Development of Inclusive Education in England: Impact on children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities

Zeta Brown, University of Wolverhampton, UK, zeta.brown@wlv.ac.uk

Alan Hodkinson, Liverpool Hope University, UK, hodkina@hope.ac.uk

Summary

This chapter considers a historical account of the development of inclusion in England and the changes made to the education of children with SEND since the 1940s. The chapter details the development of inclusive education, the complexity of defining inclusion and what inclusion has come to mean in current practice. This historical account is considered alongside the development and dominance of the standards agenda. In considering inclusion in this manner, the original intentions of its agenda are questioned against the practical implementation of inclusive education in current practice. The chapter concludes by proposing that significant progress has not been made with inclusion because it has not been possible to accommodate it within the competing political agendas replete in England's education system.

Keywords

Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, children, education, primary, integration, mainstream.

## Introduction

This chapter provides a political and socio-historical account of the development of inclusive education in England. The chapter considers in detail the educational landscape for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) before the development of inclusive education, the complexity of defining inclusion and what inclusion means in current practice. This is considered alongside the development and dominance of the standards agenda. Within the chapter inclusion is analysed through a variety of lenses. For example, by questioning whether inclusion was developed to include all children or was it specifically focused on certain groups of children with SEND? It is also considered whether inclusion's primary aim concerned provision or placement. Furthermore, the question is raised of whether, when inclusion failed, it was because that the child was not fit to be included, as they could not meet the performative expectations of the national standards agenda, or that failure related to the education system itself.

Through the application of these varying analytical lenses, it is proposed that insufficient progress has been made with inclusive education, that there has been no radical change in England's education system which has enabled the implementation of inclusive education. It is also proposed that the development of inclusive education has become stuck, through an inertia caused by the predominate focus on identification, assessment and the placement of children with SEND. This means that inclusive education, weighed down by the unrelenting standards agenda combined with a medical model categorisation of children has more in common with its predecessor 'integration' than inclusion based upon concern for individual human rights.

The chapter uses the term 'Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities' (SEND) throughout as this is used in current practice in England to describe children with additional needs. This is not indicative of the terminology used throughout the timeframe detailed in this chapter.

## Times past: what came before inclusion?

It was not that long ago when children with SEND in England were observed to be uneducable. Before the 1940s, these children were seen as suffering from a handicap of mind, body or both. Whilst their needs ranged in complexity, combining both physical and sensory impairments, collectively many were seen to be educationally subnormal: defective, feeble-minded and morally lax (Mason 2000; Vaughan, 2002). From the 1940s to the 1970s, schools started to experience a change in classroom diversity, primarily as a consequence of the communitarian approach of embracing equality within the education system. In this period, in order to ascertain whether a child was capable of being educated and, indeed where they should be educated, clinical testing was carried out (Thomas and Vaughan, 2004). Clough (2000) likens this form of assessment to a psycho-medical model, in which disabled children were subjected to assessment to ascertain their impairment. Farrell (2010) further describes this period as being within a deficit model in which the identification of need was located exclusively with the child and not related to any wider social context. Consequently, only a minority of those children, who are now referred to as Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), were offered places in mainstream schools (Thomas and Vaughan 2004).

The social changes of the 1960s and 1970s, exemplified by legislation such as the Sex Discrimination Act (1975) and the Race Relations Act (1976), prompted a significant

3

development in attitudes towards disabled people as well as other oppressed and marginalised groups, (Banks, 1981; Kailin, 2002). There was a radical re-examination of disability which encouraged a move away from focusing on children's medical needs to focus on their educational needs from a social perspective (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009). This stimulated a move away from locating the 'causation of disability' solely with the child (Callaghan, 2009; Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009). The Education (Handicapped Children) Act (1970) addressed the segregation of disabled children by proposing that all children were educable and that a greater range of pupils should be educated in mainstream settings (Thomas and Vaughan, 2004). A welfarist consensus, promoted by the Labour Government (1974-1979) encouraged Local Education Authorities (i.e. the part of local government in England that was responsible for schools - LEAs), schools and teachers to work together with the same goal – that of being to provide a good education for children across a wider spectrum of ability (Gray, 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2016). It was the case then that this period saw more children offered placement in mainstream school if it was practical, if their educational needs were compatible with mainstream education and if this could be accomplished at a reasonable cost to the public purse (Thomas and Vaughan, 2004).

### The significance of the Warnock Report (1978): placement, not provision?

The Warnock Committee started working on integration strategies for the government a few years after the Education (Handicapped Children) Act (1970). It developed a number of key concepts, including new terminology that is still used in educational discourse today. The Warnock Report (1978) described three types of integration that occurred in mainstream schools at the time. Firstly, 'locational integration' referred to the use of separate units inside mainstream schools for children with SEND; 'social integration' was when children from these special units were able to eat and play alongside their mainstream peers; 'functional

4

integration' was when children with SEND had classes or activities alongside their peers, either part or full-time. The report endorsed these three types of educational provision and found varying degrees of integration in mainstream schools (Thomas and Vaughan, 2004). However, the report did not emphasis the need for 'functional integration'; thus, it may be argued that term 'integration,' during this period was employed in a limited way in that it addressed only the placement of children with SEND into mainstream settings rather than any meaningful educational provision relating to an individual's needs. The use of new terms to describe more widespread educational needs led to mainstream-educated children being assessed and diagnosed with 'SEND' (Cole, 2005; Galloway and Edwards, 1991). The continued employment of assessments and identification coupled with no real change of societal attitudes towards SEND meant that children transferring from segregative education systems to integrative ones, still continued to experience segregation and exclusion (Galloway and Edwards, 1991).

The Warnock Report did though attempt to move away from clinical assessment by expanding the assessment process top relate to educational rather than solely a medical need. To be specific, it introduced criteria for entry to mainstream schools. This being that assessment should determine whether a child would cope in the mainstream; integration education had to be a good use of resources and integration of children with SEND must not hinder the education of other pupils (Northway, 1997). For teachers, integration meant they should be able to teach within increasingly diverse classrooms but without clear guidance on how they practically should support children with SEND (Gray, 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2006).

## The standards agenda: its influence on integration

England also experienced significant changes in the late 1970s to 1980s, with the election, in May 1979, of the Conservative government of Margaret Thatcher. Thatcher, as Prime Minister, was keen to replace Labour's socialism with a clear right-wing approach and political discourse encompassed within the traditional social values of the party (Kavanagh, 1987; Quicke, 1988). Thatcher had begun this process through a policy review in 1975, named 'The Right Approach'. Her general election campaign, drawing on elements of the policy review, focussed heavily on the failure of education (Batteson, 1999). Fuelled by the general concern arising from the economic crisis, parents had lost confidence that schools were preparing children for future employment (Quicke, 1988). As such, Thatcher's message on education chimed with a general societal consensus as to the purpose of education. The Conservatives' upon election, therefore, seemingly had a mandate to radically alter the education system. From this time forward education became a marketable commodity bound up with performativity and accountability (Bobbit, 2002).

Subsequent policy changes expanded this radical change to the education system. For example, the Education Act (1980) changed the relationships between the government and schools by removing power from LEAs and providing centralised control whilst it was argued, at the same time empowering parents to make choices of educational provision for their children. Thatcher wanted to increase the power of the 'consumer,' the parents, and reduce the power of the 'producers,' the schools. (Whitty, 2008). Traditionally, children were allocated to their nearest school by their LEA; however, the new 'public managerial state' enabled parents to choose schools. In effect, the system became 'privatised' and accountable to an external audience – the general public. This was the first phase of a new competitive ethos amongst schools where LEAs had to acknowledge parental choice and

schools had to appeal to parents (Galloway *et al.,* 1998). The Education Reform Act (1988) extended the Education Act (1980). In this act, both curriculum decision-making and assessment processes were centralised as teachers and schools were not seen as responding to the needs of the consumer (Quicke, 1988). As teachers' unions became fragmented in this process the government took more and more control of schools tightening its centralised power through the rigorous implementation of the standards agenda.

## The centralised control of education vs the relinquished control of educating children with SEND

The Education Act (1981) published a year after the Education Act (1980) had been developed from the Warnock Report (1978) and was specifically focused on children with SEND. This legislation instructed LEAs to take responsibility for integrating children with SEND, taking into account parents' views. A statementing process was introduced to assess children with SEND's suitability for mainstream schooling. According to Armstrong (2005), this process though remained focused on a deficit model of disability because it evaluated only the severity of a child's disability and *their* ability to access education within segregative provisions. The application of the Act across the country varied widely and this period saw a post code lottery of provision of education for children with SEND. As Clough (1998) concluded, many LEAs used delaying tactics, formulated within the statementing procedures, to manage the minimal funding available for resourcing the new integrative provision in mainstream schools.

The Education Reform Act (1988) sought to develop a national curriculum wherein all mainstream pupils benefited from the same knowledge, skills and understanding of life beyond the education system (Stobart, 2001). The act sought to value difference and

considered the ways in which all children, including children with SEND, could contribute as productive citizens. However, it should be noted that adaptations of the National Curriculum, in terms of children with SEND, were not promoted by this legislation. Whilst the core objectives of the Education Reform Act (1988) disempowered teachers, school diversity was expressed within the legislation as a form of 'autonomy' for teachers (Strain and Simkins 2008). So, at a time of the overall centralisation of power to control education being placed with government it is interesting to note that the control of the education of children with SEND was dispersed.

Teachers then were given the task of differentiating their curriculum to meet individual needs. In extreme circumstances, teachers could avoid the curriculum criteria entirely, if the child's needs meant it was inappropriate. Clough (1988) believed that the curriculum had always been exclusionary because it used a normalising discourse of categorising children who do not meet the national standard. The curriculum therefore attributed their 'failure' to individualised factors, such as gender, ethnicity, SEND or socio-economic location (Nutbrown and Clough, 2006) and not to failures of the education system itself. Children with SEND continued to be assessed to determine their 'ability' in relation to what learning they could access within the new curriculum. Clough (1998: p.13) concluded that "such decisions [reveal] themselves as [reaching] deep into political ideology, for the curriculum is and always has been a selection from culture for particular ends".

The introduction of the National Curriculum and subsequent assessment processes, including inspections by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), enabled the government to control classroom content, whilst continuing "steering at a distance" (Whitty, 2008: p.166). In its initial development the assessment framework, within this curriculum, was also meant

to be based exclusively on teacher assessment, later developing into formal Statutory Assessment Tests (SATs). These summative assessments at the end of each key stage were used to develop a nationally understood form of assessment. For primary schools at the time, this covered English and Mathematic tasks in Key Stage One and SATs in English, maths and science in Key Stage Two. In effect, there had been a significant move away from teacher assessment of the curriculum towards a focus on national assessment in both literacy and numeracy (Stobart 2001).

In 1991, the Parents' Charter was introduced, giving parents the right to information about their local school's performance. By publishing SATs results and producing league tables of school performance, there was increased pressure placed on the 'producers' to conform (Adnett and Davies, 2005). The Department for Education (2011) described this as an 'information revolution', in which parents were able to access performance tables comparing school success. Pierson (1998) regarded this move as inevitable following the development of a marketised education system. The basis of information for parents was to be twofold; it was to be derived from a public assessment process and also from inspections of individual schools. In 1992 these results became publicly available in national league tables, wherein schools were ranked according to what percentage of their children had achieved the desired 'national average' (Higgs *et al.,* 1998).

The publication of the SAT results in league tables made the SAT process a high stakes agenda for schools. The results produced by the SAT process were used by government to judge school and teacher success (Yarker 2006).

Parental choice meant that schools in affluent socio-economic locations were in high demand. They could opt to admit minimal numbers of children with SEND, thereby reducing the influence of these children's impact on key performance indicators. Schools in less affluent locations had fewer applications and therefore had to take more children with SEND. That is, if these children were deemed capable of education in the mainstream. Without success in the league tables, schools received fewer resources and many were placed in special measures, facing the possibility of closure (George and Clay 2008). The socio-economic divide, represented in the league tables, perpetuated a vicious cycle in which parents applied for schools higher up the tables (Pierson 1998) leaving the less ambitious or less mobile to remain in what became named as 'sink' schools. Armstrong (1998) concluded that schools found themselves under pressure to move resources away from children with SEND and towards those who could achieve and contribute to the school's reputation. The externalised assessment process appeared to become a powerful prompt for exclusion, as the presence of children with SEND could be detrimental to school performance.

It took time for the Conservative government to focus on children with SEND. The Education Act (1993) encouraged early intervention and assessment of children with SEND in order to consider their educational needs (Armstrong, 2005). The Code of Practice (1994) also introduced a five stage assessment procedure which ranged initially from classroom monitoring to statutory assessment. The role of the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) was created by this legislation and the SENCO was to produce Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for each child with SEND who was located on the Register for Special Educational Needs. In turn, SENCOs managed effective teaching strategies and the resources necessary for the effective integration of children with SEND (Armstrong 2005). There appeared to be increasing legislative acknowledgement of the need to consider

10

diversity, specifically in assessing the needs of children with SEND. Nevertheless, children with SEND continued to be viewed separately from their peers and were considered first and foremost in terms of their educational deficits (Farrell 2010).

## A change of government, but an increased focus on accountability and assessment

Over time, Labour moderated its position on accountability and assessment, distancing itself from close identification with teacher unions and their agendas. As Labour evolved into New Labour, it developed a new stance where a successful economy was based on a strong society of individuals who had a duty to each other. New Labour sought to incorporate a focus on equality and social justice alongside many existing standards objectives, including the focus on parental choice and accountability through school competition (Bines, 2000; Whitty, 2002). New Labour promoted their agenda as a 'third way' perspective which was neither completely right nor left, but was a creative partnership of 'what works' (Lawton, 1992). From 1997, New Labour (led by Tony Blair) developed the National Curriculum to be more prescriptive, especially in literacy and numeracy (Batterson, 1999). Many other areas of the curriculum were downgraded and marginalised. The *Excellence in Schools* (1997) White Paper also imposed strict targets for government, LEAs, schools and teachers (Chitty, 2002). These policy initiatives resulted in a narrowing of the curriculum content and an increased need for schools and teacher's to concentrate further on summative assessments, such as SATs (Chitty, 2008).

## The development of inclusion

Internationally, papers were published from a social justice perspective that recommended a move away from integration to inclusion (Rustemier 2002). The United Nations *Convention*

11

*on the Rights of the Child* (1989) advocated four principles. These were the need for non-discriminatory action respecting equality of opportunity; the need to ensure the best interests of the child; the need to consider child development broadly and the need to respect the child's voice in decision-making. The right to an education was inherent in these principles. Importantly, the United Nations *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities* (1993) had determined that children with SEND should be considered within all planning and curricular activities, with an assurance that appropriate additional support is available (Rustemier 2002). In 1994, representatives from 92 governments and 25 international organisations met in Salamanca, Spain to affirm a rights-based approach to education determining that countries should "concentrate their efforts on the development of inclusive schools" (UNESCO, 1994: p. 13). The Salamanca Statement insisted upon education for all children. It highlighted the need for inclusion and envisaged a system in which the norm would be for all children to be educated in mainstream schools regardless of each child's need (Nutbrown and Clough 2006). From this statement onwards, the terms inclusion and inclusive education became part of government rhetoric, which gained status in schools and the mass media (Hodkinson 2012a).

Interestingly, the New Labour government showed a commitment to reform the way children with SEND were educated and thus it began to alter its educational policies to reflect the inclusive intent that had developed at the international level (Hodkinson, 2005). Inclusion as equality was presented by New Labour as a new space of politic and possibilities, a chance perhaps to create a democratic world which offered the change for disability and equality to be located within a new cultural framework (Hodkinson, 2011). Inclusion though in reality under New Labour became nothing more than a political process (Allan, 2009), a key

12

component in governmental planning (Corbett, 2001) which was pursued through a powerful top down implementation approach (Coles and Hancock, 2002).

## Inclusion as a human rights agenda

Inclusion, at a theoretical level, aimed to change societal and educational perceptions of disability by encouraging an acceptance of diversity (Avramidis and Norwich 2002). It therfore became an ideological tool for the projected future of education in which all children were to be fully included in every aspect of the schooling experience, benefiting from an ongoing process of development (Booth *et al.,* 2000; Winter 2006). *The Excellence in Schools* (1997) White Paper proposed education should benefit all children in mainstream schools and that the rights of children with SEND should be upheld (Education in England 2013). In the same year, the *Excellence for All Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* (1997) Green Paper seemingly marked a departure from the era of integration, focusing on the provisions and support available for children with SEND to succeed (Sikes *et al.,* 2007). Integration therefore became inclusion, as schools were forced to 'accommodate' the needs of children with SEND and adapt educationally to meet those needs (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). Avramidis *et al.* (2000: p.192) suggest "the concept of inclusion therefore becomes part of a broad human rights agenda that argues that all forms of segregation are morally wrong". In this context, Nutbrown and Clough (2006) observed inclusion as a platform for social justice, dependant not only on structural changes in provision and support, but also on educating schools and professionals on inclusive practice in relation to equality, diversity and the rights of all children.

However, despite the cogent argument put forward that inclusion was educationally and socially desirable, what was meant by inclusion remained unclear (Hodkinson and

Vickerman, 2009). The term in its practical application became "subject to conceptual confusion and terminological ambiguity" (Hodkinson and Devarakonda, 2011: p. 54). In textual terms inclusion was straightforward, but in the marketized environment of educational practice came to represent a complex ideological construct. The question that came to dominate educational discourse and praxis, during this period is "what is this inclusion of which we all speak?" (Hodkinson, 2011: p.179). For example, early inclusion legislation stated the following:

pupils with SEN should wherever possible receive their education in a mainstream school, but also that they should join fully with their peers in the curriculum and life of the school. For example, we believe that… children should generally take part in a mainstream lesson rather than being isolated in. (DFES, 1997: np).

Words such as "whenever possible" and that "children should generally take part in" suggest that government always intended to pursue a "twin-track system" of SEND where the segregation of some pupils within the loci of special schools was acceptable (Barton, 2003). Pupils, it seemed, were to be allowed to be present in an inclusive system but were actually absented from a mainstream classroom. "Presence and absence [then] were secreted into inclusive education they were symbiotic, acting not in binary opposition but as an amalgam of blurred and continuingly blurring perspectives" (Hodkinson, 2011: p. 181). Inclusion we were told was meant to differ from integration as it implied a restructuring of mainstream schools to ensure that every child regardless of disability was fully involved in the school's community (Hodkinson and Deverokonda, 2011). However, inclusion legislation remained focused on the placement of children with SEND into mainstream schools. Clough (1998,

p.5) detailed concerns that inclusion meant more than just presence for children with SEND accepted into mainstream schools.  He stated

> In this multinational urge for inclusion lies the danger of physical inclusion but curricular and emotional exclusion unless children are included for and of themselves, by teachers who are professionally and personally equipped to provide appropriate education for all.  For inclusion is about a radical deal more than physical location.

Here Clough described the philosophical concept of inclusion as being a way of thinking and of embracing, in perception, practice and resources, an inclusive ethos to teaching.  Barton (1997: pp. 233-4) discussed this philosophy in terms of social justice, stating

> It is about listening to unfamiliar voices, being open, empowering all members and about celebrating 'difference' in dignified ways… inclusive experience is about… how, where and why, and with what consequences, we educate all pupils… [and] involves a serious commitment to the task of identifying, challenging and contributing to the removal of injustices.

New Labour's educational policy promoted inclusive education as the teaching of disabled and non-disabled children within the same neighbourhood of schools.  The Government set out targets for meeting the SEND of children with disabilities in England by 2002 (Hodkinson, 2012a).  Inclusive practice was defined in one early document as:

15

Where all children are included as equal partners in the school community…[and]

that is why we are committed to comprehensive and enforceable civil rights for

disabled people. Our aspirations as a nation must be for all our people (Department

for Education and Employment, [DfEE] 1997: p.5).

Words such as 'join fully', 'take part', 'where equal partners' were used to create an image of

an inclusion process which values and welcomes all into mainstream schools. Inclusion here

is defined as a right, where 'exclusion' is deemed morally in defensible. However, inclusion

in this sense can be seen more as a duty than a right. Inclusion can subsume the individually

totally. It is then the process not the person which holds importance. This form of

participation locates inclusion as an obligation (Hodkinson, 2011). Žižek's (2009) work on a

'paradox of forced choice' is useful to consider that inclusion provides one 'of freedom to do

what is necessary', so long as pupils 'do exactly what they are expected to do'. It is perhaps

interesting to note the Latin origin of the word inclusion, which is literally to 'shut in'.

Inclusion, in this form, is not defined by choice, not as a human right but rather becomes

placed upon the continuum of definition as *forced* participation on society's terms

(Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2016).

Inclusion as a concept for all mainstream pupils

The Index for Inclusion (2000) viewed inclusion in its broadest sense, attempting to move

away from a focus on children with SEND to consider the inclusive needs of all mainstream

pupils. Its definition focused on equality by highlighting the need to value all pupils and to

view difference as a resource to support learning. Booth (2000) stated that inclusion should

be a broad church whose foundations are built upon the principle that exclusion from society

has a common route in intolerance to difference.  Inclusion in this perspective, then, would

relate to SEND, as well as gender, sexual orientation, race ethnicity, age, culture and social

class.

> Some continue to want to make inclusion primarily about 'special needs education'
>
> or the inclusion in education of children and young people with impairments but
>
> that position seems absurd.  If inclusion is about the development of comprehensive
>
> community education and about prioritising community over individualism beyond
>
> education, then the history of inclusion is the history of these struggles for an
>
> education system which serves the interests of communities and which does not
>
> exclude anyone within those communities Booth *et al.,* 2000: p.118).

Clough (2000: p. 29) considered this definition as, possibly, an "emergence of a more

homogeneous response to inclusive schooling with individual learners' rights to inclusive

education – as well as needs for individually appropriate education – at centre stage?"  Booth

and Ainscow (2004: p.6) said "Inclusion happens as soon as the process of increasing

participation is started" and the Index recommended the development of communities that

celebrate all children's achievements (Booth and Ainscow 2004).  Therefore, it discussed the

social model of disability as the need to acknowledge disability in the context of the barriers

present within education.  In doing so, it promoted the creation of a non-discriminatory

environment in which difference was positively embraced.

However, there has been no fixed definition of inclusion, which has led to its multiple uses in

both theory and educational practice at both a national and international level. Nutbrown and

Clough (2006) considered inclusion to be operational, as opposed to conceptual, because of

17

the multiplicity of its manifestations. There became a pattern where inclusion legislation was developed for children with SEND, for disadvantaged children, or for all children. Fredrickson and Cline (2002) believed that government legislation focused either on disability or issues of advantage and marginalisation rather than focussing on inclusion as a more holistic concept. For example, some government policies focused on children with SEND such as the *Excellence for all children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* White Paper (DfEE 1997) and the Code of Practice (DfES, 2001). Whereas, other realisations of inclusive education, such as the Index for Inclusion (2000), considered all children and, in turn, issues of advantage and marginalisation across pupils in mainstream schools (Booth *et al.,* 2000). Fredrickson and Cline (2002) noted this shift in legislation believing government shifted its focus on including children with SEND to the inclusion of children from disadvantaged backgrounds. This shift is clearly visible in the *Excellence for all children* (1997) paper which links children with SEND and underachievement more generally as well as in the child protection issues raised in *Removing Barriers to Achievement: the Government's Strategy for SEN* (2004) (Bines 2000; DfES 2004). What became plain was that whilst government policy claimed to include all children and apparently disputed any form of marginalisation it still, at the same time, continued to consider children with SEND separately (Fredrickson and Cline 2002). By inventing such a rhetoric of elusiveness, and some practice, government concealed and cloaked such contradiction preferring to demonstrate that its heart was in the right place by promoting inclusive education for all. At least it was attempting to address the problem of inequality. Inclusive education then with its skewed reality and illusionary not inclusionary beliefs licensed a kind of conscience-salving simulacrum of social concern.

18

## Inclusion: all can achieve?

The government also attempted to align its inclusive legislation with the standards agenda and consider children's academic achievements. From the beginning of inclusion there was therefore an emphasis placed on all children achieving. For instance, inclusion in *Meeting Special Educational Needs: a programme for action* meant:

> The participation of all pupils in the curriculum and social life of mainstream schools; the participation of all pupils in learning which leads to the highest possible level of achievement; and the participation of young people in the full range of social experiences and opportunities once they have left school (DfEE, 1998: p.23).

However, from the beginning of inclusion there was also an emphasis placed on standards of education being equally important for children with SEND as their peers. For example, the *Excellence for All Children* (1997) White Paper had two main foci that aligned the development of inclusion with the educational achievement of children with SEND (DfEE, 1997). The paper suggested that recognition of SEND issues was integral to the remedy for general educational underachievement. It described standards that were equally applicable for children with SEND (Bines 2000). These key principles were supported by an emphasis on early intervention, on the responsibilities of both LEAs and teachers for children with SEND specifically and by the commitment to reduce the need for statementing through providing effective support within the classroom (Bines 2000).

Therefore, despite its human rights pedigree, inclusion during this period became operationalised by agendas of accountability. For example, Ofsted [Office of Standards in

Education] from the year 2000 employed inclusive metrics to judge schools' performance revealing an ideality where the teaching, learning, achievement, attitudes and well-being of every person mattered (Ofsted, 2000). Furthermore, in 2004, the government's publication *Removing Barriers to Achievement* refocused New Labour's vision for SEND. It formulated procedures that were designed to overcome the barriers to success that previous inclusion policy had faced (Hodkinson, 2012a). However, within this document the Secretary of State for Education further fractured the ideality of inclusion by stating that:

> We need to do much more to help children with special educational needs to achieve as well as they can, not least if we are to meet the challenging targets expected at school (Charles Clarke, Department for Education and Skills [DfES], 2004: p.16).

Clarke's words reveal a fault line of reduction as policies of inclusion became operationalized within a regime of accountability. Schools too were forced to 'compete' whatever their handicap as an inclusive obligation became a form of educational coercion (Hodkinson, 2012a).

There was however little attention given to the curriculum and teaching of children with SEND, the primary focus was on 'target-setting' within a performativity agenda. There was little mention of the nature or definition of inclusion in relation to education. What there was though was more emphasis again placed on the rhetorical mantras of 'high expectations', 'standards' and 'school improvements' (Armstrong 2005; Avramidis and Norwich 2002). Strain and Simkins (2008) noted that terms such as social inclusion can conceal power relations that obscure both responsibility and accountability. Inclusion appeared from this

20

perspective to be intrinsically linked with the need for higher standards.  This meant a need

for all children to conform within narrow parameters of success (Armstrong, 2005).  In effect,

this represented a distinctive pedagogy wherein the same teaching and standards were to be

considered effective for all children.  Gamarnikow and Green (2003: p.209) said "there are,

of course, winners and losers … [promoting] belief in the myth, or at least acquiescence to

the rhetoric, of excellence for all - everyone's a winner".

Slee (2001: p.136) believed that there was a "deep epistemological attachment to the view

that special educational needs are produced by the impaired pathology of the child".  For

Levitas (1998: p.3)

> The individual child is constructed within the discourse of *raising achievement* and
>
> *promoting inclusion* in two polarised ways: either in relation to norms of standards
>
> and targets or as outsiders 'in a society whose structural inequalities remain largely
>
> uninterrogated'. New Labour, then, persisted with terminology that was associated
>
> directly with their ownership of disability.  In such a context, terms such as
>
> 'inclusion' and 'SEN' were applied to manage the issue of disability as it conflicts
>
> with the existing schooling system.

Bines (2000) and others describe the limitations of inclusion as being determined by the

dominance of the standards agenda.  The government supported a separate statementing

process, a p-scale system attached to the National Curriculum, separate resources and an

appointed Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO).  At the same time, children

with SEND were also considered in the same context as their peers in relation to existing

objectives, such as the National Curriculum and the SAT process that was designed for pupils

who could achieve the national average (Bines 2000). As a consequence, children with SEND were discussed in relation to improving standards in a similar fashion to their peers whilst also having separate specialist provisions so that they could be 'included' in mainstream settings without any negative impact on standards. Inclusion became locked into focusing on a child's SEND (Booth *et al.,* 2000). Armstrong argued that inclusion is a normative concept, conceptualised in terms of conformity with existing standards objectives and in effect providing children with SEND with an 'opportunity to conform' (Armstrong 2005).

## What happened to inclusion after New Labour?

The Coalition Government, formed through a Conservative and Liberal Democrat collaboration in 2010, inherited a very different economy to that enjoyed during most of New Labour's years. Education policy continued to reinforce the effects of accountability, centralised control and assessment (George and Clay 2008). The Coalition noted Britain's declining position in international league tables for educational achievement (Chitty 2009) and the Education Act (2011) claimed to be designed to help teachers raise standards, improve on underperformance and strengthen the ways in which teachers were held accountable for their actions. This act concentrated on reforms in the development of new schools, with preference given to academies and free schools (Department for Education 2012a).

In the Education Act (2011), Ofsted inspections were to be refocused to concentrate on educational standards and so strengthen school accountability (Department for Education, 2012a). In 2011, a review of the National Curriculum was announced in which an advisory

22

committee considered replacing the current version with one that supported international economic success. This led to a revised National Curriculum in 2013 (DfE, 2013). Michael Gove, Education Secretary (Department for Education 2012b, p.1) at the time said:

> We have sunk in the international league table and the National Curriculum is substandard. Meanwhile the pace of economic and technological change is accelerating and our children are being left behind. The previous curriculum has failed to prepare us for the future.

This Government also indicated early that it wanted to overhaul radically those policies that related to SEND. The Government articulated that it wanted to respond to the frustrations of children, young people and families to the landmark policy of New Labour, namely that of inclusion (DfE, 2011, in, Hodkinson, 2012b). The government's White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* (DfE, 2010) and the Green Paper *Support and Aspiration: A New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability* (DfE, 2011) expressed concerns about the progress of children with SEND in comparison to their peers (Glazzard, 2013). The Government proposed and implemented a sharpening of accountability by introducing information on the progress of lower attaining pupils into the school league tables. Glazzard (2013, p.185) stated:

> Such a move could potentially be disastrous for the inclusion agenda because although low attainment is not synonymous with SEN[D], there is evidence to suggest that overall achievement in schools with high proportions of children with SEN[D] is lower than in schools with reduced proportions of children with SEN[D] (Lunt and Norwich, 1999). In the face of this, schools will be increasingly reluctant

to admit children who are unlikely to demonstrate the required progress and even more likely to exclude such pupils. Although schools are unable to directly discriminate against pupils with SEN[D], there is a likelihood that schools will employ various discreet approaches that result in exclusion.

The Green Paper set out plans to radically reform the current system, especially the identification and assessment of children with SEND. The Paper focused on a single assessment process that was proposed for use across education and healthcare by 2014, with added support for parental choice in deciding upon either mainstream or special schooling. These become known as the current Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP plan) that gradually replaced the statements of children with SEND (Jones and Symeonidou, 2017). For children with SEND, the focus of Coalition reform was again though on the identification and assessment to inform initial placement of children within schools. The Green Paper resulted in another revised Code of Practice: *SEND code of practice: 0 to 25 years* (DfE and DoH, 2014). Based on the perceived 'radical' changes identified in the Children and Families Act (2014), the revised Code of Practice provided a clearer focus on the views of children in decision-making and the close cooperation between education, health and social care services. However, with the exception of these changes, the Code of Practice was similar to previous Codes (Jones and Symeonidou, 2017).

Recent legislative changes have enabled some to say that there is now a greater emphasis on enabling children with SEND to succeed in their education and transition to adulthood (Jones and Symeonidou, 2017). However, our analysis, detailed above, demonstrates that successive Governments have not focused inclusion upon a human rights agenda but rather have continued to develop inclusive education within the realms of identification and the

standards agenda. We therefore believe that policies of inclusion have made made no notable or 'radical' changes to the manner in which children with SEND are educated in this country. Schools and Government, it appears, remain focused on accountability, centralised control and assessment and therefore inclusion remains focused on the identification, assessment and placement of children with SEND. Let us now turn to expand this argument further.

## The competing objectives of the inclusion and standards agendas

Government statements make it clear that policies of inclusion operate within a regime of accountability (Allan, 2003). Glazzard (2013: p.182) stated "the standards agenda works in opposition to the inclusion agenda despite government rhetoric, which suggests that both agendas are complementary". However, accountability is one of the most serious challenges to inclusion (Hodkinson and Devarakonda, 2009). Evidence from academic literature suggests that schools who attempt to be more inclusive then decline in academic standard and face numerous challenges. This is because of the standards agendas focus on narrow parameters of achievement (Glazzard, 2014).

> To take a *full* part, all must be able to *fully* compete and be *fully* economically
> active. This discourse of performativity promotes winners and losers as the cloak
> of inclusion disguises market economics (Hodkinson, 2011: p.182).

Schools then need to provide additional intervention programmes for children who are falling behind. "These serve the purpose of closing the achievement gap under the banner of equality of opportunity" (Glazzard 2014: p109). Fulcher (1999: p. 151) argued that the standards agenda produces a 'potentially hostile context' for inclusion. "The current education system celebrates high achievement over the valuing of difference (Goodley,

2007), which inevitably forces educators to invest more time into those learners who will produce valued outputs" (Glazzard, 2013: p.184). This creates barriers to full participation and achievement, resulting in exclusion for those who cannot meet these national standards. Inclusion seems impossible without a change in what constitutes *success* and *achievement* and the way they are measured so that all children are able to achieve and experience success (Lloyd, 2008). We therefore have to question whether inclusion as a global initiative is possible when the focus in education is on accountability, standards and economic prosperity? (Hodkinson, 2012a). There would need to be a radical change in policy that enabled educators to 'practice the policy of inclusion' (Glazzard, 2013). Hodkinson and Devarakonda (2009: p.87) considers:

> Inclusion to be a catalyst that requires schools and society to identify and overcome the barriers that inhibit a child's choices and ability to achieve their full potential. Within such definition, the controlling power of the state, institutions and vested interests as well as the accountability of academic metrics are diminished and replaced by an understanding of individual value, respect and a commitment to the development of self.

## Inclusion as exclusion

There appears to be two differing perspectives on whether inclusion means that all children should be educated in the same space, or whether some children with SEND need to be educated in special schools. This focuses the inclusion debate specifically on the inclusion or exclusion of children with SEND. Cigman (2007: p.70) named these two groups the 'moderates' and the 'universalists.' The 'moderates' hold a pragmatic view on the possibilities of inclusion and consider there to be a need for special schools. On the other

hand, the 'universalists' hold an idealistic view, believing that special schools undermine the policy of inclusion for all.

One of the major success criterion of inclusion policy was that schools should value and welcome all children (DFES, 2004). However, inclusion seems to be continuously distilled to focus on children with SEND and their placement in schools. This devalues inclusion by a process of fragmentation. Inclusion from this perspective relates then to children with SEND, as well as gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, culture and social class (Hodkinson and Devarakonda, 2011). Yet Hodkinson (2012a) found that presence and absence of children with SEND in mainstream schools was detailed in statements provided by teachers. These teachers labelled and othered children in special schools as 'them and they' and embraced segregation for children who were unable to attend mainstream settings. Slee and Allan (2001: p.553) state

> Regular schooling was never meant for all comers. Its constitution reflects this fact. Many children find that schooling does not serve them well and placing more children into the current system of schooling with exacerbate failure for increasing numbers.

Equally, Warnock (2005) rejected claims that inclusion is about all children being educated "under the same roof" (p. 36). At this time she believed inclusion should focus on engagement in learning instead of placement.

However, inclusion in mainstream schools also focus on children with SEND and the difficulties they experience in meeting expected standards. Brown (2013) considered inclusion in its broadest sense to mean all learners in her doctorate research. However, her

findings also indicated that teachers focused inclusion on children with SEND.  In considering the practical implementation of the inclusion and standards agendas simultaneously in mainstream schools, she found that teachers held two perspectives.  The first group believed that the education of children with SEND suffered as a consequence of the emphasis on standards.  The second group believed that children with SEND do not have to achieve the same standards and that academic achievement was not paramount for all.

One of the significant difficulties in benchmarking inclusion against the standards agenda objectives is that children who cannot meet these standards can often end up excluded either inside or outside mainstream schooling.  Glazzard (2013: p.184) states:

> Contemporary discourses of inclusion serve a disciplinary function, rather than promoting equity (Armstrong, 2005), and those who threaten the status quo are isolated and contained in special units.  Children with behavioural, social and emotional issues are segregated and contained in Pupil Referral Units and consequently marginalised.  They are labelled as deviants without any critical interrogation of the 'within schools' factors (inappropriate curriculum or assessment processes that label them as failures) or external factors (inappropriate parenting or lack of cultural capital) that may have contributed to their 'undesirable' behaviours.  Other children with special needs are subjected to additional intervention, which further reinforces a sense of failure and highlights their differences.  The problems are squarely located within the child, rather than within schooling itself or society, thus reflecting a medical rather than social model of disability.

The problems of not fully implementing inclusion is therefore placed within the child, rather than considering the barriers children face in mainstream schools. Justifications are then made that some children with SEND need to be excluded from mainstream settings because their needs cannot be met and 'they' need special schooling. While others who are 'included' in mainstream settings can be excluded either by not being able to fully participate or physically excluded into special units because 'they' are unable to remain included in the existing system.

## Inclusion as integration

Inclusion, as suggested in this chapter, has a particular view that is built on absolute presence.

> Either a thing is here or it is not, we instinctively think, but in fact in all kinds of ways absent things leave traces of their presence and a thing can be present while being partially absent" (Chia, 1995: p. 580).

Definitions of inclusion that focus on whether children are *able* to be mainstream educated are based on children's individual needs and encourage a return to integration. Inclusion, then, operates as a series of graduations of presence and absence with 'blurred boundaries' and no sharp distinctions (Hodkinson, 2011). Equally, definitions suggesting that inclusion is about teaching all pupils together are also problematic as they present a conceptual confusion and in reality continue to remain focused on locational inclusion, which is in essence integration (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009).

The difference between inclusion and integration was that the school environment needed to change to accommodate the needs of learners. However, despite New Labour's protestations that inclusion was going to radically change the education system it was slotted into the

existing standards-driven system.  It therefore replaced 'integration', but didn't change the

education system to accommodate the need for inclusion and the needs of all learners.

Considering Hegelian's perspective the failure to fully actualise the Idea of inclusion is the

limitation of the Idea itself.  Hodkinson (2011: p.183) stated:


> This insight would seem important as it suggests the Idea and the signifier of
>
> inclusion failed, perhaps fractured at its very outset for not being radical enough.
>
> By not retaining full fidelity to the Idea as an ideological commitment, by not
>
> embedding itself in every aspect of a school's life, inclusion lacked what Žižek
>
> (2009) calls a 'disturbing function' thus opening itself up to compromise and so
>
> becoming 'a mask of its exact opposite' (Hodkinson, 2011: p. 183).


Inclusion replaced integration but remains entwined with exclusion in a deeply rooted

discourse of absence. By absenting some children (the 'present perception') inclusion became

imaginary.  Whilst seeking the 'presence' of all children inclusive education only enabled

representation through regular supplanting presence (Derrida, 1998: p5).


Inclusion can only be successful if we move beyond a focus on identification, assessment and

placement of children with SEND.  The education system needs to be overhauled to fully

consider inclusion alongside education standards.  In doing so, terms such as *success* and

*achievement* must be redefined to fully consider the educational development of all learners

(Lloyd, 2008).  From their application of the ideas of Derrida and Foucault, Winter (2013: p.

553) discusses what she terms Slee and Allen's (2001) "commitment to a conceptual

construction that perceives inclusive education as a transformatory political project" that:

Promotes the radical reconceptualisation and reconstitution of schooling to embrace all students through the recognition, legitimisation and celebration of difference, be it 'disability', race, gender, class, sexuality, bilingualism, ethnicity, geographic position… It is the schooling that is understood to be problematical, defective and dysfunctional; it is the school curriculum, pedagogy and assessment that require radical change, rather than students (Winter 2013: p.553).

The presence of all children with SEND alongside their peers, may not in reality be possible. However, the present focus of presence justifies the absence of inclusion for both children who are placed in special schools and the exclusion of children with SEND in mainstream schools when they are unable to conform and meet the national standards.

Conclusion

The chapter has considered a historical account of the development of inclusion in England and the changes made to the education of children with SEND since the 1940s. The complexity of defining and practically implementing inclusion have been considered and problematized. We have questioned the original intentions of the inclusion agenda against the practical implementation of inclusion in current practice.

Overtime inclusion has been used to protect the status quo, providing justifications for the actions of Government, Local Authorities and school in the name of inclusion (Glazzard, 2013). However, in over 15 years since its implementation inclusion has not effectively moved away from the era of integration. There has been a focus on the identification, assessment and placement of children with SEND, without effectively considering inclusion in its broadest sense to mean all learners. Whilst radical changes were proposed when

inclusion was originally devised this did not lead to 'radical' changes in the education system that remained obsessively focused on standards, performativity and accountability.  It appears that whilst New Labour attempted to move forward into inclusive practice, where the focus was on accommodating needs, inclusion today remains stuck in the original objectives of integration.  Inclusion therefore has become, not a radical concept, but just a link in the chain of integration that shackles its ideological and practical operation to educational segregation. Inclusion can only be successful if we move beyond the focus of integration and overhaul the education system, in a similar way to the initial implementation of the standards agenda, to fully consider inclusion and the needs, success and achievements of all learners.

## References

Adnett, N. and Davies, P. (2005). Competition between or within schools? Re-assessing school choice. *Education Economics.* **13**(1), pp.109-121.

Allan, J. (2003). Productive pedagogies and the challenge of inclusion. *British Journal of Special Education.* **30**(4), pp.175-179.

Allan, J. (2008). *Rethinking Inclusive Education- the philosophers of difference in practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Armstrong, D. (2005). Reinventing 'inclusion': new Labour and the cultural politics of special education. *Oxford Review of Education.* **31**(1), pp.135-151.

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P. and Burden, R. (2000). A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority. *Educational Psychology* **20**(2), pp.191-211.

Avramidis, E. and Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, **17**(2), pp.129-147.

Banks, O. (1981). *Faces of feminism: a study of feminism as a social movement*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Batterson, C. (1999). The changing politics of primary education. *Education 3-13.* 27(3), pp.61-65.

Barton, L. (1997). Inclusive education: romantic, subversive or realistic? *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* 1(3) pp.231-242

Barton, L. (2003). I*nclusive Education and Teacher Education: a basis for hope or a discourse of delusion?* Inaugural Professorial Lecture, London Institute of Education.

Bines, H. (2000). Inclusive standards? Current developments in policy for special educational needs in England and Wales. *Oxford Review of Education,* **26**(1), pp.21-33.

Bobbitt, P. (2002). *The shield of Achilles, war, peace and the course of history* London Allen Lane

Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (2004). Index for Inclusion: developing learning, participation and play, in early years and childcare.  Bristol: CSIE.

Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M. and Shaw, L. (2000). *Index for Inclusion. Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Brown, Z. (2013). 'We just have to get on with it': Inclusive teaching in a standards driven system. Retrieved from https://wlv.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/2436/311413/Brown%20PhD%20thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Callaghan, J. (2009). British Labour's turn to socialism in 1931. *Journal of Political Ideologies.* **14**(2), pp.115-132.

Chia, R. (1995). From Modern to Postmodern Organisational Analysis, *Organisation Studies*, 16(4), 579-604. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/017084069501600406

Chitty, C. (2002). *Understanding schools and schooling*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Chitty, C. (2008). The UK National Curriculum: an historical perspective. *FORUM*. **50**(3), pp.343-348.

Chitty, C. (2009). *Education policy in Britain* [2nd ed.]. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cigman, R. (2008). A Question of Universality: Inclusive Education and the Principle of Respect. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 41(4) 775-793

Clough, P. (1998). Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clough, P. (2000). Routes to Inclusion. In Clough, P. and Corbett, J. (eds) *Theories of Inclusive Education. A Student's Guide.* London: Paul Chapman's Publishing.

Cole, B. (2005). 'Good faith and effort?' Perspectives on educational inclusion. *Disability and Society*, **20**(3), pp.331-344.

Cole, C, and Hancock, R. (2002). *The Inclusion Quality Mark*. Croydon: Creative Education.

Corbett, J. (2001) Supporting Inclusive Education: a connective pedagogy. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1997). *Excellence for All Children: meeting special educational needs.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998). *Meeting Special Educational Needs: a programme for action.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004). *Five-year strategy for children and learners*. Norwich: HM Government.

Department for Education (2012a). *Education Bill Received Royal Assent.* Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a00200186/education-bill-receives-royal-assent

Department for Education (2012b). National Curriculum Review Launched. Retrieved from

http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0073149/national-curriculum-review-launched

Department for Education (2013). The National Curriculum in England. Key Stages 1 and 2

framework document. Retrieved from

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/425601/PRIMARY_national_curriculum.pdf.

Derrida, J. (1998) *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press

DFES (2004). Removing Barriers to Achievement: The Government's Strategy for SEN.

Retrieved from

https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130404091106/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/RSG/publicationDetail/Page1/DfES%200117%202004

DfE and DoH (2014) SEND code of practice: 0 to 25 years. Retrieved from

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/send-code-of-practice-0-to-25

Farrell, M. (2010). *Debating Special Education*. Oxon: Routledge.

Frederickson, N. and Cline, T. (2002). *Special Educational Needs, Inclusion and Diversity: A*

*textbook.* Buckingham. Open University Press.

Fulcher, G. (1989) *Disabling Policies? A Comparative Approach to Education Policy and*

*Disability*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Galloway, D., Armstrong, D. and Tomlinson, D. (1994). *The Assessment of Special*

*Educational Needs: Whose Problem?* Longman, Harlow.

Galloway, D. and Edwards, A. (1991). *Primary school teaching and educational psychology*.

London: Longman.

Gamarnikow, E. and Green, A. (2003) Social justice, identity formation and social capital: Social diversification policy under New Labour. In Vincent, C. (ed.) *Social Justice, Education and Identity.* London. RoutledgeFalmer.

George R. and Clay, J. (2008). Reforming Teachers and Uncompromising 'Standards': implications for social injustice in schools. *FORUM,* **50**(1), pp.103-111.

Glazzard, J. (2013). A critical interrogation of the contemporary discourses associated with inclusive education in England. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs.* **13**(3), pp.182-188.

Glazzard, J. (2014). From Integration to Inclusive Education in England: Illuminating the Issues through a Life History Account. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research.* **9**(1), pp.107-116.

Gray, S. (2006). *Teachers under siege.* Stoke-on-Trent. Trentham.

Higgs, G., Bellin, W., Farrell, S. and White, S. (1998). Educational Attainment and Social Disadvantage: Contextualizing School League Tables. *Regional Studies.* **31**(8), pp.775-789.

Hodkinson, A. (2005). Conceptions and Misconceptions of Inclusive Education: a critical examination of final year teacher trainees' knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *Research in Education.* **73**(1), pp.15-29.

Hodkinson, A. (2011). Inclusion: a defining definition? *Power and Education.* **3**(2), pp.179-185.

Hodkinson, A. (2012a). Inclusion 'All present and correct?' A critical analysis of New Labour's inclusive education policy in England. Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies. **11**(4), pp.242-262.

Hodkinson, A. (2012b). Illusionary inclusion- what went wrong with New Labour's landmark educational policy? *British Journal of Special Education.* **3**(9), pp.4-11.

Hodkinson, A. and Devarakonda, C. (2009). Conceptions of inclusion and inclusive education: A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in India. *Research in Education.* **82**(1), pp.85-99.

Hodkinson, A. and Devarakonda, C. (2011). Conceptions of inclusion and inclusive education: A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in England. *Educationalfutures.* **3**(1), pp.52-58.

Hodkinson, A. and Vickerman, P. (2009). *Key Issues in Special Educational Needs and Inclusion.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hodkinson, A. and Vickerman, P. (2016). Inclusion: Defining Definitions. In, Brown, Z. (ed.) *Inclusive Education: Perspectives on pedagogy, policy and practice*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jones, J., Jenkin, M. and Lord, S. (2006). *Developing effective teacher performance.* London: Paul Chapman.

Jones, C. and Symeonidou, S. (2017). The Hare and the Tortoise: a comparative review of the drive towards inclusive education policies in England and Cyprus. *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* **21**(7), pp.775-789.

Kailin, J. (2002). *Antiracist education: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kavanagh, D. (1987). *Thatcherism and British politics: the end of consensus?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawton, D. (1992). *Education and Politics in the 1990s: conflict or consensus*. London: Falmer.

Levitas, R. (1998). *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour.* London: Palgrave

Lloyd, C. (2008). Removing barriers to achievement: A strategy for inclusion or exclusion? *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 12(2), pp. 221-236

Mason, M. (2000). *Incurably Human.* London: Working Press.

Northway, R. (1997). Integration and Inclusion: Illusion or progress in services for Disabled people? *Social Policy and Administration.* **31**(2), pp.157-172.

Nutbrown, C. and Clough, P. (2006). *Inclusion in the Early Years.* London: Sage Publications.

Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education). (2000). *Evaluating Educational Inclusion: Guidance for Inspectors and Schools.* London: Office for Standards in Education.

Pierson, C. (1998). The New Governance of Education: The Conservatives and Education 1988-1997. *Oxford Review of Education.* **24**(1), pp.131-142.

Quicke, J. (1988). The 'New Right' and Education. *British Journal of Education Studies.* **36**(1), pp.5-20.

Rustemier, S. (2002). *Social and educational justice: the human rights framework for inclusion.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Sikes, P., Lawson, H. and Parker, M. (2007). Voices on: teachers and teaching assistants talk about inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* **11**(3), pp.355-370.

Slee, R. (2001). 'Inclusion in Practice': does practice make perfect. *Educational Review.* **53**(2), pp.113-123.

Slee, R., and Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the Included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 11(2), pp. 173–92

Stobart, G. (2001), The validity of National Curriculum Assessment. *British Journal of Educational Studies.* **49**(1), pp.26-39.

Strain, M. and Simkins, T. (2008). Continuity, Change and Educational Reform- Questioning the Legacy of the Education Reform Act 1988. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* **36**(2), pp.155-163.

Thomas, G. and Vaughan, M. (2004). *Inclusive Education: readings and reflections.* Maidenhead: Open University.

UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action* Madrid: UNESCO/Ministry of Education and Science

Vaughan, M. (2002). Milestones on the road to inclusion 1970-2002. *Inclusion week.* Retrieved from http://inclusion.uwe.ac.uk/inclusionweek/articles/milestones.htm .

Warnock, M. (2005). *Special Educational Needs: A New Look* London: Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, Impact Series N11

Whitty, G. (2000). Teacher professionalism in new times. *Professional Development in Education.* 26(2)**,** pp.281-295.

Winter, C (2013). Spaces and places for disrupting thinking about inclusive education in *Hard Times*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 16(5–6): pp. 551–565

Winter, E. (2006). Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classrooms. *Support for Learning.* **21**(2), pp.85-91.

Yarker, P. (2006). A Kind of Twilight: how do teachers of English at Key Stage 3 respond to the requirement to prepare their students for SATS? *FORUM,* **48**(3), pp.247-255.

Žižek, S. (2009). *In Defense of Lost Causes*. London: Verso.