

apparently moved to support the integration of students with disabilities into regular classrooms (Cook & Lewis, in press), this may be too simplistic a reading of policy and practice. There is a veneer of intellectual response to current equity discourse and legislation. The veneer however is thin and those who are said to be included travel across thin ice. Discourse, procedures, and even sites, may change, but traditional ends are affected because of the resilience of ideologies of 'failure' and 'normality', and the established bureaucracies which sustain these understandings.

There have been a number of influential studies that have demonstrated the gaps between the language of policy statements and their manifest practice. Kemmis and Rizvi's Victorian State Board of Education commissioned study demonstrates the processes of policy interpretation and re-creation (1987), a point applied by Fulcher(1989) in her comparative analysis of integration to highlight the gulf between policy stated and policy enacted.

Marks(1992) has pursued the process of policy re-creation in the language and procedures (discursive practice) of Integration Support Groups as they jockey to manage school site agendas. A triangulation of the 'policy ensemble' (the context of influence; the context of policy text production; and the context of practice) has been posited by Bowe, Gold and Ball illustrating that, "The policy process is one of complexity, it is one of policy-making and remaking" (Bowe, Gold & Ball, 1992:23). Evaluation of policy and practice needs therefore to account for imperatives across a number of domains; geographical, professional, cultural-linguistic, economic and political. Similar imperatives influence the framing and practice of integration policy. My intention is simply to identify some of these and discuss contingent research implications. More important is the task of identifying and supporting emerging research initiatives that, by analyzing the policy contexts, are providing the basis for development of inclusive practice. This is profoundly different from adapted and adjusted special educational research. Which continues to command the competitive research pool in Australia.

Regulating the Flow - Who's In, Who's Out ?

Vigorous exchange about the most appropriate form for 'telling the story'(Clark, 1992), for constructing and recording history, was recently ignited amongst Australian education historians (Bessant, 1991). Whilst post-structuralist accounts veer away from the 'totalizing' theories applied to disentangle the complexity of history into linear progressions, most stories demonstrate the normative determination, surveillance, control, marginalisation and containment of human variation that we understand as disability (Foucault, 1968; Szasz,1972; Mercer, 1973; Kamin, 1974; Gould, 1984; Lewis, 1989). Oral histories enrich these accounts in detailing the personal impact and cost of segregative treatment (Campling, 1981; Potts & Fido, 1991; Humphries & Gordon, 1992).

Polemics aside, whatever method we determine for historiographic investigation, the picture looms bleak for those wearing disability labels. Where Foucault is particularly useful is in the location of the past within the present. This militates against the possibility of discontinuity, of detachment from a past which can be dismissed as an aberrant artefact never to be revisited. In his careful analysis of the genesis and expansion of special education in Victoria, Lewis (1989) demonstrates this continuity of power and the manipulation of integration policy through economic and professional imperatives.

Schooling remains a critical agent in defining, labelling and treating disability. Historical accounts are compelling in their depiction of the confused forces which spurned the development of a segregated educational provision. Confused because although anecdotally we are led to identify benevolence as the rod upon which special separate educational provision is perched, there have been a number of historical and political analyses which bring this interpretation into doubt (Tomlinson, 1982; Lewis 1989; Oliver, 1990; Hurt, 1988; Cole, 1989; Humphries & Gordon, 1992). A number of forces having little to do with education or benevolent humanitarianism drove the expansion of separate provision.

The army of unskilled vagrants, habitual inebriates, criminals and lunatics is largely recruited from the ranks of the mentally defective.... By discovering these social criminals before they have committed crime, society can take measures to prevent them ever committing it by means of permanent custodial care.

(Victorian Public Records Office, 1911, pp.1 & 2,
cited in Lewis, 1989)

The multi-layered impact of segregated educational provision can be illustrated in terms of the personal cost to those 'served' by special education as well as the impact on society generally. The research is convincing in its depiction of the deleterious effects of special education on academic and social progress (Gottlieb, 1981; Salend, 1984; Dessent, 1989; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Bennett, 1991). Bodna's(1987) research into the disproportionate transition from special educational to correctional institutions in Victoria compounds the need for a critical interrogation of special educational provision.

The costs extend beyond what Ford, Mongon and Whelan term the Invisible Disasters(1982). Knowledge and informed debate are additional casualties. Let me expand on this further. I had opportunity to witness the second reading of the Disability Discrimination Bill [Cognate Bill: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Legislation Amendment Bill 1992] in the Federal House of Representatives. To say that the level of the debate was uneven in its appreciation of the nature, implications and scope of disability issues would not be a misrepresentation.

While the member for O'Connor lamented the burgeoning power of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission and the legal profession as the floodgate of litigation was opened for deaf apprentice jockeys to issue writs against their trainers, the Member for Kalgoorlie was astounding in his blueprint for economic recovery through the advancement of services for those with `human disability':

I believe that these groups (sic the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission) and the social engineers which accompany them are doing enormous damage to the fabric of Australian society with no real gains.

.....The things we are doing today in this Bill work against the very thing that we all say we aspire to.

What we need to do in society is to make sure that people who have disabilities have every possible help. For example, prostheses should be available whenever they are needed. We should not stint on that at all. Australia could easily be at the forefront in the provision of this equipment. However, what has happened with kangaroo leather which is the lightest

leather in the world? When one talks about making orthopaedic shoes, there is nothing comparable with kangaroo leather; it is by far the best. But do we have a manufacturing industry in this country utilising this very valuable raw material - this renewable resource? The answer is: only to a very limited degree. Every attempt to do so is met with opposition.

(Mr. Campbell[Kalgoorlie] Hansard - H.O.R.,
Canberra, August 19, 1992, p.207)

One wonders which is worse, irrelevance or `compassion':

I have spent time with people with disabilities;
I have looked after them and cared for them,
particularly when I was in high school. In my
work with them I very much enjoyed their
personalities.

(Mr. Miles[Braddon] Hansard - H.O.R.,
Canberra, August 19, 1992, p.152)

Coming away from the Chamber I was bitter in my condemnation of our parliamentary representatives' lack of knowledge about disability issues and the consequent poverty of the debate. Further contemplation suggests

that they are indeed more than adequately fulfilling their role as representatives of the character and quality of disability discourse amongst their constituencies. The discourse of other groups reveals similar gaps and silences, reveals similar misunderstandings and ideologically constructed meanings for disability and non-disability.

Teachers are indicative. Lawrence(1989) argues that people lose their logic where disability is concerned. Anecdotal evidence may be admissible. A teacher in a graduate class, horrified by the practical implications of allowing the 'handicapped' into the regular class, declared that the outcome must surely be regular teachers having to preside over classes with 20 children requiring teacher assistance with their toileting. The teacher was reassured that the only scenario that would generate such an outcome would be the establishment of selective special schools for the bladder disabled!

Reported elsewhere(Slee, 1992a) is the incident where a teacher allowed a child to participate in the preparations for the school production, allowed the parents to make the costume, she even allowed the child to participate in the dress rehearsal. On the night of the performance, the parents were shocked as their child failed to appear on stage because the teacher kept her in protective custody at the side of the stage because she might be hurt if people stared at her because she looked different.

I have an undergraduate student who developed a degenerative eye disease toward the end of her primary schooling. Her parents decided to resist expert recommendations for a separate education program, because of her deteriorating vision, and sought her continuing integration in her school. A Guidance Officer applied an intelligence test to determine whether she could cope with remaining in the class she had always been a member of. Questionable practice? More questionable when we find out that the test was sight based.

Why does this continue? The failure to interrogate the assumptions upon which our expert practice is based is central(Skrtic, 1991). That the issues are construed as technical requiring expert consideration is the sustenance of segregative practice. I hasten to add that segregative practice occurs within the mainstream as well as on the margins(Biklen, 1987).

Integration as a Technical Debate: Experts & Resources

The embracing of a medical model, by special education, where learners' deficits are diagnosed, labelled and treatment is prescribed and delivered by experts outside of the classroom has been thoroughly researched and documented(Ford, Mongon & Whelan, 1982; Tomlinson, 1982; Barton & Tomlinson, 1984). Such a process of testing, diagnosis, prescription and remediation generates what Biklen, Ferguson and Ford(1989) call the myth of clinical judgement. The clinical judgements of special educators and psychologists have been observed by Gartner and Lipsky in a major study in the United States.

...when test results do not produce the desired outcome, evaluators often change the yardstick: 'If test scores indicate the child is ineligible, but the teacher feels the child needs help, we try to select other tests that might make the child eligible...'. The tests then become 'a means of corroborating referral decisions. Testing, therefore, does not drive decisions but is driven by decisions'.

(Gartner & Lipsky, 1987:372)

The point here is not to rehearse that research line further, but to consider the impact of that mode of service delivery upon teachers' current perceptions of integration.

In a recent discussion of labelling deviance and disability, Christensen (in press) identifies three problems associated with the assignation of disability or disabling labels:

1. The labels are negative in their depiction of deficits;
2. The labels become the defining characteristic of the person, denying their complex whole; and
3. The use of labels for identifying 'special educational needs' fails to properly locate failure in the education system.

This work is Corroborated by Biklen(1992).

There is another aspect of labelling that, together with the above mentioned, has enormous impact upon how we respond to integration initiatives. We must recognise that the application of the label has a deskilling effect on classroom teachers. This is not coincidental as special educators, psychologists and therapists have put enormous effort into defining and guarding their client groups(Rose, 1990). Where there exists a specialist service presided over by trained experts the teacher is deskilled, believing, often with some sense of relief, that they no longer have to put up with this particular category of child.

Tomlinson(1992) describes this process of client definition and servicing in the context of the 1988 Education Act in Britain. Ball, Gold & Bowe (1992) further consider the political economy of servicing special needs. In Australia we have documented the way in which the so-called 'socially emotionally disturbed' represent are the new sunrise industry in the special education market place(Slee, 1992b). This is driven by three factors:

1. Professionals' need for an expanding client base;
2. As school funding diminishes the opportunity to secure integration funding becomes irresistible; and

3. The crisis in the youth labour market has meant that more young people are staying on at school knowing that school is unable to deliver on the promise of work or higher education. In order to control alienation and resistance, schools then locate the problem within individual students with 'special needs' or 'behavioural problems' and refer them for alternative placement.

What all of this means is that when teachers are called upon to operationalize equity policy that includes integration, they quite predictably believe that they are only able to pursue this with extra resources, specialist help and physical aids. The problem is technocratic rather than educational. The debate then locks into resource disputes (Fulcher, 1987).

No more clearly is this represented than in the emerging Queensland approach to integration policy. Guidance Officers are being called upon to complete ascertainment schedules for children whom the teacher believes have special needs. The criteria for defining need is established according to children's characteristics based on test results. The child is given a rating and the school requests resources according to a centrally formulated schedule of entitlement.

This is problematic in conception and practice. First there is the assumption that difficulties in learning are located exclusively in the child. It may well be argued that schools and teachers also be requested to submit to ascertainment and the quotient be determined on a calculation which takes all three factors into account. This, however begs the question concerning the reliability of test data.

Secondly, there seems a certain immutability about the ascertainment result. When does the child cease to be a level 4 or level 2? The problem of dossiers and the impact they have on teacher expectations is established in the research (Good & Brophy, 1984). At a conference in Australia earlier this year *Integration: Towards a National Perspective*, one education department described its attempt to get rid of the damaging effects of labels by just having two categories of students: group A and Group B!

The intention here is not to deny the importance of resource issues to deliver an enabling education for all children. The point is to move towards an appreciation of the complexity of resourcing inclusivity. The question demands more than struggling to tie more resources to individual children. It would seem apposite that consideration be given to how schools can be resourced so that they can better respond to difference in all comers.

Coinciding with a State election, an audit of integration was commissioned by the Auditor General's Department in Victoria in 1992. This attracted

much media and political interest. One is hard pressed to find the results of a correspondingly thorough audit of special educational service delivery in that State. Two explanations may be possible. First, integration is considered as extra rather than a right to which the State is obliged to respond. Second, there is an assumption that because specialists know what they are doing, then the service delivery will be both efficient and effective. The jury is still out on both the efficiency and effectiveness of special education.

Integration as Inclusive Pedagogy, Curriculum and School Organisation.

There was an attempt to reframe the integration debate in Victoria as part of a State-wide review of policy implementation (Fulcher, Semmens & Slee, unpublished). The results of the investigations within that project indicated that while the focus of teachers, school administrators, Ministry of Education consultants and the media was leveled on experts and resources, the successful inclusion of all students in a regular education setting was contingent on a range of factors.

In this context we now return to Skrtic's(1991) call for schools to become 'ad hoc' so that they can respond to difference in more appropriate ways. Schools in rural settings have demonstrated this capacity to meet different contingencies through local planning and action as they are unable to refer and defer to experts as often as their urban colleagues (Slee, 1991).

Ainscow(1991) explores the way in which teachers can be encouraged to engage in reflective practice to expand their pedagogical repertoire to provide variety in instruction to include all learners. Slavin(1983) and Hart(1992) identify co-operative learning approaches pursuant to more inclusive schooling. Semmens(1992) provides a model for teacher education which places integration within the context of training for a general teacher education as opposed to continuing to direct this responsibility to Faculties of Special Education and maintaining marginal identity.

Curriculum development which responds to diversity has been considered at length by numerous researchers. Recently, the work of Booth, Swann, Masterton and Potts(1992) and Knight(1992) has application for professional development and pre-service education in the curriculum area. Ramasut (1989), Cook, Lewis & Sword(unpublished report), Corbett(1992) & Slee(1992) each consider organisational implications and initiatives for more inclusive schooling.

These approaches are qualitatively different in their commencement from assumptions based on the right of all children to inclusion in the regular school. Special educational research in Australia has not yet addressed the issue of critical reflection upon its foundation assumptions.

Presently its interest is in extending its research interest and practice into regular education as its client base continues to shift.

Moving beyond debating integration as a technical issue implies a reconsideration of our notion of whom schools are for. Ethical and political questions loom. Knowing that the Federal Disability Discrimination legislation has passed through the Senate, may help us to clarify these issues in terms of practice. We still have some distance to travel in terms of attitudes and beliefs. This will no doubt be a long term benefit of inclusive schooling, the dispelling of myths and ignorance on both sides of the school desk.

Facilitating these kinds of shifts requires a discussion which transcends the location of resources. Pedagogy, curriculum, an alternative model for calling on expertise, school organisation, and teacher education need to be starred on our research agenda.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M.[ed](1991) *Effective Schools For All*. London, David Fulton Publishers.

Ball, S., Bowe, R. & Gold, A. (1992) 'Special Educational Needs, in a New Context: Micropolitics, Money and Education For All', in Slee, R. [ed] *The Politics of Integration*. London, The Falmer Press.

Barton, L.[ed](1987) *The Politics of Special Educational Needs*. Lewes, The Falmer Press.

Barton, L. & Tomlinson, S.{eds} (1984) *Special Education and Social Interest*. London, Croom Helm.

Bennett, N.(1991) 'The Quality of Classroom Learning Experiences for Children with Special Educational Needs', in Ainscow, M. [ed] *Effective Schools For All*. London, David Fulton Publishers.

Bessant, B. (1991) 'Progress' and Revision in the History of Education in the 1980s', *Discourse*, Vol.11, No.2, pp.67-84.

Biklen, D. (1987) *Achieving the Complete School*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Biklen, D., Ferguson, D. & Ford, A.(eds.)(1989) *Schooling and Disability*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Biklen, D. (1992) *Schooling Without Labels*. New York, Temple University Press.

Bodna, B. (1987) 'People with Intellectual Disability and the Criminal Justice System', in Challinger, D. [ed] *Intellectually Disabled Offenders*.

Canberra, Australian Institute of Criminology.

Booth, T., Swann, W., Masterton, M. & Potts, P. (1992) Learning For All 1: Curricula for Diversity in Education. London, Routledge.

Bowe, R., Gold, A. & Ball, S. (1992) Reforming Education & Changing Schools. London, Routledge.

Campling, J. (1981) Images of Ourselves: Women with Disabilities Talking. London, Routledge.

Christensen, C. (in press) 'Deviant, Disabled or Different: The Politics of Labelling', Australian Disability Review, Number 3, September.

Clark, M. (1992) A Historian's Apprenticeship. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

Cole, T. (1989) Apart or A Part?: Integration and the Growth of British Special Education. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Cook, S. & Lewis, J. (in press) Integration: Towards a National Perspective. Bundoora, RMIT Press.

Cook, S., Lewis, J. & Sword, B. (unpublished report) 'The First Five Years Of Integration Policy In Victoria', Report commissioned by SCAEPID, Ministry of Education Victoria, April 1989.

Corbett, J. (1992) 'Totally impractical!: integrating 'special care' within a special school', in Booth, T. et al [eds] Learning For All 1: Curricula for Diversity in Education. London, Routledge.

Dessent, T. (1989) 'The paradox of the special school', in Baker, D. & Bovair, K. (eds) Making the Special Schools Ordinary?, Vol. 1., London, The Falmer Press.

Ford, J., Mongon, D. & Whelan, T. (1982) Invisible Disasters: Special Education and Social Control. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1968) Madness and Civilization. London, Tavistock.

Fulcher, G. (1987) 'Bureaucracy takes round seven: round eight to commonsense?', The Age, April 14.

Fulcher, G. (1989) Disabling Policies. Lewes, The Falmer Press.

Gartner, A. & Lipsky, D.K. (1987) 'Beyond Special Education: toward a quality system for all students', Harvard Educational Review, 57, 43:367-395.

- Good, T. & Brophy, J.(1984) Looking In Classrooms. New York, Harper & Row.
- Gottlieb, J.(1981)`Mainstreaming: Fulfilling the promise?', American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86, 115-126.
- Gould, S. J. (1984) The Mismeasure of Man. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Hart, S.(1992)`Evaluating support teaching', in Booth, T. et al(eds) Learning For All 1: Curricula for Diversity in Education. London, Routledge.
- Higgins, P.C. (1992) Making Disability: Exploring the Social Transformation of Human Variation. Springfield, Charles C. Thomas Publishers.
- Humphries, S. & Gordon, P. (1992) Out of Sight: The Experience of Disability 1900 - 1950. Plymouth, Northcote House.
- Hurt, J. (1988) Outside the Mainstream: A History of Special Education. London, Batsford.
- Kamin, L. (1974)The Science and Politics of I.Q. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Kemmis, S. & Rizvi, F. (1987) Dilemmas of Reform. Geelong, Deakin Institute for Studies in Education.
- Knight, T. (1992)`Integrating the secondary school curriculum: Balancing central and local policies', in Slee, R. [ed] The Politics of Integration. London, The Falmer Press.
- Lawrence, A. [ed](1989)I Always Wanted to be a Tap Dancer. Women with Disabilities. Sydney, NSW Women's Advisory Council.
- Lewis, J.(1988)`Removing the Grit: the development of special education in Victoria 1887-1947', PhD Thesis, LaTrobe University, Bundoora.
- Marks, G. (1992) `Contests in Decision Making at the School Level', in Slee, R. (ed) The Politics of Integration. London, The Falmer Press.
- McCallum, D. (1990) The Social Production of Merit: Education, psychology and politics in Australia 1900 - 1950. London, The Falmer Press.
- Meadmore, D. (1992) `Divide and Rule: A Study of Two Dividing Practices in Queensland Schools', in Slee, R.(ed) The Politics of Integration. London, The Falmer Press.
- Mercer, J. (1973) Labelling the Mentally Retarded. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Oliver, M. (1990) The Politics of Disablement. London, Macmillan.

Potts, P. & Fido, R. (1991) A Fit Person To Be Removed: Personal Accounts of Life in a Mental Deficiency Institution. Plymouth, Northcote House.

Ramasut, A.(1989)Whole School Approaches to Special Needs.Lewes, The Falmer Press.

Rose, N. (1990)Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self. London, Routledge.

Salend, S.(1984)`Factors contributing to the development of successful mainstreaming programs', Exceptional Children, 50, 409-415.

Semmens, R.(1992)`Implementing Policy: some struggles and triumphs', in Slee, R. [ed]The Politics of Integration. London, The Falmer Press.

Skrtic, T. (1991) `The Special Education Paradox: Equity as the Way to Excellence', Harvard Educational Review, Vol.61, No.2, pp.148-206.

Slavin, R. (1983)Co-operative Learning. New York, Longman.

Slee, R. (1991)`Successful Learning Initiatives to Include All Students in the Regular Classroom', in Ainscow, M.(ed) Effective Schools For All. London, David Fulton.

Slee, R. [ed](1992a) The Politics of Integration. London, The Falmer Press.

Slee, R.[ed] (1992b)Discipline in Australian Public Education. Hawthorn, A.C.E.R.

Szasz, T. S. (1972) The Myth of Mental Illness. London, Paladin.

Tomlinson, S. (1982) A Sociology of Special Education. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Tomlinson, S. (1992) `Conflicts and dilemmas for professionals in special education', paper presented at Social Justice, Equity and Dilemmas of Disability and Education, Conference held in Brisbane, August 11 & 12.

R.

Szasz, T. S. (1972) $\text{E}^{\phi} \text{S}^{\pm}$

\emptyset

