, informal discussions during parents' evenings and eventually in the form of a telephone call or a letter, which invited them to consider the proposition seriously and contact the school with a view to arranging to discuss the matter. The parents of those children who were transferred to mainstream education via a primary school special unit, which was part of an integration scheme, were offered additional information with the aid of school newsletters, parents' discussion groups and visits to the new unit. They were also invited to specially arranged meetings, attended by officials from the education authority responsible for the school. Some

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

of the study group were placed in mainstream schools early in their primary school careers, one member of the group before he had even reached the statutory age of school admission.

However, irrespective of their physical ability, all the members of the study group were assessed at least once, with a view to their being transferred to mainstream education. Although concessions were made with regard to the precise age at which its pupils were transferred to a secondary school, the study school was essentially a primary special school. Consequently, secondary transfer automatically entailed consideration of the suitability of an integrated educational placement and part of this process involved discussions with the subjects' parents (or guardians), during which their views were sought and recorded.

PARENTAL ATTITUDE

When the views, which were obtained from parents, regarding the possibility of their children's transfer to mainstream education, were compared with those opinions which they had expressed during interviews in connection with their children's admission to the study

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

school there was evidence of a shift of opinion.

Those parents who had originally held very definite views with regard to the relative benefits of mainstream education and special education, in respect of their own children had not fundamentally changed their points of view. The parents of eight members of the study group remained totally opposed to the idea of their children being educated in an integrated situation. In three cases they were so vehemently against the idea that this course of action was never seriously regarded as even a possibility. The same seven sets of parents who had strongly objected to the idea of their children being admitted to a special school before their children were enrolled at the study school were very pleased indeed when the opportunity of integrated education was offered to their children. However, there were indications, in some cases, that previously held rigid views had apparently been muted in the light of experience. One father said, of the study school, "I haven't changed my ideas about them being no good for A.... (his daughter), but I can see some kids need them". Five and a half years earlier he had apologized if his comments might cause offence but firmly stated that, "All special

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

schools should be closed by law" and that all mainstream schools should be forced to "make proper provisions for every child who lived in the school's area".

Other parents, who had originally displayed similarly inflexible attitudes with regard to the efficacy of the two basic forms of education which were available for their children, seemed to have remained relatively unmoved by their own experience or the experiences of others. During an interview with another parent the subject of recent local developments in education, which included the provision of a unit in a mainstream school, was raised. She commented, "I think they should be changed back a bit to what they were and the money spent on places like S----- (the study school)".

Among those parents who had accepted a place for their children in the study school, but exhibited obvious reluctance, there had been some marked changes of opinion. When the parents of this group of fourteen subjects were apprised of the feasibility of their children being educated in an integrated situation and invited to comment on the proposal there was an obvious change of attitude from the stance which many of them had originally taken. The parents of four of these

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

subjects reacted favourably, in two cases very enthusiastically, to the idea. However the parents of ten subjects exhibited varying degrees of reluctance in the matter of endorsing their children's transfer to integrated education. In seven instances they were firmer and more vociferous in their opposition to the proposed change than they had been to their children being admitted to the special school. Several conversations with each of this group of ten sets of parents who were reluctant to agree to integrated education left little doubt that their prime consideration was the well being of their children.

In several cases there was obvious justification for this point of view since the children concerned were severely disabled and they were due for secondary transfer during the seventies. At that time the chances of the education authority currently making major special concessions to facilitate integrated education seemed extremely unlikely. One mother said, of her son, "He's got enough to cope with without any more hassle". The father of another child commented, "She likes coming to school here, let's not rock the boat, how many kids like school?" However, for the most part, it seemed that

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

they considered the shelter and seclusion of the special school necessary for the protection of their children because they tended to place a relatively low value on their ability to cope in a more demanding situation. They discussed their children as if they had either accepted the inferior social value associated with deviant status and possibly regarded it as a measure of their children's real worth. They did not appear to expect them to be able to cope with normal social situations. The mother of one boy pointed out "getting on with his school work's enough for him, without having to cope with that lot" (the pupils of the mainstream school).

Alternatively the parents reacted as if they fully realized that the community had stigmatized their children, in some cases through the medium of the special school. As Banks and Lynch (1986) point out schools are generally seen as powerful symbols of and bastions of the status quo. Consequently they apparently expected a level of discrimination from the mainstream of society which would mar their children's contentment or threaten their rate of progress. One mother, for instance, was fearful of her daughter suffering public

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

ridicule. She commented, "Don't say the other kids won't take the mickey and laugh at them (the disabled children), they even have a go at children with glasses". Either stance appeared to express an anxiety prompted by the acceptance of their children's inferior social identities, either in their own eyes or the eyes of others. They seemed to fear the type of consequences of the low value of the kind of social identities which Spradley and Mann (1975) point out occur in every society, resulting in individuals being accorded little respect and treated, in some situations, as if they were objects rather than people.

The parents of two of the other subjects in this subgroup of ten based their objections mainly on the potential threat to their children's academic attainment. This is a reminder that, as Hegarty et. al. (1982) point out, the initial impetus of the move towards integration was prompted by a search for improved academic education for children in special schools. These parents saw no need for this at the time transfers to mainstream education were suggested. They were very appreciative of the efforts of the special school's staff and openly proud of the progress their

children had made whilst attending the special school. They were particularly proud of their children's level of academic attainment, which appeared to be well in excess of their original ideas of the children's capability.

Perhaps the root cause of this may have been another instance of parents under-valuing their children's abilities. Whilst they paid lip service to the idea that their children's achievements would be partially defined by the opportunities which they were offered it was very apparent that the parents of both of these subjects feared that a change of educational environment would threaten their rate of progress. One mother questioned the proposed change saying, "He's done very well here, but would they have the same amount of time or patience at an ordinary school?" The father of another girl observed,

"All teachers have special jobs really, some are good with little ones and others can control the big ones and you can't expect a maths teacher to get a kid through a French exam can you? Well it's the same with the ordinary schools can they do your job and bring her on the way you do?"

Much of the reluctance which the parents of this group of five subjects exhibited seemed to spring from their unwillingness to agree to change an apparently

successful system. There was also an implication that the prospect of an untried system generated a sense of insecurity. It was also perhaps partly a reflection of the faith in education to which Banks and Lynch (1986) refer when they comment on the generally held view that education has a powerful role in the life chances of children.

Reservations about taking a similar decision were not as pronounced in the case of the remaining group of eight parents who were reluctant to agree to their children being admitted to a mainstream school. In six instances the parents, with understandable suspicion, tended to view the timing of the proposed transfers with a degree of cynicism. The staged closure of the study school could only be completed after the conclusion of a recently accelerated programme of phased integration and the final stages of this were their children's transfers to a recently opened unit. Typical of their comments was the observation, "I'm not saying it's not a good thing, but it's obvious that it'll save money if they push the last three in quick", made by the mother of one of the last group, of three children, to be transferred to the unit. Such an attitude is understandable in view of the

history of a need for economy in the education system. Williamson (1979) explains that it was obvious that the growth in expenditure could not be sustained as early as the nineteen fifties. Most of the parents of this group seemed to feel that they had been, to some extent, let down. They had made the difficult decision to commit their children to a particular school, and they felt their children were being withdrawn from it, before the educational process was complete. The mother of one boy observed, "I know they're going to move them to a new school, but why can't they take the whole class in one go, like they would anywhere else?". It is possible that their resistance to the scheduled transfers was prompted by a feeling of disappointment, arising from the fact that the children were to be moved before the end of a generally accepted junior school stage. This, together with the unorthodox admission, served to emphasize the special classification which had been accorded to their children.

The attitudes of the other two parents, who seemed mildly reluctant to agree to their children's transfers, could have been interpreted as a resistance to change arising from inertia. They made little or no

comment when their opinion was sought apart from comments such as, "Isn't there anything else?" and "Where are the others going?". This seemed to suggest they were not fully satisfied with the proposals. In each case, several additional letters and invitations to discussions, some of which were ignored, failed to reveal the source of their objections. In both of these cases agreement was relatively easy to obtain, in terms of the actual time needed for discussion and explanation. In one instance the child's mother rang the study school and explained that neither she nor her husband could suggest a time when they might manage to attend the study school for an additional discussion about their son's transfer but added, "We've thought about it and as long as he's (their son) happy it's O.K. with us". One of the other parents eventually signified her assent to the proposal by asking the driver, who drove the school bus, to "tell the school it's all right".

SOME IMPORTANT INFLUENCES ON PARENTAL OPINION

A general movement of parental opinion, in the direction of a more favourable disposition to mainstream

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

schooling, would have been understandable in view of the contemporary educational trend towards integration. However, some of the apparent changes of parental opinion within the study group, in respect of desirability of integrated education, at first sight tend to be rather surprising. Of the thirty-two sets of parents involved, twenty-one were originally, in varying degrees, reluctant to agree to their children being educated at a special school. This constituted a majority of the sample (over 65%) expressing dissatisfaction with the idea of special education. It was part of the policy of the study school to seek parental opinion as part of an annual review of pupils' placements and progress. Records of these reviews indicate that, after periods of between two years and eight years, most of the same group appeared to have changed their opinions. Seventeen sets of parents (over 55% of the total sample) who were formerly reluctant to accept special education, were by then disinclined to sanction their children entering the mainstream education sector. Therefore, most of the sub-group seemed to have rejected their original opinions in favour of views which were, ostensibly, diametrically

opposed.

The prospect of any kind of change is liable to stimulate a conservatism, arising from a feeling of insecurity which might be generated by the anticipation of the unfamiliar or even inertia. However, it seems an unlikely coincidence that this should have had such a decisive effect on the major part of the sub-group and there was virtually no support for this supposition to be found in the comments of most parents.

In addition, there are two particularly obvious, rather glib, possible explanations, a combination of which might account for this apparent reversal. One is that the people concerned, having gained more insight into special education and seen the results of its application in the form of progress made by their children, had fundamentally revised their opinions about special schools in general or the study school in particular. The other is that the parents' views had altered because of a perceived deterioration in the level of physical ability of their own children. Apart from the low level of probability of the remarkable coincidence which would be associated with such a widespread re-evaluation of special education, the study

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

school or their children's physical capability, there are indications that the changes in parental approach to education are not explained, to any appreciable extent, in this way.

Possible changes in parents' opinions of their children's physical attainment and general progress was sought by making reference to reports from the regular medical assessments, which were part of the programme for every child at the study school. During these examinations parents were routinely asked for their comments and these were duly recorded. In the case of only two of the subjects, whose parents' views changed in favour of special education, was there any record of parents' concern about possible physical deterioration. One of the children, whose parents raised this topic, had been previously diagnosed as suffering from a degenerative condition and it was standard procedure, during the course of such an assessment, for the examining medical officer to invite parents to express their opinions on the theme of their children's physical attainment.

The same group of parents were also regularly engaged in discussions, concerning their children's progress,

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

during the course of "parents evenings" which were held at the school, near the end of every term. During these functions the children's parents engaged in private discussion with teachers, therapists and the school nurse but only in the case of three of the children, whose parents' opinions altered, was any mention of deterioration of ability queried. Throughout the school year I also had many contacts with the parents of these children, which I used as an opportunity to initiate and encourage much informal discussion. My impressions, based on these contacts, concurred with reports from the other, more formal, discussions.

In respect of the parents' assessment of the study school and the educational methods it employed, there was very little, if anything, to suggest, from their comments or reactions, that this same group of parents was any more impressed or appreciative of the school than any other group. It is doubtful if some of them were familiar with some of the main points of the policy which framed the school's approach to education. In fact, there were grounds for supposing that some of them were not nearly as well informed as the parents of many of their children's schoolmates. Only 80% of the parents

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

in the group ever attended the school, and only 60% of them attended it more than once. This included only 50% who attended more than once each year. With respect to parental involvement, the school year included monthly P.T.A. meetings, termly parents evenings, at least six social functions and a standing invitation for parents to arrange to visit the school, during the school day, as they felt necessary. Those parents in this group who did attend the school for functions such as parent teacher association meetings were not noticeably more represented than the remainder of the parents. Their contributions to discussion, the questions they asked and their informal conversation did not exhibit attitudes which suggested that they were any more appreciative than the other parents of the work of the school or differed in their evaluation of its effect on their children.

There were, however, indications that their apparent change of attitude, regarding the suitability of special education for their children, could be satisfactorily explained by looking at their situation from a social standpoint, rather than an educational one. Comments, which were made by many parents, when special school

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

attendance was proposed for their children, imply that the parents were not objecting to special education per se but to concomitant disadvantages. The objections to special education, which were forthcoming from a majority of the study group, did not appear to be rooted in their lack of faith in the efficacy of the special school, the system it used or the staff who operated it but in the status which was associated with special school enrolment.

Many parents spoke of special school attendance as though they saw it conferring a social stigma. One mother, during a visit to the study school to arrange the final details of her daughter's admission, explained "I know she needs special help but it's a shame she has to come here" and the father of another child, in the same situation commented, rather poignantly, "I used to pass this place and feel sorry for the kids who came here and now he's (his son) got to come". Two members of the same group of parents even drew attention to the enduring effects of special school admission. One said of her son's proposed admission,

"I can see your point about him getting a good start here then moving on to an ordinary infant school, but even when he gets to secondary school everybody will know he's been to a school like this"

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

and the other commented, "They won't let you forget, I know my cousin was in a school like this".

This view of special school enrolment furnished a reasonable explanation of the different stance that seemed to be adopted by many of the people who were originally opposed to their children being admitted to a special school. They were in most cases of the opinion that a special school for the physically handicapped would provide their children with much extra help. However, when faced with the prospect of their children's admission, they clearly decided that the advantage offered by such a school would be outweighed by the disadvantage of reduced social status that would be inseparable from it.

Eventually for various reasons, including extrinsic pressures emphasizing the advantages offered and perhaps an impression that they had very little or no choice in the matter, these parents reluctantly acquiesced. They regarded their children, on admission to the school, as having been officially stigmatized and they regarded this stigma as being near permanent. Having accepted the general disadvantage that would occur as a consequence of this irrevocable step they then looked to minimize

the detrimental effect by capitalising on the practical advantages that were to be obtained from special education, such as a more favourable pupil teacher ratio or a more comprehensive programme of therapy.

When the same parents were subsequently approached with the idea of their children being withdrawn from special education they appeared to take a very poor view of this. They appeared to see it as an unacceptable proposal. In their eyes they had made a commitment which allowed their children to attend a special school and thus acquire an inferior social status, which was virtually permanent, in return for advantage in other sectors of their children's lives. They considered that it was subsequently being suggested that, after their sacrifice had been made, the children should be withdrawn from the source of advantage, represented by the special education, which they had hoped might go some way to ameliorate the effects of the endorsement, or acquisition, of special status. Even those parents who did not accept their own children's deviant status, at the time schooling was being discussed, would, almost inevitably, be aware of the stigma that was associated with physical disability. Their own reactions and those

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

of their intimates, acquired during the period of their lives which pre-dated the birth of their children, would prompt this.

It is, of course, pertinent to bear in mind that the children's deviant status would be likely to have a direct effect on other members of their family, including the parents, who would find themselves in the type of situation which Goffman (1963) explains would cause them to acquire a stigma because of their close association with stigmatized individuals. Voysey (1975) points out that in their situation they would have no choice but to accept a "courtesy stigma". This fact may have been brought to the fore by their association with the parents of other children who were pupils of the special school.

Many of the parents who attended the study school regularly seemed to benefit from mutual support which they gained from the group they regularly met there. Family friendships developed from such meetings and the mothers of pupils of the school formed an independent "self-help" club, which met regularly outside the school. There is little doubt, that parents who regularly met, at the study school, in connection with

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

school functions, regarded themselves as a definite social group. One mother, when speaking of the difficulties faced by people whose children were newly enrolled at the study school claimed, "We can offer them a lot of help and advice, if only they'd take notice and come to our meetings". A man in the same parental group drew attention to their potential value, in a consultative role, to the local education authority by pointing out "If now and again they sent somebody to our meetings we could really clue them up" and another parent commenting on the group generally stated, "Even though I say so myself we really are a nice crowd and we'll help anybody".

The parents' movement into this group may have been closely connected with the acknowledgement of deviance but it also provided them with a source of solace and it was used as a means of reducing anxiety connected with their children's difficulties. In the judgement of many parents this aspect of the special school was not to be given up lightly in exchange for what they saw as the insecurity of a much larger, less intimate establishment where both they and their children would be regarded as social inferiors and fail to gain full acceptance.

THE CHILDREN'S ATTITUDE TO INTEGRATION

Because of my professional responsibility there was obviously some doubt about the ethics of subjecting children of primary school age to formal interviews solely for the purpose of writing a thesis. However, during the course of my work in connection with the preparation of pupils of the study school for integration, I had occasion to encourage them, in small groups, to discuss mainstream education and the prospect of their being transferred to mainstream schools. It was part of my task to encourage them to talk about this, to air their fears and generally express themselves on the subject.

Following these discussions I was often approached by individual pupils who had an additional question or some specific point they wished to broach in private. Their views, as explained to me were to a certain extent corroborated from two other sources. The first one was their class-work where they expressed themselves through media such as free writing, poems and general project work. The second was their general attitude to the prospect of change as outlined in their casual remarks and their reactions to the preparations for it.

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

Even with the assistance of other forms of possible corroboration, such as comments made during interviews many years later, it would have been rash to claim to have been able to obtain more than a very general impression of the children's opinions. How much, for example would their stated opinions have been influenced by their desire to please their teachers? To what extent might their views be a parrot like reiteration of their parents' opinions, or to what extent may they have been synthesizing opinions with the aid of models of the educational system constructed by others, perhaps even in terms they did not understand?

It was not unexpected to find that in most cases a child's broad views on education and ultimate verdict on the suitability for him, or her, of both integrated and segregated education seemed to owe much to the opinions I had heard expressed by the child's parents. As Pennington (1986) observes "in most societies the family is the major source of influence on the child". However, when integration was first mentioned by the children, it was during the early stages of the process, as far as the individual child was concerned. These primary-age children at the study school tended to regard it as a

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

remote stage in their lives such as starting work. At this stage their views tended to be very definite, devoid of any compromise.

As the implementation of the transfer began to approach there were occasions when comments made in the flow of conversation or questions, asked in pursuit or reassurance, did seem to reveal a child's perception of some facets of his, or her, situation in a mainstream school. It would be unwise to treat impressions thus gained as valid representations of the children's opinions of mainstream education or the integration programme in which they were currently involved. Nevertheless they obviously did reveal some of the main causes for anxiety, and some of the opportunities, which the children associated with the prospect of their mainstream admissions.

Two fears, connected with an integrated placement, were consistently expressed by both those children who were due to be transferred to mainstream schools and those who were to remain in special education. One was the fear of physical injury and physical stress. In one group discussion, involving six pupils, who were scheduled to be transferred to an integrated setting in

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

less than two terms from the date of the discussion, a boy explained that he thought it would be difficult "keeping up with them when they go from the yard to the class" (the playground to the classroom). A girl agreed, commenting, "Yeah, that's right and you might get knocked down in the corridors on the way there".

Many of the comments also hinted at the source of this anxiety being rooted in the fact that these children were adjusted to the secluded atmosphere of the special school. For instance, one boy warned, "And you might get knocked down on the yard, cos it'll be a big one and there'll be nobody there to look after you". In some cases this anxiety, connected with a situation in which the children saw themselves as operating under a greatly reduced level of supervision, may have been induced by the worries of parents.

It is, however, interesting to note that this particular anxiety about integrated education was common throughout the study group, irrespective of the opinions of the children's parents and whether the children concerned were due to be transferred to a main stream school or stay in special education. Another noteworthy fact is that those children due to be transferred to

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

mainstream schools virtually ignored this topic until their preparation for transfer to an integrated setting entered its later stages. It was then mentioned in general discussion and in private conversations with school staff. According to many of those parents who regularly attended the study school the children concerned also raised the topic at home during this stage of their integration preparation.

The second fear, connected with integration, which was widespread throughout the study group concerned the question of their acceptance by the host pupils of mainstream schools. During the course of one small group discussion a girl said, of the pupils of a mainstream school, "They might not take to you. Some people don't and kids can be funny like that too". Anxiety about this was rarely mentioned by the children during the earlier part of their preparation for integrated education. However, as the time for their transfers neared, and they saw their admission to a mainstream school as an imminent change rather than part of distant future developments, this particular worry was regularly voiced by most of them.

The precise time, relative to mainstream enrolment,

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

at which it was broached varied from individual to individual, but its significance seemed to become most apparent to the children at roughly the same time as the practical problems which they linked with the school transfer. With one exception only, the potential problems associated with acceptance by their future schoolmates were referred to regularly, and most often, during the same period that the children queried practical details such as the provision of transport to the new school, help with carrying a tray in the school dining room or the provision of aids such as electric typewriters.

Although the children's opinions about the value of integrated education may have been very heavily influenced by their parents' views on the subject, there seemed to be a stage in their approach to mainstream school admission when this domination of their opinions was tempered by the day to day problems which the children anticipated would occur after their transfers. At this point they seemed to be much more sensitive to the points of view expressed by their classmates, especially with regard to details of the quality of the social interaction they might anticipate at a mainstream

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

school.

During this period most of them approached the staff of the study school with questions that were obviously intended to elicit discussion or reassurance in connection with this particular topic. It was perhaps significant that, during conversations of this type, the children often tried to establish the relevance of the experience of the member of staff involved early in the exchange. For example, one girl was reported as opening a conversation with the question, "Did you used to work in an ordinary school before you came here Miss?". On another occasion a boy who, had asked about children knocking school fellows over when hurrying along corridors, interposed the subsidiary query, "A.... (a classmate) says you used to teach in a comprehensive school is that right?", before I had time to reply to his first question.

There was much in the attitudes of those children who had reached this stage of the integration process that suggested they felt they were about to move outside their allotted group. At times some of them appeared to regard this as an adventure but they all exhibited signs of feeling pressure associated with this move. Some,

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

rather wistfully, discussed details of the special schools to which their classmates were to be transferred and contrasted them with their own future schools.

Those children who were due to continue their education in special schools expressed opinions and reacted in a way which portrayed a mirror image of the group who were preparing for mainstream admission. For the main part they claimed to be just as pleased that they were staying in special education as their schoolmates were to leave it. Nevertheless in some cases, as the time for transfer drew near, there was the same hint of reservations about their placements.

In some instances this was apparently due to a sense of lost opportunity. Several children in this group seemed to seek reassurance about the possibility of joining mainstream education later in their school careers. A girl commented, "I'll be better at M... (a secondary special school placement), I mean I can always go somewhere else after, if I want to, can't I?" and waited for my reaction. On another occasion a boy asked the question, "I might manage better when I'm bigger, I could go then couldn't I?". Perhaps this child sensed the possibility that the degree of impediment engendered

by his disability might change. As Brennan (1987) points out the degree of handicap occasioned by a disability might change even if the disability itself does not. Nevertheless parental opinions still constituted a major influence on the formation of the children's views and the fear of physical injury and worry about acceptance were the major sources of anxiety associated with mainstream admission.

CONCLUSION

Response to the prospect of school enrolment, amongst the parents of the study group, indicated that it involved questions of status. Some parents who readily accepted the suggestion that a special school was an appropriate placement for their children seemed to do so because they regarded their children as being of inferior status in any case. Others apparently thought their children to be in urgent need of the kind of care and assistance which only such a school could provide. For the same reasons, these parents also disagreed with their children being transferred to a mainstream school.

Those parents who resisted the suggestion of special

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

education were influenced in this by the restrictions which they thought it would impose upon their children's life chances. In some cases this may have been because they were concerned about the limitation of opportunities for academic education that their children would find in a small very specialized school. However, most did so because of their antipathy to the special status, which they assumed would be an inevitable result of the enrolment.

The majority of parents of the subjects of the study appeared to accept that special education offered their children some practical advantages, but they were clearly of the opinion that these were outweighed by the social disadvantages accrued as a result of the stigma associated with special school admission.

Most of the parents who accepted the proffered placements for their children, clearly did so because they saw no viable alternative and consenting to the special school placements for their children was, in the eyes of most parents, tantamount to agreeing to their children being permanently labelled as socially inferior to their contemporaries.

Consequently, when integrated education was suggested

CHAPTER FIVE - PARENTS, SUBJECTS AND INTEGRATION

they did not see it as an advantage. They saw it as a move which would deprive their children of the advantages associated with special education without being able to provide any remedy with regard to the main disadvantage, the social stigma, which their children had acquired in exchange. Their reactions to the proposition of their children being transferred to mainstream education, therefore, suggested a change of heart that had not occurred.

The children, largely reflecting the anxieties and biases of their parents, also saw drawbacks in mainstream schooling. Some of these were practical disadvantages such as those suggested by their individual disabilities, for instance, physically incapacity limiting their rate of progress about a large building. However, their most common cause for concern was also associated with the social stigma which they carried. The problem of their acceptance by the host population of a mainstream school was dominant among their anxieties in this connection.

CHAPTER SIX

CHAPTER SIX

STAFF REACTIONS TO PROPOSED INTEGRATED EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The main foci of attention in most discussions concerning the effectiveness of education in schools are usually members of one or more of three main groups, namely, pupils, parents and teachers. It is therefore necessary, during a study which is largely concerned with the effectiveness of various forms of schooling, to examine the attitudes and reactions of the staffs of the various schools concerned with the education of the study group. The staffs were, of course, composed mainly of teachers, whose influence on any aspect of a school can be of particular importance. In addition to the fact that they constitute the major part of a day school workforce, they are more often accorded the role of "rule makers" than other members of a school staff.

Such an examination will, at least, provide some detail concerning the context in which the study group received their education. In addition it could also furnish more valuable data in the form of an indication of the function of established institutions as a medium

for the transmission of social pressures and social values.

This does not assume that the reports of the staff members concerned should be accepted as perfectly objective and unbiased. The discovery of bias and the recognition of subjective opinion in their accounts could, in itself, help to provide a broad and realistic view of the children's social situation during their school days. For instance, the attitudes and opinions of the teachers involved may well have made a significant contribution to the eventual effectiveness of those educational systems which are under review. The fulfilment of their roles would clearly be affected by basic factors concerned with their work such as job satisfaction, conviction, personal commitment and self image in the particular role they were called upon to play in this context.

REACTIONS OF SPECIAL SCHOOL NON-TEACHING STAFF

The prospect of integrated education generated mixed reactions among special school staff before the programme, which involved the study school being assimilated by a neighbouring primary school, began.

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

Until this occurred their main source of valid data about integration was the limited feedback from a comprehensive school which had been accepting a very small proportion of the study school pupils for their secondary education (six only during the course of eleven years). This was little more than a token opportunity for children attending the special school, and probably owed its inception largely to pressure from a minority of parents and head teacher of the study school.

The staff of the study school regarded such a placement as a notable achievement but a rarity which was so unusual as to be an aberration. One teacher said, of such placements, "Oh I know there have been children moved to an ordinary schools in the past but you can't really call that integration can you? I mean there's only been the odd one".

The unqualified ancillary staff of the study school, such as the welfare assistants seemed quite unsure about the ultimate effect of the proposed integration scheme but expressed some misgivings about it in the short term. One welfare assistant commented, "I know everybody's saying how good it will be for them (the

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

pupils), but it won't be the same will it?" Another commented, "They say it will be like them going to an ordinary school, but kids at an ordinary school couldn't get the kind of help some of them need". One of her colleagues explained the future dilemma she anticipated by drawing attention to the fact that some of the study school pupils needed considerable assistance in the matter of basic functions such as using a toilet, washing their hands or feeding themselves and pointed out, "It's not going to be anything like a normal school if kids get help like that, is it?" More detailed conversations on the subject suggested that much of the apprehension was rooted in anxiety connected with their ability to discharge their responsibilities, as they saw them, whilst in a different but, until then, unspecified role.

The same child-care staff clearly anticipated a change of working practice in a new environment and thought this would constitute different working conditions. Apparently they were worried, not only about their ability to cope under the new circumstances, but also about the resultant status that the future changes would bring. They seemed to sense that the informal,

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

intimate ethos of the small special school would not transfer to the larger mainstream school. They were worried about the extent to which this would affect their own status after the transfer, being of the opinion that they would be unable to maintain their close relationships with staff of other disciplines under new circumstances.

Their ideas on this subject were not without some justification. For instance welfare assistants tended to have a more prominent role in the "open door" policy of the special school, under which all parents were encouraged to visit the school during the school day, even without an appointment if they were anxious about something. This policy was deemed to be impractical at the mainstream schools, which had many more children on roll. Also the demarcation between teaching staff and non-teaching staff tended to be much less pronounced at the much smaller school.

The paramedical staff who worked at the study school seemed to anticipate a similar effect, resulting from the integration programme. They too felt uneasy about the impending change but did not seem to feel intimidated by it to the same extent as the other non-

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

teaching staff. The question of a possible curtailment of status did not seem to worry them, they appeared to feel that their professional qualifications were a defence against any such threat and there was, in one case, a hint that they could attain increased status from their more remote position in the new educational setting. This was made by a therapist who suggested that "The teachers in the normal school might appreciate the work we do more than they do here". She explained that the special school staff, "see us around, hear us talking about the kids in the staff-room and just take our work for granted."

Most of the disadvantages which the paramedical staff anticipated seemed to be connected with the programmes of therapy and support for which they were responsible. A mainstream school was, in their eyes, less flexible and more impersonal than the special school in which they were working. Consequently they expressed fears that the children's withdrawal from class, for treatment, would not be arranged so easily, emphasizing those cases when re-adjustments were needed. The cases most often quoted in this connection were those arising from absence from school, including their own, and those

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

resulting from extra therapy needed following children's hospital treatment.

Typical of their worries on this point was one expressed by a physiotherapist who explained, "The teachers in an ordinary school just won't have a clue about therapy programmes, how could they?" On another occasion a therapist pointed out, "It's not going to be easy to fit in with a hard and fast school time table". Because of their concern, they requested separate discussions with the local specialist in community health and a representative from the local education authority.

Obviously there was some substance in the assertion that the therapy programmes would be easier to organize and adjust in an environment which involved fewer staff, fewer pupils and much shorter distances to and from treatment rooms. However, it was ironic that therapists should have been particularly concerned about this aspect of the children's welfare. Withdrawal for treatment was the disadvantage of working in a special school referred to most often and most emphatically by teaching staff. Without exception the special school teachers raised it as an obstacle to their work. They

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

clearly regarded much of the variation of regular treatment timetables as inconsiderate in many cases and in some instances unnecessary.

For some years before the beginning of the integration scheme there had been a "closed period" system in operation for each class in the study school. This was an attempt to minimize the disruption that was regularly claimed by the teaching staff. As part of this system class teachers were guaranteed two lesson periods each school day, during which none of their pupils would be withdrawn for therapy, these periods varied from class to class. The system seemed to help but it did not obviate teachers' complaints. If, as both paramedical staff and teachers claimed, the withdrawal programme affected children's progress there seemed to be some grounds for supposing that its degree of precedence was a matter of balance between physical and academic progress. Hence small variations in the programme could be self-compensating in some instances.

REACTIONS OF THE SPECIAL SCHOOL TEACHING STAFF

It could be claimed that teachers, because of the nature of their work, would tend to be more altruistic,

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

in their professional lives, than the members of some other professions. However, it would be rather naive to presume that their opinions and decisions were, at all times, devoid of any influence arising from self interest, even in the form of unconscious bias. It is, therefore, germane to point out that the staff of the study school realized that the approaching integration programme, on which their opinions were probably focussed, necessitated their transfer to a different school.

There was general agreement that this would involve a radical change in working practices, the details of which were to be decided. Other factors are also worthy of note in this connection. One teacher, for instance, asked about the status she was likely to have amongst the staff of the host school, after the integration scheme had been accomplished. She explained that she was unsure whether the special school staff would be recognized as "specialists", explaining, "Some of us have taken extra qualifications and I don't think they (the staff of the host school) realize it".

Another member of the study school teaching staff saw difficulties arising from salary differentials,

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

observing, "I've only been up there (the mainstream school) twice and both times somebody has asked me about the special schools allowance (extra payment for the teaching staff of special schools)". She later clarified the source of embarrassment by saying, "They seem to think that they will be due to it (the allowance) if they have to teach handicapped children and it's not my place to tell them they won't". On another occasion a teacher, at the special school speculated, "I can't see any of us getting better scales (reference to promotion), they think we have an extra scale point with the special schools' allowance anyway".

Among the teaching staff of the study school the response to the prospect of integrated education was generally rather unfavourable. During the process of their appointments the attention of three of the teaching staff had been drawn to the intention of the local authority to make integrated education, in some form, more available to physically disabled children. The fact, that the study school would probably be involved in this reorganization, was also explained. When the integration scheme was accepted as official policy, and the necessary building began, these teachers

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

expressed some reservations about it.

One of them cautioned, "It will only work if Mrs. W----- knows what she is doing and the others support it" (reference to the head teacher and staff of the mainstream school involved). Another voiced doubts about the forthcoming plans, reasoning that, "They (mainstream school staff) are worried to death about dealing with our children they'll panic at the least thing". The third teacher expressed doubts about the situation but speculated that "It could work out all right".

As the implementation of the integration scheme approached the first two of this group of three teachers became increasingly unhappy about it. During the course of their last two terms in the special school one of them seem to feel particularly insecure in connection with the reorganization and even spoke of a feeling of rejection claiming, "They don't want us up there (the mainstream school) really, they fancy the idea of a new building but not our children or us". The other expressed great misgivings about the success of the venture concluding, "No I don't think it will work, not the way it was meant to, not with her (head teacher) attitude". The third member of staff, after an initial

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

query about the wisdom of the development, remained uncommitted until after the scheme had been implemented.

Some of their lack of confidence about the new situation probably sprang from the unease and stress felt by their future colleagues. Information, gained during discussions with some of the staff of the mainstream school referred to, suggested that there was a feeling of insecurity among them. This might have been alleviated by offering the staff in question the opportunity to gain experience by working in the special school for a short period, of two or more weeks. Unfortunately the resources for this kind of preparation were, apparently, not available. The feeling of vulnerability experienced by the mainstream staff supported the assertion of Haskel et. al. (1977), that in "regular school the teaching staff must be properly prepared", if a "handicapped" pupil is to be placed in their school.

The remaining three members of the study school teaching staff had been appointed before the integration scheme was planned. However, they were aware that the decision to implement some form of integration had been taken at least four years before it was introduced. One

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

member of this group was very much in favour of the introduction of the scheme. She had enthusiastically championed the cause of integrated education for several years before it was seriously considered in connection with the study school. It was evident that any threat, such as reduction in her own status, or alteration in the direction of her career, was overshadowed by the benefits she thought the reorganization could offer her pupils.

The other two teachers, who were established at the school before mainstream education was mooted, were uncommitted about the ultimate effect of the children being transferred to an integrated situation. One of them saw a possible personal benefit in the new role that it would entail, apparently thinking that her return to a mainstream school could be an improvement in her career prospects. The other was less optimistic, she thought her work would be more difficult in the forthcoming situation. She thought that, given a high level of cooperation from her future colleagues, the inherent difficulties could be reduced to an acceptable level.

The special school teaching staff regarded their

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

specialized contribution as being vital to the success of the integration. They saw themselves as playing a key role both in the assimilation of their pupils, by a mainstream school, and the pupils continued progress in the new system. All the members of staff concerned acknowledged, with varying degrees of fervour, that the reorganization could be socially advantageous. However their opinions varied with regard to the magnitude of the advantage and in which areas it would be most apparent. Nevertheless, it was obvious that they were of the opinion that the children's gain in this area would be partly offset by a detrimental effect on academic progress.

Only one teacher was sure that, if a good balance was achieved in this area, the overall effect could enhance the disabled children's future prospects. Her colleagues tended to think the reorganization was a matter of trading one advantage for another. They seriously questioned the wisdom of doing this, suggesting that, in many cases, the children would be net losers.

THE ATTITUDES OF MAINSTREAM ANCILLARY STAFF

Without exception the child-care staff of the

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

mainstream schools claimed that, in principle, they welcomed the idea of physically disabled children being admitted to the schools in which they worked. Nevertheless, according to their opinions, there were two areas in which extra support would be essential. The first was the ready availability of medical and paramedical advice. Ancillary staff, in common with many of their mainstream colleagues, obviously perceived the needs of disabled children as being in some ways fundamentally different from those of their mainstream contemporaries.

Consequently they saw themselves as being in a particularly vulnerable position, without specialist help or additional training and experience. One welfare assistant complained, "I mean we know nothing about how to handle them or the tablets they take or what to do if anything goes wrong". The second modification which they thought would be necessary was concerned with the provision of general assistance, to enable them to cope with the increased work load, which they anticipated integration would entail. Another welfare assistant pointed out, "There's a big difference between helping the odd kiddie who has a bit of an accident and looking

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

after them who need help every time they go to the toilet".

This kind of anxiety was alleviated in the case of the mainstream primary school which was to be involved in an amalgamation with the study school. The child-care staff, in that school, were reassured by the promised presence of experienced colleagues from special education. There was, however, some ambiguity in their response to the situation they visualized would pertain after the merging of the two schools. It was clear they questioned the effect of the alteration on their position in the infrastructure, and anticipated a resultant status implication. One of the child care staff said she was "looking forward to it really" because she thought, "We (the child care staff from both schools) should get on well". Later in the same conversation she alluded to her reservations by saying, "We'll need help when they (the disabled children) come, but we want them (the special school staff) to show us what to do, not tell us, or we'll have too many chiefs and not enough indians".

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

EARLY RESPONSES OF MAINSTREAM TEACHING STAFF

Teachers who staffed schools which were used for individually arranged mainstream placements, referred to earlier, tended to express their opinions more readily than those whose schools accepted disabled children as part of an organized integration scheme. These informal placements, which started as early as 1972, were effected without any additional provision in the way of staff or resources for the host school. The teaching staff of the schools might fairly be said to have regarded the admission of a disabled pupil in one of three main ways, the provision of opportunity morally due to the child, a charitable act, or a nuisance.

This was not surprising in view of the results of work in similar areas of education, the findings of Jones (Barton and Tomlinson 1981) were that not all teachers were "equally willing" with regard to the integration of handicapped children. Nevertheless, only a very small minority of the staff involved held the first of these opinions.

Those who saw themselves as providing charity, though often good-hearted, offered it within definite limits and on the understanding that it must not adversely

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

affect the efficient performance of their school, to any noticeable extent. A head teacher, who was approached about the future possibility of admitting physically disabled pupils to his school, agreed readily but quickly added the condition, "as long as they're not too badly handicapped or badly deformed, we couldn't manage them". Another head teacher, discussing the same proposition offered, "I'll help you as far as I can, poor kids, they deserve it". Later he added, "Remember though, we have no special facilities and we would be talking in terms of one or two carefully selected children, for the present anyway".

In the same vein a teacher, who was drawing attention to the success of a mainstream transfer from the study school, explained, "If every secondary school could offer a place for just one of them (pupils of the study school) it would, help some of them". The tenor of the reactions echoed some of the findings of Hegarty et al (1982) who noted some teachers concerned with the integration process referred to the disabled pupils as objects for charity.

Recalling the period, in the education authority area, when integrated educational placements depended on

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

these informal negotiations one teacher explained, "Nobody really wanted them (disabled pupils) except the head". When questioned further she added, "He persuaded the senior master and the deputies thought it was a good thing, or so they said, but most people seemed to think that S----- (the study school) was the best place for them (disabled pupils)".

A member of staff from the same mainstream school remembered hearing some of his colleagues being assured, by the two senior members of staff, about the near normality of the disabled pupils who would be enrolled there. He quoted phrases such as "We just won't have anybody who doesn't look normal" and "If they might upset anybody they just wouldn't be considered". The tenor of teachers' reactions, as indicated by these remarks, was supported by my own observations.

During the period when the same approach to integrated placements was in current use, I visited a comprehensive school which was to be used for future integrated placements and was invited to join an informal staff-room discussion on the subject of physically disabled children. As I entered the staff-room I saw a senior member of staff looking at what I

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

later realized was a notice concerned with the proposed admission of disabled pupils. He was complaining to his colleagues saying, "I can't help thinking that this is the thin end of the wedge. We could be dumped with them of all shapes and sizes, once they get one in". During a similar visit, to another school, a teacher explained, "I believe in supporting handicapped children, I would give money to them, but I couldn't work with them day in day out".

There was little doubt that, at that time, the majority of teaching staff in potential host schools were not in favour of receiving pupils from the study school. This may have been for a variety of reasons, including some which were remediable, such as insecurity arising from the unfamiliar and reluctance to accede to unorthodox practices. However, there are grounds for supposing that some of the teachers regarded handicapped children as members of a category of children who were inappropriate for the mainstream school where they worked.

THE MAINSTREAM TEACHERS IN THE INTEGRATION SCHEME

An integration scheme for physically disabled

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

children eventually resulted in the role of the study school being largely absorbed by the mainstream sector of the education authority in which it was situated. It was implemented in four distinct stages.

The first was the designation of a secondary school, provided with an extra member of staff for that purpose, to which "suitable" pupils of the study school could be transferred for their secondary education. The teacher was accorded the status of head of department and promoted to the appropriate salary scale. This particular channel of integration was closed twelve years later, when the secondary school concerned was closed during reorganization.

By this time the second stage had been introduced, this was the rebuilding of a mainstream junior school on campus with an E.S.N. (s) school, as it was then termed. The site was chosen in order to allow the sharing of medical facilities such as hydrotherapy and physiotherapy. The junior school was allocated extra classroom space and a more favourable pupil/staff ratio, which was effected mainly by the absorption of the staff of the study school.

Following the implementation of this phase the newly

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

vacated junior school was modified in order to provide similar facilities for integration at the infant level. Finally a comprehensive school in the same local authority was designated for the admission of physically disabled children, after which modifications to facilitate this were begun.

Some of the teaching staff of the host schools had been appointed after the plans for the integration scheme were formulated, in some instances even after they had been partially implemented. Their response to the mainstream admission of disabled children was often different from those of their colleagues who had been in post before the integration programme was envisaged. This was not really surprising, especially since some of the later appointees had actually applied for the posts in response to advertisements for teachers required to work in an integrated educational situation.

The attitudes of teachers also tended to vary in response to the gradual assimilation of the implications of the Education Act 1981. As the middle eighties approached they became noticeably more reticent about openly expressing opinions, such as those which indicated disapproval of integrated education. Even when

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

discussing the subject in confidence they often tended to be reluctant to state negative views in an overt manner.

A Comparison of notes made in the late seventies and the middle eighties, during discussions with the same teachers, at first suggested a change of the opinions of a majority of the people concerned. Those who had formerly expressed opinions opposing integrated education quite readily no longer objected to it. However discussions of their opinions in more detail revealed this was not so. Although the objections to integration appeared to be muted it was by no means fully accepted. A typical example of this was provided by a teacher who merely nodded when it was suggested in a group discussion that mainstream education would greatly help physically disabled children. When he was asked later, in the course of a conversation, if he thought the integration of physically disabled children and young people was "a good thing", he replied, "Well I can't see it working too well here". When asked if he thought this was because of factors which were peculiar to the particular situation in which he was working he replied, "It might be I suppose, I don't really think

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

so". He was then asked if he could envisage any changes in the system which might bring success and commented, "I can't think of any off hand, no, but then I expect the powers that be will have some more brilliant ideas. You never know, some of them might work".

Other teachers were more definite but less informative with regard to details. During my attempts to obtain the views of teachers who had not volunteered, nine of them declined to be interviewed offering reasons such as "I don't agree with it (integrated education), ask one of the keen ones" or "I'm not looking forward to it at all, you'd only get a biased opinion from me". Explanations, to the effect that all views were of importance and treated confidentially, were of no avail. It was difficult not to speculate about the connection between the reactions of these teachers and the opinion of Booth And Swann (1987), that "Our sense of normality has little or no place for disability".

Sixteen teachers, from four mainstream schools which were designated to take part in an integration programme were interviewed. Two of them expressed serious misgivings about the scheme, one complained that it was "just another way of saving money". The other explained

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

that he thought it was being introduced prematurely before adequate staff training and without any kind of pilot scheme. He commented, "We're in such a hurry to keep up with the fashion we haven't time for the ground-work".

Fourteen were clearly in favour of accepting physically disabled pupils. Eight of them, however reported a lack of support for the programme from the majority of their colleagues. They explained that in some cases this was indicated by apathetic reaction during discussions on the subject. However they reported that in many cases their colleagues reacted in rather hostile ways. These reactions were described as ranging from reluctant acceptance of suggested changes, to openly expressed antagonism to the idea of integrated education.

The most commonly quoted objection, which they reported having heard, was that the mainstream assimilation of physically disabled pupils would hamper the education process in the host school. Most teachers who had serious objections anticipated that it would absorb a disproportionate amount of time and resources. During an impromptu staff-room discussion, in which I

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

participated, at one of the main stream schools in question this suggestion, that scarcity of resources would result from integrated education was raised.

When I asked if the three teachers, who held this view, thought that the problem was mainly a question of scarcity of resources which could be obviated by sufficiently generous financial allowances and extra staff they did not agree. One of them explained, "You can't treat kids in the same class differently". Another added, "No you can't leave ordinary kids marking time while you wait for an answer from a disabled kid, and you can't ignore the disabled kid". The third member of the group suggested, "To be fair to everyone you'd have to put them in a separate class - the idea of having a minder (reference to additional individual help) trailing after them's not on in an ordinary classroom".

This apparent opposition to integrated education seemed to be rooted in the supposition, of the teachers, that to cater for the special needs of physically handicapped pupils would distort the character and aims of the school, rather than in specific difficulties.

Seven of those teachers who reported that they had noticed no unfavourable reactions from their colleagues

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

were appointed to their current schools after integration schemes had been agreed. Four of them had obtained promotion by being appointed to posts which carried special responsibility for the welfare of the physically disabled pupils due to be admitted.

After interviewing the eight teachers who claimed to have encountered no unfavourable reaction to the mainstream admission of physically disabled children there was some doubt in my mind about the accuracy of their assessment of the situations they described. Three of them were rather subjective in their reports. One of them explained that the odd dissenting comments she had heard were just a matter of other members of staff "indulging in a bit of bravado or mickey taking" and assured me that as the time for the new admissions approached she could see signs of her colleagues "rising to the occasion". Another explained that there was good in everyone and "this kind of challenge was just the thing to bring it out, even if there is the odd crack (deprecating remark)".

Two others exhibited such a high level of enthusiasm, reinforced in one case by a rather aggressive way of discussing integrated education, that it was difficult

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

to imagine that their general demeanour would promote any kind of open discussion that might invite criticism of the proposed changes. One of these teachers asserted that "everyone knows in their heart of hearts that this is the only way forward for handicapped children". When a certain lack of enthusiasm in some quarters was mentioned she interpreted this as my "negative thinking", defining the situation I referred to as an illustration of people "waiting for a lead". I found it difficult to reconcile the accounts of the three teachers, who claimed to have encountered no opposition to the integration scheme, with other statements they had made.

Their accounts were also at odds with comments made by others in their presence. One of them drew my attention to the fact that, in a mainstream school, the disabled children would "need an awful lot more support" than I thought since, in her words, "some of the others (teachers) won't put themselves out for them (the disabled children)". Another teacher joined in the impromptu discussion and pointed out that "some of the new staff, especially the medical staff might cause a few headaches, never mind the kids".

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

He further explained, "They won't be used to working the way we do, we've got to be firm with the kids". On another occasion, when I visited a school to interview one of this trio, integrated education was mentioned in connection with my visit. The quality of the conversation which it stimulated was not concomitant with even passive support from at least three members of the teaching staff present. One teacher offered the unsolicited opinion, "We have enough on our plates, at the moment, without any extra complications". One of her colleagues added "too much if you ask me".

Even though a number of the teaching staff of the mainstream schools which had been scheduled to take part in the integration scheme saw the presence of disabled children as an impediment to their work, there was a general feeling that the disabled children themselves would benefit greatly from the proposed arrangements. I was at pains to check this impression, which I gained from the reported comments of the sixteen teachers I interviewed at length. I took care, during my several visits to their schools, to speak briefly with as many teachers as I could and listened carefully to any discussion on the subject. Having worked in the same

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

education authority area for over nineteen years I was also in a position to be able to exploit personal contacts, both direct and indirect, with some of the teachers of the schools involved.

It appeared to be generally accepted by the mainstream teaching staff that most, if not all, the disabled children, who were about to be enrolled at their schools, would benefit greatly from the admission, once they were able to adjust to the change of environment which would be entailed. The widespread opinion among these members of staff was that although the children would be offered a wider curriculum they would be unlikely to secure academic gains of any consequence from the change.

An experienced teacher suggested that the increased academic opportunity would probably be offset by the discouragement they encountered when working with children whose attainment was significantly higher, explaining, "It could even put them off when they meet some really stimulating competition". Another pointed out that even though there would be a minority of children who might have the ability to take advantage of the new facilities their physical impediments could

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

largely negate this. He enlarged on this by saying, "If they are slow in getting round the school they'll miss a lot of lesson time or if they're slow writers or slow to turn the pages of books they'll miss a lot of work".

However, there was little doubt, in the minds of most teachers, about the social benefits that would arise from the implementation of the new system. It was widely accepted that the host population would also derive benefit from integrated education. Some teachers thought that it would, as one put it, "be good for some of these kids (the host population of the school) to see how bad some of them (the incomers) are and they might be grateful for what they've got".

Others thought the implied responsibility would be beneficial to the pupils already on roll. One woman claimed, "I know we have some rough kids here but I think they'd rise to the occasion, they can be kind". When asked about the social benefits for the disabled children almost all the teachers asked were certain that the incoming children would benefit greatly. On being questioned further their replies were equally prompt but rather imprecise. They tended to make comments such as, "The other children will be wary about them at first but

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

eventually they'll be accepted as normal". Typically the teacher who stated this then introduced a measure of ambiguity saying, "Oh yes, after a couple of weeks here they'll be real V.I.P.s, no bullying, first in the dinner queue, that sort of thing".

When asked questions directly concerned with social contacts most of the teachers seemed to be rather taken aback. Asked, for instance, if they thought some of the disabled children might mix with other pupils outside school hours their replies seemed to be rather vague such as, "I couldn't say about that, some of our kids come from quite long distances", or "You never know even some of the roughest of our children can be surprisingly nice". This type of comment appeared to support the findings of Booth and Swann (1987) who report that, "Even people who are heavily involved in the development of integrated education fall prey to perceptions of pupils which are dominated by their disability".

CONCLUSION

During the course of the development of opportunities for integrated education, as experienced by the subjects of this study, the attitudes of school staffs altered

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

noticeably. The extent and rate of this modification was clearly influenced by changes that occurred at two different levels. The first was the expansion of integrated placements at a local level. The second was the review of special education at national level, which was granted formal recognition in the form of the "Warnock Report" (1978) and eventually resulted in the Education Act 1981.

These changes were, of course, symptoms of the evolution that was evident from the general climate of educational debate. This was readily apparent from other sources, such as the more recent literature on education and articles in the press. As Craft (1984) points out, it is widely acknowledged that educational change usually occurs as a result of social change and "only rarely precedes it".

The non-teaching staff, of both the special school and the mainstream schools, anticipated their involvement in integrated education with apprehension. They were clearly uncertain of their future roles and were unable to find reassurance from any quarter. Unlike the welfare assistants, the paramedical staff were reasonably sure about the nature of their work after the

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

forthcoming changes. Nevertheless, in common with the child care staff, they saw the outcome as a potential influence on their status and a possible impediment to their efficiency. Like them, they found it difficult to imagine that their level of assistance for the children in their care could be maintained, after a change in working practices, without an overall increase in staff resources.

Most of the teachers who were currently working in special education were concerned that the proposed change would prove to be a threat to their status. They regarded themselves as specialists and expressed some doubt as to whether their mainstream colleagues would acknowledge this, even worrying that the new working environment could prove a threat to career advancement.

The admission of disabled children also caused some concern among the teaching staff of the mainstream schools. In agreement with their colleagues in the special school, they considered the needs of disabled children to be very different from those of the children already in their care. To this end they felt insecure about the idea of working in the approaching educational situation without the benefit of extra training and the

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

availability of on-the-spot specialist advice. Paradoxically the idea of working in close proximity to some of those people who could provide advice, such as experienced teachers from special education and paramedical staff, seemed to suggest a threat to their authority.

Throughout the period of time to which the material used for this study refers there was much evidence of the overwhelming good will of teachers, in respect of physically disabled pupils. The provision of special education had formerly been widely regarded as an unqualified benefit. However, as the completion of the integration scheme referred to in this work approached, opinions about the most appropriate way to educate these children had changed. It was no longer unconventional for a teacher to support the idea of integrated education.

Consequently the majority of the members of staff, of the schools involved, supported the scheme and expected the disabled children to gain much from it. Even though they may have had reservations about its effect on the host pupils of the mainstream schools integration was generally accepted as an important opportunity for those

CHAPTER SIX - STAFF REACTIONS

children who would have formerly received special education.

Some of the staff who had been appointed to the mainstream schools after they had been designated for involvement in the integration scheme expressed such a deep faith in its efficacy and exhibited such boundless enthusiasm for it that it was tempting to theorise about their attitudes. Perhaps they regarded mainstream admission as an attempt to re-label the children involved and presumed it would be a successful antidote to the deviant status, which they sensed the children had acquired. If this was so they probably anticipated the early removal of some of the serious social impediments the children would otherwise encounter because they did not seem to anticipate that any initial difficulties would be associated with the integration process.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CHAPTER SEVEN

INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

INTRODUCTION

Whilst the aims and general notion of integrated education may be widely accepted, the method of its introduction and the manner in which it is subsequently conducted may vary widely. Unlike both mainstream education and special education it was, until recently uncommon. Consequently, lacking the sustenance of historical background, evolved standards and widely accepted credentials, it can vary according to individual concepts and be subject to diverse constraints imposed by such factors as local conditions and limited resources.

It is therefore necessary, if the possible effects of integration are to be appreciated or discussed, to provide a résumé of the forms of integrated education that were offered to the subjects of this study. It is, after all impractical to try to outline the various forms of schooling they experienced, in the absence of widely accepted standards in this sector of education, without defining one of the basic terms to be used.

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

For most, if not all, of those closely involved with the education of the former pupils of the study school there was a considerable discrepancy between the reality of integrated education which was eventually achieved and the model of the situation they had previously constructed. This was not surprising in view of the fact that many of their constructs would, necessarily, be partially generated from little more than extrapolation and biased expectation.

This chapter is an attempt to arrive at a reasonably objective description of the situations encountered by those members of the study group whose schooling included education in an integrated setting.

INTEGRATION AT THE INFANT SCHOOL STAGE

The first two members of the study group who were admitted to mainstream primary schools were enrolled at infant schools before any integration scheme was introduced. At the time of writing one of them is seventeen and a half years of age and the other is almost nineteen. The younger boy, who suffered from cerebral palsy, was ambulant, without the aid of any apparatus. His writing, in the early stages of his education, was very distorted but he was able to pursue

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

his education without the provision of special apparatus. Needing very little more help than a child in a mainstream infant school, his mainstream admission was effected after he had completed his nursery education in the study school. The older of these two young men was admitted to the study school because of a congenital heart defect. His fair complexion tended to emphasize his very obvious cyanosed colour, but he was active with regard to almost all classroom activities.

Both these subjects were regarded as intelligent children by the staff of the study school and this opinion was supported by attainment tests. For instance, both comprehension tests and word recognition tests indicated "reading ages" greater than their chronological ages. Their transfer was initiated following informal contacts between the study school and the infant schools to which they were transferred. The local education authority consented to each transfer only after careful consideration. No extra resources were provided for the host schools. Questions pertaining to the subject of additional support were not raised by either the special school or either of the infant schools.

Both of these attempts to integrate physically

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

disabled children seemed to be successful in the eyes of most of the people closely involved. The parents claimed to be satisfied with the outcome. At the special school the children's former class teacher was pleased with the opportunity that had been offered to the children and the head teachers and class teachers at both infant schools reported that the ventures were successful. As part of a follow-up process I visited both schools midway through the second term of the children's respective admissions. At each school it was explained to me that the disabled children concerned were fully integrated, "completely accepted" as one head teacher put it. However, at those times, I noted that I was introduced at both schools as the subject's head teacher, not former head teacher, to both staff and pupils alike.

During these visits I was told that, apart from during more vigorous physical exercise such as P.E., the children concerned took a full part in the classroom activities. This was confirmed some years later when both the subjects remembered that they disliked being "left out", as one boy explained, during games lessons and P.E. In retrospect both the subjects and their parents were of the opinion that they had been "accepted

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

as normal", in the words of one parent or "regarded as ordinary normal children" as one of the parents of the other child explained. The teachers at the infant schools also used the term "accepted as normal" when describing the situation of these two boys.

Nevertheless ten years later, when I was conducting some earlier research (Thornton 1986) the children were clearly remembered by members of staff at both schools and their efforts were commended using expressions which did not unreservedly support this opinion. One teacher recalled "They did very well really considering they were handicapped, I mean nobody really thought about integrating handicapped children in a school like this". A teacher in the other school commented "Yes A----- was a plucky little boy, at times when he was working away in class you'd hardly know he was handicapped". It was, however, clear that the two children had competed on equal terms with their school-mates in many areas and apparently continued to do so during the rest of their school careers, which indicates a large degree of success, in respect of the attempted integration.

Apart from these two cases the integration of pupils from the study school, at the infant stage of their school careers, was confined to that which

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

occurred as part of the integration scheme, which largely superseded the study school. None of those pupils enrolled at the infant school which participated in this programme were selected for inclusion in the study group. Since this study is principally concerned with young people who have reached, or are approaching, adulthood, they were precluded because of their ages. Nevertheless a brief outline of this particular section of the integration scheme offers useful background information. For example, it reveals that not all those children who would have been pupils of the study school, continued in mainstream education beyond the infant stage. It is also a useful indicator of the ethos of the situation in which the integration appertaining to the study group was taking place.

The physically disabled pupils who were able to take advantage of places provided by the infant school involved in the integration programme could be regarded in two distinct categories, those who were integrated after being transferred from a special school (the study school) and those who were enrolled directly into the integrated situation. Reviewing the situation later there was little evidence, at that early stage, to suggest that either method of entry into integrated

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

education provided any significant advantage, in terms of the children's level of academic, or physical, attainment.

More than six years after the integration scheme started, the head teacher of the infant school suggested that comparing the progress of these two groups of physically disabled children indicated that the method of entry was largely irrelevant, with regard to the children's academic progress. She did however point out that those children who had been enrolled from the special school took longer to settle into her school and accept the new routine.

This was an opinion later endorsed by most of the rest of the school staff. Some were unsure about this point but no-one contradicted it. The comments of the staff suggested that the necessity for this extended settling in period may have been caused by the necessity of breaking entrenched habits, which were acquired as a result of the routine of the study school being more rigid than that of the children's home situation. One teacher, for instance, pointed out "You've just got to have some sort of a routine when you are running a class. At home a mother can fit her life round one young child, a teacher can't. She has other children to cope

with".

The relative achievements of the children in question and their subsequent progress suggested, to the head teacher and her staff, that the influence of other factors in the children's backgrounds tended to overshadow any that they may have accrued from either method of entry. However they were of the opinion that direct entry was still a slight advantage, in most cases, with regard to acclimatisation. Parental attitudes, home backgrounds and the children's own personalities were three of the overriding influences factors to which she referred.

The head teacher was asked about the range of physical disability to be found among the children with special needs who were on roll at her school. Her opinion was that it was comparable to that to be found in a special school but did not include some of the more severely physically disabled children from the education authority area. She disclosed that she had not opposed the admission of any child on grounds of severity of physical disability. However, it was her opinion that the admission panel, who made the ultimate decisions about admissions of disabled children, held the view that even the extra provision of staff at her school

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

would not be sufficient to cope with the requirements of a group which included very severely disabled children.

The views of other members of the infant school staff generally supported the head teacher's opinion. However, they were sure that their school did not admit the very severely disabled children who would once have been enrolled at the study school. The staff included a former teacher, at the special school for physically handicapped children, who explained that "the odd severely handicapped child, who we had there is missing". Also on the staff of the infant school was a welfare assistant, who had worked at the study school, she agreed with the teacher, commenting "Oh no, we don't get the really bad ones here".

On being questioned about the opportunities offered to her physically disabled pupils, the head teacher admitted that, in some instances, she was a little disappointed. She explained that during the period, in excess of six years, that the integration scheme had been in full operation the junior school involved in the same scheme found it was unable to accept an "average of at least one child a year".

Modifications in the procedure used to prepare children for the transfer, such as allowing children an

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

extra year in the infant school had not, she reported, produced any significant improvement. This meant that between one third and one quarter of the attempts to integrate physically disabled children, via this infant school, were unsuccessful. The head teacher concerned had apparently expected a much higher figure and the current success rate which some years was as high as 75% failed to impress her, but she anticipated that this would increase.

Her colleagues seemed to take a similar point of view. When I asked them about the rate of success, in respect of integrated placements at their school, they tended to either offer excuses or make comments which suggested they were no more satisfied than the head teacher. One teacher, for example, pointed out that they were "doing pioneering work" and forecast that "when the message really gets through to everybody involved and they start to be a bit more adventurous, we should see a big improvement".

According to the infant school staff, the majority of those parents whose children had been successfully integrated there were satisfied with the education that had been provided for their children. This impression was supported by the comments I heard when I spoke to

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

parents of physically disabled children who were in the local self help group.

During the same encounters I heard strongly expressed opinions which supported another of the head teacher's conclusions. It was that the parents of children who were not accepted by the junior school, in the same scheme, felt their children had been badly treated. The most common phrases I heard in this connection were "let down", "not wanted", and "rejected".

For a small minority of parents this was apparently a matter of some distress. As the staff of the infants school pointed out, many of the parents of the disabled pupils were very sensitive about their children's needs and the opportunities that they were being offered. During an informal interview the head teacher of the infant school admitted that she found this negative aspect of the integration programme tended to mar the feeling of achievement engendered by the successful integration of the other children.

INTEGRATED EDUCATION AT THE JUNIOR SCHOOL LEVEL.

Prior to the introduction of the integration scheme, referred to earlier, transfers from the study school to mainstream junior schools were confined to those

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

children who were being prepared for mainstream admission at the secondary stage. When it could be arranged this kind of junior school transfer was preceded by a series of visits, which increased in length until they became part-time attendance. This was followed by a short period of full-time attendance, of less than one school term, the purpose of which was to allow the disabled child to make contacts with some of his, or her, future school-mates and so assist the process of acclimatization to a mainstream school.

It was also thought that the secondary school would then be more inclined to regard their intake which included the disabled child as a standard transfer of groups of children from junior schools, even though it was known that one of them would include a child who was involved in the process of integration. This was hoped to avoid the undue emphasis that might be produced by regarding the appropriate intake as groups of junior school children plus an unorthodox admission from a special school.

Being professionally involved with these transfers I solicited the opinions of the children, their parents, the head teachers of the junior schools and the host class teachers. There were no reports, from any quarter,

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

which indicated any significant problems arising from these junior school transfers. In the early stages of each transfer there were usually many questions from the host schools concerning the management of the children, but the majority of these seemed to be linked with the junior school staff's need for reassurance.

The other queries that did arise were connected with practical considerations, such as the ability of a child to traverse a distance in excess of half a mile during a junior school visit to the local secondary school. On contacting more than half of all children involved, over eight years after these transfers, I was a little surprised to find total unanimity regarding the absence of problems of any consequence. However, as the comments of some members of the study group implied, each of the schools was being asked to support one temporary departure from normal practice which was, in the circumstances, voluntary. A member of the group, recalling his transfer, pointed out, "They knew they didn't have to put up with me for long and we all thought they were doing me a big favour so I played along as well".

The other members of the study group who were admitted to a mainstream junior school were transferred

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

as part of the integration scheme. At the time of writing, the junior school involved in this scheme had been admitting pupils from the study school for only seven years. Therefore, those children from the study school who were admitted to this school for all their junior school education were not old enough to justify their inclusion in this study. However, four children, 12% of the study group, were educated at the same junior school for periods in excess of one complete academic year.

The comparatively small number of children involved in this type of transfer was the result of a policy decision connected with the integration programme. It was decided that, in the initial stages of integration, only those children at the study school who seemed to be obviously suitable for assimilation by mainstream education should be enrolled directly at the junior school. The admissions were governed by assessments made by the head teachers of the study school and the host school, the authority's senior educational psychologist, and an educational psychologist who had special responsibility for the children who were to be transferred.

The decisions prompted by these assessments were

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

subject to broad guide lines, which had been agreed by the education authority. Such decisions required the endorsement of the appropriate area health medical office and the education department before they could be effected. Following the enrolment of the first two children from the study school, a standard routine evolved in connection with the transfers. First the special school head teacher contacted the head teacher of the junior school and the educational psychologists to establish an approximate time in the future when the junior school would be in a position to receive additional physically disabled children. In this respect particular attention was paid to any outstanding problems from earlier transfers, both within the school and in the children's homes, in order that the junior school might be in a position to offer maximum support to the newly admitted children.

The head teacher of the study school then consulted the study school staff, including the paramedical staff, and after discussion the most appropriate candidates for transfer were suggested. The parents of these children were then invited to engage in discussion and, if they agreed, the head teacher of the junior school was consulted and a provisional timetable for the transfer

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

was agreed. If they were unhappy about the proposed transfer it was in the first instance deferred and later, in some cases, cancelled. This occurred in respect of less than 10% of those children who had been recommended for integrated placements. In such a case the parents were invited to suggest alternatives. In most instances they then pressed for a place at a special school.

The next step in the integration process was to involve the parents more fully with the junior school. They were consulted about details of the probable timetable for transfer and invited to contact the junior school head teacher and visit the school if they had not already done so. When the preliminary visits were begun the parents were invited to contact the study school immediately they saw any problem and, in any case, their opinions were regularly sought by the head teacher of the study school.

One of the early decisions reached by those professionally involved in the transfers was that the special school pupils should be transferred to the integrated situation in pairs. It was thought that this would provide a certain amount of mutual support for the children concerned whilst reducing the amount of

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

adjustment required for the host school. There was a tacit understanding among those concerned with this process, especially in the early stages of the programme, that only those children whose ability to cope with an integrated educational situation seemed beyond doubt should be transferred.

This was intended to provide confidence for both the parents of the study school children and the staff of the mainstream school. It was thought that an apparent failure of the system before it had become established might have a demoralizing effect. Consequently only those children within the higher range of physical ability, who seemed as though they would be able to cope with the academic pressures involved, were admitted.

Before the programme of integration came into operation there had been some discussion and exchange of views with regard to a strategy for integrating the special school pupils. Preliminary meetings, connected with the integration programme, took place. They involved varied groups composed of staff from the special school, officers of the education authority and the head teacher of the junior school. During these meetings the role of the special unit, which distinguished the junior school involved in the

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

integration programme from other local junior schools, was discussed.

The special school staff saw one of its main uses as being that of a transfer unit, for the gradual integration of the incoming physically handicapped pupils. They proposed that it was used to receive these children who would then be gradually integrated in the other classes in the school according to the disabled children's confidence and ability to cope. It was suggested that some of them might require the use of the unit as a refuge and be closely connected with it or partly educated in it during their stay at the school.

The mainstream school head teacher appeared to regard this as rather counter productive with regard to integrated education. She pointed out that the Warnock report (H.M.S.O. 1978) had recommended the abolition of categories of handicap and that, in line with this, the unit should be seen as a facility which was equally available to all children with special needs.

After an initial "settling in" period the policy of the host mainstream school was decided. All the incoming children were assigned to classes as normal and only joined the unit as part of a withdrawal system, a similar kind of support system to that used when any

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

children in the school had special needs arising from academic difficulties. This method did not gain the confidence of the teachers from the special school. They explained, during interviews about the integration scheme, that they thought the system being adopted was too rigid. One former special school teacher complained, "Even if she (the head teacher) is right you can't treat all the children the way you do in an ordinary school, some can't write some can't talk properly, you've got to give a bit not try to force them all into the same pattern".

During the first academic year of the integration programme one of the three former teachers, from the study school, left and the remaining two later retired early. Within the same academic year three disabled children left the school prematurely. They were transferred to special schools. Only three of the eleven pupils who were transferred directly from the study school to the junior school were eventually enrolled at a mainstream secondary school.

INTEGRATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Before 1974, as outlined in chapter five, integration at the secondary school stage was not part of standard

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

educational policy, in the authority responsible for the education of the study group. Before that date it was viewed as unusual arrangements made in respect of individual children. It usually occurred as a result of initiatives from the study school which had found support from people of other disciplines who were professionally involved with the child, such as medical officers or educational psychologists. Such a placement was only considered by the education authority after the opinions of everyone concerned with the child in question had been sought and found to be favourable. Even then it was not readily sanctioned by the authority without additional prompting, perhaps in the form of pressure from parents which was endorsed by the school, or a medical recommendation from the child's consultant.

In 1974 a special unit was opened in a local comprehensive school. This was a unit in name only, providing only limited extra facilities, such as ramps and wider toilet compartments. No extra equipment for the advantage of the disabled children being integrated was provided. In retrospect this seemed to be an instance of the assertion, of Wolpe et. al. (1983), that the "principal of integration has been undermined" by a "lack of additional resources".

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

However, an extra member of staff was appointed to the school. This appointment carried a special responsibility in respect of the disabled children who were to be integrated. Both the special school staff and the newly appointed secondary school teacher initially expected much from this initiative. There was broad agreement between them on the way that the children should be catered for, but the requirements of the mainstream school rendered many of their ideas impractical. For instance, they visualised much more support being offered to the disabled children in the early stages after their transfers. However, the newly appointed teacher explained that the level of commitment required of her, in respect of academic tuition in the main body of the school, rendered this impractical. Before the end of her first academic year this teacher had resigned.

Her replacement was charged with a wider responsibility than the integration of physically handicapped pupils and spent much of her time involved in general remedial tuition. It seems reasonable to assume there was a lack of emphasis on the needs of the children being integrated for, as Wolfendale (1987) points out, the curriculum of a such a school should

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

"underline its day to day work" in respect of all pupils. Bloom (1979) points out that the curriculum can be engineered and organized to enable it to suit the needs of virtually all students.

During the course of the next academic year a recently integrated child was transferred back to special education when it was decided that he could not cope with the day to day pressures of the school. It was explained, by the member of staff who had special responsibility for physically handicapped children, that he just "couldn't keep up with the pace life" in the mainstream school. She added "He was late for all his classes and such a slow writer and slow at getting out his books and that sort of thing". This tended to sap the confidence of the study school staff, since they had regarded the boy in question as a prime candidate for integrated education. The boy was later transferred to a special school, on campus with a comprehensive school, where a measure of integration was achieved.

Throughout the thirteen years of its operation only five children, from the special school, were accepted by this secondary school. Some of the teaching staff who were closely involved in this attempt at integration felt that it had not fulfilled its potential. It did,

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

however, provide regular liaison between the schools, and offered the newly enrolled disabled children a designated person to whom they could relate at times of stress. Additionally, it gave the notion of integration a form of official recognition and implied that, being connected with a recent development, integration indicated advanced thinking. Therefore, further examination of the concept of integrated education and its likely consequences was prompted. Ten years later the comprehensive school was effectively superseded, as a channel of integration, by the introduction of the integration programme referred to in this and previous chapters.

The introduction of the integration programme was completed, two years before the closure of this comprehensive school. The final phase of its implementation was the designation of an alternative comprehensive school, for the admission of physically disabled children. To this end the newly designated school was allocated extra equipment, including a portable electric typewriter and a micro-computer. Extra teaching staff were provided.

Since they were appointed for the benefit of all children with special needs it is not possible to be

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

definite about what proportion of the improved pupil-teacher ratio was aimed at providing additional support for physically disabled children. Nevertheless a comparison with other comprehensive schools in the same education authority indicates a generous provision and a more favourable ratio than that which existed at the school it replaced.

A building programme was also undertaken. Classrooms were converted to provide facilities, such as therapy rooms, specifically for the children to be integrated. However, the construction of the extra facilities did not begin until over a year after the first physically disabled pupil was admitted. Many of the extra resources, such as extra teaching space were, provided for a wide spectrum of children with special needs, not merely for those handicapped by physical impediment. Nevertheless the school appeared to be moving towards a situation that would offer valuable support for a wide range of children with special needs, including a few with varying degrees of physical disability. Even so, there was some doubt about its status as a mainstream comprehensive school.

More than half of the teachers working there, to whom I spoke, mentioned without prompting that the school

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

roll was exceedingly small and added that because of a very favourable pupil/staff ratio the school was able to offer more support to physically disabled pupils. It is also interesting to note that, at the time of writing the total number of pupils on roll was less than three hundred and fifty. Two years after the beginning of this development, for integrated education at the secondary level, another comprehensive school was closed in the same local authority area. This was one of two closures that had been publicly announced by the education authority. The reason given for the closure of that particular school was the size of its roll. It was claimed that this indicated that the school was no longer a viable proposition. At the time the closure was announced the school in question had over six hundred pupils on roll.

The implementation of the system of integrated education, in the education authority area served by the study school, was completed by the incorporation of the comprehensive school. Five years after this school had begun to admit physically disabled pupils only three former pupils of the study school were in attendance. They had come via integrated placements at the junior school in the same scheme. At this time nine of those

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

children, who were transferred directly from the study school to the junior school involved in the integration programme, were of secondary school age. In view of the high expectations of many of the proponents of the integration scheme it was rather surprising that only a minority, of one third, had been successfully integrated by this route. This was especially so, when it was remembered that these children, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, were specially selected because of their presumed ability to cope in the more demanding situations of integrated educational placements.

Most of the former pupils of the study school, who have since reached secondary school age, have been enrolled at special schools. The majority of them were admitted to a special school in a neighbouring local education authority area. The school where they were enrolled is an all-age special school for physically handicapped children. It is on campus with a mainstream school and was involved in an integration programme which included both schools on the campus.

The schools are, for administrative purposes, regarded as separate, independent institutions but it is part of their brief to cooperate, especially in the matter of integrated education for the pupils of the

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

special school. As an aid to mutual understanding and cooperation some of the teaching staff are timetabled to teach in each other's schools for a small part of the week. During the course of interviews, with members of the acting head teacher and staff of the special school, their method of achieving integrated education was explained to me.

First the disabled child is allowed a period of "settling in" at the special school, to allow him, or her, to relate to the special school staff, in case of future difficulties at the mainstream school. Next, where it is deemed appropriate the pupil is assessed for integration on a part-time basis in the comprehensive school. After this is effected and found to be successful, the time the pupil spends in the mainstream school is increased, by stages, until virtual full-time attendance is achieved. When the point is reached, where the pupil is returning to the special school only for specialized attention, such as therapy the child is regarded as having transferred to mainstream education. The deputy head teacher explained that, when this occurs the pupil is registered at the mainstream school.

The results of the methods used by the two schools on campus suggested a considerable degree of success. For

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

instance, a review of the subsequent education of those children who were pupils of the study school, when it was closed, seemed to support this. The majority of the children who left the study school at that stage and successfully entered mainstream secondary education did so via the combination of these two schools. All the study school pupils who completed their education at the special school on this campus were eventually admitted to the comprehensive school in question. Which means that, at the time of writing, six former pupils of the study school had been enrolled there.

Meanwhile, in their home authority area only four of their former schoolmates, from the study school, had been successfully admitted by mainstream secondary schools. One was admitted directly to a standard comprehensive school and the others were enrolled at the mainstream secondary school operating within the integration scheme.

The apparent success of the system in the neighbouring authority, which had been in operation for approximately four years before the closure of the study school, was noted by many parents of the children who attended the study school. Three sets of these parents, who were unhappy with the integration programme,

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

operated by their own education authority, were unable to obtain places for their children at the other authority's special school. The reason given for the rejection of their applications was a lack of available places in the special school concerned.

CONCLUSION

The attempts to place children in integrated educational situations in primary schools, before a structured integration programme was available, were apparently totally successful. They were, however, relatively few and regarded largely as experiments. This meant that, as far as the staff of the host school was concerned, they were reversible if the problems incurred proved to be unacceptable. In addition these transfers, because they were somewhat unorthodox at the time, were only allowed when almost every factor encompassing them was favourable. This included the full support of the special school, the host school and the parents. They emphasized a valuable point, that integrated education was feasible for some physically disabled children, in the education authority area.

However, to use their apparent achievements as a bench mark in the assessment of later efforts is to risk

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

making unfair comparisons. Subsequent attempts to place children in integrated educational settings were, of necessity, much less selective. They involved children, whose physical and academic ability spanned a much wider spectrum and parents who, in some cases, had reservations about their children's mainstream admission.

In the minds of the participating teachers there was room for some doubt about the efficacy of the structured integration programme referred to, in terms of academic achievement. These reservations did not, however, extend to the other areas of the children's development. There was wide agreement among the staff involved that the programme had provided a dividend in the area of social skills and social awareness. This was seen as benefiting both the disabled children and the population of the host schools. Success in the integration process was, nevertheless dependent upon other factors which have an obvious influence in children's lives such as parental support and personal characteristics.

The majority of the staff involved in the integration programme considered it to be a successful venture but some of them were disappointed that it had not immediately solved most of the problems confronting the

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

disabled children involved. Many of them looked for an improvement in the future operation of the programme. Some of the parents of their disabled pupils were also disconcerted. In addition to those whose children had been unable to take advantage of the integrated placements offered, there were some whose expectations concerning their children's progress were so high as to anticipate unreasonable dividends from mainstream education.

In the comprehensive school referred to in connection with the structured scheme there were much more obvious changes, to accommodate the integration programme than in the primary schools. All three schools in the scheme had extra resources and facilities specifically for the children who were to be integrated there but the comprehensive school had much more of a specialist air than the others. Most of the staff working in this secondary school gave the impression that the success of the school depended as much on their efforts in favour of the disabled pupils as in any other sector.

It was unfortunate that most of those special school staff who had been transferred to the junior school involved in the integration programme left within the first two years of its operation. Some of the comments

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

of these teachers induced speculation that their action may have been as much the result of personality clashes with the head teacher of the junior, or with the method of their assimilation, as their inability to adjust to the new situation. The fact that a similar situation, which occurred in the infants school involved in the same integration scheme, appeared to stimulate the efforts of the former special school staff, one of whom was eventually promoted within the mainstream school, tends to support this view.

Despite the obvious efforts of the primary schools involved, most of the successful integration of the former pupils of the study school took place via a special school, in a neighbouring authority, which is on campus with a comprehensive school. There was a fairly deep involvement of the special school staff, who normally worked at the all age special school, with the comprehensive school and an implied commitment to the programme, which was echoed by the comprehensive school teachers' visits to the special school.

It seems clear that successful integrated education involves extra skills and experience on the part of the teachers involved. However, it also involves building community acceptance of its suitability for disabled

CHAPTER 7 - INTEGRATION IN OPERATION

children and a more widespread realism with regard to the expectations which it generates.

It appears that only the continued operation of this method of educating physically handicapped children can furnish the experience which is necessary for the construction of standards by which success can be judged. It is obvious that re-location of children, educationally does not constitute automatic re-labelling of the children socially and perhaps this is not always clear in the minds of either the parents or teachers involved. Nevertheless integrated education has a very important role to play in this area of social evolution and schools should be aware of their responsibilities in this direction.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CHAPTER EIGHT

PARENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOLING PROVIDED

INTRODUCTION

This research is concerned with the various forms of institutional provision which were used to educate a group of young people, the study group. Its ultimate assessment of the effectiveness of the various combinations of the different types of schools used in this process hinges on the benefits they have provided for the young people whose education was derived from them. This being so, the appraisal of their children's schooling, by their parents, is of considerable consequence.

It is obvious that, in many cases, the importance of their judgements may be limited. Their special relationship to the children and their prolonged proximity to them, is a potential source of bias in any evaluation of the children's progress. Even so, many of their statements can be corroborated and the same factors which call their objectivity into question

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

probably also single them out as the major influence on their children's formative years, which is far more potent than the effects of any other group of people or institution. It is, therefore, important to be aware of parental opinions, no matter how irrational or uninformed they might seem to be.

This chapter is a significant part of an attempt to move towards a more holistic view of the subjects of the study and those factors which affect their life chances by utilizing a fund of material which is unavailable from any other source, the opinions of those who have a unique view of the subjects, their parents.

THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF PARENTAL CHOICE

The parents of the majority of the study group clearly felt that they had a very limited choice of available options in the matter of their children's schooling. It was apparent, during the many conversations and interviews I held with the subjects' parents that most of them did not articulate positive points of view with regard to their children's education. This seemed to be the case throughout the whole of the young people's schooldays. In most cases

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

the parents did not seem able to do this during the later stages of the education process any more than they did prior to the children's enrolment (as outlined in chapter four).

Most of them did, at some stage, either object to proposals or question the desirability of the suggested course of action involved. It is clear from their comments that, in many cases this was done in a low-key, if not diffident, way. Despite the fact that some of these reservations may have been expressed in a rather restrained manner or without an accompanying suggestion of a constructive alternative they were, for the most part, sincere and arose from a conscientious desire to improve the life chances of the children and young people concerned.

The apparent rejection of their opinions in this connection, was still a cause of resentment when I asked them about their children's school placements. At this time periods of between seven and fifteen years had elapsed since the parents had been involved in the process of secondary selection. Their opinions were in accord with the work of Barton and Tomlinson (1981) which indicates that the parents of disabled children

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

commonly have less "say and influence on a number of important decisions on what happens to them" than "any group in the educational system". The same work also claims they are subject to coercion and persuasion which is sometimes overt. This was supported by the reported experience of the study group. The mother of one boy, who was placed in a special school for his secondary education commented, thirteen years later, "I had no real choice, I should have fought it". Another young woman had been admitted to a mainstream secondary school fourteen years earlier and her mother explained, "I didn't want her to go there really but there wasn't really much choice was there? They said she should and that was that".

Parents' impressions, that their views in the matter of their children's education were, for the most part, disregarded during the school selection procedure may have been heavily influenced by the context in which they encountered the operation of the decision-making process. Initially this would probably involve separate appointments with three relatively unfamiliar people a senior staff member from the proposed school, a medical officer and an educational psychologist. These

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

interviews may well have been conducted in an uneasy atmosphere induced by vaguely esoteric factors such as references to psychological tests or medical assessments, giving rise to a feeling of insecurity and pressure.

This could have been rather intimidating and may well have inhibited the parents' attempts to express themselves. Some substance for this kind of assumption is evident from the fact that the same people recalled that they felt their views were heeded by the head teacher and staff of the study school. Diaries covering the period of their children's attendance at the school, which recorded many of their telephone calls, their unscheduled visits and requests for information, in conjunction with detailed records of conversations extending back over a period of more than ten years, offer some explanation for this confidence.

The parents had obviously formed relationships with the school staff and clearly felt more at ease in the presence of people with whom they were familiar and their communication approximated more nearly to day to day social intercourse. However, the same records, reinforced by personal recollection, also indicate that

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

this quality of interaction did not usually develop for approximately a year and it was probably after this period that parental impressions were formed.

It would, nevertheless, be ingenuous to assume that this provides a comprehensive explanation for parents' opinions about their lack of freedom of choice. A review of the type of education provided for the pupils of the study school displays a remarkable correlation between the time of the children's school placements and the type of schools selected for them. In the six academic years prior to September, 1974 only four children were transferred to schools where mainstream education was provided. At the end of that year a comprehensive school in the same borough began, as a matter of borough policy, to accept physically handicapped children.

During the seven academic years following the availability of this facility, from 1974 to the end of 1979, fourteen children were transferred from the study school to integrated education. The rate of transferring children to integrated educational placements increased further following the introduction of an integration scheme, in the same education authority area, which offered placements in a primary school. From the

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

beginning of this scheme to the closure of the study school, a period of less than three years, a further sixteen physically disabled children were transferred to mainstream education.

A review of the physical disabilities, of the pupils of the study school, and the handicapping effects they impose (see appendix I tables C and D) provides no obvious evidence that this increase in mainstream school admissions was the result of a variation of successive pupils' needs or abilities. Another obvious factor that could affect the amount of integrated education is parental views. During recent years there has been a trend towards paying attention to parental preference and a general acknowledgement of the value of integrated education which has evolved during the past decade. However, conversations and interviews with parents of the study group reveal that this is unlikely to have been a controlling factor. One of their major concerns was status and, as summarized in chapter five, transfer to an integrated situation seems to do little in their eyes to remedy the problems they perceived in this area.

There is, therefore little alternative to assuming that the great increase in mainstream placements was

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

largely at the behest of the educational policy makers, whether at local or national level, or the appointees who are authorized to implement their policies. Such circumstances call to mind the role of educational institutions, as agents of social control. Flude et. al. (1974) draw attention to the importance of this aspect of education, citing the work of Durkheim and Mannheim and their interest in education, which was "derived from the knowledge that educational institutions play an important part in most societies as agents of social control", including cultural change and social selection. Thus the parental options were limited by extrinsic influences.

To some extent this places the parents of physically disabled children, who are educated by their local authorities, in a parallel situation to that which faces the parents of many able-bodied children, in respect of the breadth of choice of schools available to them. Many parents of mainstream children who favour the opportunities provided by the tripartite system, for instance, those who believe their children would benefit greatly from the academic competition to be found at a grammar school, no longer have that option available to

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

them. Their local educational authority, has followed the trend to comprehensive education. Similarly, in other areas, some of those who would eschew the rather more elitist approach, in favour of the benefits of the social mix to be found in a comprehensive school, find that the policy of their local education authority obviates this alternative. Nevertheless the comments of the parents of the study group imply a far greater degree of dissatisfaction with the proposed placements for their children than those voiced by many of the parents of mainstream children.

The parents of only five children, less than 16% of the study group agreed to their children being enrolled at the study school, without some form of prompting or persuasion and only three sets of parents, actively sought admission to the special school. Subsequently the parental agreement to the proposition of integrated education was readily obtained in only twelve instances, less than 38% of the group.

Parental agreement concerning the admission, of able-bodied children, to the infant school involved in the same integration scheme sharply contrasted with this. Over a four year period, which encompassed the

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

implementation of the integration scheme, more than 99% of the places offered, on a neighbourhood basis, by the mainstream school were readily accepted. Subsequently more than 90% of the able-bodied children, who were admitted, were transferred to the junior school involved in the same integration scheme. During the period in which the implementation of the integration scheme was completed more than 75% of the secondary placements, in the same education authority were in accordance with parental choice. Most of the comprehensive schools in the education authority concerned were then over-subscribed.

Viewed against this background of reaction to educational provision, it is evident that the parents of the study group felt they had been treated rather badly in the matter of the educational opportunities offered to their children.

RETROSPECTIVE VIEWS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOLING

In some cases the opinions, which parents of the subjects of this study expressed, altered as the context in which they were sought changed. Nevertheless, a careful examination of all the material collected, for

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

this study, reveals that only a minority, less than 20 per cent of them, ever professed that they were satisfied with the schooling which their children received.

In one instance the subject was transferred to a mainstream schools before he attained the age of five and completed the rest of his education in standard mainstream schools. During his third year his parents agreed to the suggestion that the handicapping effect of his disability, a relatively mild diplegia resulting from cerebral palsy, would be reduced by nursery school education coupled with regular therapy. Nevertheless they were reluctant to agree to his receiving this at a special school, commenting that "other people would know he had gone there" even after he was transferred to a "normal school". Even after their choice had been made they were hesitant to agree that it was an appropriate one until after he had settled into the mainstream school to which he was subsequently transferred.

These parents were very pleasant and cooperative at all times. However, they avoided all contact with the study school after their son's transfer. When I contacted them in connection with this piece of work

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

they acknowledged no friendships connecting either their son, or themselves, with former pupils of the school, or their families. They explained, "Although we were pleased he went to S---- (study school nursery unit) we're also very grateful indeed that he was able to integrate into an ordinary school".

The others who, on at least one occasion, gave unreserved approval to their children's schooling were the parents of subjects who were educated entirely in special schools. Typical of their comments on the subject was one made by the mother of a subject who had received his secondary education in a residential special school for delicate children. She observed that "P---- (her son) was happy enough where he went and they seemed to do well enough by him". When it was suggested to her that her son might have benefited from an alternative system of education she replied "No, I don't think so". One of these young people, however, attended a secondary special school which was on campus with a comprehensive school and received most of his secondary classroom tuition in the mainstream school. His father pointed out, "I was pleased with his schools and grateful he went on to the secondary school where he

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

was".

When they were interviewed in connection with this study the parents of sixteen of the study group, exactly 50%, broadly approved of the type of schooling that their children had received. However, this group of parents, expressed some complaints and had some serious reservations about certain sections of it.

Some of them expressed reservations in a restrained way. One mother claimed that her daughter "needed the small classes" and "and all the staff that was around" at the special school but suggested that these facilities were in themselves, disadvantages, explaining that her daughter "had too many staff, too many adults" and reporting that "she didn't go out into the playground and learn what life is about, getting on with other children".

Other people questioned some of the details of the various programmes employed. The mother of one subject pointed out, "There's no way she could have coped in a classroom with ordinary children" but opined that "she might have joined the others for lunch". Some of the same group of parents were apparently pleased with the result of their children's education but the general

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

trend of some of their conversation on the subject implied criticism. When they were questioned about this they seemed unable to articulate their doubts and were rather vague and indefinite about the subject.

The mother of one young man drew attention to the additional stress which she considered was involved in her son's integrated education at a comprehensive school but, when asked if she thought anything might have been done to reduce or eliminate this, admitted, "I can't see anything could really". When she was later asked if she thought another school, or type of school, might have offered more help in this particular area she said, "Possibly I don't really know".

Some other parents who expressed only a qualified approval of the schooling their children received objected only to minor parts of it. One subject, for instance, was re-admitted to a special school after his integrated secondary placement was unsuccessful and his father categorized that as "a real shame". In a similarly unsuccessful attempt at integration, in this case as part of an integration scheme at primary school level, the boy's parents, who had been reluctant to agree to the integration, tended to place the sole blame

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

on the primary school's inability to cope with the demands placed upon it by integrated education. The subject's mother recalled, "The main time when I got my rag up was when he was at C----- (the school concerned)". This kind of uncompromising view of a particular school was confined to a minority of four subjects, less than 13 percent of the parents of the study group.

The parents of two members of the study group, whilst acknowledging both advantages and disadvantages arising from the schooling their children had received, were unsure whether they were satisfied with this provision. However, on being questioned further they were unable to suggest a reasonable alternative.

In one case the parents had been pleased when their son, who suffered from a congenital heart defect was integrated at the age of ten. Later they were disappointed when he was admitted to a special school for his secondary education, following a reported deterioration in his physical condition. They agreed that their son, who was awaiting a suitable donor for a heart transplant at the time of writing, was unable to cope with the increased physical demands of integrated

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

education in the secondary sector. Nevertheless, they were reluctant to admit that the only alternatives available were either some form of special education or home tuition. The young man's mother commented, "I mean there must have been something else they could have done". It was likely that their view of their son's schooling was coloured by his re-admission to the special education sector, which they seemed to regard as a demotion.

The parents of the other young man felt that their son had not fulfilled his academic potential and were convinced that this was, for the most part, due to unsatisfactory secondary education, in the early stages. They regarded the secondary special education, offered by the school where their son was enrolled, as appropriate to his needs but thought his efforts were frustrated by an unreasonable regime, imposed by a newly appointed head teacher. Their opinions were, they explained, reinforced by subsequent publicity connected with the school and the resignation of the head teacher, a relatively short time after her appointment. Nevertheless, they regarded the selection of this school as an apt choice, in principle, for their son and saw no

merit in him being educated elsewhere.

A minority of parents of the study group, the parents of only two subjects of the group of thirty-two, reported that they were in general dissatisfied with their children's school placements. When questioned further they claimed they recognized the high standards of the schools concerned, and conceded that their children had gained some extra advantages from them. One of these young people was admitted to a special school for nursery education and continued to attend the special school until she was transferred to a comprehensive school, for her secondary education.

Her enrolment at the special school was much against her parents better judgement and they were never completely happy with the placement, regarding an integrated situation as the only appropriate form of education for their daughter. Her father recalled, "I thought, why should they stop her going to a normal school if she can manage". They were convinced that the period she spent in a special school adversely affected her educational and social progress. Another subject, a young man, attended the study school for his primary education and was transferred to a special school in a

neighbouring education authority. His mother regarded the primary school as an apt placement, remembering, "When he was at S---- (primary special school) I was always very happy with him".

Referring to his secondary education she explained, "I don't know that he was stretched enough, I don't think so". Speaking of her son's possible attendance at a mainstream school she recalled that it was suggested to her that practical problems, mainly a mild incontinence obviated this possibility but commented, "I wish I had pursued it, maybe it's my fault, maybe I took the line of least resistance".

A third member of the study group was considered by his parents to be rather introverted and limited in his academic attainment and they regarded this as being, to some extent, the result of his being educated in special schools. Even though they volunteered the opinion that their son would not have walked, even in the unsteady limited way he eventually achieved, without special school attendance they suggested, "It would have been better if he had had the normal teaching he would have got at an ordinary school".

During the course of collecting material for this

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

study I encountered only one instance of a parent regarding his, or her, child's education as ineffective or almost totally inappropriate. In this instance the young person concerned was admitted to a mainstream infant school just before the age of five and continued in mainstream education until he was withdrawn from a junior school during his eighth year, when he was transferred to the study school.

His secondary education began in a residential school for delicate children and after less than one year there he was transferred to a school for E.S.N.(m) children. On one occasion his father commented, "I think going to a special school held him back a terrific amount" and later he estimated the effect of this on his son's academic attainment by stating, "I'd go so far as to say there's an eighty to eighty five per cent chance that he'd have done very well if he'd gone to an ordinary school".

A review of the opinions of the parents of the study group reveals that more than two thirds of the sample regarded their children's education as a largely favourable response to the young people's needs. It can, therefore be said that the majority of them felt their

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

children had been adequately provided for, in respect of their education.

FACTORS WHICH WERE A SOURCE OF BIAS

It would be unrealistic to presume that the parents of the study group, in every case, arrived at their opinions of their children's schooling via a logical procedure which utilised an unbiased, objective approach. Therefore, to note factors which were likely to have had a capacity for influencing the formulation of their views in this matter, may help to provide useful context, against which their assessments of the various schools involved could be evaluated.

One such consideration, which was very important to most of the parents of the study group, was concerned with social status and the possible effect on this, for both the subjects and their parents, of the type of school the children attended. This factor has been discussed and referred to earlier, especially in chapters two and four. On occasions it led parents to automatically assume that a certain school was unsuitable, or appropriate, in accordance with their pre-determined and biased image of their children and

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

the degree to which it was in accord with the stereotypical image they had formed of the pupils of that school.

In some instances these considerations overshadowed their children's progress and achievements, during their period of attendance at the same school. For instance, the parent, cited earlier in this chapter, who regarded the education provided for his son as totally inappropriate spoke as though he did not accept the complete picture of his son's educational problems. Throughout my more recent conversations with him he stated several times his son was a "bright lad", whose limited rate of academic progress was solely due to his being transferred to special schools. Such an opinion seemed to ignore the fact that one of the main reasons his son was admitted to a special school was the concern of the mainstream school about the child's very low academic attainment, in addition to the boy's main handicap, epilepsy.

This particular problem gave rise to parents' interviews with the head teacher concerned and an educational psychologist. Topics discussed during the course of these two interviews were raised during a

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

medical assessment, concerned with the boy's possible transfer and later in a preliminary meeting with the head teacher of the proposed special school (the study school). This meeting resulted in the construction of an individual programme designed to ameliorate the child's numeracy and literacy problems, and the parents' cooperation was sought as part of this programme.

When the young person was admitted to a residential secondary school for delicate children later in his school career the placement was regarded as unsuccessful and he was transferred to a school for E.S.N.(m) children. After the subject had attained the age of twenty, conversations with his father continued to give the impression that he thought his son was an academically capable child who had been totally misplaced in special schools. Yet on one occasion, shortly after the boy's sixteenth birthday, the father asked if I thought his daughter's repeated lack of success in applying to join public services, such as the police force, was "because of him (the subject)".

It was clear that one of the subject's parents, at least, felt he was stigmatized by special school admission and had been impeded by the inferior social

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

status that was thus accorded to him. In the father's view this was an inappropriate status for his son, in view of his early attendance at a mainstream school and his obvious near normality. He said of the decision to admit him to a special school, "I think it was a lot of wrong thinking because, if you think about it I--- was the only one who could run about"

The influence of the image of the child, which was constructed by parents, was not confined to those children whose parents disagreed with their school placements, nor was it confined to those who unsuccessfully sought mainstream admission for their children. Other parents clearly judged the appropriateness of schools for their children by comparing the social image, or status, concomitant with admission with the image of their children to which they subscribed.

Speaking about her daughter, a member of the study group who was educated entirely in special schools, a mother said, "There's no way she could have coped in a classroom with ordinary children" and added, "Everyone would lose all round". She later emphasized this concept she had of the child, when asked about changes in the

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

educational system which might help children with disabilities similar to her daughter's, by saying, "I think they should stop closing down special schools for a start". She explained, "The way it's going, putting more of them into ordinary schools, that I don't really agree with. I don't think it works". This parent was one of those who expressed a favourable opinion of the schools which their children had attended.

Some parents of those children who were partially educated in an integrated situation were rather disturbed about certain aspects of the integration, especially those which, in their eyes, tended to emphasize the handicapping effects of their children's disabilities. The parents of one member of the study group agreed to him being transferred to the purpose built primary school, as part of the integration scheme, albeit with some initial reservations. Afterwards they were so unhappy about the placement that, in response to their persistent requests, their son was re-admitted to a special school after a period of less than two school terms.

His mother explained, "He can walk, but unsteadily, the coordination isn't all that great, up until he went

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

there he was O.K., I mean I'd got used to those problems". When asked to clarify some of her other comments about the school in question she stated that, "He wasn't socially acceptable up there (the mainstream school), yes definitely, it's different people and different people's attitudes". Despite comments about social acceptability her opinions about the integrated placement were obviously biased by her own reaction to the effects that the new background had on her perceived image of her child.

The mother's account of the shortcomings of the educational situation, in respect of her son, included her explanations about the special arrangements for him during social occasions such as lunch times and sports day, and her objections to his exclusion from school excursions. There was a distinct implication that the limits of the child's physical ability had been highlighted, in her eyes, by the fact that he could only indulge in some areas of school life in a modified way. This was clearly something which she regarded as unacceptable and there was little doubt that her opinion of the school concerned was adversely affected.

In many cases, as can be seen from material cited in

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

this chapter, there is a link between a child's achievement and the parental evaluation of the school. A number of parents, however, tended to confuse the effectiveness of their children's schools with their own expectations concerning the potential level of academic attainment of their children and the degree to which this was fulfilled.

The mother of one young man expressed her appreciation of the comprehensive school her son attended and pointed to his achievements to substantiate this opinion. Records showed that he had been reading fluently at the age of six and, in his last term before he was admitted to the comprehensive school his reading ability was assessed as follows, a word recognition age more than two years in advance of his chronological age and a comprehension age more than three years in advance of his chronological age. One of the comprehensive school staff remembered him as "a bright child with real potential who just tailed off". He was not entered for "O" levels at the end of his fifth form year but he passed four "O" levels, including English language and English literature, during a sixth form course in the following two years. His mother's good opinion of the

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

comprehensive school was obtained over five years after these results were known.

It is readily apparent that parental appraisal of schools is inextricably connected with the parents' perception of their children. When a child reached, almost reached or, surpassed the kind of general level of academic attainment suggested by his, or her, parents' estimation of eventual success, then the parents regarded their child's schooling as largely successful.

Dissatisfaction and reservations, about the children's schooling, were more often expressed in respect of the integrated education than special education. Only four sets of parents, less than 15 per cent of the parents questioned, claimed to have been unhappy with the special education their children received. However, thirteen sets of parents, more than 38 per cent of the sample, were dissatisfied with the integrated education provided for their children.

Two facets of the children's education merit attention in this context. The first is that only nineteen, less than 60%, of the study group experienced education in an integrated setting. The other is that

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

the usual pattern, which applied to more than 95 per cent of the sample, was that mainstream admission occurred after they had established their credentials, as pupils, in a special school. Their transfers to integrated settings usually were effected at the beginning of their secondary schooling, or near the end of their primary schooldays.

One possible consequence of this is the greater degree of independence, which children have usually acquired at this age, may have highlighted the social disadvantages suffered by the study group. For instance, difficulties would be experienced by children of limited mobility when visiting school-friends without parental assistance. Such a disadvantage could be exacerbated by secondary school admission when the homes of their classmates were likely to be spread over a much wider area and the presence of parents, in many social situations which involved their contemporaries, would be regarded as an unacceptable intrusion.

One mother, during the course of recalling the mainstream school her son had formerly attended observed, "The only thing was he was so cut off, at nights and weekends, there was only one lad he knew

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

round here and he hardly ever saw him". The social problems arising from this situation would be compounded by the status implications involved in other stages of social development associated with young people during the secondary school stage, such as the acquisition of a boy-friend or girl-friend, something claimed by only one of the study group who was integrated. A special school may have provided a cocoon to temporarily insulate young people from this kind of situation and hide the effects from their parents.

It seems reasonable to suppose that this kind of problem would have affected the happiness of the children who were physically disadvantaged. The apparent existence of additional problems may have influenced parental evaluation of the mainstream schools where they occurred. The same social situations may also have emphasized effects that parents presumed the school attendance had on the social images of both the children and themselves and so provided an additional bias.

CONCLUSION

It is true that the majority of the parents of the subjects of the study were eventually satisfied, if not

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

impressed, by the schooling which was provided for their children. However, their assessment of their children's educational progress clearly necessitated the review of a part of the children's development which had generated great anxiety.

Many of them had regarded the special school as a potential source of help, so great that it would tend to negate the impediments imposed by their children's disabilities. The blind faith of a minority of them was, at times, such as to imply paranormal benefits.

In some cases they seemed to have convinced themselves that their children's progress, in the rather esoteric ethos suggested by the special apparatus and paramedical staff of the special school, would defy logic. In others they apparently regarded their children as being urgently in need of the kind of care and attention that was only possible in a specialist institution.

Others were suspicious that the special school's main effect might be to endorse the inferior status which they feared for their children. In some cases attendance alone seemed to be a cause for shame. However, in retrospect, a majority of the parents whose children had

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

been integrated were sure that their children had gained extra advantages from special education. One man said of his son's education, "He needed a good start, if he was going to do anything and he got it with all the special help and the classes of seven or eight". Another was sure that his son "would not fit" in a main stream school. He explained that his son would "stand out too much in an ordinary school".

During the schooldays, of the subjects of this study, mainstream education also had the dual role, of bête noire and benefit, to play in the eyes of parents. Many of them initially approached it with trepidation but, with the benefit of hindsight the majority of those, whose children had participated, saw it as a distinct advantage.

A small minority of the study group's parents, in the face of their children's obvious physical restrictions, tended to cling to the opinion that denial of complete attendance at a mainstream school had prevented their children from attaining normality or near normality, and were resentful that this had not been allowed. One mother, discussing her daughter's employment prospects explained, "If only A----- (her

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

daughter) had gone to ordinary school, I'm sure she would have been all right".

This was not in accord with the experience of the majority of those members of the study group who had been educated in an integrated setting. Their comments tended to support the findings of Jowett (1982), concerning the effects of further education and training on the prospects of disabled young people. She concluded that, "whatever else young people may gain" they "will undoubtedly be unemployed afterwards". In contrast to those parents who placed great faith in integrated education, a very small minority of parents insisted that their children's mainstream schools had been a complete failure. Although only one set of parents insisted that their child was immediately withdrawn from mainstream education others were just as dissatisfied .

Parental assessment of the children's schools was obviously, to some extent, a matter of comparison between expectations and their fulfilment. Most of the people concerned seemed to be measuring their perceptions of their children's level of achievement, at the time they were questioned on the subject, against projections of the children's attainment, which were

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

formulated during early childhood. In many instances projections had obviously been modified during the course of the children's lives, in some cases they may have lacked realism. Nevertheless parental views of their children's potential and the degree to which it was realized were an inescapable influence on their opinions of the success of the schools.

Although most of the parents of the group were satisfied with the education which had been provided for their children they were not without suggestions regarding its improvement. Almost invariably these suggestions were directed towards an alteration in the proportion of mainstream and special education that the children had received. Many of the alterations were ostensibly logical. For instance, the use of integrated educational situations were suggested, to aid the development of social skills, and the provision of special education facilities was proposed, in order to give extra help with basic literacy and numeracy, for children whose education was grossly impeded by physical difficulties.

In the concepts of some parents, however, there were degrees of unreality, which seemed to be spawned by

CHAPTER EIGHT - PARENTAL ASSESSMENT

wishful thinking. For example, attendance at a "normal school" would have ensured that their children were "normal" or the extra attention available in a special school would have largely remedied their children's current deficiencies.

Most of those parents whose children had experienced integrated education expressed opinions which indicated that they thought it had been of significant value to the development of their children. A majority of the study group were inclined to the view that special education had a useful role to play in the early stages of the education of children with special needs, such as their own. Nevertheless only a small minority of them failed to draw attention to the potential for the development of social skills which they saw in integrated education.

CHAPTER NINE

CHAPTER NINE

LIFE CHANCES

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of information has been collected in respect of the subjects of this study. It relates to a time span which covers most of their lives. Corroborated data is available over a period reaching back to the beginning of their infant school education, in most cases even before that. The subjects of the study group are now adults, with the exception of one young man who is within one year of reaching his majority. They have reached stages in their lives when most people have begun to enjoy some of the facets of adult life. In addition they will have faced some of the associated problems, such as those arising from the decision-making connected with reaching compromises.

Many people, perhaps the majority, need to reconcile their ambitions with their abilities and opportunities in order to find contentment and fulfilment. In most instances any outstanding necessity for this kind of accommodation is obvious to others, if not the person involved, by the time adulthood has been reached. At

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

this point in their lives people with unreasonable expectations or ambitions, such as the uncoordinated person who seeks a career in sport or the vertigo sufferer who looks to work as a steeplejack, have modified their goals or are judged to be partially detached from reality and labelled accordingly. Therefore, it seems there is some justification for expecting a realistic indication of the future prospects of the study group from an examination of their present situations.

This chapter is intended to review the progress of the study group hitherto. The purpose of this is to allow reasonably accurate speculation about their life chances by paying attention to some of their basic achievements and skills, such as their degree of independence, success in personal relationships, job satisfaction and career prospects. It is, in addition, intended to note those factors which appear to have had a significant influence in this area. Hence it will also provide an opportunity to compare the relative influences of disability and personal competence upon the value which has been accorded to members of the group, in the different areas of activity to which they have obtained access.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

The aims of education in this country have always been circumscribed by debate and controversy. They have varied over the years as society has developed and the demands on the individual have changed. Precisely how far education has fulfilled its allotted role has also been a subject which has induced dissent and discussion. Nevertheless, as Banks and Lynch (1986) explain, the general public strongly believes that education has a "powerful role" to play in the life chances of children. There are also some generally held assumptions connected with the service that the public expects from the educational institutions charged with children's primary and secondary education. The educational establishment may dispute the relative importance which the public attaches to many aspects of formal education. There is, however, little doubt that some of the basic academic skills which the general public expect from their children's schooling, such as literacy and numeracy, are widely recognised as being of considerable importance.

Social skills may not be referred to directly, by the public, as often as the academic attainment traditionally associated with education. Even so, they are a necessary acquisition and the school has a

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

significant part to play in this area for as Lamb and Sutton-Smith (1982) explain enrolment marks a child's first major encounter with a "child oriented world". Probably the least contentious way to delineate the school's role succinctly would be to categorize its efforts as preparing its pupils for life in the wider society. Such a definition is in accord with the Department of Education and Science (1981) "summary of orthodoxy" which refers to the school curriculum preparing the child for adult life in a way which "helps him to develop his potential" in relation to "his subsequent needs and responsibilities".

It is, therefore, necessary to consider the education received by the study group if their achievements are to be fully appreciated. Inadequate or unsuitable preparation would be an obvious adverse bias in their search for success in any field. During the course of a review of the development of the members of the study group, from infant school to adulthood it is also possible that some indication of the effectiveness of education may be evident. It may even be apparent that there are grounds for supposing there is a connection between methods of schooling used for various members of the study group and the eventual realization of their

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

potential in a wider sense.

Ten members of the study group were educated entirely in special schools. The selection of an appropriate school for them, as for other members of the study group was affected by the degree to which their disability, or disabilities, restricted them. These limitations were, in some cases controlling factors in the decision making process.

For instance, two subjects who were quadriplegic and almost aphasic were never seriously regarded as candidates for mainstream school placements, despite the fact that the possibility of such a placement was suggested to their parents and class teachers, for serious consideration. Nevertheless, in common with other members of the group, the choice of their schools was subject to the influence of several factors which were not directly connected with attempts to meet their particular needs.

Their educational opportunities and hence probably their life chances were partially dependent upon their ages. In the sixties and well into the seventies integrated education was not always regarded as an option worthy of serious consideration by either parents or teachers. Many people, at that time, saw special

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

education as the obvious answer to the major needs of children who were physically disabled. At that stage in the development of education most children, who were physically disabled to any obvious extent, were categorized at the pre-school stage, or very early in their school careers. The process was then referred to as ascertainment. With two exceptions, the members of the study group were all categorised as either physically handicapped or delicate before they were enrolled at any school. However the categorization of these two young people was implied by the recommendation that they should attend a school for physically handicapped children.

This kind of assessment was, in effect, a disincentive in the matter of investigating the level of the help children needed in the school situation. As outlined in chapters two and four the children were allocated to broad categories of need as a result of medical assessment and hospital reports. Thus the child's ability to cope with life in a classroom was largely pre-judged by people who had little or no relevant experience of the situation which would face the child on school admission. In any case it is difficult to imagine how such a judgement, based on

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

clinical reports and medical examination, could be expected to pay due regard to other important considerations, for example, the child's personal characteristics and personality traits such as intelligence, determination and resilience.

As a consequence of this general attitude there were subsidiary influences on the choice of educational setting. These were compounded by the high demand for places in most schools, which pertained during the same period. The outcome, especially for some of the older subjects, was a lack of available places in certain schools, a shortage of mainstream schools willing to cooperate and a feeling of insecurity about the idea of mainstream education in the minds of parents. This curtailment of choice was exacerbated by the constraints arising from the child's personal traits, such as academic ability and persistency and the characteristics of his or her particular background, such as familial support and the personalities of the parents.

Four members of the study group experienced integrated education but were later enrolled at special schools to complete their education. One boy was admitted by the study school as a result of a transfer requested by the mainstream primary school he originally

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

attended. Both he and his parents were still resentful about this transfer when he was aged twenty-one. His father was of the opinion that the education system had failed his son. He saw the special school admission as the mark of failure and thought this did not do his son justice. He felt guilty about his part in the special school admission, unwilling though he was. He explained, with much emphasis, "I should have fought it (the transfer) but I wasn't very well at the time with this (indicating a back injury)".

The placements of three subjects, when they were transferred to mainstream schools, were regarded, by the host school, as unsuccessful. They were returned to a special school after periods of eight weeks, twelve weeks and two school terms respectively. One of these two young people was later transferred to a special school on campus with a comprehensive school, which was referred to in chapter seven. He attended the comprehensive school on a part-time basis but did not achieve the same degree of social integration as many of his former school-mates, who were transferred directly to the same special school.

In common with the others who were returned to special education, after attempted integration, both he

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

and his parents spoke of re-admission to special schools as failure and rejection. During the period when his re-admission was pending he explained, during an informal social encounter, "They don't want me there, because I can't really keep up (the mainstream school)" and asked, "Have you heard what they are going to do with me?". Ten years later his father commented, during an interview, "No I can't really see him getting a job, I would like him to, but remember he couldn't even manage in an ordinary school, and they did make allowances for him".

The remaining twelve members of the study group attended special schools early in their school careers, but received a substantial proportion of their education in integrated settings. Two children were transferred to their neighbourhood primary schools, following an approach by the study school, but the other transfers were effected with the aid of the education authority initiatives referred to in chapter seven. In the majority of these cases the integration was associated with secondary school attendance.

For some children this entailed transfers at the end of their primary school education as part of a staged mainstream entry. For most of them the integration began on a part-time basis. In four instances this was

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

developed as part of the cooperative effort on the campus referred to earlier and outlined in chapter seven. These twelve young people ended their secondary schooling as part of a class in a mainstream school. They were separated from their class-mates for only a very small part of the school timetable. For instance, they were allowed to treat games and P.E. lessons as "private study periods" and were withdrawn, in some cases, for physiotherapy.

The experiences of the study group indicated that, despite the change in educational practice prompted by the Education Act 1981 and the development of theory which spawned it, limitations of educational opportunity for physically disabled young people still persist. These constraints may now exist only in attenuated form in some areas but they are an impediment to the disabled. Their constricting effect is reinforced by the stereotype of the physically disabled child, which is widely held by the public, and the attendant discrimination.

Teachers involved in the integration programme, referred to earlier, were justifiably proud of their efforts to extend educational opportunity that they had helped to introduce. However, some of the study group,

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

whilst noting this approvingly, pointed out that children who experienced physical disability were, by the implication of the integration programme, limited to one mainstream school in the education authority at each stage of their education.

They pointed out that this separated them from many of the social aspects of school life and alienated them from natural social contacts in their own community enclave. Only one member of the study group claimed to have made a friend of an able-bodied contemporary, from his home neighbourhood. Another young man in the group commented, during an interview at his home, "No, I still hardly know anyone around here (his home district), all the kids I knew were at S---- B----- (Special school and comprehensive school he attended)". Madge and Fassam (1982) report that parents and teachers frequently suggested that disabled children experienced more difficulties, in the matter of making and maintaining friendships, than their able-bodied counterparts.

Several parents, of members of the study group, noted this social restriction. Two of them also pointed out that the able bodied children had a wider choice of secondary schools and, therefore, access to schools with a better reputation for academic achievement. One woman

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

added, "So you see the handicapped children come off worst again, don't they?", a clear reference to discrimination in the matter of parental choice.

Much of the discrimination experienced by the study group was positive and apparently intended to be helpful to them but they often found it to be unintentionally obstructive or insulting. Most of the resulting curtailment of educational opportunity that endures beyond the implementation of the Education Act 1981 is clearly a manifestation of prejudice or ignorance which is rooted in the wider society which gave rise to the schools themselves. As Haskell et. al. (1977) explain a child is "rated" according to "the criteria adopted by society" from his "first moments of life".

The introduction of new practices, the provision of extra resources and the enactment of new laws may be of substantial aid to improvement. However, such things do not allow a precise regulation of factors such as prejudice or discrimination. As Barton and Tomlinson (1981) point out, the moral, political and practical judgements which give rise to the situation are "the prerogative of the social participants". In some areas only the slow evolution of social standards, can be expected to remedy the constraints.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

However, restrictions such as these did not dominate the opinions of everyone connected with the children. For instance, a teacher who worked at the study school spoke with enthusiasm about the potential of integrated education before the integration programmes referred to in this study were proposed (see Chapter 6).

There were also instances of parental enthusiasm. For example, the parents referred to in chapter four who made repeated representations about the possibility of their daughter being transferred to a mainstream school. They continued from the time she was admitted to the study school until she was transferred to the first special unit that was opened for integrated education. They had apparently gained the confidence to do this because of the advice of their child's medical consultant who favoured mainstream education.

Their child, who is twenty-five years old at the time of writing, was the only member of the study group who was a patient of that consultant. She had no obvious advantage, in terms of physical ability or academic attainment, over some of her classmates at the special school she attended. This is an illustration of the degree to which a physically disabled child's educational opportunities might be dependent upon

chance.

With three exceptions only, the young people involved in the study, who were educated solely in special schools, wished that they had been given the opportunity of mainstream education. Some of them seemed to have unrealistic expectations about the beneficial effect of both the academic and social opportunities that mainstream education would offer. Many, for instance, thought that they would have had a wide circle of close friends who were able-bodied and some thought they would have been able to find a job relatively easily. This was not the experience of the other members of the study group. Nevertheless, the outstanding impression to be gained from their comments was their sense of deprivation. They felt they had been denied normal schooling and consequently labelled as different.

The only subjects of the study who expressed regret about their mainstream education were two who had been returned to special schools after unsuccessful attempts at integration. The others recalled that integration had been far from easy, in some cases a traumatic experience, but said they were pleased that they had been educated in mainstream schools.

With only two exceptions, however, they thought that

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

a physically handicapped child's education should begin in a special school. The general opinion was, as one young man put it, that this would, "give him a good start, because he'll need it later on in a comp. (comprehensive school)". The suggestion that integration from the beginning might be easier for the child in the long run was not accepted by these young people. They clearly viewed a "good start" in a special school as an appropriate form of discrimination, but their ideas about the length of time disabled children should stay in special education varied from "until they learn to read" to "till they go to the comp.", as two young people explained.

Although they regarded this start in a special school as beneficial it obviously did not, in their minds, assume the same level of importance as integrated education. When asked which kind of school was best for physically disabled children, if it were not possible to combine both special schools and mainstream schools, they all chose integrated education as the most appropriate. However, two of them did admit that there may be some children whose physical impediment was too severe to allow this.

When asked about the particular benefits that

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

integrated education could offer, the same group of young people drew attention to the academic and the social advantages offered by a mainstream school. On being asked about this in more detail some drew attention to the stimulation of keener academic competition and others to the wider academic range offered by a mainstream school, others mentioned both. Even though they were very definite that integrated education had been good for them socially, they were at first rather indefinite about which particular areas that this had proved to be an advantage, except to point out that it was useful for them to be accustomed to being part of a large group and it allowed them to meet many more people of different types.

All the study subjects reported that they had encountered discrimination on a much larger scale at mainstream schools than anywhere else previously. They also admitted that this had enabled them to come to terms with the fact that discrimination was part of life early in their careers and claimed that this had been a great advantage. One young woman said, of her reactions to her former schoolmates, "When you've been there (mainstream school) a bit they start saying things that really upset you at first, but there's nobody there to

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

mollycoddle you and you learn to ignore it".

There was some indication that the social group at the mainstream school served the deeper social need, which required the subjects to find a position in society from which they could operate with confidence. This entailed the construction of a code of conduct appropriate to their particular category of membership, including a method of coping with discrimination. A young man, in the study group, quoted an instance, "If you go into a shop or somewhere and people look at your wheelchair or sticks and callipers and look down their noses at you or maybe won't look at you, but that's nothing compared with the cracks the kids made in the school yard". When questioned further about coping with this kind of incident he explained, "Oh by that time you've learned to leave it alone and just get on with life. I can't see kids straight from a handicapped school could though, it's a shock when you're not used to it." This seems to be reference to part of the process of accepting assigned role, which Frankenberg (1957) points out is decided by society and refers to as social position.

Many of the comments of the young people who had received part of their education in a mainstream setting

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

indicated that a background of integrated education helps a physically disabled young person to come to terms with the problems associated with disability much earlier in life. Hence, as one young woman put it, be "in a better position to cope". Some basic points of socialization such as those quoted by Lambert et. al. (1970), who refer to a "process of inculcation" during which the individual "learns the principal values and symbols of the social system in which he operates", and the "norms governing the roles which he and others enact" suggest this is evidence that education in a mainstream setting provided a distinct social advantage to members of the study group. Those young people who had the advantage of integrated education were, apparently, in a better position to cope with problems by the time other sources of stress arose, such as the search for a job and adaptation to the role of employee.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT

For the majority of people in our society their job, or profession, can be an important influence on the quality of their lives. It is more than merely a means of generating income, although this is in itself potentially important since a person's standard of

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

living, in monetary terms, can restrict social contacts or create additional stress. Finding a first job is clearly an important part of the lives of most young people, one of the "critical events" which Lamb and Sutton-Smith (1982) explain have been of significance to life-span developmental psychologists in their study of formative influences. A job also has implications of status which can furnish an individual with a prominent social label. This tends to extend its influence to his chances in other spheres.

However, if a worthwhile assessment of the success of the study group, in respect of employment, is to be obtained it is obvious that due regard must be paid to the apparent limitations of some of the group in the eyes of potential employers. It is also relevant to remember that a minority of the group are severely restricted in the skills they can offer any employer. Because of this it is not appropriate to consider the subjects as members of one homogeneous group when considering their search for employment.

Two of the study group had, in addition to their physical handicap, emotional problems which had hampered their relationships with their fellow pupils throughout their school careers. They were unable to obtain

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

employment of any kind and are currently attending a day centre. One young man, who attends the same centre, has been so far unable to find employment. He left school with a record of very low academic attainment. At the age of twelve, for example, comprehension and word recognition tests indicated his reading age was less than six and a half years.

Five other members of the group are severely limited in their movements by spastic quadriplegia and experience communication difficulties arising from their distorted speech. In two cases the distortion is such that the young people are virtually aphasic and anarthric respectively. Two of the others showed very limited aptitude academically. Attempts were made to assess the level of their academic attainment but their physical limitations precluded any specific figures being given. This group of five are hitherto unemployed, four currently attend day centres and the fifth is engaged in completing a third year in the sixth form of a residential special school.

Also included in the study group were four young people who, although not handicapped by multiple disabilities, were so severely limited by physical disability as to suggest that paid employment, in the

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

conventional sense of the term, was virtually impossible for them. Two of the four were limited by cerebral palsy. One was a young man disabled by athetoid quadriplegia. His hand and arm movements are so restricted that he is unable to feed himself or produce any form of written communication with them. Although he needs assistance with all basic bodily functions, he is able to operate a word processor with his feet. He is currently attending a higher education course at a polytechnic. Neither of the other two young men, who were hampered by congenital heart deformities, had been in employment. One of them is currently waiting for an organ transplant. The other died within three days of my beginning the current chapter.

Three other members of the study group were still at school, one on an extended course and two in the sixth form of a local comprehensive school. The remainder of the study group had been available for employment for at least one year and in the majority of cases for periods in excess of three.

During this time, despite actively searching for work, only five of the eighteen involved had managed to find any kind of employment. Only one of these jobs could be fairly said to hold out any realistic prospect

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

of career advancement and two of the recipients were firmly convinced that they were offered their jobs because of the establishments need to employ a proportion of disabled people.

One of the young people who held such a job reported, "I was sent there, I didn't apply and they were more interested in if I was registered disabled than my name - I think I was lucky they needed me to make up the quota". This is a reference to the Disabled Persons Employment Acts of 1944 and 1958, which require that every industrial organization employing twenty or more people engages at least two per cent of its workforce from people who are registered disabled. Another young man, after becoming rather disillusioned with work offered by a day centre, had obtained assistance from the Spastics Society in the form of a subsidized flat and a job in a sponsored factory.

There seem to be grounds for claiming that this company of eighteen young people, despite their physical disabilities, were employable in many areas of industry. However, their success rate in the job market, approximately 28%, was unduly low in the context of the relatively high employment current in the Greater London area where they lived. Their rate of failure to find

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

jobs represents an unemployment rate of over 72% for the group of eighteen. Griffin (1989) tells us that the unemployment rate for October 1988 stood at 7.7%. The Daily Telegraph of the 14th of April 1989, in an article which quoted the Employment Secretary, stated that the national unemployment figure for March 1989 was 6.7% of the available workforce.

The employment situation of the study group, as seen from this comparison, supports Brennan's (1987) suggestion that lower economic activity constitutes a greater disadvantage to the "employment prospects for the handicapped" than for "normal workers".

Some of the fourteen young people who had been unable to find employment were convinced that their failure to do so was mainly due to discrimination. For example this was the opinion of three of the group who used manually-operated wheelchairs. In common with other wheelchair users in the study group they were not optimistic about their employment prospects. One young woman who uses a wheelchair explained, "As soon as they see this (her wheelchair) they just don't want to know". The mother of another subject commented, "When they see any special equipment, especially a wheelchair, that shows somebody's handicapped and things change". Apart from a

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

period of "YTS" training, no member of the group who was largely confined to a wheelchair had been able to break into the mainstream labour market.

All fourteen of those who were unsuccessful in their quest for employment were able to write with standard writing instruments and none of them were in need of any assistance with bodily functions. In addition to those using wheelchairs only three needed any kind of apparatus to make them fully ambulant. The pieces of apparatus in question were arm crutches, in two cases, and a walking stick. All were able to indulge in normal verbal communication, although two of them spoke very slowly and deliberately, as a consequence of cerebral palsy. Only two of these young people had not obtained some successes in either "CSE" or "O" level examinations.

THE INFLUENCE OF HOME BACKGROUND

As must surely be the case with almost all children who spend a significant part of their formative years with their parents, the home background of the study group was clearly important. As Lamb and Sutton-Smith (1982) disclose the influence of "early and prolonged adult-oriented socialization" persists into later areas

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

of the life-span.

Parental cooperation, which varied throughout the study group, provided a potentially valuable background to the subjects' schooling. It could also offer support and endorsement for much of the effort that was directed towards the benefit of the children involved, including academic, social and physical progress. Some of the parents of the study group provided motivation for their children by openly showing appreciation of their progress and achievements, and thus, in the manner of the parents of children at many other schools, furnished them with an advantage over some of their schoolmates.

In addition to this some parents regularly visited the school and accepted suggestions aimed at widening their children's experience of the environment. This entailed allowing them experience of situations that might, at first sight, seem inappropriate. For instance, a parent might accept the suggestion of providing a child who is not ambulant with some form of groundsheet so that he/she could experience gardening, or allow the child the experience of travelling on public transport, even when it might be inconvenient to do so.

Many of the same parents were also keen to liaise with the school in connection with therapy programmes.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

With parental help some of these were reinforced by exercises carried out at home. This was regarded as very helpful, by the therapists concerned, especially when it was carried out during weekends and the school holidays.

The quality of parental attitudes was also important to the study group. This was particularly so for those young people who attended the study school at a time when integrated education was being introduced. At that time, those parents with a more flexible approach to their children's education seriously explored the possibility of integrated placements and thus extended the opportunities available to their children.

Home background also affected another source of influence on the quality of life, and life chances, of the study group. The type of area where the family home was situated and the scale of values imparted to the members of the group by their parents had a bearing on the type and quality of the social contact between the subjects and other members of their community enclave. For instance, the parents of one subject were members of the Salvation Army and this was the source of most of the subject's social contacts. Another member of the study group was greatly dependent upon his membership of the local Catholic Club for his social life.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

Those members of the study group whose parents belonged to social classes one and two (as defined by the Registrar General's classification) and the majority of those whose parents held non-manual salaried posts appeared to lack the level of support from their community enclave that was taken for granted by some of the others in the group. This was particularly apparent when considering their situation as they approached adulthood or after they had attained it. For example, in some cases part of this support was apparently engendered by the kind of ethos to be found in an enclave of a large council house estate populated largely by working class people.

Among a group of people who took for granted unquestioned access to each other's homes, sometimes without even having to knock at a door, the physically disabled young people were accepted as part of the community. They were not accorded the status concomitant with their age and intelligence, but their right to be there was not challenged and their special status entailed consideration and privilege in the form of practical help. There were aspects of this which were viewed, by some subjects, as a source of discomfort, embarrassment, or even, in extreme instances, insult.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

For example, a physically disabled young adult might be the only member of his/her household on the "present list" for Christmas and holidays, of most of the neighbours.

However, no members of the study group, in this kind of situation, complained of loneliness. Perhaps some of the privileges of membership, of their enclave were taken for granted. For instance, they all seemed to be privy to the mainstream of adult gossip and most complained that they were gossiped about at times. As Bott (1957) and Klein (1965) point out, these are fundamental characteristics of community membership.

It was interesting to note the similarity between the subjects' status in this kind of situation, and some of their observations about life in the comprehensive school. One member of the study group, for example, commented, "Even when you got used to it (the comprehensive school) some of the mickey taking can be a pain in the bum, but they're (able-bodied pupils) good in other ways". He explained, "I mean you never get pushed to the back of the queue and they never got really narked with you, not the way they would with each other".

OTHER ASPECTS OF LIFE CHANCES

Social contacts were also available to the subjects of this study via the institutions in their local community. Members of the group were, or had been, members of many associations and clubs. These catered for widely separated interests such as amateur radio and embroidery, as well as special clubs for the disabled. According to their comments they were not accorded status appropriate to their ages or intelligence in any of these. Nevertheless, there were two types of social groups in which a sizable section of the subjects of the study felt comfortable. Those who were regular attenders reported that they felt more at ease in their local pub, the local workmen's club or among the members of a vigorous committed religious sect than they did in any other group, institution or organization.

As with their experience in other places they met discrimination, most of it being positive, and they were aware that they accorded special status. One subject said of his local workmen's club, "They don't always take notice of what you say, unless they agree with you". When explaining why he always went early on a saturday night he added, "Sometimes I'd just as soon

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

lean against the window ledge and put my pint on the table, when it's full, but somebody always gives me his chair and some of them wouldn't even do it for a woman in there".

Another member of the group said of the religious group to which she belonged, "They're kind people, sometimes almost too kind but it's lovely, the way everybody knows everybody and passes on all kinds of information". She later explained this was "not only about meetings and services, but about people who are ill and engagements and sales at shops." These institutions seemed to offer the nearest approach to acceptance which most of the subjects of the study had experienced outside their family groups.

It was also interesting to note that the young people who were at ease in these kind of situations were referring to groups which did not normally include close relatives. Other than explaining that they felt more relaxed and more accepted without family members "crowding" them or "butting in," to use terms employed by the young people themselves, they were unable to explain why this was so. However, some of their comments, such as one young man's explanation, "It makes things a bit awkward", suggested that it could arise

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

from the presence of stress.

One source of this was connected with the "courtesy stigma", referred to by Goffman (1963), which is accorded to close relatives of a person of deviant status. Their awareness of this in a situation which includes the person who is the source of their stigma may generate additional stress. Baldwin (1977) notes the additional stress caused by the presence of a disabled child in a family. He claims that, because of this, mothers of such children have an additional need to find employment outside the family. Phillip and Duckworth (1982) draw attention to the demands of the dual role of "normal" and "different" which parents of disabled children play and Voysey (1975) points out their constant efforts to create and maintain an appearance of normalcy. Another reason for the young people avoiding these groups may have been that they felt the presence of family members inhibited their efforts to "pass", or otherwise influence their own social identity.

An aspect of life which the majority of the subjects of this study found very disappointing was relationships with the opposite sex. Claims about pair bonding could be substantiated in respect of two members of the group only. In both cases the nature and severity of their

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

disabilities precluded any reasonable supposition that they would be able to "pass" (Goffman 1963).

One was a young man in his middle twenties who had set up house with a a young woman two years his senior. Apparently their relationship was a source of irritation and disappointment to the young woman's family of origin. Asked why this was he offered the explanation, "Well I'm handicapped and they come from the sticks (the more remote provinces) and they're just ignorant really, you know, pig headed about it". When asked if they were going to marry, he said, "Yes I'm sure we will. We're just waiting to see how it works out really". I did not obtain his partner's views on the subject since I was unable to arrange an interview with her. She did not refuse to meet me but on the occasions I visited their home she was out and, unfortunately, she professed to being "busy" on the several times I tried to arrange to interview her.

The other member of the group who was pair bonded was in the final stages of preparing a flat which she was due to move into with her partner. They were both in their early twenties and were looking forward to setting up house together. When asked if they thought they might marry eventually the young woman replied, "I hope so".

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

Both members of the study group who had achieved pair bonding received their secondary education in an integrated setting. Another subject, in his early twenties explained he had a girlfriend. She was seven years his junior. He had known her for seven weeks and said she was his first girlfriend.

Relationships were referred to in connection with two other members of the group. The parent of a young man in his middle twenties referred to a relationship which his son had developed with a much older woman, who had previously been one of the care staff working with him. This was not confirmed from any other source. Another young man also claimed to have had a girlfriend, when he was attending a residential college for the disabled. He explained that he had known her for three months but reported that he "didn't really take her out" except to escort her to the college social functions. Enquiries among the study group and their parents disclosed no other similar relationships.

Only four of the remainder of the study group did not freely admit that they would like to have some sort of relationship with a member of the opposite sex, but had failed to achieve this. However, none of these four young people denied they had ambitions in this area.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

They responded to my questions on the matter with replies which were vague and indefinite such as, "There are plenty other things to worry about just yet" and "I have had some friends who were girls".

Most of the group were open about the fact that they were keen to develop a relationship with a member of the opposite sex but their efforts in this direction had been unsuccessful. Two of them recounted that they had approached introduction services. One, a nineteen-year-old said he had not received any replies to his application. The other, a young woman in her early twenties, did not forward her completed form to the bureau. She said she did not wish to advertise her disability but felt she could create a very embarrassing situation if she did not include some details of it in the personal information required. A third subject was currently attending counselling sessions to help him to come to terms with his sexuality. He offered the opinion, "A lot of the homosexuality which happens with handicapped people is because other people just don't want to know them".

In addition to the two members of the study group who were pair bonded, twenty-seven subjects said they would like to marry and create a home with a member of

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

the opposite sex. When asked for more detail about their opinions in this area seven of them said they regarded this as impossible. Four of them thought so because they could not visualise anyone other than a disabled person wanting to marry them and they felt they would need the full-time attention of an able-bodied person for the rest of their lives. The other three were unable to imagine anyone who would want to engage in a heterosexual relationship with them. The idea of marriage was, for six of the sub-group, a distinct possibility but not a realistic ambition. One young man amplified his views on the matter by pointing out, "First I'd have to find someone to put up with me being like this, and I don't think there'll be many of them and then it would have to be somebody I could get on with". He concluded "it would be nice but I doubt it".

The others who looked upon the idea of a long-term relationship with favour appeared to think that such a thing was highly unlikely. One subject, when I questioned her on this topic shook her head and smiled, commenting, "It would be nice but I doubt it, it's more sensible to get on and organize your life without being too way out in your expectations, there's no sense in building yourself up for a fall".

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

The subjects' parents, whilst being in agreement with my assessment of their children's opinions, were more pessimistic about the subjects' marital prospects.

One of the more commonly expressed sources of parental anxiety was the situation of the disabled young people, after the parents' deaths. One woman commented "You can't ask her sister to take her in. That wouldn't be fair, but you can hope when anything happens to us she will". The father in a single parent family said, of his disabled son, "I'm the only one left and at times I can't help thinking he's now only one heart beat away from real trouble." More than 87 per cent of them visualized the children eventually living in an institution, with other siblings, or alone in a flat. The possibility of the children setting up a home with a member of the opposite sex was, for most parents, not a realistic expectation.

More than 73% of the fathers interviewed thought it to be virtually impossible but almost 56% of the subjects' mothers had some hope that their children might set up their own homes, even though the majority of them admitted that they thought it was unlikely. One woman said of her son's prospects, "I don't hold out much hope, but you never know for certain, I mean I've

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

known girls get mixed up with some of the strangest people".

CONCLUSION

It is clear that, in most cases, the physical disabilities of the study group exert a considerable influence on their life chances. However, the patterns of their lives hitherto reveal that the severity of their disabilities are not directly proportional to the threat to future prospects that these impediments represent.

It would have been very difficult to have predicted the type of education allotted to members of the study group from an appraisal of their abilities, both physical and mental. Often the kind of school to which they were assigned owed as much to factors such as their home backgrounds, the opinions of parents, current trends in their home education authority, or availability of school places as it did to their physical problems.

However, those young people who had attended a mainstream school for their secondary education seemed to have an advantage over those who had received all their education in a special school. Their accounts of

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

day-to-day experience indicated that they were more able to adjust to life in the wider society outside their schools.

It was widely held, among the group, that a special school was valuable for the early stages of education. Within the confines of the range of this study it was virtually impossible to find sufficient evidence to reinforce or refute such a theory. However, it was interesting to note that if this were true there would be a price to pay in the form of the stress which was generated, according to all those who were integrated, by the adjustment involved in the transfer from special education to mainstream.

The inconsistency of their school placements was echoed by an apparent lack of fair treatment in later life. Their ability to cope with life in an integrated environment and their academic success was not reflected by the employment opportunities they were offered. The minority who did manage to find employment had to be content with jobs which did not seem to justify their attainments and school records. Nor did their apparent ability to cope appear to have much influence in the matter of their relationships with members of the opposite sex.

CHAPTER 9 - LIFE CHANCES

There appeared to be a very low correlation between general capability and social attainment such as successful personal relationships. For the most part, their status was dominated by the social category to which they had been assigned, because of physical disability. This inferior status has curtailed the life chances that would otherwise appear to be appropriate to them on the grounds of basic personal characteristics such as age, intelligence, social class and personality.

CHAPTER TEN

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Most members of the study group were subject to severe physical disability. In many cases the broad pattern of their lives was affected by the dominance of organic malfunction. However, throughout the course of the research, the importance of social elements in the lives of the study group, began to emerge. In some cases they were overshadowed by gross handicaps, such as the impediment of a combination of very severe multiple disabilities. However even where the influence of social factors was comparatively minor, they appeared to exert considerable constriction on the quality of life of the young people concerned and imposed parameters with regard to their future prospects.

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL CATEGORY

The term "physically handicapped" is still in current use in the field of education. Recently it has been used largely as a descriptive term not as a diagnosis of educational category. Those children who were referred

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

to before the Education Act 1981 as "physically handicapped" are now more often designated, in the literature, as being children with "special needs". However, as outlined in chapter 2, prior to the introduction of the Act the term "physically handicapped" was an officially recognised educational category, and had been for more than thirty-five years. Consequently it is firmly entrenched in the vocabulary of the general public.

Throughout the course of the research for this study, people, other than those professionally involved, usually referred to the subjects as "physically handicapped" or "handicapped". Occasionally a term applying to a specific condition, such as "spastic" was used and less often the young people were referred to as "disabled". The term "special needs" was not used by the parents of the study group. The term "handicapped" was used most commonly of all and the context of its use often seemed to connote membership of a homogeneous group, irrespective of the type or severity of the disability which prompted the use of the term.

It was clear that this category to which the young people had been assigned had social implications. Their admission to the group was dependent solely upon

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

societal perceptions of their physical competency, not necessarily their actual level of competency. They had not all been assessed as "physically handicapped" following medical examination of their level of physical ability. However they had been assigned to the same deviant group despite a wide range of each variety of distinguishing factors, such as academic ability, temperament, levels of attainment and home backgrounds.

There were indications, in some cases, that the group affiliation occasioned by their admission to special schools had been a major influence on the social identity which was deemed, by society, as appropriate for them. For many of the group, despite the extra assistance it offered, special education had been a net disadvantage.

Few of the subjects' parents actively resisted moves to enrol their children at special schools, even by objecting strongly and persistently to the initial proposals. The majority of them were not aware that they had any real choice in the matter. They explained that they thought they were either being informed of decisions which had already been made or consulted as a matter of courtesy.

Most parents pointed out that, at the time they were

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

asked to agree to special school placements, they felt vulnerable because of their comparative ignorance about education and were unsure of the outcome if they refused point-blank. Often the implication, in their eyes, was that the first school offered would have to be rejected before they were allowed to see another, which might be an inferior establishment.

The majority of them accepted their children's entry into special education as inevitable. Although many of them had been unhappy about it, most of them appear to have accepted it with hindsight as unavoidable and, to some degree, appropriate. This was surely an indication of their acknowledgement of an established deviant group.

It is also relevant to note that those parents who did resist their children being admitted to a special school did so on the grounds that a school for physically handicapped children was not a suitable placement for their children, not that segregated education was inappropriate for disabled children. During the course of explaining the substance of their objections they frequently acknowledged that the special school offered a useful education for "some children". Nor did they deny the right of the duly appointed

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

community agents, such as a medical officer or an educational psychologist, to categorize children. They merely suggested that, in their particular case, a mistake had been made.

They were, in essence, claiming that their children did not belong to a specific category, not that it was inappropriate to segregate a particular group of children from their contemporaries. Special school admission may not have been the acid test for the social re-categorization of these children but it did imply that they were unable to fulfil the role expected of them and it must, therefore, have been at least an endorsement of presumed inferior status.

INTEGRATED EDUCATION

The importance of the role of the school, in the life of an individual is widely accepted. Its influence is concerned with the wider social life of children as well as with its narrower educational function. Banks (1976) highlights its prominence as a source of influence. Frankenberg (1982) views its day to day operation as that of a micro society. Reid (1981) draws attention to the fact that a school class is the first group, outside the family and community enclave, which is

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

universally entered into in our society. The potential effect of the introduction of a new form of education, into the lives of the group of physically disabled children involved in this study was, therefore, potentially significant. This was especially so in view of some of the social problems associated with special education, such as those outlined by Tomlinson (1982) and those referred to by Anderson (1971 and 1973) (chapter I - The Influence of the School).

The eventual introduction of integrated education owed very little to the pressure from parents of children attending the special school referred to in this study. When transfers to mainstream schools were initially offered most of the parents of the study group refused them, or accepted with marked reluctance. In spite of the momentum generated by the new policy of integration, which was launched by their local education authority and endorsed by the public debate which attended the introduction of the Education Act 1981, they appeared to feel their children were about to be deprived of valuable assistance.

Considerable efforts, over a period in excess of a year, were directed towards, first apprising them of the nature of the new facilities available for their

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

children and, secondly, persuading them to accept the offer. There were two reasons commonly offered, as part of parental objection to integrated placements. The first was that they were not convinced that a mainstream school could provide the same level of staff expertise and special apparatus that was needed by their child, and had been available in the special school. The second was that they were unsure about the mainstream school being able to provide the level of care and attention which their child needed. Assurances to the contrary and invitations to visit prospective schools had little apparent effect.

They reacted as if they recognised a social stigma which special school enrolment had conferred upon their children and regarded it as permanent. Having submitted their children to a situation which gave rise to this, they saw there was little advantage to be gained by withdrawing them. Consequently they decided to exploit the special school situation to obtain maximum advantage for them.

In addition to this there were implications that some parents saw a mainstream school as a source of discrimination. Having recognized the labelling effect of a special school, as outlined in chapter four, they

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

wished to save their children from the humiliation which they feared might result from the children's deviant status in the new situation.

Ten years later the majority of parents whose children were transferred to integrated education thought that their children had benefited from it. Some even thought, in retrospect, that a longer period of integrated education would have been very helpful.

Before the integration schemes referred to in this study were implemented, a minority of those professionally concerned perceived integrated education as a means of achieving the complete social integration of physically handicapped children with their schoolmates. They anticipated that the mainstream children would accept them as friends and colleagues who had a similar social status to themselves.

The people who expected this were among those who, at that stage, were unfamiliar with the problems of physically disabled children. Many of them expected this social integration to be almost complete relatively quickly. Some were soon disappointed. Others did not seem to be fully aware of the reality of the situation. Perhaps their ideas of acceptance differed widely from that of their colleagues. Perhaps they were not as

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

perceptive as their colleagues. Some of them when asked about the success of integration in their schools cited the unusual kindness and consideration of the able-bodied, towards the disabled, as evidence of the host population accepting the children with special needs as "ordinary people" rather than deprived children. Apparently they did not associate these actions with the concept of positive discrimination.

By the time the implementation of the Education Act 1981 was in hand it was difficult to find school staff who disagreed with the principle of integrated education. Nevertheless, more than half of the staff I questioned at that time were convinced that it would not provide a short term answer to most of the major problems of physically disabled children. A significant minority of them professed, in private, to being disillusioned with it.

Some of their comments raised the possibility that their commitment to this form of education had not been very deep in the first place. This seemed to provide support for the opinions of Hegarty et. al. (1981), that one of the difficulties of introducing a scheme of integrated education lay in the inflexibility of teachers. It is also possible, however, that some of

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

them had formerly been aware of the loss of status associated with special school attendance and presumed that mainstream school admission would quickly solve many problems by effectively re-labelling the disabled children involved. Presumably, in this case, they assumed that the self-labelling effect would also be revised, resulting in a speedy change of role acceptance and were accordingly disappointed.

A majority of the members of the study group, when commenting in retrospect, thought that, during the secondary age range, integrated education was the most suitable form of schooling for them. However, those of this opinion, who were educated in special schools only, seemed to have unreasonable expectations, in terms of both the academic and social advantages that it would have provided. Those subjects who had completed their secondary education in a mainstream school were largely pleased to have had the opportunity to do so but were satisfied with having accrued a more modest range of advantages.

The fact that they were not segregated throughout the whole of their schooldays had clearly been, in itself, an advantage to them in terms of their self esteem. Those advantages which they most often referred to,

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

however, hinged on the fact that an integrated situation approximated more closely to adult life in the wider society which they eventually had to enter after school. Their explanations of this indicated that they had left school with a much more realistic appreciation of life in this adult world.

They recounted the problems and irritation caused by the discrimination they encountered in the integrated situation and pointed out that a partial solution to the problems was found when they learned to come to terms with their special status. One young man explained this by saying, "You realize that you've got to take hold of what you've got and get on with it, there's no fairy godmother going to come and help you out with a magic wand".

SOCIAL STATUS AND LIFE CHANCES

Some of the comments of the subjects of this study, as referred to in chapter nine supported the theories of Chazan et. al. (1980) that, organic deficiencies constitute an impediment to life chances. They suggest that there can be little doubt that physical disability can restrict life chances in ways other than that which arises directly from limitations occasioned by organic

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

incompetence.

In the case of the subjects of this study these supplementary impediments seem to have been engendered by a labelling process. This defined them, in the eyes of the situational public as people of abnormal status and they were, thus, stereotyped. As Goffman (1963) points out, this results in a discrepancy between virtual identity and actual identity. Consequently, their personal traits and attributes, such as skills and intelligence tended to be overshadowed by the characteristics assumed as a result of the stereotype.

Over the years their lives were also affected by another result of stereotyping. It had influenced their assigned roles and hence their own perception of these roles. Obviously the subjects' perception of their roles affected the constructs from which self image was synthesized. This had invariably given rise to secondary deviation which Lemert (1967) explains is, in effect, a reaction to societal response to the effect of a person's primary deviation.

Hence there was a tendency for study group members to organize their lives around the facts of deviancy. They assumed that it was highly unlikely that they would ever be judged on their merits to the same extent that their

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

able-bodied contemporaries were or valued for their personal qualities. Consequently they generally presumed that their future lives would be unnecessarily limited. For example, they assumed that they would be confined by the parameters of low income and bereft of some of the major sources of quality of life, such as heterosexual relationships and wide circles of friendship. In the overwhelming majority of cases this was apparent during interviews with the subjects of this study. Their low expectations obviously affected their confidence, their sense of fulfilment and the quality of social interaction in which they were involved. This supported Becker's (1970) assertion that, in such circumstances, an individual's code of behaviour and identity are heavily influenced by the category to which he, or she has been assigned. Freedman and Doob (1968) supported this point of view, indicating that feelings of deviancy have important effects upon behaviour.

Those members of the group who attended a mainstream school, were conscious that they were accorded an inferior status there. Nevertheless they felt that they had an advantage over those of their former schoolmates who had continued their education in special schools. Conversations with them, their assessments of their

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

progress, parental opinions and reviews of their current situation in the context of their disabilities, indicated they had acquired increased social competence. For example, these subjects seemed to be more socially aware and more fluent during the progress of day-to-day social intercourse than the other group of their former schoolmates.

They were also of the opinion that their social credentials had been enhanced by mainstream enrolment. Their ideas on this point were broadly in accord with Goffman (1963) who explains that the nature we ascribe to an individual and the role he assumes is heavily influenced by the nature of his group affiliations.

The subjects of this study, who received all their education in the segregated situation of a special school, clearly were disadvantaged. The everyday interaction, which is an important constituent of their social development had been severely restricted. This suggests a social development which has been truncated. In this connection Lemert's findings (1967), that social controls instigate social problems, highlight the possible disadvantages encountered by the members of the segregated group. The validity of this application of Lemert's theory also finds support in some of Goffman's

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

work (1961 and 1969) when he introduces and discusses the influence of "social face" and its effect on the social valuation of an individual. The nature of the deprivation of the study group is explained when he develops this (1971 and 1981) to include an analysis of the interaction and conversational exchanges which constitute day to day social intercourse. His work emphasizes the importance of these exchanges to the development of social status.

It is clear from the comments of the subjects of this study (e.g. Acceptance - chapter five) and those of their teachers (e.g. The Mainstream Teachers in the Integration Scheme - chapter six) that their assigned social group differed from that of their contemporaries at mainstream schools. This obvious deviant status applied whether they were integrated or not. As Rubington and Weinberg (1973) point out deviance is a matter of social definition.

All the children in the study group spent a considerable part of their lives at school. A main difference between their situations was in their schooling, which constituted a significant part of the environment outside the home. It was there that a major part of their social learning and development took

place. In many cases this particular aspect of the role of the school seems to have been more prominent in the minds of the study group than the provision of an academic education.

The experience of social interaction, of those who were educated entirely in special schools, was largely confined to situations where they were insulated from the wider range of their contemporaries. Meanwhile those subjects who attended mainstream schools were exposed to a broad range of social experience from the kind of heterogeneous group who would one day be their colleagues, competitors and neighbours.

This indicated a shortfall in the education provided by special schools. Assuming a young person is to be educated with a view to his/her, eventually living in the community at large, rather than an institution then it is clearly part of the role of the school to prepare him/her, for this. Such a preparation must surely take cognizance of the main facts of life which the young person will encounter, such as stereotyping and discrimination. As Freedman and Doob (1968) point out deviance is a social fact. It would, therefore, seem to be more efficient to allow a physically handicapped young person the opportunity for interaction, which is

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

subject to the social protocol of the mainstream school. In this situation the quality of interaction between pupils should be, in any, case monitored and influenced. The skills in this area, which it is assumed school staff have acquired, could then be used to benefit the social development of physically disabled young people as well as those of their contemporaries.

As Becker (1963a) emphasizes deviance is, in general, created by the public. Since it is virtually impossible, in the short term, to radically alter societal standards and social mores it seems to be logical to educate the physically disabled young person in an environment which will, under controlled conditions, tend to foster the social skills necessary to cope with deviant status.

The study group found that deviancy presented additional difficulties, which restricted their life chances. Most subjects were acutely conscious of the effect of prejudice. Some were angered by it. One young man stated, "All this business of equal opportunities and civil rights didn't get as far as the disabled - some of them who make a fuss about people in other countries want to look at kids in their own street". Most members of the study group realized that they would

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

have to make what Sullivan (1980) described as "an adjustment to prejudice".

SOCIAL ATTAINMENT

Most members of the study group, at the time of writing, are adults. The two who are not are within weeks of reaching adulthood. It seems reasonable to assume that the development of their social situations will now be sufficiently advanced to give some indication of the quality of life that they can reasonably expect.

By this stage in their lives the majority of them have come to terms with the physical limitations imposed by their disabilities. Most of them have also accepted, that they are, in addition, subject to an additional impediment, a social handicap, which derives from special status. None of them see this additional hindrance as anything but unfair. It is accepted with varying degrees of reluctance and engenders a certain amount of bitterness in the minds of some subjects. To many of them any manifestation of this status, including positive discrimination, is a source of considerable annoyance. Some members of the group have largely come to terms with it and in the vast majority of cases

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

accept it as a fact of life.

One of the areas in which this additional handicap seems to operate is in the field of employment. The record of the study group in their efforts to find jobs is, by any standards, very disappointing, especially in view of their abilities, both physical and mental. Their search for jobs was perhaps particularly disappointing in view of the fact that they were all resident in a borough which provided special assistance and extra careers advice for people who were registered disabled.

Most of the group have decided that it is highly unlikely they will find any form of employment on the open market unless there is a radical alteration in the prevailing conditions, such as a gross shortage in the country's work force.

They claimed that, in an overwhelming majority of instances, evidence of disability virtually eliminated them before any employer had considered their application. Their experience seems to support Burstyn's (1986) assertion that if we "as a democratic society" decide that people will have to face periods of unemployment then we should provide the appropriate skills, to help them to cope with this.

Other important areas of the subjects' lives

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

indicated similar deprivation. Few of them claimed to have a circle of friends. Those who did listed former schoolmates from special schools. With only one exception, no member of the group claimed an able bodied contemporary as a close friend. Apart from two members, who were pair bonded, the other subjects' close relationships, outside their kinship group, all involved other people with disabilities.

Everyone in the group had experienced discrimination and had noted that they were denied full membership of the wider social groups in which they lived. They found their nearest approach to normal participation in social encounters occurred in social institutions which they attended regularly, such as churches and pubs, but this fell short of that which they saw between able-bodied people in the same situation.

This lack of acceptance extended to their relationships with members of the opposite sex. Only two subjects claimed to have been involved in a heterosexual relationship and many of them expressed disappointment at the general rejection they elicited from members of the opposite sex. By the time I had started interviewing them for this study most of the subjects appeared to have lost confidence in their ability to sustain such a

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

relationship and no longer actively sought situations where one was likely to be initiated.

This echoes the findings of Freedman and Doob (1968) who noted that fear of rejection and social comparison pressures deviants to associate with other members of their deviant group rather than people such as their contemporaries or their intellectual and social peers.

SUMMARY

The particular contribution which this study attempts to make is, in essence, the construction of a useful perspective, on physically disabled young people and the secondary handicaps which they experience. These additional handicaps are seen to take the form of a general impediment arising from the deviant status, which has been accorded to them because of their disabilities. This status has proved to be a restriction in respect of the life chances of the young people in question.

It is not within the power of the education system to provide an immediate re-adjustment of status but the type of schooling offered to the young people has had an important effect on their acquisition of social skills and, ultimately, their ability to cope with daily life.

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

Those educated entirely in special schools are deficient in some of these skills, having been isolated from the heterogeneous mainstream school groups where such skills are naturally developed.

It has been possible to demonstrate this with conviction because of such factors as the particular combination of research methods employed, the techniques used to collect data, the amount of data available, the relatively long time span from which reliable data was available and the background of the researcher, in respect of both the area being researched and personal relationships with the subjects of the study. The singular qualities of this perspective depend upon the combination of these characteristics. This is especially so when they are viewed in conjunction with other considerations such as the widely varied educational opportunities offered to the members of the study group, the biographical aspect of the subjects' lives provided by the longitudinal approach used, and the considerable changes in education then being effected.

However, some aspects of this research, which could be regarded as its strengths, also indicate its limitations. For instance, the size of the sample and the method of selection used mean that it is not

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

statistically defined. Therefore, although the findings may be perfectly valid in the area of generating theory, the extent to which they can be extrapolated to other situations is limited. However, as with the results of much qualitative research, the findings of this study do make a unique contribution to the overall picture. They are fabricated from a wealth of detail allied to a depth of investigation which could not be achieved by any other method. Thus they furnish the type of material that could promote understanding, rather than providing demographic detail only.

PERSONAL ENRICHMENT

Having previously been engaged in a similar kind of study, I approached the beginning of this one with the conviction that a carefully thought out approach would save time and secure access to additional research material. Early in the study I discovered that even forward planning which is based on known facts and the most reasonable of obvious assumptions is subject to unexpected complications and difficulties.

Nevertheless, my belief in the value of experience and forethought was, to some extent, confirmed when I found, in these cases, that I was able to modify my

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

plans, in order to effect some form of compensatory adjustment. Often this was done by relinquishing a particular line of investigation which I had previously adjudged as valuable and in which I had invested a substantial amount of time. Such moves exercised the considerable self-control required to make painful decisions.

Often this kind of process also introduced a measure of realism, which emphasized the frequent necessity of reaching a compromise between ambition and reasonable expectation. Although this is widely accepted as being a valuable lesson to learn, its application necessitated a deflation of vanity which, in retrospect, I think represented a move towards personal improvement.

The work which continued against this background was heavily dependent upon the collection and handling of data. In order to gain the maximum flexibility that my work situation and finances would permit I spent some considerable time attempting to reach an accurate forecast of the data handling facilities I would need. I, therefore, regarded the selection of a suitable combination of micro-computer and software as an important part of my pilot study. I was, thus, in a position where there was strong motivation for me to

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

make sensible decisions which required reaching an accommodation between competing demands in respect of the computer, such as speed of access to data, total handling capacity, flexibility of handling and cost. This kind of exercise also provided worthwhile experience.

I also benefited from this study because it helped me greatly in the development of a much wider view of physically disabled children than that which I had previously held. The altered perspective which this engendered helped me to focus more acutely on their adult lives. Previously I had tended to regard them primarily as former pupils, rather than considering my prior professional connection with them in a relatively minor role. This adjustment helped me to achieve a more balanced understanding of their view of the world and mirrored some of my own, unconsciously held, prejudices. Consequently I was inclined to be more appreciative of the significance of interaction between the general public and physically disabled people and the attitudes of those people whose family group included a person who was handicapped by organic incompetence.

Much of the material which I collected also provided the means of seeing the role of the school in a

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

sociological context, emphasizing its limitations as well as its importance. I was reminded that, whichever system of education may serve those people who are physically disabled, the eventual test of its success is best judged by the contribution it makes to the quality of life of the recipients.

AREAS WORTHY OF FURTHER RESEARCH

It is difficult to visualize anyone, who has examined the social situation of physically disabled people seriously challenging the conclusion, that the life chances of physically handicapped people are restricted by impediments in addition to the limitations which arise from their physical disabilities. It also seems reasonable to assume that this kind of extra limitation which, in some cases, is a severe restriction, cannot be counteracted by existing educational facilities.

However there is some indication, from the material collected for this study, that integrated education significantly assists some young people to adjust to the resulting situation in which they find themselves. Unfortunately it is less than nine years since the integrated education, which promises to offer this assistance, was fully implemented and the education

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

provided for young people is scheduled to span a minimum of eleven years.

Integration for most of the study group was, therefore, a rather hastily arranged alternative to special education. Reviewing its early achievements against results obtained by the established alternative is perhaps an unfair comparison. Therefore, a detailed examination of its effects in the study area after the lapse of four, or more, years could provide a more meaningful picture. By that time it will be more established and will have been on offer, as a standard practice, to physically disabled children throughout the whole of that period of their lives when formal education is appropriate.

Some of the material which was collected as part of a pilot study for the current piece of work suggested that although the Education Act 1981 is fully implemented, it has not been uniformly applied. Much valuable information could be gained from exploiting this situation. A comparative study between groups of children, who are handicapped by similar physical disabilities but are being educated, throughout their schooling, in different ways would seem to be a useful piece of work. Given some of the observations collected

CHAPTER 10 - CONCLUSION

in connection with this study, a similar comparison designed to compare the effects of different social, community and geographical backgrounds could also be enlightening.

As outlined in chapter seven, the local authority responsible for the education of the study group organized integrated education so that it was centred on only one school in each main sector of the system. One of the assumptions of the staff of these schools was that integration would alter the way in which able-bodied children perceived physically disabled people. The particular facilities which the authority has provided for the implementation of integration would provide a good opportunity to investigate this theory. It would be relatively easy, in a large authority, to compare the attitudes of groups of children and young people whose personal characteristics and circumstances were broadly similar, with the exception of the fact that some had been educated at a school used for the integrated education of physically disabled children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDERSON Elizabeth M. (1971) Making Ordinary Schools Special (London: Methuen).
- ANDERSON Elizabeth M. (1973) The Disabled Schoolchild (London: Methuen).
- BALDWIN S. (1977) Disabled Children. Counting the Costs (London: The Disability Alliance).
- BANKS James A. and LYNCH James (Eds.) (1986) Multicultural Education in Western Societies (London: Holt Reinhart and Winston).
- BANKS Olive (1976) The Sociology of Education (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd.).
- BARTON Len and TOMLINSON Sally (Eds.) (1981) Special Education: Policies, Practices and Social Issues (London: Harper Row).
- BECKER Howard S. (1963a) The Outsiders (Free Press of Glencoe).
- BECKER Howard S. (1963) The Other Side (Free Press of Glencoe).
- BECKER Howard S. (1968) Through Values to Social Interpretation (New York: Greenwood Press).
- BECKER Howard S. (1970) Sociological Work- Method & Substance ((London: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press).
- Bennett Neville and CASS Allyson (1989) From Special to Ordinary Schools Case Studies in Integration (Southampton: Camelot Press)
- BLOOM, B. (1979) Alterable Variables. The New Direction in Educational Research (Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education).
- BOGDON R. & TAYLOR S. (1975) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (New York: John Wiley).
- BOOTH Tony and SWANN Will (Eds.) (1987) Including Pupils with Disabilities (Milton Keynes: Open University Press) .
- BOTT Elizabeth (1957) Family and Social Network (London: Tavistock).
- BRENNAN Wilfred K. (1987) Changing special Education Now (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BURGESS Robert G. (Ed.) (1985) Field Methods in the Study of Education (London: The Falmer Press).
- BURGESS Robert G. (Ed.) (1982) Field Research: a Sourcebook and Field Manual (London: George Allen & Unwin).
- BURGESS Robert G. (1984A) In the Field - an Introduction to Field Research (London: George Allen & Unwin).
- BURGESS Robert G. (1984B) The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies (London: The Falmer Press).
- BURSTYN Joan N. (Ed.) (1986) Preparation for Life? - The Paradox of Education in the Late Twentieth Century (London: The Falmer Press).
- BURTON L. (1975) The Family Life of Sick Children (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- CHAZAN Maurice, LAING A.F., BAILEY Michael Shackleton & JONES Glenys (1980) Some of Our Children. The Early Education of Children with Special Needs (Shepton Mallet: Open Books).
- CICOUREL Aaron V. (1964) Method & Measurement in Sociology (New York: The Free Press).
- CICOUREL Aaron V. (1973) Cognitive Sociology- Language and Meaning in Interaction (Harmondsworth Press: Penguin Education).
- Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped children and Young People (1978) Report (H.M.S.O.). Referred to as "The Warnock Report".
- CRAFT Maurice (Ed.) (1984) Education and Cultural Pluralism (London: The Falmer Press).
- DAVIS Fred (1972) Illness, Interaction & Self (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc.).
- D.E.S. (1981) The School Curriculum (London: H.S.M.O.) para. 3 (summary of orthodoxy).
- DEUTSCHER I. (1973) What We Say/ What We Do: Sentiments & Acts (Illinois: Scott Foreman).
- DOUGLAS Jack & Daniell (1976) Investigative Social Research, Individual & Team Research (California: Sage Publications).
- FLUDE Michael and AHIER John (1974) Educability Schools and Ideology (London: Croom Helm).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- FRANKENBERG Ronald (1982) Custom & Conflict in British Society (Manchester University Press).
- FRANKENBERG Ronald (1957) Village on the Border (Cohen and West).
- FREEDMAN Jonathan L. & DOOB Anthony N. (1968) Deviancy (New York: Academic Press).
- GLASER Barney G. & STRAUSS Anselm L. (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory (London: Wedenfeld & Nicholson).
- GLASER Barney G. & STRAUSS Anselm L. (1971) Status Passage (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1959) The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (London: Allen Lane. the Penguin Press).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1963) Stigma (N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1974) Frame Analysis (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1967) Interaction Ritual (New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Ltd.).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1961) Encounters. Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction (New York: The Bob Merrils Co., Inc.).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1969) Strategic Interaction (London: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1971) Relations in Public Micro Studies of the Public Order (London: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1981) Forms of Talk (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1969) Where The Action Is (London: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press).
- GRIFFIN Tom (Ed.) (1989) Social Trends 19 (London: H.M.S.O.).
- HARRIS A. (1971) Handicapped and Impaired in Great Britain (H.M.S.O.).
- HARRIS C. C. (1983) The Family and Industrial Society (London: George Allen and Unwin).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HASKELL Simon H., BARRETT Elizabeth K. and TAYLOR Helen (1977) The Education of Motor and Neurologically Handicapped children (London: Croom Helm).
- HEGARTY Seamus & POCKLINGTON Keith with LUCAS Dorothy (1981) Educating Pupils with Special needs in the Ordinary School. (Windsor: NFER Nelson).
- HEGARTY Seamus and POCKLINGTON Keith, with LUCAS Dorothy (1982) Integration in Action (Windsor: N.F.E.R.).
- HELLE H. J. & EISESTADT S. N. Eds. (1985) Micro Sociological Theory- Perspectives on Sociological Theory Volume 2. (London: Sage Publications Ltd.).
- HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE (1987) Memorandum to Education Science and Arts Committee (London: H.M.S.O.)
- HEWITT Sheila with NEWSON John and Elizabeth (1970) The Family and the Handicapped Child (George Allen & Unwin, London).
- HIMES Joseph (1950) Some Concepts of Blindness in American Culture Social Casework 31.
- HINSON Mike (Ed.) (1987) Teachers and Special Educational Needs (Harlow: Longman).
- HOEKSTRA Gerlof F. (1981) The Vocational Training of Adults Paper 158 at the third European Conference of Rehabilitation International, held April 6th. to 10th. in Vienna.
- HODGSON, Ann, CLUNIES ROSS, Louise and HEGARTY, Seamus (1984) Learning Together. Teaching Pupils with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School (Windsor: NFER-Nelson).
- JOHNSON Allen W. (1978) Research Methods in Social Anthropology (London: Edward Arnold, Ltd.).
- JOWETT, Sandra (1982) Young Disabled People. Their Further Education Training and Employment (Windsor: NFER-Nelson).
- KLEIN Josephine (1965) Samples from English Cultures (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- KNORR-CETINA K. & CICOUREL A.V. (Eds.) (1981) Advances in Social Theory and Methodology. Toward an Integration of Micro & Macro Sociologies (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- KROEBER A.L. (1953) (Ed.), Anthropology Today (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).
- LAMB Michael E. and SUTTON-SMITH Brian (1982) Sibling Relationships (London: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates).
- LAMBERT Royston, BULLOCK Roger and MILHAM Spencer (1970) A Manual to the Sociology of the School (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).
- LEMERT Edwin M. (1950) Social Pathology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc.).
- LEMERT Edwin M. (1967) Human Deviance, Social Problems & Social Control (N.J. Prentice-Hall Inc.).
- LOFLAND John (1969) Deviance & Identity (N.J. Prentice-Hall Inc.).
- LOFLAND John (1971) Analysing Social settings (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc.).
- MADGE Nicola and FASSAM Meg (1982) Ask the Children - Experiences of physical disability in the school years (London: Batsford Academic and Educational).
- MILLS C. Wright (1959) The Sociological Imagination (Oxford University Press)
- MURPHY Raymond (Editor) (1979) Sociological Theories of Education (London: McGraw-Hill Ryverson).
- PARSONS Talcott and BALES Robert F. (1956) Family Socialization and Interaction Process (London: Routledge And Kegan Paul).
- PENNINGTON Donald C. (1986) Essential Social Psychology (Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd.).
- PHILIP Mark & DUCKWORTH Derek (1982) Children with Disabilities & Their Families- A Review of Research . (The N.F.E.R.- Nelson Publishing Co. Ltd.).
- REID Ivan (1981) Social Class Differences in Britain Second Edition. (London: Grant McIntyre Ltd.).
- RUBINGTON Earl & WEIBERG Martin S. (1971) The Study of Social Problems (Oxford University Press).
- RUBINGTON Earl & WEIBERG Martin S. (1973) Deviance (New York: The Macmillan Company) .

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SCHARTZ H. & JACOBS J. (1979) Qualitative Sociology (New York: Free Press).
- SPRADLEY James P. and MANN Brenda J. (1975) The Cocktail Waitress - Womans's Work in a Man's World (London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.).
- SULLIVAN Harry Stack (1980) Americal Journal of Psychiatry X.
- THOMPSON Paul (1978) The Voice of the Past Oral History (Oxford University Press).
- TOMLINSON Sally (1982) A Sociology of Special Education (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- TOMLINSON Sally (1988) Special Educational Needs: the Implementation of The Education Act 1981 -Journal of Education Policy,3(1),51-58.
- THORNTON A. S. (1986) A thesis submitted for M. Phil. to Brunel University .
- VOYSEY M. (1975) A Constant Burden: The Reconstitution of Family Life (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- WATSON James L. (Ed.) (1977) Between Two Cultures (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- WILLIAMSON Bill. (1979) Education, Social Structure and Development (London: The Macmillan Press).
- WOLFENDALE Sheila (1987) Primary Schools and Special Needs Policy, Planning and Provision (London: Cassell).
- WOLPE Ann Marie and DONALD James (Eds.) (1983) Is There Anyone Here from Education? (Pluto Press).
- World Health Organization (1980) Manual of Terminology 1980a.
- World Health Organization (1980) Manual of Terminology 1980b.
- YIN Roberts K. (1984) Case Study Research. Design and Methods (London: Sage Publications).
- YIN Roberts K. (1989) Case Study Research. Design and Methods - Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 5(Revised Edition) (London: Sage Publications).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SCHARTZ H. & JACOBS J. (1979) Qualitative Sociology (New York: Free Press).
- SPRADLEY James P. and MANN Brenda J. (1975) The Cocktail Waitress - Womans's Work in a Man's World (London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.).
- SULLIVAN Harry Stack (1980) Americal Journal of Psychiatry X.
- THOMPSON Paul (1978) The Voice of the Past Oral History (Oxford University Press).
- TOMLINSON Sally (1982) A Sociology of Special Education (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- TOMLINSON Sally (1988) Special Educational Needs: the Implementation of The Education Act 1981 -Journal of Education Policy,3(1),51-58.
- THORNTON A. S. (1986) A thesis submitted for M. Phil. to Brunel University .
- VOYSEY M. (1975) A Constant Burden: The Reconstitution of Family Life (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- WATSON James L. (Ed.) (1977) Between Two Cultures (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- WILLIAMSON Bill. (1979) Education, Social Structure and Development (London: The Macmillan Press).
- WOLFENDALE Sheila (1987) Primary Schools and Special Needs Policy, Planning and Provision (London: Cassell).
- WOLPE Ann Marie and DONALD James (Eds.) (1983) Is There Anyone Here from Education? (Pluto Press).
- World Health Organization (1980) Manual of Terminology 1980a.
- World Health Organization (1980) Manual of Terminology 1980b.
- YIN Roberts K. (1984) Case Study Research. Design and Methods (London: Sage Publications).
- YIN Roberts K. (1989) Case Study Research. Design and Methods - Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 5(Revised Edition) (London: Sage Publications).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I - TABLES

TABLE A - ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

DATE	ACT
1867	Metropolitan Poor Act
1870	Elementary Education Act
1876	Elementary Education Act
1886	Idiots Act
1891	Lunacy Act
1893	Elementary Education (Blind & Deaf Children) Act
1899	Elementary Education (Defective & Epileptic Children) Act
1903	Elementary Education (Defective & Epileptic Children) Act
1913	Mental Deficiency Act
1914	Elementary Education (Defective & Epileptic Children) Act
1921	Education Act
1927	Mental Deficiency Act
1944	Education Act
1946	National Health Service Act
1948	Education (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act
1959	Mental Health Act
1970	Education (Handicapped Children) Act
1976	Education Act
1980	Education Act
1981	Education Act
1986	Education Act (Number 2)

APPENDICES

TABLE B - EVENTS WORTHY OF NOTE

1851. Opening of the Cripples' Home & Industrial School for Girls, Marlybone, London.
1870. Elementary education for all.
1888. Foundation of Invalid Children's Aid Association.
1889. Royal Commission Report on the Blind, Deaf & Others.
1890. Presentation of the London School Board's Scheme for special schools & classes.
1892. A special class opened in Leicester. Three Special Instruction Schools opened in London.
1896. Poor Law School Committee Report following Dr Warner's Survey of 100,000 children- recommended special schools being set up for "defective & afflicted children".
1898. Report of Committee on Defective and Epileptic Children recommended that assessment of children for special school to be a 'team' decision (medical officer, class teacher, head of special school). Six hours per week manual training to be given and feeble minded children to be prepared for employment.
1899. Elementary Education (Defective & Epileptic children) Act. Suggested local authorities make provision for special instruction. This was not mandatory.
1903. Association of Teachers in Special Schools founded.
1904. Introduction of Delicate schools for semi-invalid children.
1907. School Medical Service established.
1914. Elementary Education (Defective & Epileptic children) Act. Local Authorities required to make provision for mentally defective children.

APPENDICES

TABLE B - (continued)

1918. Fisher Education Act required local authorities to provide education for the physically handicapped.
1920. Inspection of Special Schools by the Medical Branch of the Board of Education.
1921. Education Act gives Local Authorities the power to compel parents of "certified" children to send them to special schools.
1944. Education Act. Local education authorities had a duty to ascertain children suffering from " a disability of body or mind" and to provide "special education treatment" in special schools or elsewhere.
1945. Handicapped pupils and health service regulations defined eleven categories of handicap.
1946. Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 5, 'Special Education Treatment', defined the categories of handicap.
1953. Eleven handicaps modified to ten.
1956. Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 30, "Education of Handicapped pupils" reviewed the position over ten years.
1965. Department of Education & Science published a report, "Special Education Today". Report on Education No. 23.
1970. The Education (Handicapped Children) Act required severely subnormal children to be educated.
1973. D.E.S. Report on Education. No. 77, The Warnock Committee was set up to enquire into the education of handicapped children and young people.
1975. D.E.S. Circular No. 2/75. Discovery of Children Requiring Special Education & the Assessment of their Needs.
1976. Education Act suggested laying a duty on L.E.A.s to provide special education in normal schools when it is practicable.

APPENDICES

TABLE B - (continued)

1978. Warnock Committee Report. It is recommended that statutory categories of handicap be abolished in favour of "special education needs" although descriptive labels could be retained.
1980. White Paper, "Special Needs in Education", recommended the abolition of categories of handicap and the introduction of a 'broad definition of special needs'. It introduced the notion of "recorded" and "non-recorded" children. Owing to a lack of financial resources none of its recommendations were implemented. Legislation was proposed for 1981.
1981. International Year of The Disabled. Education Act- A child has "special educational needs" if he has a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision. L.E.A.s must "make & retain" a statement to record children with special needs.

APPENDICES

TABLE- C _ DETAILS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE FROM WHOM THE STUDY GROUP WAS CHOSEN.

KEY TO TABLE C.

- w - uses a wheelchair outside the classrooms.
- a - uses some form of aid in order to walk.
- s - suffers from a speech impediment (cannot be easily understood by strangers).
- ss - suffers from a severe speech impediment (class teacher & welfare staff find difficulty in understanding).
- ns - no verbal communication in the classroom situation.
- t - needs help to use lavatory or wash hands and face.
- f - needs help during the course of every school lunch.
- type - unable to make any realistic attempt at written work without the aid of an electric typewriter or similar piece of apparatus.
- p - unable to make any realistic attempt at written work without sophisticated aids (e.g. a possum, or a programmed micro-computer).
- c.p. - cerebral palsy.
- m.d. - muscular dystrophy.
- ht. - congenital heart deformity.
- hydr - hydrocephalus.
- epil - epilepsy.
- diab - diabetes.
- kid - renal malfunction.
- neo - neoplasm.
- v - defective vision.
- o.f. - ossium fragilatas.
- asth - asthma.
- cyst.f.- cystic fibrosis.

APPENDICES

anem - aplasic anaemia.

KEY TO TABLE C (continued).

musc - abnormal muscular development.

p.p. - damage caused by poliomyelitis.

p.acc.- damage resulting from an accident, after the neo-natal stage.

con.def.- congenital deformity(ies).

u.ab. - unspecified abnormality(ies).

n.deg. - neural degeneration.

ret.p. - retinitis pigmentosa.

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
1	m	51	c.p.	ss
2	m	56	c.p.	w s t type
3	m	53	c.p.	w s t
4	m	56	c.p.	w s t
5	m	52	c.p.	a
6	m	51	c.p.	a s t
7	m	54	c.p.	w ns f t p
8	m	53	s.b.	w
9	f	56	ht	
10	m	59	c.p.	
11	m	59	s.b. hydr.	w t
12	m	60	s.b.	
13	m	59	c.p.	
14	m	57	u ab(spine)	
15	f	60	c.p.	w s f t
16	f	60	c.p.	w ns f t
17	m	57	m.d.	w f t
18	m	59	ht	
19	m	61	c.p.	
20	m	59	m.d.	w f t
21	f	60	con.def.	a t
22	m	59	p.acc.	a f
23	f	62	ht con.def.	
24	m	61	s.b. hydr.	w t
25	m	59	m.d.	w f t

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
26	m	58	p. p.	
27	f	62	ht	
28	f	60	c. p.	w s f t
29	m	61	c. p. epil	s
30	m	62	s. b. hydr.	w t
31	m	63	c. p. epil	
32	m	63	s. b. hydr.	a
33	m	59	c. p.	s
34	m	62	c. p.	s f t
35	f	59	cyst. f.	
36	m	54	s. b. hydr.	w t
37	m	63	c. p.	a t f
38	f	63	s. b. hydr.	w t
39	m	60	p. acc.	
40	f	64	s. b.	
41	f	59	s. b.	a
42	m	64	con. def.	
43	m	65	p. acc.	
44	f	66	s. b.	t
45	f	65	c. p.	
46	m	66	c. p.	ss
47	f	64	ht.	
48	m	66	c. p.	s f t p
49	m	67	c. p.	
50	m	66	s. b.	w t

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
51	m	61	asth.	
52	f	62	c.p.	a s s t
53	m	67	c.p.	a s t type
54	f	63	neo(leg)	
55	m	67	c.p.	a
56	m	67	c.p.	a s type
57	m	66	neo(spine)	a
58	m	62	m.d.	w t
59	f	61	s b	a
60	m	67	ht.	
61	m	63	kid	
62	m	65	p. acc.	
63	m	64	asth. ec.	
64	m	67	ht.	
65	m	65	m.d.	w t
67	m	68	c.p.	ss
68	m	67	neo(abdomen)	
69	m	66	c.p.	a t
70	m	68	neo(brain)	
71	f	65	c.p.	w t
72	m	66	s. b.	w t
73	m	67	p. acc.	a s s f t
74	m	67	c.p.	
75	m	65	m.d.	w t
76	f	68	ht	
77	f	69	c.p.	w t

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
78	f	68	c.p.	w ns f t p
79	m	69	c.p.	w f t p v
80	f	68	s.b.	w t
81	m	68	c.p.	
82	f	68	c.p.	w f s t p
83	f	70	s.b.	w t
84	m	64	diab	
85 temporary re-admission of subject 52				
86	f	67	c.p.	
87	m	67	s.b.	w t
88	f	70	s.b.hydr.	a t
89	m	70	ht.	
90	m	66	c.p.	w ss f t p
91	f	70	o.f.	
92	f	70	s.b.	w t
93	f	66	c.p.	a s
94	m	68	epil.	
95	m	72	c.p.	
96	m	71	ht.	
97	m	70	m.d.	
98	m	71	c.p.	w s t
99	m	71	c.p.	s type
100	m	72	c.p.	w t
101	m	67	ht.	
102	f	71	c.p.	
103	m	67	cyst.f.	

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
104	f	72	ht.	
105	m	72	c.p.	a s
106	m	72	s.b.	a t
107	m	67	c.p.	s
108	m	73	c.p.	
109	f	73	s.b.	a
110	m	73	c.p.	v
111	f	74	ret.p.n.deg	v
112	m	73	c.p.	
113	m	69	c.p.neo	
114	f	75	c.p.epil.	
115	m	70	c.p.	w s t f
116	f	70	hydr.con.def. (hip)	
117	m	72	anem.	
118	f	75	spinal m.d.	w t
119	m	78	c.p.	
120	f	75	musc.	
121	m	73	m.d.	a t
122	m	78	c.p.	a t f ns
123	f	76	s.b.	a t
124	f	76	s.b.	a t
125	m	72	s.b.epil.	
126	m	71	p.acc.	w ns t f p
127	m	77	s.b.	a t
128	m	77	c.p.	w t f
129	m	78	c.p.epil.	w t f ns

APPENDICES

Subject's ref. No.	Sex	Year of birth	Diagnosis*	Specific** disabilities
130	m	79	s.b.	w t

* Some of the terms listed under the heading diagnosis might more properly be regarded as descriptions of disability, but many of these terms, for example cerebral palsy, are used by medical officers as working definitions of diagnosis and a description of condition is probably more appropriate to this study than mere nomenclature.

** In order to be able to obtain reliable information about the young people's specific disabilities and to be able to make more objective comparative judgements by observation about their individual difficulties I documented the specific difficulties which they experienced in the school situation.

N.B.1.) In the cause of confidentiality the month and year only is quoted as the date of birth.

APPENDICES

TABLE D - FURTHER DETAILS OF CHILDREN FROM WHOM THE STUDY GROUP WAS CHOSEN.

KEY TO TABLE D.

f	-	Single parent (father) family.
m	-	Single parent (mother) family.
s	-	One member of the family group is a step parent.
i	-	The child of immigrant parents.
o	-	Only child.
h	-	At least one other handicapped child in the family group.
(s)	-	Special school.
(c)	-	Special class.
n	-	Nursery age range.
k	-	Infant age range.
j	-	Junior age range.
a	-	All -age.
sec	-	Secondary age range.
(ph)	-	For physically handicapped people.
(d)	-	For "delicate" (J) children.
(e)	-	For E.S.N. (m) children.
(es)	-	For E.S.N. (s) children.
w	-	Sheltered employment.
(h)	-	Hospital school.
t	-	Home tuition.
r	-	Residential establishment.
(p)	-	Private school.
c	-	In care.

APPENDICES

TABLE D - FURTHER DETAILS OF CHILDREN FROM WHOM THE STUDY GROUP WAS CHOSEN.

KEY TO TABLE D (continued).

- (u) - School with specific provision for physically handicapped. e.g. special unit.
- (a) - Living with adoptive parents.
- x - Now deceased.

The symbol * denotes those children whose last recorded placement was in accordance with the integrated scheme referred to in this study.

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school transferred to	Other details
1	j	-	w f
2	n	-	a (ph) s x
3	j	-	a (ph) h (ph)
4	k	-	h
5	j	-	w o
6	s	t	w o
7	j	-	- o x
8	j	-	sec (ph) r i
9	j	t	a (ph) o
10	k	-	a (e)
11	k	-	sec (ph) r o x
12	k	-	sec
13	k	-	sec
14	j	-	a (e)
15	k	-	sec (ph) o

APPENDICES

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school transferred to	Other details
16	k	-	a (m) o
17	k	-	sec (ph) h (ph) x
18	j	t	sec (ph) r m o x
19	k	-	sec (ph) r m o
20	j	k	sec (ph) r o x
21	k	-	sec (ph) o i
22	j	j	sec (ph)
23	k	-	sec x
24	k	-	sec (ph)
25	n	-	t i x
26	j	j	sec (ph) r s
27	k	-	sec h
28	j	-	e
29	k	-	sec (ph) o
30	k	-	sec (ph) o m
31	k	-	a (s)
32	k	-	sec o m
33	j	j	sec (ph) r s
34	n	-	j (ph) i
35	j	t	- o x
36	sec	sec (ph)	sec (ph) r
37	k	-	sec (es) o
38	k	-	sec (ph)
39	j	j	j o i
40	k	-	sec
41	j	t	sec (ph) o m

APPENDICES

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school transferred to	Other details		
42	k	k	j		
43	k	-	j		
44	k	-	j		
45	k	-	sec (ph)		
46	k	-	sec (d)		
47	k	-	sec (ph)	x	
48	k	-	sec (ph)	f	
49	k	-	j (p)		
50	k	h	j (s)	c	
51	j	j	sec (d)		
52	j	h	sec (ph)	c see 85	
53	k	-	sec	o	
54	j	j	sec (ph)	o	
55	k	-	sec (ph)	h	
56	k	-	sec (ph) r		
57	k	k		x	
58	j	j (ph)	a (ph)	o	x
59	j	j	sec		
60	k	-	j	s	
61	j	-	sec		
62	k	-	sec (d)		
63	j	j	a (s)	o	
64	k	-	a (s)		
65	j	j	sec (ph)	m	
67	k	-	sec (e)		
68	k	-	-	m	x

APPENDICES

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school transferred to	Other details	
69	k	-	j (s)	
70	k	-	a (ph)	o
71	j	h	a (s)	c
72	j	h	a (ph) r	c
73	k	-	sec (ph)	o
74	k	-	sec (ph)	
75	j	k	sec (ph)	o x
76	k	-	t	o
77	n	-	sec (ph)	
78	n	-	sec (ph)	o
79	n	-	a (es)	h
80	k	-	sec (ph)	o
81	k	c	j (s)	
82	k	-	sec (ph)	o
83	n	-	sec (ph)	o
84	j	t	sec (ph)	
85 Temporary re-admission of subject 52 following the failure of a foster home placement.				
86	n	(es)	sec (ph)	s (grand-parents)
87	k	-	a (s)	o
88	n	-	sec (ph)	
89	n	-	j	
90	j	-	a (s)r	i
91	k	k	j	
92	n	-	a (s)	o
93	j	t	sec (u)	o
94	j	k	sec (ph)	

APPENDICES

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school	transferred to	Other details	
95	n	-	k	o	
96	n	-	j (u)		*
97	k	-	sec (ph)		
98	n	-	a (ph)		
99	k	-	j (u)	o m	
100	n	-	n		
101	k	-	sec (e)		
102	k	-	sec	o m	
103	j	j	j		x
104	n	-	j	s	8
105	n	-	j (u)		
f*					
106	n	-	j (u)	m	*
107	j	j	j (u)	i	*
108	n	-	k (u)		*
109	n	-	j (u)	o	*
110	n	-	a (s)		
111	n	-	j (u)		
112	n	-	j		
113	j	k	sec (ph)	i	
114	k	k	k & j	m o	
" re-admitted from first placement.					
115	n	-	a (ph) r	o	
116	j	j	j (u)	m o	*
117	j	j	j (u)		*
118	k	-	j (u)	o (a)	*
119	n	-	k (u)		*

APPENDICES

Ref.No.	Age range on admission	Previous school transferred to	Other details	
120	n	-	j (u)	o *
121	j	k	j (u)	f *
122	n	-	k (u)	*
123	n	-	k (u)	i *
124	n	-	j (u)	*
125	j	k	j (u)	*
126	j	j	sec (ph)	*
127	n	-	k (u)	i *
128	n	-	k (u)	o *
129	n	-	a (s)	o
130	n	-	k (u)	o *

APPENDICES

TABLE E

SUMMARY OF PHYSICAL DISABILITIES OF STUDY GROUP				
Study group ref number	Sex	Mobility	Manipulation	Speech
1	m	u	r	d
2	f	u	n	c
3	f	w	s	d
4	m	w	s	d
5	m	a	r	i
6	f	u	n	c
7	m	u	n	c
8	m	u	r	i
9	m	w	n	c
10	m	w	n	c
11	m	u	s	i
12	m	u	n	c
13	m	a	n	c
14	f	u	n	c
15	m	a	r	d
16	m	a	r	d
17	m	w	n	d
18	f	w	n	d
19	f	w	n	c
20	m	a	r	d
21	m	u	n	c
22	f	a	n	c
23	m	a	r	d
24	m	w	r	d
25	f	u	n	c
26	m	u	n	c
27	m	u	n	c
28	m	u	r	i
29	f	a	n	c
30	m	a	r	i
31	f	w	n	c
32	f	u	n	c

APPENDICES

KEY TO TABLE E

- m - Male.
- f - Female.
- w - Largely confined to a wheelchair.
- a - Unable to walk without aids.
- u - Ambulant without aids.
- n - Able write at or near normal speed without the aid of special equipment.
- r - Manipulative ability restricts written communication.
- s - Unable to write without the aid of special equipment, e.g. electric typewriter or microcomputer.
- c - Speech intelligible to strangers.
- i - Oral communication with strangers limited.
- d - Oral communication severely limited or virtually non existent.

APPENDICES

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP										
Sub. R. No.	N.	I.	J.	S.	F.E.	H.E.	S.C.	P.B.	E.	H.
s1	s	s	s	s	-	-	3	n	y	p
s2	s	s	s	s	-	-	3	n	n	p
s3	s	s	s	s	-	-	3	n	n	p
s4	s	s	s	s	-	y	2	?	n	p
s5	s	s	s	s	i	-	2	n	y	p
s6	s	s	s	i	s	-	3	n	y	p
s7	-	i	i/s	s	-	-	3	n	n	p
s8	s	s	i/s	s	-	-	4	n	n	p
s9	-	s	s	i	-	-	3	y	y	o
s10	-	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s11	s	s	s/i	i	-	-	3	n	n	p
s12	s	i	i	i	-	-	3	n	n	p
s13	-	s	s	s/i	s	-	5	n	n	p
s14	-	s	s	i	s	-	5	n	y	p
s15	s	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	w
s16	s	s	s	i/s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s17	s	s	s/i	s/i	-	-	5	n	n	p
s18	s	s	s	s/i	s	-	4	n	n	p
s19	s	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s20	-	s	s	s	-	-	4	n	n	w
s21	-	i	i/s	s	-	-	3	n	y	p
s22	s	s	s	i	i	-	3	n	y	p
s23	-	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	w
s24	s	s	s	i	s	-	5	n	n	p
s25	s	s	s	i/s	-	-	1	n	n	p
s26	s	s/i	i	i	-	-	5	n	n	p
s27	i	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s28	s	s	s	s	s	-	4	n	n	p
s29	s	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s30	s	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	w
s31	-	s	s	s	s	-	3	n	n	p
s32	s	s	s/i	s	-	-	2	n	n	p

APPENDICES

Key to Table F

- N. - Nursery school.
 - I. - Infant schools.
 - J. - Junior school.
 - S. - Secondary school.
 - F.E. - Further education.
 - H.E. - Higher education.
 - P.B. - Pair bonded.
 - S.C. - Social Class (Registrar General's classification).
 - E. - Currently in employment.
 - H. - Location of home.
-

- s - Special education.
- i - Integrated education.
- y - Yes.
- n - No.
- o - Independent dwelling.
- p - With parents.
- w - Supervised accommodation

APPENDICES

APPENDIX II - PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE STUDY GROUP

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s1
Year of birth -----1966
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----ungainly gait,
restricted manipulation with one hand
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----very indistinct -
virtually unintelligible,
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education (1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
sweeping out leisure centre
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
with parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school none
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
none- had one
Any friends from own community enclave -----none
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Examination successes -----
-----one C.S.E.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s2
Year of birth -----1965
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----ungainly gait
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
mild
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
day centre
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
with parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
none
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
yes- day centre
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s3
Year of birth -----1968
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----confined to wheelchair
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education (1 - 5 = good to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----day centre
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----with parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --none
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no- at day centre
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good to bad) -----1

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s4
Year of birth -----1966
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----lack of use of hands and
 arms and unsteady gait
Apparatus used -----computer (possum type)
Speech -----very quiet and
 indistinct
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special/mainstream
Further education -----polytechnic- degree
 course
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----none
Any parental objections to integrated education ---none
Parental assessment of special education (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1- secondary
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1-primary
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1- secondary
Subject's assessment of integrated education (1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----yes?
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 yes
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----2
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----1

Examination successes -----
-----five 'O' level 2 'A' level

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s5
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----restricted use of arms
 and legs- slow walking, lack of fine manual dexterity.
Apparatus used -----electric typewriter
Speech -----slow and slurred
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----tertiary college
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 trainee accountant
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 trainee accountant
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school ---yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----2
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Examination successes -----
 -----five 'C.S.E.' one, six 'O', three 'A'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s6
Year of birth -----1964
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities -----slow ungainly gait and
 lack of normal height
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----college for disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
 yes
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----5
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 clerk
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 yes? -Salvation Army
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Examination successes -----
-----three 'C.S.E'. shorthand & typing etc.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s7
Year of birth -----1968
Condition -----epilepsy
Main disabilities-----interrupted
 concentration and occasional fits
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----as normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----mainstream education
Junior school -----mainstream/special
 education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
 yes
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----5
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----4
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 'Y.T.S.'
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----4

Examination successes -----

-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s8
Year of birth -----1971
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----ungainly gait, lack of
manual dexterity, partial sight
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----mainstream/special
education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----5
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
one
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----4
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----2

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s9
Year of birth -----1963
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----slow ungainly gait, lack
of normal height
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
accounts clerk
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----yes
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
with fiancée
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Examination successes -----
-----four 'C.S.E'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s10
Year of birth -----1962
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----confined to wheelchair
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----residential college for
the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----yes
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----5
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parent
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school ----yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----yes
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----4
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----4
Examination successes -----
-----four 'C.S.E.'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s11
Year of birth -----1972
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----quadriplegia, walking
 severely restricted, limited hand and arm movement
Apparatus used -----computer (possum), stick
Speech -----soft and indistinct
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special/mainstream
 education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 some
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parent
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 yes- one during school hours
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----3
Examination successes -----
 -----3 'C.S.E.'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s12
Year of birth -----1970
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----slightly ungainly gait
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----mainstream education
Junior school -----mainstream education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
some
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
yes
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Examination successes -----
-----five 'O' one 'A'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s13
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----ungainly gait
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education--
integrated part-time
Further education -----residential college for
the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
some
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
yes- one
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----5
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----3

Examination successes -----
-----three 'C.S.E.'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s14
Year of birth -----1962
Condition -----congenital heart
 deformity
Main disabilities-----inability to withstand
 physical stress
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----college for the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
 none
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 some
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----5
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 clerk/typist
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 yes- fellow church goers
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----5
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) ----3
Examination successes -----
-----five 'O' level seven 'C.S.E.'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s15
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral palsy-
 following road accident in early childhood
Main disabilities-----lack of fine physical
 control, quadriplegic
Apparatus used -----adapted typewriter,
 stick
Speech -----aphasic
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----residential college- aid
 to disablement- living and assessment
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----5
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 warden controlled accommodation
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- one
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s16
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----lack of fine control-
 quadriplegic
Apparatus used -----adapted typewriter
Speech -----very indistinct and soft
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----mainstream/special
 education
Further education -----residential college for
 the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----5
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- two
Any friends from own community enclave -----
 yes- pub
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----2

Examination successes -----

-----one 'O', two 'C.S.E.'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s17
Year of birth -----1971
Condition -----congenital heart
 deformity
Main disabilities-----severe restriction of
 physical activity
Apparatus used -----electric wheelchair
Speech -----indistinct
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special/mainstream
 education
Secondary school -----special education part-
 time integration
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 no- reservations
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- one
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----5
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s18
Year of birth -----1970
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----confined to wheelchair
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education- part-
time mainstream
Further education -----residential college for
the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
none
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
none
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
Y.T.S. British Airways
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
yes- one
Any friends from own community enclave -----
yes- one
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----4
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2

Examination successes -----
-----two 'O'.

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s19
Year of birth -----1968
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----confined to a wheelchair
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----residential college for
the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----4- not suitable in
present form
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----unsure
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s20
Year of birth -----1961
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----restricted use of hand
 and arms, unsteady gait, poor speech
Apparatus used -----tripod
Speech -----slurred and indistinct
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 no- not offered
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----4
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 day centre
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 residential hostel (spastics), occasional week-ends with
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school ---no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 no- hostel only
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----4
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----4
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----5

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s21
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----congenital heart
 deformity- surgery
Main disabilities-----limited stamina
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----mainstream education
Junior school -----mainstream/special
 education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2- child would feel left out
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 clerk/general
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 Y. T. S.
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----
 no- young girlfriend
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- formerly
Any friends from own community enclave -----
 doubtful
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s22
Year of birth -----1966
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----unsteady, ungainly gait
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----Local Council Further
 Education secretarial course
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 personal clerk
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 Y.T.S. Civic Centre
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----
 yes- due to move in with boyfriend following week
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 yes
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) ----2

Examination successes -----

-----four 'C.S.E.'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s23
Year of birth -----1961
Condition -----cerebral palsy- right
 hemiplegia and epilepsy
Main disabilities-----very little use of right
 hand and arm and pronounced limp
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----slightly indistinct-
 near normal
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----residential college for
 the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 Spastics Society sponsored wheelchair factory (mixed
 workforce)
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 Spastics Society- aid to daily living
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 alone in Spastics Society sponsored flat
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school ----yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----
 yes- pub
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good to bad) -----1

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s24
Year of birth -----1971
Condition ----- spina bifida,
hydrocephalus
Main disabilities----- slow unsteady gait
Apparatus used -----stick
Speech -----as normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school ----- mainstream
Further education -----residential college for
the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----5
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
with mother and brother (single parent family
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----5
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----4
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Examination successes -----

-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s25
Year of birth -----1971
Condition -----cerebral palsy-
quadriplegia
Main disabilities-----very limited use of all
four limbs
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----slow, slightly
indistinct
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education- some
integration mainstream/ special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
originally yes- now no if high academic standard
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
originally now yes after experience of it
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----5 junior low
standard, 1 secondary high standard
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----4
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5- resented being
treated as handicapped
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----1 but against
integrated units in mainstream education
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
school
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
n/a
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
residential special school and parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

no/yes children of parents' friends
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----1
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3-5 patchy
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Examination successes -----
-----four 'O'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s26
Year of birth -----1970
Condition -----congenital heart
 deformity
Main disabilities-----lack of stamina (grossly
 undersized- taken as 12 at 18).
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----as normal but breathless
 at times
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special/mainstream
 education
Junior school -----mainstream education
Secondary school -----mainstream education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
 no- father, no- mother initially
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 yes- father initially, no- mother
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----2
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 Y. T. S.
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --
 no- brothers' friends only
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- two
Any friends from own community enclave -----
 Yes? brothers' friends
Social class of parents (Registrar General's

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

classification)-----5
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Examination successes -----
-----three 'C. S. E. '

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s27
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral atrophy
Main disabilities-----very restricted use of
right arm and restricted use of right leg
Apparatus used -----none
Speech -----immature- otherwise
normal
Nursery school -----private mainstream
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----Spastics Society
residential (social training)
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----3
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
no- sheltered workshop
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
M.S.C. course at Spastics Society centre
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
one? parents' friend's child- only very occasionally
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----1

Examination successes -----

-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s28
Year of birth -----1970
Condition -----spina bifida
Main disabilities-----slow ungainly gait
Apparatus used -----callipers and walking
sticks
Speech -----normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----Residential course for
disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----
yes
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
bad) -----4
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----3
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----no
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----4
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s29
Year of birth -----1967
Condition -----cerebral palsy
Main disabilities-----slow awkward gait and
 clumsy hand movements
Apparatus used -----walking stick
Speech -----near normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----residential colleges for
 the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5- not appropriate
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----4
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----1

Examination successes -----

-----one 'C.S.E.'

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s30
Year of birth -----1969
Condition -----cerebral palsy- spastic
Main disabilities-----inability to walk
 without aids
Apparatus used -----wheelchair and walking
 frame
Speech -----as normal
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----Residential college for
 the disabled
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----5
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 Residential courses for the disabled
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 warden controlled accommodation
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes- one
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
to bad) ----1
Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s31
Year of birth -----1968
Condition -----congenital heart
 deformity
Main disabilities-----restricted physical
 activity- little stamina
Apparatus used -----electric tricycle for
 longer, outdoor distances
Speech -----slight impediment-
 palate deformity
Nursery school -----none
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----Assessment centre
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----
 yes
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----2
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----5- unsuitable
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 National Star Centre aid to disabled Y.T.S.
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----3
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----2

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good to bad) -----3

Examination successes -----
-----none

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

Group reference number -----s32
Year of birth -----1971
Condition -----cerebral degeneration
 and retinitis pigmentosa
Main disabilities-----partially sighted, very
 limited physical capacity, degenerating
Apparatus used -----wheelchair
Speech -----slurred, very difficult
 for a stranger to understand
Nursery school -----special education
Infant school -----special education
Junior school -----special/mainstream
 education
Secondary school -----special education
Further education -----none
Higher education -----none
Any parental objections to special education -----no
Any parental objections to integrated education -----no
Parental assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good to
 bad) -----1
Parental assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of special education(1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of integrated education(1 - 5 =
 good to bad) -----1
Subject's employment at the time of interview -----
 none
Training scheme or course taken by subject -----
 none
Married? -----no
Pair bonded? -----no
Subject's home?(lives alone or with parents etc.)-----
 parents
Any friends who were pupil's at a mainstream school --no
Any friends who were pupil's at a special school -----
 yes
Any friends from own community enclave -----no
Social class of parents (Registrar General's
 classification)-----2
Parents' assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good
 to bad) -----1
Subject's assessment of schooling received (1 - 5 = good

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDY GROUP MEMBER

to bad) -----1

Examination successes -----

-----none

APPENDICES

APPENDIX III - INTERVIEWS

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Child No. 4

The subject of this interview was a twenty year old young man who had his primary schooling in a special school for physically handicapped children and was then transferred, for his secondary education, to a special school for physically handicapped children. This school was on campus with a mainstream secondary school and party to a partial integration scheme, which allowed the subject to join the mainstream school for many lessons in academic subjects, whilst benefiting from the special school support. The subject's use of his hands and arms is so restricted as to be negligible. He is unable to dress himself, feed himself or use a toilet without help, he is able to write only with the aid of a remotely controlled typewriter or micro computer which is adapted for operation by foot controls.

N.B. Despite the fact that this young man was well known to me, I had on several occasions to ask him to repeat a word or phrase, on one occasion three times, because of his slightly indistinct speech. These repetitions are not documented here.

Question

When you were young, for instance at primary school, what kind of employment did you see for yourself when you grew up?

Interviewee's answer

I can honestly say that I didn't have any real idea what I wanted to do initially, obviously as you get older you get set ideas, like everyone gets, but as you grow up you realise that that's not for you.

Question

What caused your ideas to change, if anything?

Interviewee's answer

As you grow up you have this sudden self awareness and you've got to tailor your ideas around that.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Would it be fair to summarise that as realism starting to take over from fantasy?

Interviewee's answer

Yes that's it exactly.

Question

What are you doing now?

Interviewee's answer

I'm currently taking a B.A. in Applied Social Studies at Lancashire Polytechnic, it's a three year course.

Question

Looking back to the ideas you might have had when you were younger, if you can, is this the sought of work you might have envisaged yourself doing now, might you for instance have seen yourself as doing something better or worse?

Interviewee's answer

I don't know, when you are younger you automatically think you are going to get a job when you leave school, but as you grow up you realise it's not going to be like that, to get a job, a decent job you need to be educated really well and it's only the fortunate people who get that opportunity.

Question

How did you come to choose this course, were you particularly influenced by anyone, or any circumstances, for instance?

Interviewee's answer

I think it was a combination of things, in a way I would have liked to have left school and gone straight into employment but talking to people at school, you know talking to careers officers, teachers and that, you realise that you are going to need a good education and that is really the thing that made me go for it.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Why did you embark upon the course you did and why did you choose the particular polytechnic where you are?

Interviewee's answer

I was originally going to go into straight psychology but I found that the places, where I wanted to do that wouldn't take me on for various reasons, so I looked at courses which included psychology in them and then I began to think there would be more opportunity in jobs like social services and actually it was my sixth form tutor that told me about this course and it looked really good so I just took it on.

Question

Are you happy with what you've got?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, I think so, when you are working hard studying you sometimes think I could be earning money but you come round and say, "Well hopefully this training will be worth it in the end", and you know help you to get a better job than you would have done.

Question

Do you think that, apart from the money earning aspect, going for higher education will enrich your life?

Interviewee's answer

Definitely, I think it will. Going back to the course that I'm on it's a very socially aware course and it sort of broadens my horizons, every where I go I meet people of different types, people who have different attitudes and this is enriching as well.

Question

How much of this enrichment do you think is going to come from the participation in higher education and the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and how much is going to come from the contents of the course itself?

Interviewee's answer

The main thing in life is people, I think and the course that I'm on has got that personal touch, I think that is the most important thing, I think studying science or

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

arty subjects I think you get detached from the real world.

Question

How much helped your schooling helped you?

Interviewee's answer

Primary and secondary?

Question

Yes all your schooling?

Interviewee's answer

I think they could have done more at primary school rather than secondary.

Question

What exactly could have been done?

Interviewee's answer

At primary school they put too much emphasis on the physical and getting you to cope with physical things and I think the academic side was neglected. When I went to my secondary school I found it quite a shock, you had to sit down at a desk all day and do a lot of work, you soon get into it, obviously secondary school wasn't terribly exciting but it was a good school, it really helped me a lot.

Question

How much of the primary school deficiency you mention do you think was due to the particular school you attended, how much was due to a primary school attitude, or how much was due to a special school attitude?

Interviewee's answer

I think it definitely was the special school attitude, they concentrate on the pupils' physical side and neglect the academic side.

Question

Which physical disability, or disabilities, has been the greatest impediment to you in your progress towards achieving your ambitions in life?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Obviously not having the full use of your body is a great impediment, for getting a job obviously holds you back a great deal.

Question

Thinking in terms of your achievements so far which has it been?

Interviewee's answer

It seems that I have to work twice the time anyone else does, because it takes me longer.

Question

Are you referring to the speed of your writing?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, I have to put in double the time and obviously I can't go out as much, obviously things like working in the library are out of the question, you've always got to work at home, it's a disadvantage and things like that also taking your own lecture notes, I'm hoping to get a portable computer but individual note taking is out.

Question

This comes back to relying on other people doesn't it?

Interviewee's answer

Yes.

Question

Do you have to rely on other people a lot?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I have to rely on other people quite a lot, for notes and carrying books and lots of things.

Question

Does anyone help you on a semi-permanent basis?

Interviewee's answer

Yes two volunteers from a social organisation, they attend to all my personal needs and help me a lot, they do it in shifts.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Do you find that this works well?

Interviewee's answer

Oh, yes, but you've got to think of them, you've sometimes got to think would he like to go out and suggest going out, even if you might want to work really.

Question

How would you advise someone, with similar physical disabilities as yourself, who was about to embark upon a degree course in similar circumstances to yours?

Interviewee's answer

I'd say definitely go there with an open mind and don't necessarily expect too much of other people, obviously you've got to spend a lot of time with other people, make sure they get as much out of it as they can.

Question

Which are the main ways in which you find physical disability having a direct effect upon your academic work?

Interviewee's answer

I have to get friends to carry things like books for me, I can't really use the library properly and friends take notes then give me a copy of their notes at the end and obviously that is great, you know, but at the same time they might not take notes about things that I think are important, but I've been waiting to get a portable computer for about a year now it still hasn't come.

Question

What do you use to write with normally, a micro?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I use the B.B.C.

Question

Which program do you use with it?

Interviewee's answer

View.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Are you a member of any clubs or associations?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I'm a member of Amnesty International and Anti Apartheid and the Afro Caribbean Club.

Question

Is the Afro Caribbean Club a social club concerned with leisure activities, with an ethnic bias, such as music and dancing etc?

Interviewee's answer

Yes they have a lot of social events and visiting bands.

Question

Have you any political affiliations?

Interviewee's answer

I'm a member of the Labour Party back there, but I found I couldn't commit myself to the extent I wanted to.

Question

Do you mean you hadn't the time, or you had difficulty with accepting some of the political doctrine?

Interviewee's answer

It was just I hadn't the time to give it the attention I should, I'm still a member but not an active member, I did go to meetings and everything like that but I found it was interfering with my work, I had to stop it.

Question

How do you spend the rest of your free time?

Interviewee's answer

I listen to music a lot and I don't really do a lot of reading I like going to watch cricket and the odd football match and I like going to the pub occasionally.

Question

Have you any special friends?

Interviewee's answer

I've got a set of friends up there and down here as

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

well, it's nice to have two different sets, you can get away from the academic side when you want to.

Question

Are your friends up there connected to your work, say largely students at the poly?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes.

Question

And down here your friends are?

Interviewee's answer

Mainly ex-schoolfriends.

Question

Have you a girl-friend, you know a romantic attachment?

Interviewee's answer

No not at the moment.

Question

Do you drive?

Interviewee's answer

No.

Question

Are you a member of any library, that is other than the polytechnic?

Interviewee's answer

Yes the local library.

Question

Do you go on holiday regularly?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I go with the family, I haven't actually been away on my own yet.

Question

What do you think of the idea of going on your own?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I think I'd like it.

Question

Where would you like to live eventually?

Interviewee's answer

I think a lot of it depends on where your job takes you, but I think I'd maybe like to stay in the South.

Question

How would you like to live eventually, in a flat, a house, on your own, with some one else, or whatever?

Interviewee's answer

I think I'd like to settle down and get married eventually.

Question

Do you ever have any meals out?

Interviewee's answer

As a student it's very difficult but we do occasionally have a meal out.

Question

Do you have much contact with your relations?

Interviewee's answer

Yes a lot, I see most of them regularly.

Question

Which qualifications did you obtain at school?

Interviewee's answer

Five "O" levels and two "A" levels.

Question

What were your "O" levels in?

Interviewee's answer

English Lit., English Language, History, Geography and Law.

Question

And your "A" levels?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

History and English.

Question

Some people says schooldays are the happiest days of your life other people say school days are a time of problems and pimples, what are your views on the subject?

Interviewee's answer

In some ways they can be the happiest days of your life, particularly at an early age, I enjoyed my primary school, but as you get older and you get into the examination period, it can be absolute hell, when you've got to study, there's so much pressure these days, I think some people are under too much pressure.

Question

Looking back on your school days, what do you think about the integration of physically handicapped children?

Interviewee's answer

I think it's a great system as long as it's handled properly and worked out extremely well. If you're just going to throw a disabled child in to an ordinary school, say when they want some personal service and can't get it they're going to go through so many psychological problems. I think you're going to have to be very careful about how you handle it if you just try to put disabled people into a normal school I don't think that's going to work, they must have plenty of special facilities built in and lots of back up services there.

Question

Is there anything in life you are particularly looking forward to?

Interviewee's answer

Mainly getting a job I think.

Question

Is there anything in life you are dreading or very reluctant to face?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

No not really.

Question

Have you ever encountered any thing that you think might fairly be called discrimination?

Interviewee's answer

Once two of us went into a pub, the other lad was disabled as well, and we ordered two pints of lager and the barmaid wouldn't serve us, when we asked to see the manager he told us we might embarrass the customers and we had to come out, that's the worst discrimination I've met but you get on a daily basis, you encounter a condescending attitude. A classic example is they think you're mentally handicapped as well as physically handicapped and they think you're some sort of freak in a way.

Question

Do you think this is general?

Interviewee's answer

Oh, definitely, that's why integrated schools are so good, you're catching them at an early age and you're mixing with these people and we can show them we're no different to what they are in a way.

Question

There is a point of view that once his schoolmates start taking the mickey out of a physically handicapped child integration has started, or occurred, what do you think of that?

Interviewee's answer

I totally agree, for the first few weeks you got ignored and people wouldn't talk to you but, but they got to know you and they started having a joke with you and you know made fun of you you felt you were accepted, you'd become one of them in a way you know.

Question

Which questions do you think I should have asked, which topics have I missed?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I can't say you have missed anything really. I'm pleased you mentioned discrimination because I think that is important and it is often totally left out, but again, also it's not good to emphasise that too much, because there are benefits as well as negative things.

Question

Which particular benefits spring to mind?

Interviewee's answer

I think just to be accepted, perhaps fifty years ago you would be locked up in a back room but now you can go out in the street. OK. you'll still be looked at and still stared at but you're still taking part in society.

Question

Any other points you'd like to mention?

Interviewee's answer

No, I don't think so.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Semi-structured interviews with parent Number 1, 1987

This was the mother of a twenty-one year old young man, who had been educated a school for physically handicapped children until the age of twelve and then transferred to a school for delicate children for his secondary education. He was affected by cerebral palsy to the extent that his speech was so indistinct as to be virtually unintelligible, even to people with whom he came into regular contact and normal conversation with members of his nuclear family group was impossible. He walked with a slight limp and suffered some restriction with regard to the use of one hand, but since his primary schooldays he had been able to dress himself, feed himself and write in a near normal manner.

Question

When he was very young what kind of job did you think he would get eventually?

Interviewee's answer

I didn't really care as long as he could hold down a real job I knew I would be satisfied.

Question

Did your ideas about this change during the time he was at school?

Interviewee's answer

No I don't think so.

Question

What do you think of the job he did get?

Interviewee's answer

Well to start with I'm very pleased he's got it, the way things are about jobs at the moment he's lucky to have one really, but it's not a very interesting job for him, just cleaning. He really would like something more interesting, he says he isn't meeting many people at work, you know mixing with them. And he does have to work split shifts, that's not very nice for some-one young, it would be awkward if he wants to go any where. I know he's looking round for another, in fact he's got everybody we know on the lookout for him and he keeps

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

chasing them to see if they've found anything new and he looks in the paper everyday, or practically everyday.

Question

Is this a better or worse job than he should have?

Interviewee's answer

Well it's difficult to say really, as I said before, in times like these anyone who's got a job can count himself lucky, but I think he could manage more than just a cleaning job.

Question

Did you help to find the job ?

Interviewee's answer

Did I not I used to scour the circulars at work, and I'd look in any paper, even one I found lying round at work, if I hadn't seen it and I was always ringing up places, you could tell that by the size of our telephone bill.

Question

How did he find out about the vacancy?

Interviewee's answer

I saw it in one of the internal circulars at work.

Question

Did you help P-- with his application?

Interviewee's answer

Did I not, after we'd filled in the form we practiced him for days and told him what he had to wear for the interview when he got it, in fact we bought him a new shirt and tie because we thought his others looked a bit too trendy. I rang up and made the arrangements to go with him after they asked him to go for interview and I made sure he was there early, in fact I think I was more worked up than he was, he didn't seem a bit nervous about it.

Question

Are the wages good?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes the money's quite good it's the split shifts that he doesn't like.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Is he happy with the job otherwise?

Interviewee's answer

Well I think he'd really like a more interesting job, you know meeting people and a bit of variation.

Question

Is trying to change it?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes, he's got us all looking in papers and circulars, but there's no way he'll let go of this one before he's got another, I think he realises there are a lot of ordinary people out of work.

Question

Has any organization helped with regard to him finding a job?

Interviewee's answer

No, the Spastics sent him circulars and they helped him when he went to college but actually helping him to get a job, no. I think they might have helped to fix him up if he had been badly handicapped though, you know needed to go to a day centre.

Question

Did schooling help in this respect?

Interviewee's answer

No, not really, I suppose it helped him being able to read and write, but not with the job hunting.

Question

How could it have helped more?

Interviewee's answer

It's hard to say really, he was interviewed by the careers officer, but I don't think that really helped.

Question

Could another school have helped more?

Interviewee's answer

I can't see it could really.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Not even one like H--- or P--- (the two nearest comprehensive schools)?

Interviewee's answer

No I don't they would even realise what his problems were, how could they?

Question

How does P-- spend his free time e.g. evenings, Saturdays and Sundays?

Interviewee's answer

He goes training very regular and he hangs around the house playing tapes and watching videos but he doesn't go out much, except sometimes with his sisters and their friends.

Question

Do you think he would be lonely if it wasn't for his sisters and their friends or do you think that without them he would have been pushed into making more friends of his own?

Interviewee's answer

No I think he might have done badly without them, at the moment he hasn't really got any friends apart from them.

Question

Has P-- ever had any special friends apart from them?

Interviewee's answer

He used to have friends at school and when he was at college but apart from that he's only ever been specially friendly with one boy. You probably know him, M---- (a former school-mate from the special school where P-- received his primary education - the boy in question was transferred to a school for slow learners, after successful surgical intervention to correct a cardiac defect, for his secondary education) and he was just sponging on him really.

Question

Sponging?

Interviewee's answer

Yes he only wanted P-- because he had a car, I found out

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

that P--- had been running him places then waiting outside until he came out.

Question

Do you think this often happened?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I think it did and if they did go anywhere together, like the football match, he didn't stay with him. He used to go in with them and then meet them at the car after, M-- just used him as a taxi and P-- admitted to me later that he didn't even help with the petrol.

Question

Did you advise P--- to end the friendship?

Interviewee's answer

No, that is not until the last time when his car broke down twenty-five miles away and he wouldn't even help him to get help, he just went home on the bus or the underground. B---- (the subject's father) had to go and get him, it was lucky we were in that time on a saturday night. He was so upset that we could hardly find out where he was or what the matter was. We had to go through all the underground station between there and here, in the "AtoZ", and get him to say which was the right one it was a nightmare. I think P-- was too embarrassed to go about with him after what we said that night.

Question

Has P--- a steady girlfriend?

Interviewee's answer

No he's filled in these dateline things more than once, I know he hasn't sent them in but he was serious about it. I think that's what he really wants a girlfriend.

Question

Does he go on holiday with the family?

Interviewee's answer

No not since he was at school.

Question

Do you think he will get married eventually?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I'd like to think he'd settle down with a wife and family sometime, but unless there's a big change in people's attitudes I can't really see it, I mean how's he going to get wife when he can't even get a girlfriend, its a shame because he's so keen to have a girl.

Question

Can you see him living alone in a flat or a house?

Interviewee's answer

He could but he doesn't like cooking or housework, but I suppose he would settle to it if he had to.

Question

Does P-- have much contact with your parents or other relations?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes we're a close family and P-- mixes in with the rest of us, to tell the truth he probably sees more of the others than the rest of us, you know when he was young they always brought him presents whenever they'd been anywhere.

Question

Did he leave school with any qualifications?

Interviewee's answer

No.

Question

What do you think of the schools he attended?

Interviewee's answer

They were quite good really.

Question

Would you rather he had gone elsewhere?

Interviewee's answer

No I don't think so.

Question

Do you think schooling prepares children for life?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I don't know really but P--- was happy enough where he went and they seemed to do well enough by him.

Question

Do you think the services schools offer children should be changed in any way?

Interviewee's answer

Yes I think they should be changed back a bit to what they were. It was the worst day's work anybody ever did when they closed S--- (the PH school which the subject attended). I'm glad he wasn't younger, I don't know what we'd have done if he had to go to C---- (the integrated primary school which replaced the special school to which she referred). I know its supposed to educate the handicapped kids but it doesn't, it doesn't do any thing that they said it would and, I mean I know because of the group (the local association of parents of disabled children), sometimes we've spent all the meeting and more just trying to calm down some of the mothers whose kids are having a rough time up at that place.

Question

Were there more of these incidents just after the school opened or more now?

Interviewee's answer

More now, when the school first opened the people from the education office were always out to see the school or see parents who had any grumbles. They made a lot of hollow promises but they did make her up there (the head teacher of C----) take notice of some of the things that were upsetting the parents, but now they've wriggled out of it and the parents and kids are left high and dry, all they can do is see there councillors and that's a fat lot of good, they don't even know what the parents are talking about.

Question

Have many parents have been to see their local councillors?

Interviewee's answer

One or two have but it's a bit of a waste of time.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Was P--- happier at primary school, secondary school, or since left school?

Interviewee's answer

It's difficult to say really.

Question

Which part of bringing up gave you the most problems?

Interviewee's answer

Dealing with his handicap, I don't think other people have any idea what it's like when you've got a handicapped child, I know we were lucky in a way, I mean P--s not very handicapped at all when you look at some of the others, apart from his speech, but you've got to fight all the way.

Question

What kind of thing caused you the most trouble?

Interviewee's answer

Well if you want the best for your child you've got to be really pushy, you've got to have a go at the hospitals sometimes, even just to find anything out, even though I've got to admit some of the doctors are very nice at times. Then you've got to have a go at the council, of they'll just do the easiest thing for them, they're not worried about your children, and when they do something it's often just to keep you quiet I mean look at C---- (the parent of a handicapped child who had written a series of letters to the press and given interviews about the L.E.A.'s proposed placement of her son, which was later altered).

Question

How about the public at large, for instance, have you had any trouble with people you met in the street?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes you get plenty of hassle from strangers, they seem to think that P--'s mental because he can't talk properly, but you get used to it to a certain extent, it still annoys you but you learn to ignore it and you're so conscious of people staring that you can get a bit of a complex about it. More than once I've gone up to a woman with a handicapped kiddy and said, "I'm sorry if I

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

seem nosy, I'm not staring at your little boy, I have a handicapped son myself and I was interested in your little boy's walker" - or whatever it was that had taken my eye - "And I think one of my friends, who has a handicapped child might be interested in it".

Question

Has the attitudes of other people ever gone as far as discrimination ?

Interviewee's answer

Yes often, once when he was young we were in a shop and there was a woman in there with a little girl about the same age and she said to her, "Come away from that imbecile", I was so mad I was going to put one on her, I had hold of her by the scruff of the neck and it was only because the man in the shop knew me and came up and said, "Don't it's not worth it," that I stopped.

Question

Is there any part of the future that you see as presenting special problems?

Interviewee's answer

I suppose P--- will always be all right, you know having his sisters, but it would be nice to think that he could have the chance of settling down and getting married so he'd have his own family.

Question

How do you see his future prospects?

Interviewee's answer

Well, quite good really all things considered, apart from that.

Question

Have I missed out any important questions that I should have asked if I want to find out what you think, either about life in general or topics on which you feel strongly or are interested?

Interviewee's answer

No, I don't think so really.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interview of teacher number one

This teacher took up a post in special education after working for over ten years in mainstream schools and was transferred to a mainstream school as part of an integration scheme after she had taught in a special school for physically handicapped children for over ten years. She was put in charge of a special unit at the mainstream school.

Question

Can you remember when the possibility of physically handicapped children attending a mainstream school first came to your attention, can you remember what your reactions were?

Interviewee's answer

Well I think the first time was when I went on the course at Maria Grey, I came back full of enthusiasm about integration, that's when I first thought about it. But regarding the school here it was talked about six years ago, seven years ago.

Question

Can you remember what your reactions were then?

Interviewee's answer

I think as they are now, if they can keep up academically it's half the battle and also if they can toilet themselves and look after themselves physically, hygienically.

Question

Can you remember the reactions of your colleagues?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, stunned they didn't want handicapped children in their class at all because they felt they couldn't cope with them and they kept coming to ask me what to do with this one or what not to do with that one, they just couldn't cope with the work, from their point of view and from the children's point of view.

Question

How much was this a lack of confidence in the children?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Oh no, not a lack of confidence in the children, in the teachers.

Question

In themselves?

Interviewee's answer

Yes because they felt they hadn't had the experience or the training and they didn't know how to approach the children at all.

Question

Can you remember what they think should have happened?

Interviewee's answer

They thought they needed extra training before they coped with the children not even the year when we did the exchange and that (a reference to exchange visits between the special school and the primary school involved), it wasn't adequate really to give them an idea of the children.

Question

Did any of them have any kind of training after that?

Interviewee's answer

No.

Question

Do you know if they communicated their feelings about the need for further training to senior colleagues such as the head teacher or visiting officials?

Interviewee's answer

I don't think they expressed it openly, no, none of them I think perhaps only one person who was doing it part time but the others all felt that they didn't really know enough about them. They all wanted to know the medical side which they weren't really allowed to know, stupid. They should have been told more about the children.

Question

That would have meant access to confidential information?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Yes and also in the discussions we had about them to start with, they weren't told how much the children could cope with and they, the teachers all got terribly worried because they felt they weren't helping the children enough with their work they just couldn't cope with them.

Question

Which discussions are you referring to?

Interviewee's answer

We had staff meetings.

Question

At the new school?

Interviewee's answer

Yes we had them about once every fortnight to start with but, you know they just went through the names, the disabilities, nothing further was said about whether they could cope with the language the maths of anything else and they were put straight into the classes.

Question

Did you think that was wrong?

Interviewee's answer

I still do because the teachers didn't know what to expect. I went into N's class and he asked me, "Please could you not sit at the back of the class because I can't shout at my class when you're sitting there." And the reaction of I--- and the other two who were in there (reference to the physically handicapped children in that class) to me was that there was far too much noise in the class and they couldn't cope. It was so free in there and they felt it was just too noisy for them.

Question

Do you think that a more formal atmosphere would be better for the integration of physically handicapped children, or is it just coincidence that it seems so in this instance?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I think more formal because it's a quieter atmosphere, than when people are just milling around noisily doing things and the discipline up here was so bad you know, they just couldn't cope with it. I think the first three had a better chance because they were more mobile, and again although the whole school had been told that the handicapped children were coming into the classes - they were told how to treat them, to be kind etc. etc. That worked to begin with but when it came to games and things like that the handicapped children were always isolated. You know a child was told this is your friend, you've got to look after him, but they were always isolated.

Question

I gather there was some sort of, what the Americans might call, "buddy" system with one able-bodied child having a special responsibility for a handicapped child?

Interviewee's answer

Yes that sort of thing.

Question

Was that helpful?

Interviewee's answer

To some of them, yes, but I think it sort of wore off towards the end. The initial thing, "We've got to help these handicapped children", did come up again later.

Question

Do you think it was a good thing?

Interviewee's answer

Yes but again, if they were mobile and could cope with their work. The people who couldn't like J-----, she was absolutely lost and the teacher who had her was in tears half the time, she couldn't cope with her at all.

Question

Couldn't cope with the demands that the child made?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Because she needed a one to one almost and so did E--- when she came.

Question

And this was the result of the children's disabilities with regard to their academic work?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, and the teacher felt that she needed her undivided attention, to get her on with anything.

Question

Do you think, knowing the children that they should have been further on with their school work?

Interviewee's answer

Well I think if they had been in smaller groups they would have been further on, for a teacher in a big class to try to devote enough attention to them, well she just couldn't.

Question

Do you think that in these cases the child was doing as well as could be expected.?

Interviewee's answer

Yes.

Question

Your comments seem to imply that the decision to integrate a child should be dependant upon the child's academic attainment, is that so?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes, but even after integration they should have some small group work to keep them up to the standard of their class, especially on the reading and the writing side.

Question

Are you referring to children who are integrated from a school for physically handicapped children or do you also include those physically disabled children who are integrated from the beginning of their schooling?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Yes but the teachers accept them more if they have come from a normal infants school. I think their reactions are different if they they have come up to a junior school through normal channels.

Question

The reactions of the children?

Interviewee's answer

Both, the teachers' as well.

Question

How?

Interviewee's answer

Because they felt they have had, how shall I say? A more integrated education.

Question

A Better education?

Interviewee's answer

No I wouldn't say better because they are still below the standard of their class, generally speaking they're below the standard of the other children and still need what I would call real group work.

Question

So you think there should be remedial groups for the disabled children?

Interviewee's answer

Yes and I don't think this Warnock thing which said everybody integrated whether they can cope or not succeeds, because it doesn't and I still think their academic attainment is important At S--- (the school for physically handicapped children where the teacher had previously worked) they were taught more independence over toileting and helping themselves. Here they have a welfare and the welfare takes them out and helps them all the time, at S--- they were trained to look after themselves more.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

Does this imply a paradox, that integration makes them more dependent?

Interviewee's answer

That's right , that's right and even for the P.E. they join with some apparatus work if the can cope but they still have a welfare with them, when they have ordinary games the handicapped children are in a corner just throwing balls to each other and the rest are doing all the other activities, I don't really see that as integration. I think they should have their own P.E. and games lessons, things they can cope with.

Question

In other words remedial P.E.?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, they have got someone at the school who has done remedial P.E. and games for the disabled, but she's not allowed to do it. They'd be much better off having their own games with her strengthening the things they can do rather than just playing "pat a ball" in a corner.

Question

Does this mean you think that their difficulties should be treated by operating remedial withdrawal groups?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, depending on the lessons, I mean A--- has done well on the language side then she should stay with her class for language work, but she comes out to me for number work.

Question

Do you think the children who have been admitted to the school where you are now were a representative sample of the special school where you worked, thinking in terms of their physical disabilities?

Interviewee's answer

Most of them yes but some of those who would have gone to S--- (the special school where the teacher formerly worked) didn't come here from the infants, they went to special schools

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

because they couldn't cope. There was one case recently which you must have seen in the local paper. His parents wanted her to come but the authority said "no", and I think they were right, the child wouldn't have been able to cope, not by any stretch of the imagination and the decision was taken because they found that the child couldn't cope at the infants school. There was another child who came but shouldn't have done she had W---(a teacher) following her all day and all she did was glean a bit of information from the lesson, write it down one sentence and get her to copy it. After W--- left I was taken out of the unit and spent a year following her, I thought it was a waste of a teacher's salary, I really did. Eventually E---(the child in question) was confined to a wheelchair in case she fell over, she was never in a wheelchair at S---(the special school)

Question

Before that you were operating a group withdrawal system?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, but now, it's changed again it is teacher supporting the class.

Question

Back at the back of the classroom?

Interviewee's answer

With groups within the class.

Question

What do you think of that?

Interviewee's answer

Again for some it's alright but some still can't manage, and they lose out. One child in particular is being sent to B---(a secondary school containing a special unit) and she'll spend all her time in the unit, there's no way she can manage without one to one help.

Question

Did you make your opinion about this known to your head teacher?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

I did, I did.

Question

What was the reaction?

Interviewee's answer

" Oh no she's got to integrate, she's got to go on from here."

Question

Was this decision from the authority or from the school?

Interviewee's answer

From here, I expect she (the headmistress) discussed it with the office but there was no question of reconsidering and C--- (the child in question) would do much better in a P.H. school she'd just be fighting for survival, even in the unit, if she goes to B---.

Question

So you think there is still a role for P.H. schools?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes definitely.

Question

Thinking in terms of the children you knew at the special school what sort of proportion of physically handicapped children do you think should be educated in a special school?

Interviewee's answer

I'd say a third.

Question

Before the integration scheme started what did you think the disabled children's main problems would be?

Interviewee's answer

I think being accepted I thought the children might learn to accept them but I thought the main problem would be the teachers, they didn't seem prepared to accept them.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

What kind of resources support or special training, if any, do you think should be given to mainstream schools who are going to be involved in integrated education.?

Interviewee's answer

I think right from teacher training colleges. They should go out into schools so they have experience of meeting physically handicapped.

Question

In what kind of situation?

Interviewee's answer

Well in special schools and in schools where there's integration.

Question

What kind of specialist knowledge or training should the students be given at the college?

Interviewee's answer

I think they've got to know a bit on the medical side so they will know how much the children should be expected to do and how much the children can't do because some of them pretend to feel tired but they won't have had the experience so they know whether the child is genuinely tired or just trying to get out of it. They need to know if the children are genuine when they are complaining.

Question

Your comments seem to suggest that you think we should only use experienced teachers to educate disabled children. Am I right?

Interviewee's answer

Yes that's right, I think you've got to have a lot of common sense, to work with handicapped children and yet the probationers have the intake from the infants, they are finding it very difficult (reference to her present school) it's difficult enough for them with their children getting used to the new school and then they've two or three handicapped children in the class as well I think this

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

is why they've now changed to teacher support, I think they need it.

Question

Are they showing signs of stress?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, yes they need more support from experienced teachers in the classroom and I think more discussions are needed on the progress of the children.

Question

What is the reality of the situation with regard to integration, as far as your experience is concerned?

Interviewee's answer

You mean has it worked or not. Well for some it has I think some have gained tremendously from being accepted by the other children and a lot of the other children have been kind to the handicapped taking them out into the playground and that sort of thing. I think from the humane side it's done a lot for both the P.H. and the normal children.

Question

Do many normal children gain noticeable benefit from it?

Interviewee's answer

The odd child, I don't mean odd in the sense of being peculiar, remained kind to the handicapped children but with most of them the novelty wore off and the children were left and they would never choose a handicapped child for a game or for a partner, unless the teacher said so and so's left out, can he join your group?

Question

Did they all accept them?

Interviewee's answer

No the majority didn't but they're kind on the surface but when it came to specific things the handicapped child was left out. Of course it's difficult really if you find a child's going to hold your team back he's not going to be chosen, it's

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

the same with an ordinary child who's a poor runner. All the weaker ones are left till the end when they're choosing teams and it's even more so with the handicapped children.

Question

Was this just in the case of games?

Interviewee's answer

No it happened generally but it came out more in the case of games.

Question

Do you think the situation will improve in this respect?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, give it another five years or so, when more children are coming up from the infants and the teachers have accepted them and the children have accepted them, and it'll improve, but at the moment it's like a forced thing.

Question

Does this new educational situation offer any form of enrichment to the children's lives?

Interviewee's answer

You mean the handicapped?

Question

Yes?

Interviewee's answer

Well they've had a wider curriculum, you know special schools tend to have a smaller number of teachers and then they have more teachers, to give them more experience of meeting people and a wider range of subjects.

Question

Some people have said it would be good for the disabled children socially, what are your comments on that?

Interviewee's answer

Well I think that's where the unit has failed. If they had stayed in the unit which was the original idea and had the small group

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

situations for most of their lessons and then joined the other children for art cookery and generally the more social side they'd have got on much better and much quicker.

Question

What do you think the main thing is that the situation can offer the handicapped children social or academic, or what?

Interviewee's answer

I think social but it depends, if the child is grotesque or grossly handicapped he is not accepted but if they are more mobile and look more normal I think they are accepted and socially they join in the games more at parties and such like.

Question

You've used the words accepted and acceptance quite a lot is this coincidence?

Interviewee's answer

No it isn't.

Question

Do you think the children and the children's parents have gained more from the integration situation than they expected or less than they expected?

Interviewee's answer

I still get parents coming up occasionally and saying that they're not very happy, but some people because their child has looked normal and been accepted as a normal person are quite happy.

Question

Am I right in thinking that there is an implication in your comments that in many cases you can almost prejudge the situation, with regard to whether the child is going to be accepted?

Interviewee's answer

Yes and if the child is accepted the parents feel they're accepted.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Question

And if the child isn't accepted?

Interviewee's answer

The parents feel rejected and it's a failure.

Question

Do the parents seem to feel exposed or hurt when this occurs?

Interviewee's answer

Yes definitely.

Question

Are there any conclusions to be drawn from that?

Interviewee's answer

I think you've got to be very careful about integration, if you try to force it the parents can be very sensitive. From some of the parents I've spoken to I gather they still have their own little meetings and they still feel, I think, isolated. Some of them were very hurt when that article appeared in the local paper, you remember the one, saying "are the parents of handicapped children so handicapped themselves that they cannot integrate with other parents?"

Question

Was this written by one of the editorial staff?

Interviewee's answer

No it was written by one of the parents of the other children.

Question

Was that the parent of a normal child?

Interviewee's answer

Yes, the parent of an ordinary primary school child, she knew nothing about handicapped children, she had been a dinner lady at the school. I think that some parents feel they haven't been accepted and some feel they'll always have that stigma attached to them and they stay in little cliques fighting for survival. Even Mr O--- (the parent of a

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

child who is cited by his current and former schools as an example of successful integration) is not a hundred per cent happy with M---'s (his son) schooling.

Question

How did you find the other parents, the parents of the non-handicapped children reacted to integration?

Interviewee's answer

I think they have been very sympathetic to them. At the first meeting at C--- (the school where she currently works), one of the fathers stood up and said, "We've got to support these handicapped children," and when one of the others said "but we've got to think of our own children," he said "Well I'm all for them" and walked out of the meeting. There was a lot of this, people thinking the integration of the handicapped children would affect the education of their own children. But that was at the beginning, I think now they are very sympathetic towards them. In fact I think the normal parents have been better towards the handicapped parents and the handicapped parents have been better towards the others.

Question

Do you think this is because they are now more aware of each others problems or because they are learning how to put their case in a more civilized manner?

Interviewee's answer

Well they are learning more generally.

Question

Is the acceptance you talked about earlier any nearer than it was at the beginning?

Interviewee's answer

Well I think it's probably the parents of the handicapped children themselves who have an in-built feeling that "We've got a handicapped child" and they're fighting with all around them, judging from the ones I have spoken to.

Question

Have you seen any disadvantages arising from integration for the special needs children?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Well some of them have fallen behind on the academic side, they seem to adapt well in the classroom, but definitely they have fallen behind on the academic side individual coaching really is needed.

Question

Are changes needed to the system as it is at the moment?

Interviewee's answer

Yes as I've just mentioned, more individual help is need with academic work and more training for independence, that has fallen off since integration.

Question

Which other questions should I have asked if I want to find out more about integration, which important topics, or interesting points do you think I have missed, or which topics should I have given more emphasis to?

Interviewee's answer

The children's independence, they're not independent enough with regard to toileting and looking after themselves generally.

Question

Do you think adjustments could be made in mainstream school, where special needs children are integrated, to remedy this?

Interviewee's answer

To some extent yes, a lot of training for independence could take place in the infants. Its very noticeable that children who come here from a P.H. school have been trained in the infants' class and are more independent than those who have come up from the ordinary infant school, they might need the odd button fastening but they can go to the loo themselves, they don't need to be pampered. When the others want to go to the loo a welfare comes and takes them, they don't help them they do everything for them. For instance I have suggested that M---(one of the physically handicapped children who attends the school where she is currently employed) should be given a bottle when he wants to urinate but they don't use

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

bottles here like they do in P.H. schools, they treat him like a baby. They take his trousers down, hold his little willy and everything. I mean he's eleven and due to go to secondary school soon. How will he manage there? He can walk he should be trained to do it himself, stead of people standing with him all the time.

Question

Is this a fair reflection of a general attitude to these children?

Interviewee's answer

Yes it is, they're still being treated as babies, I know they're handicapped but they've got to be taught to look after themselves, like they are in P.H. schools because they are going to be adults and need as much independence as they can get, even if they can't be fully independent. That's the main thing I really have doubts about in this set up.

Question

How would you categorise the area where more attention is needed?

Interviewee's answer

Social skills, Practical social skills.

Question

Is the general approach to the handicapped children improving, in your experience?

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes the first year they couldn't cope, teachers were coming to me in tears and saying so. I said to them "go and tell the head how you feel about it." Their reaction was "no" it would go down in their notes, saying they couldn't cope with handicapped children. So I said well you can't be expected to at first, if you want any help come to me, but they wouldn't go to the head about it, perhaps that's why there's been such a change of staff.

Question

Has there been a big turnover of staff?

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviewee's answer

Oh yes, sixteen, no seventeen have left within the last three years.

Question

What is the full complement of staff?

Interviewee's answer

Twenty-two including the head teacher and the extra staff for special needs, it was remarked on by the advisers, during the in depth.

Question

Do the physically disabled children mix with the other children?

Interviewee's answer

Yes to a certain extent they do.

Question

Do they mix with them outside school hours?

Interviewee's answer

No.

Question

Not at all?

Interviewee's answer

Well only J--- but there again the chap he'd made friends with is a bit of an oddity himself, he doesn't really mix with the others, and this happened with another girl, D--- she had a very firm friend but they wouldn't move without each other, they didn't mix with the rest of the children.

Question

And apart from that, has there been any other contact between the disabled children and the others, outside school?

Interviewee's answer

At the beginning one or two parents made the effort and invited them to their children's parties, but only if they looked fairly normal. So far as I know no-one in a wheelchair or no-

APPENDICES

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

one with a heavy shake or speech problem was ever invited.

Question

Generally are you pleased with the effects of integration so far?

Interviewee's answer

Yes but I have reservations.

Question

Would you like to make any other comment?

Interviewee's answer

No I don't think so.