Full Length Research Paper

Special educational tapestry of needs in mainstream schools of London Boroughs

Cahil Edison

Birmingham University

This study focuses the issues and arguments about SEN and its provision in mainstream schools. The objective of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness and management of SEN to explore the impediments in its affective way. The study based on qualitative research paradigms for which in-depth semi-structured interviews were selected tool for data collection. The sample includes the head teacher, deputy head, SEN Co-ordinator (SENCO) and teaching and teaching assistants (TAs) who were randomly selected from one of the middle schools in London Borough. The methodology is content and themes analysis to express the views and experiences of the sample about SEN children, their attitudes, models of disabilities, definitions and types of SEN and the support providing in their school. Furthermore, critical discussion of the findings and the methodological issues germane to the research findings elaborated analysis of teacher's perceptions towards mainstreaming SEN students. The study concludes that lack of funds/resources, inadequate SEN component in initial teacher-training curriculum and untrained supporting staff make SEN provision ineffective in the mainstream.

Key words: SEN, inclusion and exclusion, management, learning difficulties.

INTRODUCTION

A great deal has been written about SEN because since the last decade it has emerged as a key educational issue. This study explores various aspects of the SEN provision and related issues to co-related research findings with one or other aspect of the existing research studies. This study is also a combination of mixed findings of contemporary research studies. The selection of this topic was due my personal interest and curiosity about SEN and its provision in mainstream. Because SEN are of immense importance – often the most critical factor contributing to the quality of children lives in childhood. It is essential, therefore, to ensure that the characteristics of SEN provision enable individuals to optimise their abilities and to overcome, minimise or circumvent their learning difficulties. The purpose of the study is to investigate the process of inclusion and the supporting attitude of schools within the existing frameworks of SEN. Many influences have shaped the nature of provision for SEN. They include philosophical

and political standpoints, location, history and tradition, parental views and the very different and changing needs of children. They have resulted in an ever widening range of provision across schools. What matters is that the provision made is suited to the individual's age, stage of development, and educational, social and emotional needs. The starting point in making decisions about educational placement is consideration of mainstream provision in the individual's own area. Most pupils with SEN in England attend their local schools. Where the quality of the individual's educational and social experience is in doubt in such a setting, or where it is not feasible to provide the exceptional levels of support required, then other, more specialised forms of education will be necessary. However, the overriding concern must be to ensure that the SEN provision takes account of all-round needs and that the individual is not socially isolated. This study is worth by exploring the variation, elaboration and adaptation needed from professionals to

ensure continued effective provision to meet the very wide and increasingly complex SEN now found in schools. Furthermore the study highlights key features of SEN practice in mainstream and provides a stimulus for further consolidation, development and research.

Aims and Objectives of the Study

- To evaluate the meanings and understandings of SEN in mainstream.
- To ascertain types of SEN and how the students cope with their peers.
- To triangulate the role of teachers, TAs and SENCO in an inclusive environment.
- To map-out common impediments in effective inclusion.

Research Questions

The federal government has defined thirteen categories of disabilities these included:

autism**, **deaf-blindness**, **deafness**, **hearing impairment**, **mental retardation multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, serious emotional disturbance, special learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment (DfEE, 2001:13).

Keeping in mind the above list of disabilities, the main research question and framework of this study was structured to investigate whether the existing provision of SEN is effective, according to the requirements of SEN students? Furthermore how to promote a successful inclusion in mainstream?

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature search conceptualises; definitions, features of policies and practices and their implementation in the mainstream schools. SEN were defined as physical or mentally disabilities under the Education Act 1944, children with SEN were categorised by their disabilities defined in medical terms. Many children were considered 'uneducable' and were labelled in categories; 'maladjusted or 'educationally sub-normal' and given SEN in pirate schools.

A child is disabled if he is blind, deaf or dumb or suffers from a mental disorder of any kind or is substantially and permanently handicapped by illness, injury or congenital deformity (Legislation, 2005-6:7).

Furthermore, the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE, 1994:11) defined;

A person has disability, if he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his ability to carry out normal day-to-

day activities.

At time, only the physical or sensory challenged children were considered SEN and the other learning disabled children were kept in mainstream without noticing their special needs. However the limited and specific meanings of the SEN become more comprehensive and broad with the passage of time. The Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) describes; children who have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities. However children who speak English as a second language, their language problem is not considered to be learning difficulty. The SEN students include all learning difficulties groups, not just physically and mentally disabled children, whether those children are facilitated with SEN in special school or in the mainstream. SEN has been variously defined, described or explained by different people at different times. Their explanations are based on their individual, personal and professional experiences and their cultural backgrounds. These definitions of SEN are useless unless the provision can be implemented which is only possible if an effective implementation of SEN polices are developed in schools.

SEN Policies and Practices

The SEN policies can be traced back to the Education Act 1944 when efforts were started for SEN provision in state schools. The SEN concept in the mainstream was not introduced because the government did not realise its need and importance. Although the Handicapped and Pupils and School Health Service Regulations 1945, the Underwood Report of 1955, the Plowden Report 1968 and 1970 and Handicapped Children's Act carried out their struggle for the effective provision of SEN in the state special schools with special children of physical/sensory or mental disability.

The Warnock Report 1978 and the Education Acts 1981 changed the typical concept of SEN students and introduced the idea of SEN, 'statements' and 'integrative' which later became known as the 'inclusive' approach, based on common educational goals for all children (Farrel, 2011). The introduction of SEN Children Assessment Statements (CAS) encouraged the government to revise their SEN policies in the mainstream but did not give additional funding for the new processes involved in statements of SEN children or SEN teachers training in special schools (Legislation, 2005-6). The CAS and improper SEN teachers training programme block its effective implementation in mainstream because parents complained the ineffective long, time-wasting lengthy assessment procedure delay the education of SEN students. However, the increased number of SEN students increases the LEAs workload so their assessment tests criteria change every year (Ofsted, 2007). Additionally initial teacher training (ITT)

failed to develop teachers' skills and confidence to help SEN children to reach their full potential in mainstream (Golder et al. 2009).

The government inherited the existing SEN framework and sought to improve it through the SEN and Disability Act (SENDA) 2001 and 2002, and the 2004 SEN Strategy Removing Barriers to Achievement which claimed to set-out the government's vision for the education of SEN children. The government substantially increased investment in SEN but these policies worked well in their own frame of time and targets, with major insufficiency of practical involvement of mainstream SEN qualified teachers (Ainscow, 2013). Warnock et al., (2010) argue, teachers are 'policy makers in practice' and the importance of teachers' professional judgments in SEN implementing is a sense creating, education policy for successful implementation. The SEN teachers should have a major role in the development of a SEN policy to promote effective inclusion an increased academic performance of SEN students in inclusive settings, while Norwich (2013) found low-self-esteem and question its ineffectiveness due to inflexible curriculum is one of the issues of SEN provision. Curricular changes are introduced in order to benefit students with learning difficulties. This requires school staff, in particular teachers, to be more reflective and analytical of their current practice (Warnock et al., 2010). In general, the current situation gives teachers neither the time nor the confidence to make a bridge between the students in the mainstream, the Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) was being introduced to increase the flexibility of the National Curriculum. However this flexibility is minimal (Ofsted, 2007).

Successful SEN includes: specifically trained professional educators, special curriculum content, special methodology and special instructional materials (UNESCO, 2010: 24). The determination and coordination of headteacher, class-teacher, SENCO and TAs in school general policy is vital and greatly influenced on SEN provision. Additionally appropriate funds, resources, TAs' support, regular and partnership of parents, school and Local Educational Authority (LEA) boost SEN provision. Farrell (2011) criticises inadequate resources, and funds for the SEN students, low-payment for SEN teacher's professional development and refresher courses jamming this effective inclusion. Moreover most of the schools rely on unqualified TAs or learning support assistants (LSAs) who have no specific qualifications or training to support SEN students (Ainscow, 2013). It entirely depends on school management how effectively they use their TAs/LSAs.

METHODOLOGY

This study is based on qualitative research paradigm as multiples of realities exist in any given situation by the individuals involved in the research situation (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This is the naturalistic/constructivist approach, also known the interpretative approach or the post-positivist or post-modern perspective. Semi-structured interviews technique was the tool chosen for data collection according to the nature of enquiry and socio-cultural constraints. The methodology for the interview data was content and theme analysis, a technique that inferences by objectively and systematic coding of the interview scripts into categories (Chadwick, et. al, 1984). The school was randomly selected for nine intensive interviews; headteacher, deputy-head, SENCO, teachers and TAs. The small sample size was decided due to the small scale project however it does not invalidate qualitative research because issues raised and discussed in the interviews in order to focus more sharply on the perceptions of the interviewees (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The interviews were coded according to respondents and subject; HT; DH; CT1; CT2; CT3 SENCO; TA1; TA2; TA3; for reference to identify the interviewees. The interviews were transcribed in verbal and non-verbal thoughts of my interviewees.

Data Analysis and Discussion

The study explored three aspects of interviewees' lives; their personal beliefs, values and expectations; classroom experiences and interpretation and professional training and its impact on their professional development. The codes were pattern, descriptive and interpretive main-codes and sub-codes as shown in Table 1.

The pattern codes described the interviewees' perceptions of disability derived from their values and belief systems and individual experiences. The descriptive codes described the types of learning difficulties and support; the interviewees' identified and provided to the children that they considered the causes of learning difficulties additionally their evaluation and provision of National Curriculum and Code of Practice. Grouping the codes according to the areas of agreements and exceptions, the following broad themes were emerged;

1. The teacher's perceptions of SEN

The teachers perceived disability in terms of medical conditions, visible physical/sensory or mental conditions that required medication and left permanent impairment. These were discerned certain models of disability described by Sandow (2004), the medical, magical and moral models respectively. Four interviewees, explained disability in terms of a 'within child' syndrome or nature.
It is in a child nature, when a child developed his/her nature then none of the teachers can change it because

Table 1. The codes were pattern, descriptive and interpretive main-codes and sub-codes

Type of Codes	Main Code	Mode of Code	Sub Code
Pattern Code	PD	Perceptions of disability	
		▪ Medical condition	PD- MC
		▪ Within- child factor	PD-CF
		▪ Environmental factors	PD-EN
	DSN	Definitions of special needs	
		▪ Physical impairment	DSN-PI
		▪ Sensory impairment	DSN-SI
		▪ Mentally disabled	DSN- MD
		▪ Slow learning/learning disabled	DSN-SL
		▪ Special attention	DSN- SA
Descriptive Code	TLD	Types of Learning Difficulties	-
		Slow learning	TLD-SL
		Physical disabilities	TLD- PI
		Visual impairment (plus blindness)	TLD VI
		Hearing impairment (plus deafness)	
		Mental disability	TLD- HI
		Reading writing and mathematics	
		Speech and language	TLD MD
		Emotional and behavioural	TLD- RWM
		Gifted and talented	TLD-SpL
	TSP	Type of Support Provided	TLD-EB
		Home/ school partnership	TLD-GAT
		Counselling	
		Reading Recovery programmes	TSP-HSP
		Individual Support Plans	TSP-C
		Ability setting and in-class support	TSP-RRP
		Withdrawal for individual tuition	TSP-ISP
			TSP-AS
			TSP- WIT
Interpretative Codes	CLD	Causes of learning Difficulty	CLD-P
		Lack of parental awareness	CLD-LPA
		Environmental influence	CLD- ENV
		Natural and Medical factors	CLD-NMF
		Inadequate educational resources	CLD-IER
		Poor teaching	CLD-PT
		Interviewees' evaluation	-
	ITE	Motivation	ITE-M
		Inadequate teaching resources	ITE-ITR
		Inadequate teaching training	ITE-ITT
		Inadequate SEN funds	ITE-ISF
		Continuing professional development	ITE-CPD

nature does not change.CT1. PD- CF

A child nature could be moulded by individual attention and conducive learning environment with his/her peers, because learning difficulties might be a result of social deprivation, parental indulgence, poor teaching and inappropriate curriculum (Dyson, 2012). The interviewees recommended special schools for severe SEN children.

2. Definitions of SEN

The definitions were based interviewees' training, experience and individual perceptions. These were combinations or influenced by old and narrow concepts of SEN.

SEN children, who are slow learners or

mentally/sensory disabled/handicapped or need help during lesson. DH, DEF- SL, DEF-SI, DEF- PI
  However, the SENCO had understanding;
It is a kind of support/help for children who having any type of learning difficulty/ies. SENCO, DEF-SA

TAs and teachers lacked of understanding their responses. Their perceptions of SEN were contradictory, restrictive and narrow. Although they agreed upon emotional and behavioural difficulties affected child's learning. Similarly Croll and Moses (2009) argue that the mainstream teachers lacking awareness about SEN and its provision that reflects through their lesson plans, class room management and resources. However majority of children experience temporary learning difficulties which can be quickly remedied by additional help from the class-teacher or with the assistance specialist TAs and/or some curricular adaptations.

3. Types of Learning Difficulties

a. Slow Learning: (SL)

The sample referred slow learners as SEN students;
These children cannot go at the same rate so we arranged secluded class for all subjects SENCO. TLD-SL
The slow learners always stay behind from their peers (Halliwell, 2011). Schools arrange this group or one-to-one support within school hours. Halliwell argue that the content of the curriculum should specifically design to meet the needs of SL with delayed or seriously disrupted general development.

b. Reading Writing and Mathematics Difficulties (RWM)

The study found children with specific learning difficulties in reading, writing, and mathematics:
Some students mostly girls, find science and mathematics are difficult subjects. HT. TLD-RWM.
  They considered these subjects as stereotypes that the boys are more interested than girls. The school has a number of boys with learning difficulties in these subjects. Most SEN arise from curricular difficulties, such as gaining access to the curriculum or problems in grasping and retaining concepts and skills in areas such as English language, mathematics, science and the expressive arts. The causes of such difficulties are most likely to lie in a mismatch between delivery of the curriculum and pupils' learning needs (Halliwell, 2011).

c. Speech and Language Difficulty (SpL)

The assumption for language difficulty was seen in terms of English language because the school is situated in a mixed-racial cultural population;

lack of proficiency in English language is a major problem, rather the children's lack of proficiency in their mother-tongue is more disturbing difficulty. HT TLD-SPL
Nevertheless, the Code of Practice (DfES, 2001:3) declared children must not be regarded SEN solely because the language of their home is different from the language in which they will be taught. However, the teachers and TAs put them same category of SpL difficulty;
They can't read English reading books how their reading skill will improve. CT1. CT2. TS2. TLD-SPL
  However some schools have SpL units and therapist/specialist to assess child's SpL.

d. Emotional and Behavioural Difficulty (EB)

Bullying, aggression, disruption, withdrawal and restlessness were some of the identified EB. Some teachers were keen to investigate the causes with school councillor;
I have pupils with certain emotional and behavioural problems. Majority of these pupils from broken homes, there main concern is poor concentration. CT1 TLD-EB
  SEN may arise from delays or disturbances in emotional and behavioural development family life which may affect the individual's capacity to learn.

e. Difficulty due to Exceptional Ability (GAT)

The interviewees were eager to provide data of their GAT children;
These children are challenging if the work is not set according to their calibre. CT3. TLD GAT
There was good balance management of the class work;
  GAT children are all rounders. We encourage them by giving more challenging work not to feel them dejected. CT1. TLD-EB.
  Thus GAT students were more challenging for teachers and TAs because they have top set one group rather than specific GAT. Halliwell (2011) recommended that the content of the curricular areas or courses is expanded to ensure that abler pupils are suitably stimulated and challenged to reduce their disruption. Most of the interviewees were more comfortable, discussing general type education issues rather than specific SEN issues.

.4. Types of Support Provided to SEN Children

a. Home School Partnership (HSP)

The interviewees emphasised the idea of HSP in addressing learning difficulties.
We celebrate open days and invite parents to discuss about their children plan accordingly. CT3 TSP-HSP.
  However, Norwich (2013) dealt a comprehensive

discussion about the importance of home, school and LEAs relationship to make SEN provision more effective. 'The schools' LEA failed in developing successful co-ordination because only schools' efforts are not enough for successful inclusion,' the sample complained.. Thus the interviewees did not show any positive attitude to develop home, school and LEA partnership.

b. Counselling (C)

The interviewees believed on counselling therapies to restore the children's self-esteem and confidence, thereby reducing/eliminating children's learning difficulties.

We have the facilities of school counselling for children with emotional and behavioural issues. CT1. CT2. TSP-C

A child statement is the only required document that gives a picture of his/her SEN. The LEA sends a child's with statement and requests the school counselling for support therefore most of the schools rely on LEA's statements only. Additionally Halliwell (2011) suggests that the Individual Educational Plan (IEPs) should be prepared with short and long term goal to be attained with indications of: expected time-scale; approaches to learning and teaching; assessment and recording; staff involved; resources; learning contexts; and involvement of parents.

5. Special and Specific Intervention Programme

a. Reading Recovery Programme (RRP)

We have special intervention reading-classes under the supervision of SENCO, teachers and TAs such as guided reading. SENCO. HT. TSP- RRP.
We divided students in groups; gifted, advanced, average and SEN. CT1 TSP-RRP.

However, it can be argued that the teacher will find hard to manage four groups at a time because there are usually one TA per year. TA job is to assure task completion and signed students' Reading Records (Ainscow, 2013). There is no proper timetable for Reading recovery programme the students supported by SENCO or TA (Halliwell, 2011). Nevertheless this situation is varying from school to school and their individual class room and staff management.

b. Individual Support Programme(ISP)

The school adopted ISP for specific subject learning difficulties.
We arranged separate booster sessions for SEN students like reading, writing or mathematics and science. TA1. TA2. TA3. SENCO TSP-ISP

This one-to-one support is very worth while for

individual improvement. The school had very positive response from the students and their parents. It positively affected a child's academic progress. A child's dependency is eliminated and a sense of self-confidence and reliance and habit is developed (Halliwell, 2011).

c. Ability Setting and in Class Support (AS)

The teachers acknowledged that children learn at different levels of achievements;
The class teacher allocates TAs for individual or group support, sometimes in one lesson there are 2 to 3 TAs. HT. SENCO. TSP-AS.

The teachers allocate TAs according to the needs and abilities of the children. However (Ainscow, 2013) criticised that the mainstream schools over or misuse their support staff because most of them are inexperienced and unqualified for SEN support.

d. Withdrawal (WIS)

Withdrawals of students from classroom make the classroom management easy for teacher. However; withdrawal students are supported by TAs in a reserved room. CT1. HT.DH.WIS
This constant withdrawal of SEN students put negative impact on their learning, sharing and team work abilities (Halliwell, 2011). To minimize this practice an effective lesson plan is vital with combinations of varieties of tasks according to the calibre of SEN students within the classroom. Although very few SENCO support class-teachers in lesson planning their main focus are SEN support (Ainscow, 2013).

6. Causes of Learning Difficulties

a. Lack of Parental Awareness and Lack of Interest (LPA)

Lack of parents' involvement and interest in their child's education is the main cause of learning difficulties they always complaining lack of time and other engagements. Most of the parents do not understand the importance LPA in their child education. They always lacking of time and even don't turn-up on parents-meeting. HT. DH. CLD-LPA

The rights and responsibilities of parents should respected and they are actively encouraged to be involved in making decisions about the approaches taken to meet their children's SEN. Parents can do much to support the work of the schools when the teachers involve them in assessing and reviewing SEN; making decisions about the content of the curriculum; and monitoring and reporting on progress as observed at school (Dyson, 2012). However, sample teachers and TAs were disappointed with parental response.

b. Environment Influence Peer-group Pressure (ENV)

Children home and social environment contribute a significant role in pedagogy;
Peer groups and environment affect the child's performance and ability. CT3 CLD ENV

Home and social environment have positive or negative effect on a child's abilities usually children from split families have negative impacts. The study found more negative aspects in terms of parental attention and interaction with students' families.

c. Inadequate Provision of Educational Resources (IER)

The interviewees complained about lack of educational resources to prepare their lessons.
Sometimes the borough delays the provision of resources, or the school lacks funds. HT. CLD IER.
This is one of major issues now that LEAs have failed in the provision of teaching and learning resources to schools on time (Ainscow, 2013). As a result, the school has struggles for an effective SEN provision. There was an impression among the teachers and TAs that it is the responsibility of the head and deputy to make this supply possible in time.

e. Inadequate SEN Funds (ISF)

ISF obstructed the way of successful SEN provision.
First we were getting individual SEN funds per child but now it is for the school therefore its insufficient for SEN students. HT, DH, SENCO, CLD-IER
However, the concerned school's LEA mostly delays the provision of funds and resources that causes ineffective SEN provision and management (Ainscow, 2013). Both the head and deputy were not happy with the present allocation of funds, resources and revised polices of its provision. The government revised their strategies due to increased number of SEN students every year. The interviewees were in favour of individual SEN student funds. Frederickson and Cline (2009) further supported the argument that teachers in the mainstream are confident in their ability to implement inclusion effectively. Nevertheless, the main barriers are the inadequate funds and educational resources.

f. Poor Teaching (PT)

A poor teaching methods increase children' learning difficulties. The system could be developed to raise the profile of the profession, increase professionalism and competency and ensure good practice.
A lesson is interesting, no matter how dull the child is

there will be an aspect of lesson that a child enjoyed. CT1, CLD PT.
The sample school has all qualified teachers. There is no proper arrangement for their training or refresher courses to introduce them to the new strategies and techniques to make their lessons more interesting for SEN students. Their lesson plans mostly rely on the availability of material and their knowledge. The teachers had PGCE or GTP without specific SEN qualifications. Similarly TAs had no proper training and qualifications only few have considerable experience working with children but not with the SEN exclusively. Schools rely on TAs for SEN provision (Ainscow, 2013). Interestingly the school avoid hiring a supply-qualified teacher in teachers' absence they give the class under the supervision of unqualified TA or split the students into groups (5-7) and send them to different classrooms.

6. Teacher evaluation and Implementation of National Curriculum/Code of Practice

The National Curriculum and Code of Practice affect teaching practice. In this regard, a theme that constantly emerged in all interviews was that of teacher motivation, resources availability, teacher training curriculum, funds for SEN students and professional development. Most of the teachers were interested in the SEN classroom arrangement and SEN lesson plans.
We need workshops and seminars and refreshers courses to merge Code of Practice in National Curriculum. CT1 CT2 CT3 TA1 TA2 TA3, ITE-CPD.
Golder et al., (2009) recommend teachers in-service training regarding necessary understanding and skills for SEN provision to make a bridge between the National Curriculum and Code of Practice for an inclusive setting. Therefore teacher-training curriculum in colleges/universities should be revised to include generic broad based SEN as a compulsory element in initial teacher training. Further tailoring of the curriculum to meet individual needs is possible through a degree of flexibility within programmes to enable students to select subject areas of individual relevance.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that teachers do not regard the SEN that helped in identifying children with special needs. The study theorise lack of funds, resources, SEN trained staff and partnership between parents, school and LEAs blocking the effective provision of SEN. Additionally it is vital to involve SEN qualified teachers from mainstream for an effective review of inclusion policies and practice. They are the real means or policy makers for the evaluation and review of existing polices to be effectively implemented in the mainstream. Every policy

has been judged by its effective provision in practical environments. Because we have to start asking what is wrong with the school rather than what's wrong with the child!'(Ainscow 2013:17).

This small-scale research study has limited scope of generalisation because the qualitative data analysed does not allow many strong conclusions regarding differentiating the various SEN issues described here. The sample hardly interpreted an accurate picture of the present situation of policies and practices. Inclusion represents a complex system of education and need more time and practice to absorb each other. However, it may be concluded, that inclusion has not gained much ground in the country since the mid 1990s, it seems that SEN needs more practical reforms and policy organisation. Educational segregation provision in mainstream presented mixed views, that a gradually increasing number of parents want their children with SEN to attend a regular school. Furthermore, inclusion requires a rethinking of the role of SEN in mainstream; why some students are failing to learn, and the teachers fail in effective teaching. The present polices of the schools are mostly theoretical and formal documents. Overall, the research found no evidence in the school of systematic discrimination or unfavourable treatment of students with SEN in the classroom setting or in admissions process. For students with SEN there were no statements, schools simply did not have an opportunity to do this, as information about pupils' abilities and needs was not available when the admissions criteria were being applied. All schools respected the legal position of SEN students and arranged special provision for such students. To conclude this discussion both opponents and proponents of SEN can find scattered research to support their respective views, since the current research is inconclusive. Opponents point to research showing negative effects of the provision of SEN, often citing low self-esteem of students with disabilities in the general education setting and poor academic grades. For those supporting inclusion, research exists that shows positive results for both special and general education students,

including academic and social benefits. Currently, the issues of SEN appear to be under discussion. The practical definitions of government polices supporting the practice, schools need to continue their search to find out the ways to include SEN students in the mainstream schools successfully.

REFERENCES

Ainscow M (2013). From special education to effective schools for all in: Florian, L. (Ed); The Sage Handbook of Special Education; Sage Publications London (SPL); pp. 146-159.

Chadwick A, Bahr M, Albrecht L (1984). Social Science Research Methods; Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Croll P, Moses D (2009). Pragmatism, ideology and educational change: the case of special educational needs. British J.Edu. Studies. 4 (6):11-25.

(DfEE) Department for Education and Employment, (2001). Code of Practice on the identification and the Assessment of Special Educational Needs; DFEE, London.

(DfEE) Department for Education and Employment, (1994). Excellence for all children: meeting special educational needs; DfEE, London.

(DfES) Department for Education and Skills, (2001). Special Educational Needs Code of Practice; DfES, London.

Dyson A (2012). Special educational needs and the world out there in: Contemporary Issues in Special Educational Needs. Open University Press London (OUPL); pp.13-27.

Farrell P (2011). Special education in the last twenty years: Have things really got better. British J. Sp.Edu. 28 (1): 3-9.

Frederickson N, Cline T, (2009). Special Educational Needs, Inclusion and Diversity: A Textbook; Open University Press, London.

Golder G, Norwich B, Bayliss P, (2009). Preparing teachers to teach pupils with special educational needs in more inclusive schools: evaluating a PGCE development. British J. Sp.Edu. 32 (2): 92-99.

Halliwell M (2011). Supporting Children with Special Educational Needs; David Fulton Publishers London.

Legislation and Guidance in relation to SEN (2005-06) http://teach.newport.ac.uk/sen/SEN0405/Law/Legislation0405.htm(Retrived 7/1/13).

Miles B, Hubermen M (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis; Sage Publications London.

Norwich B, (2013). Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: living with uncertainty; Routledge London.

(Ofsted) Office for Standard in Education (2007). A survey of the provision in mainstream primary and secondary schools for pupils with a statement of special educational needs related to specific learning diffculties; Ofsted London.

Sandow S, (2004). Whose special need? in: Sandow S, (Ed). Whose Special Need? Some Perceptions of Special Educational Needs; Paul Chapman Publishers London (PCPL); pp. 153-159.

UNISCO Report, (2010). http//:www.unisco/report.html/0000 231 (Retrieved 7/1/13).

Warnock M, Norwich B, Terzi L (2010). Special educational needs: a new look; Continuum Publishers, London.