

A STUDY ON MAKING SPECIAL SCHOOLS ORDINARY

Author

Biharilal, Lecturer, Dept., of Education, Patna University

In the early 1990s special schools for students with intellectual disability in South Australia were encouraged to use the same basic secondary curriculum frameworks used by mainstream schools, adapting the various subjects as necessary for their senior students. The same assessment and reporting procedures were also to be used. This article reports the perceptions of 53 special school principals and teachers who, after seven years of implementation, were asked to identify the benefits and the disadvantages of using this approach. Results indicated some perceived benefits for students with mild degrees of intellectual disability (and their teachers), but little or no benefit for those with moderate, severe or multiple handicaps. The findings raise the issue of whether principles of social justice and equity in education, if taken to extremes, actually militate against the best interests of the most handicapped students.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s it became popular in some countries (e.g. Britain, Australia, USA) to talk about making ordinary schools special in the sense of becoming better able to meet the needs of all children. At the same time it was argued that existing special schools should become more ordinary in the sense of becoming as much like mainstream schools as possible in their management style, curriculum, teaching approaches, and the assessment of students' learning (Baker & Bovair, 1989; Baker & Bovair, 1990; Dessent, 1987). The rationale for these moves was based on notions of social justice, anti-discrimination, and equity. It was argued that all students have an equal right to experience a broad and enriching curriculum, while at the same time having their individual needs adequately met.

The 1990s have seen the first of these concepts moving slowly but steadily toward fruition in many countries through the inclusive schooling movement (e.g. Daniels & Garner, 1999; Lipsky & Gartner, 1998). This article deals with the second concept that of making special schools more ordinary. On this topic there is very little extant literature. The context of the study: South Australia The study reported here is based on data collected in 1997 in one state of Australia, (South Australia) where for more than twenty years strong government policies of social justice, anti-discrimination and equity have had significant influence on the educational provision for students with special educational needs. South Australia was one of the first states to embrace integration in the early 1970s, and is currently prominent among Australian states actively implementing inclusive practices in schools. At the same time, it is a state that retains (and intends to retain) a number of segregated special schools designed to meet the needs of those students who cannot cope with the physical and academic demands of mainstream schooling, even when given additional support.

The changing nature of the special school population

Given the growing movement toward integration and inclusion of children with disabilities in South Australia, it is natural that the nature of the population of students remaining in special schools has changed in recent years. For example, in the case of students with intellectual disability, the students who are mildly disabled, together with a few of the younger moderately disabled children, are now integrated with support in regular schools. This has left the more severely disabled and dependent students to form the majority population in the special schools. Some of these very dependent students have multiple disabilities and some exhibit extremely challenging behaviors such as aggression and self-mutilation. The focus of the special school curriculum therefore had to change, with even more emphasis than before being given to the teaching of skills for self-care, daily-living, communication, and socialization. Behavior management also emerged as a growing concern for teachers.

Outside pressures on special school curriculum

During the 1970s and 1980s in South Australia, special schools for students with disabilities had developed very effective and relevant reality-based and community-based curricula, with due attention given to the provision of training and experiences to help each individual prepare for an independent life (Casey, 1994). In the senior years, for example, emphasis was given to work-experience, community-based learning, social skills development, daily living skills, and the acquisition of recreation and leisure interests. This situation changed from 1990 due to pressure from the Education Department to encourage senior special schools to offer students with intellectual disability equal access to secondary school subjects within what is called the South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE).

At a time when the nature of the special school population was changing quite significantly in South Australia, coincidentally the policies of social justice and equity began to cause some educators and administrators to call for a re-appraisal of the curriculum taught in special schools. It was argued for the first time that these students, regardless of their degree of disability, were entitled to receive a broad, balanced and enriching programme, as similar as possible to that enjoyed by their non-disabled peers in mainstream schools. Traditionally this had not been seen as the role of the special school. The freedom to offer something entirely different had been seen as perhaps the greatest strength of a special school. These schools in the past had had the opportunity to develop truly alternative curricula and to apply innovative teaching practices to match their students' aptitudes and learning characteristics (Hallahan, 1998; Lewis, 1999). In this respect, a special school could be regarded as an alternative school; and according to Goodman and Kuzmic (1997) alternative schools in most education systems are usually free from the constraints placed upon regular schools in terms of a prescribed curriculum and examinations.

The South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE)

The South Australian Certificate of Education is the basic credential that all secondary school students hope to obtain when they leave school to signify a successful completion of their studies. Within SACE, the subjects of English (or English as a Second Language), Mathematics, and Australian Studies are compulsory. A writing-based literacy assessment is also compulsory, and no student can be awarded SACE if the literacy requirement is not met. To be awarded the Certificate students must study 22 semester units, some of which may be combined into full-year courses, reach a level of successful achievement in at least 16 out of the 22 units, and satisfy the literacy assessment. Each SACE unit usually represents between 50 to 60 hours of programmed school time. Most mainstream students complete SACE within a two-year period.

From the perspective of the individual school, each unit available for SACE is described by the examination board within a document called an Extended Subject Framework (ESF). The ESF indicates the general goals and objectives for the unit, but schools are left to plan in detail the types of learning experiences and the actual curriculum content to use to achieve the goals. There is thus considerable flexibility in how schools can actually implement a particular unit. Teachers, usually working collaboratively, take each ESF and develop it as a fully detailed program of work for their own school. This program is then submitted to the examination board for accreditation.

An individual student's achievements in SACE are reported as Successful Achievement (for those passing at or above the required standard), Recorded achievement (for those undertaking a subject but not quite meeting the standard), and Requirements not met (a euphemism for failed). On completion of the course each student is issued with this Statement of Results. It was argued that the principles of the Equal Opportunities Act of 1984 point to the right of every student, regardless of ability or disability, to participate in units of work and programs developed under the SACE framework (Wallace, 1993). Any failure to provide such an opportunity for students with intellectual disability could be regarded as discriminatory.

Initial reactions from principals and teachers

Staff of special schools for intellectually disabled students were not easily persuaded to believe that

SACE, a mainstream school curriculum and assessment model, would suit their students' needs and abilities. The fact that special school teachers would be expected to teach to the SACE framework became a contentious issue. Some teachers and principals expressed deep concern that students with moderate to severe handicaps could never be expected to achieve the standard required to complete SACE subjects successfully (Department of Education and Children's Services, 1993). Others expressed concern that if students with intellectual disabilities were awarded SACE this could be perceived as a token gesture, ultimately devaluing the Certificate in the eyes of mainstream students and the community. Another common concern was that no student with intellectual disability was ever likely to pass the compulsory writing-based literacy assessment, so it would be impossible actually to gain the Certificate even though participation in parts of the program could be recorded.

The issue entered the public arena in 1993 when the Shadow Minister for Education at that time remarked:

Some special school principals have described the policy paper entitled Framework for Post Compulsory Schooling for Students with Disabilities as inclusivity gone mad. They question how profoundly intellectually disabled students, some of whom are not even toilet trained, can be expected to study Year 11 curriculum simply because the Department wants to give all students access to SACE. (Lucas, 1993, p.1). The same Media Release also described the proposal as an example of Education Department social policy gone haywire, with special school students the reluctant victims.

In 1993 further serious concerns regarding the relevance of SACE for students with a significant intellectual disability or with severe multiple disabilities were conveyed to the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) in a written submission from experienced teachers working in the special schools (McKerral & Bickley, 1993). The material in the submission represented not only their own views but also those of staff in eleven other special schools. The concerns included, inter alia, that the intellectual demands of the content to be covered under many of the subject areas in SACE (no matter how extensively adapted) was far beyond the cognitive level of students with intellectual disability. For example, most subject areas assume the presence of basic oral communication, literacy and numeracy skills, the ability to deal with issues at a conceptual level, the capacity to learn quickly, and the ability to generalize. These are relatively unrealistic expectations for most students with moderate to severe intellectual impairment.

It was also reported that attempting to implement SACE subjects for these students seriously reduced the flexibility of the entire special school program and of the teaching procedures these students require. The more fixed nature of a SACE subject made it much more difficult to adapt instruction to meet the students' individual needs (McKerral & Bickley, 1993). In particular, it was observed that typical SACE lesson formats did not allow adequate opportunity for the degree of repetition and over learning of information and skills normally required by students with intellectual disability.

Contributors to the submission also made it clear that the time taken to teach formal SACE subjects significantly reduced the time available to teach important daily living skills to students with high support needs. While some advocates for SACE claimed that everything the student needs to learn can be incorporated within SACE subjects, others indicated that it is difficult to understand how some of the most basic and essential self-care, therapy and hygiene practices necessary for these students can be taught with the required frequency and intensity unless specific time is devoted to them.

Assessment and reporting

The assessment and reporting procedures of SACE also came in for harsh criticism (McKerral & Bickley, 1993; Lasscock, 1996; Lasscock 1998). Assessment tasks that are fixed in terms of time, content and standards commonly led students with intellectual disability to receive a failure grade (requirements not met). On the other hand, assessment tasks in which the demands had been greatly diluted, or in which huge amounts of assistance had been provided for the student, led to students receiving the result of Recorded achievement. In their case this really represented a false, inflated and misleading description of

what the students can actually do.

Through his contact with parents of students with intellectual disability, Lasscock (1996) became aware of the negative impact that these Statements of Results could have. His voice was added to those expressing serious doubts about the value of attempting to make special schools ordinary through the imposition of mainstream-type curricula, assessment, and reporting systems. His principal objections were that the Statement of Results did not describe what the student could actually do or the real progress he or she had made over the years. The statement merely indicated what the student had participated in and had failed. The information provided was virtually useless for potential employers, and utterly depressing for parents. In terms of the student's self-esteem and confidence, a final graduation paper containing a list of failures could be extremely damaging. Some educators in favor It should not be inferred that all special school teachers and principals were negatively disposed toward SACE. Some found much value in the way that the development of units under the Extended Subject Frameworks caused teachers to think constructively about their teaching and assessment methods (e.g. Bourdon & Waters, 1995). This was particularly the case with teachers and co-coordinators in units and centers where students with less severe degrees of intellectual impairment were enrolled. The negativity concerning the introduction of SACE in special schools appeared to be related most obviously to its lack of relevance for students with the greatest degree of cognitive impairment. The Department of Education and Children's Services (1993) acknowledged that some special schools were reticent to apply SACE, but confidently expressed the view that this problem would resolve itself over time as the teachers gained experience.

A survey of teachers' and principals' perceptions:

Some seven years after the initial introduction of SACE in special schools and special units in South Australia it was felt to be important to discover whether the attitude of teachers toward SACE had indeed become more positive, as the Department of Education and Children's Services (1993) predicted. The following study reports an attempt to appraise the perceptions of teachers and principals in South Australia's special schools for students with intellectual disability. The teachers and principals were to be asked to comment on the benefits and the disadvantages of applying SACE courses in special schools.

Method

Approval was granted by the South Australian Department of Education and Children's Services, the Catholic Education Office, and the Independent Schools Board for the researcher to contact staff in special schools, special units and centers, seeking information. It was decided that the simplest method for data collection was by means of an open-ended questionnaire.

The questionnaire

Seven open-ended questions were asked in the questionnaire. This paper deals with only the first three key questions. The remaining questions related to issues concerning teachers' programming and how they reported student progress.

The three questionnaire items considered here are:

Please list the benefits of using the Extended Subject Frameworks of SACE for students with intellectual disabilities.

Please list any disadvantages in using the Extended Subject Frameworks of SACE for students with intellectual disabilities. Please suggest any actions or changes needed to improve the application of SACE in special schools.

Schools and participants

Initially, telephone contact was made with the principals of all 17 government special schools, the co-coordinators of 3 special education units attached to secondary schools, and with the principals of 7 non-government schools and units. During this telephone contact, the purpose of the study was explained and an invitation to participate was extended to the principal and staff. Eventually 26 out of the 27 schools or centers agreed to participate. An indication of how many questionnaires would be required by each school was also obtained at this time.

As a result of the contact with principals, 87 questionnaires were sent to government schools and 25 to non-government schools, centers, or units. The return response rate was 49.4% for government schools and 40.0% for non-government schools (overall response rate: 47.3%). Of the 53 questionnaires returned, 31 were from special school teachers, 12 were from principals, deputy principals or co-ordinators, 6 were from teachers in units attached to secondary schools, and 4 were from mainstream teachers who taught SACE subjects to students with intellectual disability enrolled in special education units.

Analysis of data

The information presented in the 53 questionnaires and in the supplementary material submitted by some respondents, was read and recorded. Responses to each question were analyzed to determine any common themes or issues emerging. In particular, the frequency of occurrence of specific words or phrases used by respondents was noted as a first step in categorizing the information. Finally, the theme of the responses in each of the categories was captured by a general statement which appeared to encapsulate the essence of that particular point (see Table 1 and Table 2). Frequency counts were then used to indicate the relative importance of each theme or category.

Limitations of the study

As with all studies requiring the analysis of descriptive rather than quantitative data, there is an inevitable degree of subjectivity in the way in which responses to open-ended questions are finally analyzed and classified (Holbrook & Butcher, 1996; Macpherson, 1998). Every possible attempt was made by the investigator to treat the data objectively, but this weakness is fully acknowledged. The number of respondents is not large in this study (n = 53). Since this group comprises only 47% of the subjects to whom questionnaires were sent, it would be inappropriate to assume that the results are fully representative of all special school staff in South Australia. Caution is needed therefore in generalizing beyond the results described below for this sample of special school staff.

Results

Benefits of using SACE in Special Schools

Table 1 summarizes the pattern of responses obtained for question 1. The categories of emerged. The teachers were asked to list the benefits they had perceived in the use of SACE subjects in special schools and units for students with intellectual disability.

Table 1.
 Benefits of using SACE in Special Schools (N= 53 respondents)

Benefit	Times mentione
SACE framework helps teachers with programming	19 (35.8%)
SACE has broadened the curriculum offered in the school (24.5%)	13
Using SACE has helped to link special and mainstream schools	7 (13.2%)
The procedures in SACE have made teachers more accountable	5 (9.4%)
The assessment process has improved (now outcomes-based)	5 (9.4%)
SACE helps with continuity if a student transfers from school	4 (7.5%)
SACE has given staff and students a sense of purpose	4 (7.5%)
The work has increased motivation level of some students	4 (7.5%)
The framework is flexible enough to meet special needs	3 (5.7%)
SACE causes teachers to analyze how and what they teach	2 (3.8%)
Using SACE makes the special school program 'legitimate'	2 (3.8%)
The system has improved the school's record keeping	2 (3.8%)
Students are more involved in their own learning	1 (1.9%)
Teachers' strengths in curriculum can be fully utilized	1 (1.9%)
Literacy and numeracy skills can be integrated	1 (1.9%)

Teaching SACE improves the status of special school teachers	1 (1.9%)
Parents at our unit are mainly supportive of SACE	1 (1.9%)
No response to this question	14 (26.4%)
Specific comments that there were 'no benefits'	8 (15.1%)
Total positive comments under 'benefits'	75

Note: The figures in parenthesis in the right-hand column refer to the percentage of the 53 respondents making a comment that fell within each specified category. As some respondents made several comments falling into different categories (and some respondents made no comment, or made negative comment) the percentages will not total to 100%.

Two main benefits are perceived by principals and teachers to have resulted from the use of SACE in special schools, particularly with mildly disabled students. The first is improving the way in which teachers plan work for their students (35.8% of respondents). Comments concerning improved assessment (9.4%), recording methods (3.8%), and better analysis of teaching and learning (3.8%) are also closely related to the same theme. If these categories are combined, it would appear that using the Extended Subject Framework documents for each subject area may have given the special school teachers some useful guidelines for curriculum planning, teaching and assessment. Approximately 53% of the responses supported this view. The majority of respondents recording these positive benefits were working with students in the mild range of intellectual disability. The second benefit reported was a broadening of the curriculum traditionally offered in special schools. This belief was supported by the comments of approximately 25% of respondents. A third but weaker issue was a belief that applying SACE had brought mainstream and special education closer together (13.2%). This feeling was reported mainly by staff in units already attached to mainstream schools. Some mainstream teachers actually taught SACE subjects to the students in these special units.

It is important to point out that for this first question 15% of respondents specifically commented that no benefits had occurred as a result of introducing SACE in their own special schools; and a further 26 % of respondents made no comment at all under this item.

Disadvantages of using SACE in Special Schools

Table 2 (see next page) summarizes the responses from the second item in the questionnaire. Teachers and principals were asked to indicate the disadvantages they had encountered in attempting to apply SACE units in special school contexts.

What is most evident when Table 1 and Table 2 are compared is that many more responses were made under the disadvantages category ($n = 121$) compared with the responses under benefits ($n = 75$). A null hypothesis would suggest that there should be no reason to expect significantly more negative than positive responses. The Binomial Test (Siegel, 1956) produced a statistically significant z value of -3.21 ($p = .001$, two-tailed test). Clearly a difference of that magnitude indicated that respondents were tending to be far more negative than they were positive about the value of SACE in the special school curriculum.

The main conclusion of teachers and principals appears to be that, regardless of the views of the policy-makers, studying SACE subjects is irrelevant for many of their students. This is perceived to be particularly the case for students with severe degrees of disability. Coupled with the issue of lack of relevance is the evidence that most students do not remember the core content of subjects they have studied within the SCAE units, partly due to their level of cognitive functioning and partly because there is inadequate time available to over learn the essential knowledge and skills.

The issue of time emerged as an important factor in several ways in the comments made by school staff. Time was thought to be inadequate to cover the work thoroughly with the students. Teaching time devoted to SACE was reported to erode the available time for other important areas of the special school curriculum. Too much time was believed to be spent in paperwork related to writing and adapting

programmes and reporting.

Some particular concern was expressed regarding the compulsory subjects (English, Mathematics, and Australian Studies). It was felt that these subjects are extremely difficult to adapt suitably for students with intellectual disability. They were also the subjects requiring adequate levels of literacy and numeracy, --- skills which most of the special school students did not possess.

Table 2.
 Disadvantages of using SACE in Special Schools (N= 53 respondents)

<u>Disadvantages</u>	<u>Times mentioned</u>
SACE not relevant for students with intellectual disability	36 (67.9%)
does no meet students' needs,	n = 16
content not relevant,	n = 7
students lack prerequisite skills,	n = 6
especially irrelevant for severely disabled students,	n = 4
demands too much higher-order thinking,	n = 3
Too much teaching time taken up by paperwork	15 (28.3%)
Time is eroded from other aspects of the curriculum	13 (24.5%)
Not enough time for daily living skills instruction,	n = 6
Special IEPs difficult to include,	n = 3
Art/craft/tech studies time reduced,	n = 2
Loss of important time for social skills,	n = 1
Other,	n = 1
Students do not remember what they have studied	11(20.8%)
Lack of recall,	n = 7
Too little time to practise and overlearn,	n = 4
Too little time and no flexibility	8 (15.1%)
Assessment procedures inappropriate	8 (15.1%)
Core subjects are too difficult to modify	7 (13.2%)
Adapting SACE subjects is an artificial (token) process	6 (11.3%)
Students have to be helped too much by teacher	5 (9.4%)
Teachers have to teach too many different subjects	3 (5.7%)
Difficult to organise with only 1 or 2 students involved	2 (3.8%)
Other comments:	7 (13.2%)
Undermines the credibility of mainstream SACE,	n = 1
SACE doesn't help to get student a job,	n = 1
The report is a meaningless piece of paper,	n = 1
Tension between function curriculum vs. SACE,	n = 1
Forces some students to leave school early,	n = 1
It is a PR exercise,	n = 1
Students can't pass literacy component, so what is the point,	n = 1
No response to this question	4 (7.5%)

To Improving SACE in special schools

In a separate question, respondents were asked to indicate how the application of SACE could be improved in special schools. In reply, 24 (45.3%) of the 53 respondents said that SACE should be abolished. An additional 15% suggested that doing or not doing SACE should be entirely optional, rather than mandatory, and that parents should be allowed to choose whether or not their child participated.

There was a feeling that only students with at least some potential to succeed with the subject matter should be enrolled. Other changes that were suggested included allowing the students much more time to cover the courses, removing the compulsory literacy requirement, providing teachers with classroom release time to plan work and make resources, and encouraging the examination board to approve life-skills type programmes for assessment purposes.

A sample of comments from teachers and principals

The selected comments below were typical of those made by teachers and principals in response to the open-ended questions.

Positive views

This is the fourth year we are running the SACE program and at the end of the year our students will obtain the compulsory 16 units for the first time. Looking back, I believe SACE changed people's attitude towards educating students with an intellectual disability. (Staff of a special unit for mildly handicapped students in a mainstream school)

I still feel positive about SACE. It has made staff more accountable and open to a variety of subjects and teaching and learning that they weren't previously. (Teacher in a special school)

SACE offers a framework on which a basic curriculum can be offered and monitored for all students. (Special school principal)

I found SACE a good framework for students, teachers and parents. I also found that if some areas don't work well this could be modified. (Teacher)

It has put fun, challenge, new knowledge and diversity into the learning of intellectually disabled students. Hooray! Even if we do have to work harder as teachers. (Teacher in special unit)

Negative views

For the majority of our [intellectually disabled] students SACE has been a hindrance to their development. (Teacher from special school)

What benefit is it to a student to receive a certificate stating that they have participated if the work isn't appropriate to their needs and ability levels? (Principal of special school)

Students with severe and multiple disabilities are rather disadvantaged by the SCAE program--- their developmental level is low and their cognition is also poor. These students need to be exempt from SACE and have a more sensory program in place. (Teacher from special school)

Our students are in special schools because they could not cope with education offered in normal schools. We must ensure that we offer a special education to meet their needs by providing tools and experience to assist them in achieving long-term personal goals. (Principal in special school)

The assessment is disturbing. None of our students achieve higher than an RA (Recorded Achievement). Their physical or intellectual disability does not allow them to do so. (Teacher in special school)

Parents think the whole process is a joke. (Teacher in special school)

Discussion and conclusions

It is clear that the introduction of SACE in special schools has been regarded as very beneficial by some teachers and principals. Almost all of these respondents were working with students whose impairments are within the mild range of intellectual disability. The respondents report that SACE has broadened the school curriculum for these mildly disabled students and has assisted teachers with their programming. It is also considered that using this curriculum framework and its assessment procedures has made teachers more accountable for the educational outcomes from their programs. They also report improvement in the

students' motivation level, and teachers' commitment. From their viewpoint, the introduction of SACE in special schools and units had been inspirational.

In contrast with this positive perspective, there is strong evidence that many more teachers and principals involved with students who are moderately to severely intellectually disabled do not believe in the value of using SACE courses with these students. Many of the concerns expressed seven years earlier, when SACE was first introduced to special schools continued to be evident. In particular, there was concern that students' real needs and priorities within the curriculum are not being adequately met through courses adapted from SACE subject frameworks. Time devoted to work on SACE is perceived by some teachers as valuable time eroded from other important aspects of the senior special school program.

In other countries, Christensen and Dorn (1997) and Wilson (1999) have questioned whether a stage has been reached where principles of social justice and equity are being used to justify the restructuring of special education in ways that may not always be to the benefit of the students with special needs. Baines (1997) suggested that some changes occurring in education (and making special schools ordinary may be an example) are based on political correctness and ideology, rather than on any clear evidence that the proposed changes really benefit the students concerned. Jenkinson (1997) has pointed out that for students with severe disabilities, the gap between their educational needs and those of the majority of students increases as secondary level is reached. This increase occurs to the extent that the academic curriculum followed by their non-disabled peers may have little to offer that is relevant or useful. She observes that the learning characteristics of students with severe disabilities cause their instructional needs to be quite different from those of their non-disabled peers.

The SACE is regarded by some teachers as an inappropriate framework within which to plan work for students with severe and multiple disabilities. Most, if not all, of these students are functioning below the cognitive level required to access even the most simplified units of work under SACE. Their priority needs are in such areas as self-care, hygiene and mobility. These areas are extremely difficult to integrate in any meaningful way within SACE subject frameworks.

The final conclusion to be made from this study of principals' and teachers' perceptions is that making special schools ordinary by introducing SACE in South Australia appears to have benefited some students with milder degrees of intellectual disability, but there is no evidence that studying SACE subjects has been of benefit to those with moderate to severe and multiple disabilities. Their needs may be best served by a truly alternative programme, rather than one adapted from mainstream. There is truth in the comment by Holgate (1992, p.49) that, A curriculum can only achieve credibility when it serves the needs of the pupils.

Postscript

It should be noted that the special school curriculum and the ways in which SACE is implemented are currently under review in South Australia.

References

- Baines, L. (1997). Future schlock: using fabricated data and politically correct platitudes in the name of education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (7): 493 – 498.
- Baker, D. & Bovair, K. (Eds). (1989). *Making the special school ordinary: Volume 1, Models for the developing special school*. London: Falmer.
- Baker, D. & Bovair, K. (Eds). (1990). *Making the special school ordinary: Volume 2, Practitioners changing special education*. London: Falmer.
- Bourdon, R. & Waters, G. (1995). *Writing a SACE unit for students with disabilities*. Mount Gambier, SA: The Gordon Education Centre.

- Casey, K. (1994). *Teaching children with special needs*. Wentworth Falls, NSW: Social Science Press.
- Christensen, C. & Dorn, S. (1997). Competing notions of social justice and contradictions in special education reform. *Journal of Special Education*, 31 (2): 181 – 198.
- Daniels, H. & Garner, P. (Eds) (1999). *Inclusive education: World Yearbook of Education 1999*. London: Kogan Page.
- Department of Education and Children's Services (1993). *Implementing SACE in Special Schools*. Adelaide: Government Printer.
- Dessent, T. (1987). *Making the ordinary school special*. London: Falmer.
- Goodman, J. & Kuzmic, J. (1997). Bringing a progressive pedagogy to conventional schools: theoretical and practical implications from Harmony. *Theory into Practice*, 36 (2): 79 – 86.
- Hallahan, D.P. (1998). Sound bytes from special education reform rhetoric. *Remedial and Special Education*, 19 (2): 67 – 69.
- Holbrook, A. & Butcher, L. (1996). Uses of qualitative data analysis software in educational research: the literature, the hard questions, and some specific research applications. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 23, (3): 55 – 80.
- Holgate, J. (1992). An evaluation of a leavers' curriculum in a special school. In G.Vulliamy & R.Webb (Eds) *Teacher research and special educational needs* (pp.49 – 67). London: Fulton.
- Jenkinson, J. (1997). *Mainstream or special? Educating students with disabilities*. London: Routledge.
- Lasscock, E.D. (1996). *Letter to Minister for Education and Children's Services*, Adelaide.
- Lasscock, E.D. (1998). *Sunk Without a Trace (SWAT): The story of a failed attempt to reintroduce real life into educational programmes for intellectually disabled young people in South Australia*. Private Publication. Seacliffe, South Australia.
- Lewis, A. (1999). Changing views of special educational needs. *Education 3 – 13*. 27 (3): 45 – 50.