

## **Inclusive Education: Promoting the Rights of Young People with Severe/Complex Learning Difficulties**

**In Scotland, the concept of special educational needs has evolved to the point where the right of all learners to an appropriate curriculum is generally accepted by all. The journey from a medical/deficit model to a needs model has been difficult but enlightening.**

**PAUL HAMILL is head of the Department of Special Educational Needs, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.**

### **SETTING THE SCENE**

In Scotland it is now widely accepted that labels such as ‘mentally handicapped,’ ‘profoundly retarded’ and ‘educationally subnormal’ are discriminatory and tend to devalue individuals. However this was not always the case and for most of this century the medical model has prevailed with its emphasis upon categorisation and segregation. The traditional view has been a negative one where difficulties in learning arose because of inbuilt deficiencies which resided firmly within individuals and for many years this deficit philosophy underpinned policy and shaped provision for those individuals deemed to suffer from a ‘mental handicap.’

From the late 1970's there has been a growing awareness of the inadequacy of the medical model. In particular educationalists now realise that it promotes stereotypical thinking and denies equality of opportunity to many individuals. It is now more clearly understood that difficulties in learning cannot be divorced from the context in which they occur. There has been a shift in focus and the emphasis is now upon the curriculum model as a framework for understanding the complex nature of learning difficulties. Educators now appreciate more fully that many individuals fail to learn because they experience a range of barriers over which they have no direct control. There has been a gradual move away from the concept of handicap to one of individual need and it is now recognised that all individuals have the right to be educated and are entitled to access an appropriate curriculum.

The promotion of individual rights is high on the educational agenda and as we enter the millennium the issue of inclusive education versus exclusive education continues to dominate

debate within the field of special education. It is becoming increasingly clear that the inherent professional challenge is to develop effective provision which optimises learning opportunities and improves the quality of life for all. This is a demanding task which involves first and foremost a fundamental rethinking of the label 'mental handicap.'

## **HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

Within Scotland it is now widely accepted that the concept of special educational needs is both complex and subtle. To understand it one must take a reflective and analytical stance both at a personal and professional level. This is summed up in the SOEID report (1994), *Effective Provision for Special Educational Needs* (EPSEN) which recommended that those responsible for planning, creating policy and delivering effective provision must "share an understanding of what is meant by the continuum of special educational needs" (p. 9). It is not possible to develop such an understanding without considering how the concept has evolved within an historical context. This involves an examination of the process of social and educational change which has shaped and influenced current thinking over the past one hundred years.

In the late nineteenth century for example labels such as 'feeble-minded,' 'imbecile' and 'defective' were firmly established within the Scottish consciousness. The medical model prevailed and permeated the thinking of those nineteenth century philanthropists who were among the first to show "humane concern for the feeble-minded" (Thomson, 1983, p. 233).

However one must also sound a cautionary note when considering the factors which motivated these individuals. Barton and Tomlinson (1982) for example take a fairly critical stance which interprets the 'good works' of these philanthropists in a less favourable light. This viewpoint is summed up by Adams (1990) when he says that these philanthropists were to some extent motivated by self-interest, "segregating the disadvantaged in order to ensure that they remain so" (p. 6). Regardless of how one interprets this paternalistic concern it is, I think, fair to say that for some it was genuine and it most certainly helped to raise public consciousness. An example of this was the formation in 1862 of the Society for Imbecile Children in Scotland which published a paper entitled *The Imbecile and their Training*. There was therefore some evidence at this time to suggest that a more enlightened stance was being taken in relation to the needs of the 'mentally handicapped.'

## **Labelling**

Nonetheless the focus was upon labelling individuals as 'mentally handicapped' thus internalising a set of attitudes and expectations based upon the notion of inbuilt individual deficiency.

Consequently the early institutions which emerged to care for the 'feeble minded' emphasised manual skills training within a segregated context. As Warnock (1978) states, "These early institutions were protective places with little or no contact with the outside world. Education was subordinate to training" (p.9). Thus individuals were identified as deficient and this deficit philosophy underpinned practice and provision in Scotland for the next one hundred years.

In 1872 the Education (Scotland) Act emerged within the context of the Industrial Revolution with its need for a disciplined workforce. This act outlined the provision of compulsory education for all, but in practice, as attempts were made to implement this principle, it became evident that many individuals could not effectively access what was on offer due to their difficulties in learning. It was not until 1907 with the Education of Defective Children (Scotland) Act that school boards were empowered to set up special schools and classes.

## **Testing**

At this time the development of mental testing also had a profound impact upon provision for the 'mentally handicapped.' It was now considered possible and acceptable to diagnose and categorise individuals more precisely and "gradually standardised tests such as IQ tests were widely used to place pupils in Special Schools" (Lunt & Evans, 1994, p. 43).

Overall the mental testing movement tended to reinforce the process of categorisation and labelling. For example concepts such as 'subnormality' and 'lunacy' were now seen as clearly distinct categories. It was felt those deemed to be subnormal could benefit from special schooling whereas those now identified as lunatics would not. In 1913 the Mental Deficiency (Scotland) Act legitimised this situation when it gave power to school boards to ascertain which individuals would benefit from attendance at a special school. It set out some guidelines for this process when it said that "those incapable by reason of mental defect" would not benefit from attending a special school. The aim may have been to improve the quality of life for individuals with learning difficulties. In reality however an even more divisive system emerged with a sub-group of individuals deemed to be ineducable and placed in institutions for 'the mentally handicapped.' There was little further change in the system until 1945 when the Education (Scotland) Act heralded what appeared to be a

new era when for the first time all children were “seen to have a basic right to education” (Pearson & Lindsay, 1984, p. 4).

### **Categorisation**

In reality this Act did not break new ground as it still relied heavily upon the ‘individual deficit model’ with its strong focus upon selection, segregation and the provision of vocational training as opposed to education. This Act simply presented a new ‘three tier approach,’ i.e. ‘educable,’ ‘ineducable but trainable’ and ‘trainable and ineducable’ (Education (Scotland) Act, 1945). Those educationalists who put this new tiered system forward probably did so for what they considered to be laudable reasons and for the good of those involved. In retrospect however one can see clearly that they were oblivious to the potential damage inherent within such a system. This is well illustrated by Dockrell, Dunn & Milne (1978) when they say, “Few seemed alive to the fact that to describe human beings as ineducable and untrainable was to place them in the evolutionary scale lower than sea lions or performing fleas” (p. 3).

This system of categorisation was further expanded when in 1954 the Special Education Treatment (Scotland) Regulations identified nine categories of handicap i.e. deaf, partially deaf, blind, partially sighted, mentally handicapped, epileptic, pupils with a speech defect, maladjusted and physically handicapped. This reinforced “the process of labelling which...tends to encourage the creation of stereotypes that are to the disadvantage of those involved” (Ainscow, 1991, p. 2).

### **Placement**

The Scottish Education Department had issued SED Circular 300 in 1947 and posed a fairly forward looking alternative to simply placing individuals in special schools. For the first time an enlightened definition appeared “Special educational treatment should indeed be regarded simply as well defined arrangements within the ordinary system to provide for the handicapped child the individual attention that he particularly needs” (Thomson, 1983, p. 237).

This recommendation in relation to integrating so called handicapped children was perhaps too far reaching for its time and education authorities failed to respond presumably in the belief that mainstream education might prove to be inappropriate or inadequate. For whatever the reason it must be pointed out that at that time. According to Blythman (in Barton, 1988, p. 42), “The Scottish

education system...was essentially meritocratic rather than democratic and was still concerned with minimising similarities and exaggerating differences.”

### **Entitlement**

Finally in 1973 the Melville Report moved a step in the right direction when it stated that “no child is ineducable.” This move was given a boost by the Education (Mentally Handicapped Children) Scotland Act of 1974 which said every child was entitled to an education. “As a result junior occupational centres were replaced by schools appropriately staffed with qualified teachers” (Adams, 1990, p. 131). For the first time there was a recognition that all children, including those previously labelled ‘ineducable,’ were entitled to an education. Although the situation was beginning to improve by the early 1970's the main focus was still upon individuals who were labelled as ‘mentally handicapped.’ The deficiency was still seen to reside firmly within the individual and the medical model was still prevalent which viewed learning difficulties as a disease which had to be diagnosed and hopefully cured. However these traditional views began to be challenged and the scene was set for a radical rethinking of the deficit philosophy which had for so long been dominant.

### **SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS: AN EVOLVING CONCEPT**

The term ‘special educational needs’ has only come into common usage in Scotland over the past twenty years or so, although its origins can be traced back to the early nineteenth century. In 1974 the Warnock Committee began its review of educational practice and provision for handicapped children and young people. This was the first comprehensive examination this century of special education covering England, Scotland and Wales. The Warnock Committee introduced the concept of ‘individual need’ as opposed to focusing upon ‘mental handicap.’ They encouraged all professionals to take on board a broader concept of special education related to the child’s individual need as distinct from his/her disability. Under previous legislation pupils who required ‘special educational treatment’ were placed in statutory categories. Warnock summarised the gradual opposition to this system. From the Committee's own viewpoint categorisation promoted too sharp a distinction between the so called handicapped and the non-handicapped. According to Swann (1988), "The emphasis was to be on the child's educational need not his or her disability" (p. 180).

### **Record of Needs**

The whole purpose and extent of assessment was also redefined by Warnock. The purpose was not to allocate individuals to categories but it was to be a means of arriving at a more comprehensive view of the individual as a learner. The aim of assessment was to provide a guide to what constitutes the most effective education based upon need. As Warnock (1978) said, "We recommend that there be a system of recording as in need of special educational provision those children who on the basis of a detailed profile of their needs are judged to require special education not generally available in ordinary schools" (p. 45). This system became known as 'statementing' in England and 'recording' in Scotland and thus the concept of the record of needs was born.

In 1978 the vast majority of children with records of needs were still educated in Special Schools, for which Warnock recognised there would continue to be a need. At the same time, however, Warnock formulated the idea of integration as opposed to segregation stating that if up to one in five children were deemed at some time to have special educational needs, it is obvious that many will have these needs identified and met in mainstream schools. Thus Warnock reflected "both the gradual disenchantment with statutory categories and the developing rhetoric of integration" (Gilbert & Hart, 1990, p. 18). The Warnock Report was regarded in Scotland as a watershed in the history of special education. Many of the views expressed were extremely enlightened and provided the context for change.

### **Focus on Curriculum**

In the same year as the Warnock Report was published a significant key report was published in Scotland by HM Inspectors, *The Education of Children with Learning Difficulties in Primary and Secondary Schools in Scotland* (1978). This report focused exclusively upon mainstream education and most of its recommendations reflected those of Warnock. The report concluded that special educational needs was a whole school responsibility and that the curriculum could in fact be a source of learning difficulty. This was a new and far reaching idea which emphasised for the first time that learning difficulties could reside within systems as opposed to individuals. All teachers were encouraged to rethink their educational philosophy and move away from a restrictive concept of 'remedial education' to one of 'supporting the learner' within the context of an appropriate curriculum. The keynote was change and the idea was that all children should be able to access an appropriate curriculum. In summary, the deficit model gave sway to a curricular model as a framework for understanding the concept of special educational needs and the most effective means of supporting individuals with learning difficulties. The HMI Report stressed throughout that "appropriate rather than remedial education is required" (p. 25).

### **Education (Scotland) Act, 1981**

Both Warnock and the HMI Report influenced subsequent legislation and in 1981 the Education (Scotland) Act took on board within the legislative framework the philosophy they advocated.

The philosophical objectives of the legislation were outlined in the research study undertaken for the SOEID (Thomson, Stewart & Ward, 1996) as follows:

#### **PHILOSOPHICAL OBJECTIVES**

- **minimising of the distinction within the education system between individuals with handicaps and others**
- **replacing of the system based upon statutory handicap by one which emphasises a profile of individual need**
- **increasing parental participation in decision-making**

The 1981 Act embraced the wider definition of special educational needs as advocated by Warnock. It supported concepts such as integration and established the Record of Needs (known as 'statementing' in England) as a vehicle for describing individual needs and indicated what an education authority was duty bound to do in order to meet these needs. The perspective was a positive one of fulfilling the rights of all children rather than a deficit view of trying to alleviate disability. "Every child has individual needs and schools must offer an appropriately differentiated curriculum to take account of these and a supportive climate in which the contribution of all children is of equal value" (Strathclyde Regional Council, 1992, p. 6). Gradually this philosophy was reflected across Scotland by all education authorities.

### **Education in Mainstream Schools**

Special educational needs was now considered to be part of a continuum of need and individuals had the right to effective support for learning within the context of an appropriate curriculum. The idea that all children had a right to be educated in mainstream schools began to be more widely accepted and the focus was now upon 'inclusion' rather than 'exclusion.' The concept of special educational needs has therefore been shaped and influenced by social, philosophical, political and historical factors. However the biggest single factor has been the increasing awareness among professionals of the different and changing needs of individuals.

Most children with special educational needs in Scotland are now educated in their local mainstream school. However the overriding concern is that educational provision should be suited to individual need. A great deal of educational debate is currently focused upon the individual's right to full mainstream inclusion (Booth, 1988; Hall, 1997). Hall, in particular, tends to use mainstreaming and inclusive education as one and the same thing and advocates that all learners, regardless of the nature or degree of disability, should be educated in the mainstream context.

However I would argue that inclusive education does not necessarily imply mainstreaming. It is about ensuring that all individuals are educated in contexts whereby their needs are accommodated and success is fostered for all. In relation to these learners previously labelled as 'mentally handicapped' or 'ineducable' the focus is no longer placed upon their individual deficiency or handicap but upon the barriers to learning they face. We now refer to these individuals as learners who experience severe or complex learning difficulties. Inclusive education is ultimately concerned with improving the quality of life for all learners including those who experience severe and complex difficulties and ensuring their needs are met in an appropriate context.

Professionals must therefore take care that they do not get too hung up upon the relative pros and cons of integration versus segregation. As Corbett (1997) says we must take care that we are not "sidetracked into an ideological battlefield" (p. 63) where meeting individual need can all too easily be lost in the relentless drive towards mainstream inclusion for all. It is crucial that we keep sight of our main concern which is to ensure that all learners access a curriculum appropriate to their needs – a curriculum which provides the same opportunity for all learners to be equally valued and to have their diverse learning needs catered for.

### **INCLUSIVE EDUCATION – RHETORIC AND REALITY**

In some respects Warnock simply redefined the system of categorisation and gradually in Scotland there emerged two categories of individuals with special needs. Those with a record of need (statement) became known as SEN (Recorded) and those without a record of need, SEN (Non-Recorded). This was a step in the right direction but there were still problems inherent within such a system. In particular, "There is danger that the Record of Needs may have become simply another label like imbecile or ineducable" (Solity, 1991).



Solity argues that there has in fact been little real change and all that has happened is that we have become more sophisticated in our use of labels. However labelling in itself is not necessarily pernicious, it may merely show that we are human. The danger comes when we equate labels with negative attitudes and low expectations which perpetuate the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure thus devaluing individuals and damaging self-esteem.

In general the process of recording in Scotland has benefitted learners. It has also encouraged professionals to focus upon individual needs and appreciate more fully that learning difficulties may be systems based and as much a product of inappropriate curriculum as factors intrinsic to the individual learner. The Warnock Report (1978) envisaged that around 20% of learners experienced difficulties in learning and at the time of the report, 18% of these were already being educated in mainstream schools in Scotland within mixed ability classrooms. It was felt that around 2% would require records of need and in 1978 almost 100% of this group were being educated in special schools outside the mainstream. However in the past few years the trend towards integration has grown dramatically. In 1995 there were 14,288 children with records of need in Scotland; 7745 were being educated in mainstream schools in inclusive contexts -- 3724 in Primary and 4021 in Secondary schools (SOEID statistics, 1996).

### **Individuals with Severe/Complex Learning Difficulties**

There is therefore a sizeable minority of children whose needs are deemed to be severe or complex who continue to be educated in contexts outside mainstream which are suited to their particular needs. This view conflicts with that expressed by educators such as Hall (1997) who suggests that segregation like this is “culturally deviant.” He suggests that it is morally wrong to separate a minority of our children for the duration of their educational careers. It could however be argued that such inclusionist theorists tend to take a fairly extreme stance and their view of inclusion could be considered to be both naive and restrictive. We should not be arguing for a full mainstream education for all but for an appropriate education where all are valued and equal opportunities are available to all, regardless of the learning context.

In the long term this Utopian ideal of mainstream inclusion for all may or may not be something professionals should strive to attain. However we live in the real world and in the short term we may in Scotland have come as far on the journey towards inclusion as is currently possible. It is fair to say that professionals in Scotland have made tremendous progress towards the principle of inclusive education within the mainstream context. However before we decide to take the next step

we must stop and ask ourselves some very serious questions in relation to the minority group of individuals who experience severe/complex learning difficulties and who are not yet included in mainstream settings.

### **INDIVIDUALS WITH SEVERE/COMPLEX LEARNING DIFFICULTIES: IMPORTANT QUESTIONS**

- **If provision relates to individual need is the mainstream the most appropriate learning environmental for all?**
- **Do we have the resources to effectively support all learners in the mainstream?**
- **What support will be available to teachers in mainstream schools to help them cater for the full range of diversity?**
- **To what extent are we motivated by the needs of learners as opposed to reacting to social, economic and political pressures?**
- **Is it possible to provide an appropriate curriculum accessible to all without reducing its breadth and balance?**

All too often those who undertake research in relation to inclusive education and theorise about it do not have to make it work in practice.

#### **Towards an Appropriate Curriculum**

We have many excellent teachers in our Scottish schools who have welcomed learners with special needs into their mainstream classrooms. These professionals are keen to provide appropriately differentiated learning experiences for all. However one only has to listen to these teachers to realise that many are finding it difficult to meet all of the challenges they currently face as they strive to create an ethos of attainment where the needs of all learners can be met effectively.

The majority of mainstream teachers in Scotland have now accepted that it is their responsibility to develop an appropriate curriculum for all and they do appreciate “that special educational needs arise from difficulties in learning or barriers to learning” (Education (Scotland) Act, 1981). They also realise that learning difficulties arise due to the mismatch between the delivery of the curriculum and pupil learning needs (EPSSEN, 1994). The fact that they now teach an increasing number of learners with records of need (statements) has helped them develop professionally and encouraged them to reflect upon and examine their own practice. Their ability to provide effective

learning experiences has also been enhanced as they work collaboratively with learning support teachers to develop an appropriate accessible curriculum.

Having said this however it is also important to accept that for learners who experience more severe/complex difficulties in learning the mainstream may not be the most appropriate context in which to meet their individual needs. They may be best served in a Special School which operates as a supportive community and structures an environment whereby the needs of learners are accommodated and success is fostered for all. In Scotland such schools have already developed a curriculum which both reflects and supports the concept of inclusive education in its widest sense.

It is true to say that considerable progress has been made in Scotland in relation to inclusive education. It would be foolish however to suggest that mainstream schools are currently at the stage when they could effectively deliver a meaningful curriculum for all. To say that all learners are entitled to an appropriate education does not imply that this should automatically be delivered in mainstream schools.

### **Appropriate Learning Context**

For those learners who experience severe/complex difficulties the mainstream may, in fact, be an inappropriate learning context. This does not mean they have no rights. All individuals have rights which must be addressed and children's rights are now high on the educational agenda in Scotland. Article 2 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child emphasised that rights apply to children without exception. This issue was taken up in the Children (Scotland) Act (1995) which made specific provision for children affected by disability or "in need." Additional duties were placed upon local authorities with regard to children and there is now a more effective forum for the child's voice to be heard.

Inclusion is about providing opportunity for all, meeting need and providing the highest quality of life possible. I have argued that for the majority this will probably occur in our mainstream schools but for the minority it may be more effectively delivered in a context outside the mainstream.

Ultimately professionals who wish to provide inclusive education must internalise the view that "all students are individuals and this diversity should be valued by providing opportunities for all" (SCCC, 1995, p. 3). Catering for diversity is at the heart of the curriculum and if achieved it will reduce stereotypical thinking and labelling.

Inclusive education is therefore about promoting individual rights through the process of curriculum entitlement and ensuring curricular access for all. Several authors have presented the case for entitlement (Ashdown, Carpenter & Bovair, 1991; Jordan & Powell, 1994). The concept of an appropriate curriculum which addresses individual needs has also been widely debated in the literature (Bovair, Carpenter & Upton, 1992; Sebba, Byers & Rose, 1995). However it is now broadly accepted that curriculum entitlement does not automatically enable curriculum access. As Carpenter and Ashdown say (Carpenter, Ashdown & Bovair, 1996), we now need to look at access -- "How do we enable all pupils to have access to a curriculum that is dynamic, coherent, meaningful and allows them to prepare themselves for the challenges of adulthood?".(p. 1)

## **ENABLING ACCESS**

### **National Guidelines**

In Scotland over the past decade or so there has been a gradual move towards modernising the curriculum. The 5-14 National Guidelines now provides the curricular framework which ensures a firm foundation for learning and pupil progress from the age of 5 to 14 years. The rationale underpinning these guidelines is set out in the consultative paper *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990's* (1990). From the outset the 5-14 programme was recognised as an inclusive programme which catered for the needs of all learners. It highlighted the need for "a common curricular framework ensuring appropriate education for all pupils" (SCCC, 1994).

These National Guidelines emphasised curriculum entitlement for all. However this did not automatically result in meeting individual needs. The professional challenge for schools and teachers was to design and deliver a curriculum which catered for a diverse range of needs. In relation to those learners who experienced severe/complex difficulties in learning, this was a particularly demanding task which required creative thinking and innovative approaches to curriculum planning and design.

The 5-14 framework is underpinned by five key principles -- breadth, balance, coherence, continuity and progression. All of the curriculum areas are covered, e.g. Language, Mathematics, Expressive Arts, Environmental Studies, Religious and Moral Education and Personal/Social Development. Each of these disciplines has been broken down into a number of attainment outcomes and these in turn are organised into levels from A-E which provide the targets learners should achieve from the age of 5 until 14 years. These targets are progressive and developmental.

### **Needs of Pupils with Severe/Complex Learning Difficulties**

Schools for learners with severe/complex learning difficulties share these aims and subscribe to the purposes and general approaches of the 5-14 programme. By adopting the 5-14 framework professionals working in these contexts can ensure learning experiences are planned and delivered within the context of a common curricular structure. They use a common curricular language and apply a common set of principles to planning, teaching, recording, reviewing and reporting. It is also essential to understand the needs of learners who experience severe/complex learning difficulties if we are to provide an appropriate curriculum. Needs vary in degree and complexity and are particular to each individual. These learners face barriers to learning which include “severe sensory and physical disabilities, significant levels of intellectual impairment, emotional and behavioural difficulties and the debilitating effects of drugs essential to support life and control seizures” (SCCC, 1994, Part 5, p.2).

I have argued that for these learners inclusive education means accessing a curriculum which values them as individuals and provides equal opportunities based upon their individual needs within an appropriate learning context. Professionals in Scotland who support this group of learners have explored ways of maximising the learners’ potential within the 5-14 framework. They have enhanced curricular provision in ways which are relevant to the needs of specific individuals and which are consistent with the general purposes of education for all. The five key principles of the 5-14 programme have been utilised. These are: Differentiation, Individualisation, Adaptation, Collaboration and Enhancement. The main strategy used in schools for learners who experience severe/complex difficulties in learning is elaboration. This strategy breaks down the curricular components and modifies them to take account of individual developmental needs. This does not constitute a separate curriculum. It is a planned elaboration which articulates smoothly within the 5-14 curriculum guidelines.

### **CONCLUSION**

The concept of special educational needs has evolved considerably over the past decade or so. In Scotland we no longer accept the deficit philosophy which traditionally underpinned this concept. The focus is now upon the curriculum with its potential to both exacerbate or alleviate learning difficulties. In particular we now recognise labels such as ‘mental handicap’ are discriminatory and unhelpful. The majority of learners with special needs are educated successfully within our

mainstream schools and the concept of inclusion is well understood and generally accepted. The fundamental principle guiding provision is that it should meet need. Thus it is recognised that for a sizeable minority of learners, mainly those who experience severe/complex difficulties, the mainstream is not necessarily the most appropriate learning context.

Inclusion does not automatically imply mainstreaming. It is about providing opportunity for all, valuing all learners and catering for diversity. Thus the barometer of success is how effective we are in meeting needs within a common curriculum framework which all are entitled to and which is accessible to all. In Scotland this has been achieved by ensuring the concept of special educational needs is central to all national curriculum development rather than peripheral as has traditionally been the case.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, F.J. (1990). *Special education in the 1990's*. Longman: Harlow.
- Ainscow, M. (1992). Becoming a reflective teacher. In T.Booth, W. Swann, M. Masterton, & P. Potts (Eds.), *Curricula for diversity in education*. London: Routledge.
- Ashdown, R., Carpenter, B., & Bovair, K. (1991). *The curriculum challenge: Access to the national curriculum for pupils with learning difficulties*. London: Falmer Press.
- Barton, L., & Tomlinson, S. (Eds.) . (1987). *Special education policy, practice and social issues*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Blythman, M. (1988). From the other side of the wall. In L.Barton (Ed.), *The politics of special educational needs*. London: Falmer Press.
- Booth, T. (1988). Challenging conceptions of integration. In L. Barton (Ed.), *The politics of special educational needs*. London: Falmer Press.
- Bovair, K., Carpenter, B., & Upton, G. (1992). *Special curricula needs*. London: Falmer Press.

Carpenter, B., & Ashdown, R. (1997). Enabling access. In B.Carpenter, R. Ashdown, & K.Bovair (Eds.), *Enabling access: Effective teaching and learning for pupils with learning difficulties*. London: David Fulton.

*Children (Scotland) Act* (1995). HMSO.

Corbett, J. (1997). Include/Exclude: Redefining boundaries. *Inclusive Education, 1* (1).

Dockrell, W.B., Dunn, W.R., & Milne, A. (Eds.) . (1978). *Special education in Scotland: Scottish council for research in education*. Edinburgh: Lindsay and Co.

*Education of Defective Children (Scotland) Act* (1907).

*Education (Scotland) Act* (1872).

*Education (Scotland) Act* (1945). Edinburgh: HMSO.

*Education (Mentally Handicapped Children) (Scotland) Act* (1974). Edinburgh: HMSO.

*Education (Scotland) Act* (1981). Edinburgh: HMSO.

Gilbert, C, & Hart, M. (1990). *Towards integration*. London: Kogan.

Hall, J.T. (1997). *Social devaluation and special education: The right to full mainstream inclusion*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Jordan, R.R., & Powell, S.D. (1994). Whose curriculum?: Critical notes on integration and entitlement. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 9* (1), 27-39.

*Lunacy (Scotland) Act* (1862).

Lunt, I., & Evans, J. (1994). Dilemmas in special educational needs: Some effects of local management of schools. In S. Riddell & S. Brown (Eds.), *Special educational needs policy in the 1990's*. London: Routledge.

Melville Committee Report (1973). *The training of staff for centres for the mentally handicapped.*

*Mental Deficiency (Scotland) Act (1913).*

Pearson, L., & Lindsay, G. (1986). *Special needs in the primary school.* London: Nelson.

Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (1994). *Special educational needs within the 5-14 curriculum: Support for learning.* Dundee: Author.

Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (1995). *Higher still: Provision for students with special educational needs.* Edinburgh: Author.

SOED, HM Inspectors of Schools (1978). *The education of pupils with learning difficulties in primary and secondary schools in Scotland.* Edinburgh: HMSO.

SOED (1990). *Curriculum and assessment in Scotland: A policy for the 1990's.* Edinburgh: HMSO.

SOED, HM Inspectors of Schools (1994). *Effective provision for special educational needs.* Edinburgh: HMSO.

Sebba, J., Byres, R., & Rose, R. (1995). *Redefining the whole curriculum for pupils with learning difficulties.* London: David Fulton.

Solity, J.E. (1991). Special needs: A discriminatory concept. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 7 (1).

*Special Education Treatment (Scotland) Act (1954).* Edinburgh: HMSO.

Strathclyde Regional Council, DfE (1992). *Every child is special: A policy for all.* Glasgow: Author.

Swann, W. (1988). Statements of intent: An assessment of reality. In T. Booth & W. Swann (Eds.), *Including pupils with disabilities.* Milton Keynes: OU Press.



Thomson, G.O.B. (1983). Legislation and provision for mentally handicapped children in Scotland since 1906. *Oxford Review of Education*, 9 (3).

Thomson, G.O.B., Stewart, M.E., & Ward, K.M. (1996). *Criteria for opening records of need* (Interchange No. 40, Research and Intelligence Unit). Edinburgh: SOEID.

*United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* (1990). Article 2 & Article 23.

Warnock, M. (1978). *Special educational needs: Report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people*. London: HMSO.