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ABSTRACT

Physical education (PE) for pupils with special educational needs (SEN) is an important contemporary issue for primary teachers and other practitioners. In particular, how they are to include pupils with SEN in their classroom activity is a processing concern. This study is concerned essentially with how policy influences the ability of teachers to deal with SEN pupils in PE. It explores the relationships between education policy on SEN and its implementation within PE when SEN pupils are placed in mainstream school settings.

The main aims of this thesis are to explore how ‘equality’ and ‘inclusion’ are expressed in legislation, for example the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan, and how teachers, local education authority (LEA) Advisors, pupils with physical disability and their parents interpret policy and engage in practice for SEN. The findings of the study are intended to provide guidance on education policy needed to promote ‘inclusion’ and connect SEN policy and its implementation within PE.

This thesis develops and utilizes a theoretical model to illustrate the ‘flow’ of policy from government to schools. This framework has followed Bernstein’s (1990) assertion that knowledge is produced and reproduced at different sites of practice and that ‘discourses’ are recontextualized in each. Qualitative research methods were used to explore these relationships. The research fields were located in the Midlands in England and in the North of Taiwan and investigate LEAs and primary schools. The research employed interviews, documentary analysis and observation to explore policy and its implementation for SEN pupils from not only a ‘macro’ but also a ‘micro’ perspective. Accordingly, this thesis has explored the relationships between teachers, the learning
support assistants (LSA), pupils with physical disability and their activities in PE classrooms in order to throw light on processes of inclusion within PE and the difficulties associated with policy implementation for pupils with physical disability.

The findings suggest that the implementation of SEN policy within PE was driven by ideals of inclusion and attempted to achieve equality. However, SEN policy and its implementation was rendered difficult by the production and reproduction of particular understandings of inclusion, and inadequate provision (training and resource) for teachers to deal with SEN pupils in PE. Compared with teachers in England, PE teachers in Taiwan seemed to be more 'able' to include SEN pupils in PE as they were less regulated by National Curriculum texts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and Context

Inclusion of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) in mainstream settings has become a prominent pedagogic issue (see, Campbell, 2002; Barton, 2003) perhaps especially in primary schools where teachers are trying to include all pupils with a variety of needs in their classroom activity. The early years of formal education are an important stage for pupils, including those with SEN, to develop physical and mental health and social relationships with other pupils of their age (e.g. Malina and Bouchard, 1991; Bailey, 1999). In this context, physical education (PE) has a vital role to play not only in developing inclusive pedagogies but also creating a more equal environment. Having been a primary PE teacher in Taiwan, I found it difficult to teach pupils with SEN alongside none-SEN pupils in PE classes. I felt I was constrained by the 'limitations' of the environment, such as the facilities of classroom, the limited skills of teachers (including my own) and how they planned and taught the curriculum. All these factors were, and are, influenced by policies. I, therefore, wanted to explore the relationship between education policy on SEN and its implementation within PE for pupils with SEN in primary schools in Taiwan and England. I wanted to explore how to reduce those 'limitations' to ensure pupils with SEN can take their place and learn in mainstream classrooms. In England, all primary schools in the public sector are defined as mainstream schools. Pupils with SEN can attend any of those schools. In Taiwan, however, pupils with SEN can attend specific 'mainstreaming schools' which receive additional resources so that pupils with SEN can be
included within them. I will say more of these distinctions in Chapter 6.

Before exploring these issues, it should also be noted that SEN in England means that a child has a greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of his or her age or has a disability that calls for special educational provision to be made for them as defined by the Education Act, 1996 and subsequent Special Educational Needs: Code of Practice, 2001. In Taiwan, SEN means that pupils with ‘gifted’ or ‘mental and physical impairment’ are the subjects of special measure as defined by the Special Education Act, 2001. In both contexts, SEN refers to a broad category of ‘conditions’. In this study, however, I refer only to those pupils with physical disabilities including cerebral palsy, permanent physical injury etc. I wanted to include all categories of SEN pupils in this study but I felt it would be less difficult to elicit the opinions of pupils with physical difficulties than other SEN, although I anticipated that pupils with physical disabilities may have multiple difficulties.

The study begins by addressing the socio-political contexts of education policy for pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England. I will then discuss the current debates on policy, equality, mainstreaming and inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN and outline the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Education Policy for Pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England

The social and educational development of pupils with SEN always intersects with social hierarchy, prejudice and poverty. Barton (2003: 5) stated that an historical analysis of how to define SEN would help us understand the development of social value and attitude towards SEN pupils. He illustrated that the terms of ‘moron’, ‘imbecile’, ‘mentally handicapped’ and ‘learning difficulties’ on SEN pupils ‘are themselves a
reflection of particular socio-economic and cultural developments and the different ways in which policy and service provision are associated with particular conceptions' (ibid.). SEN policy, therefore, reflects current thinking on SEN including the way in which pupils are to be dealt with in PE. In the next sections, I will briefly draw attention to the social and political contexts of SEN policy in Taiwan and England (see Chapter 5) by way of introduction to the contexts in which the study occurred.

1.2.1 SEN Policy in Taiwan

In Taiwan, the first educational institution for blind people was established in 1880 by a missionary from England, but there was no more provision until 1968, when the 9 Years Citizen Compulsory Education Act, published by central Government, introduced the concept of equal educational opportunity for pupils with physical and mental 'disabilities' (Article 10). That was the first official document in relation to pupils with SEN in Taiwan. However, the Special Education Act, which was mandated in 1984 (MOE), was a landmark for pupils with SEN in Taiwan. Whether the Act provided a more equal education environment for SEN pupils after its amendment in 1997 and 2001 will be a matter for later consideration (see Chapter 2). Moreover, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines (MOE, 2001) replaced the National Curriculum for primary and junior high schools in 2001. This is considered as one of the most significant pieces of education reform in the last two decades in Taiwan (Ou, 2000). Human rights, social integration and respect for individuals are explicitly stated as the main concerns of the new Curriculum Guidelines. However, it is not to be assumed that the new Curriculum Guidelines devote more attention to pupils with SEN than was previously the case. As a teacher, I was not aware of any 'difference' when dealing with SEN pupils in PE when the new Guidelines were enacted. It is, therefore, an appropriate time to reflect on the nature of educational
policy making and implementation for pupils with SEN. My central concerns lie with policy implementation in Taiwan and I will confine my focus essentially to the recent major texts such as the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and the Special Education Act 1984 and the related provisions derived from it.

Because of the changing political atmosphere and greater emphasis of human rights, research on and for pupils with SEN has become more prevalent over the last two decades in Taiwan (e.g. Wu, 1990; Lin, 1999). This study, unlike previous studies, will approach the development of policy in PE for SEN pupils from the viewpoint of the sociology of education. To this end, I will draw on concepts from the work of Basil Bernstein (1971; 1990; 1996) to explore, critically but constructively, the relationship between policy and implementation within PE for pupils with SEN. This approach will provide a better understanding of SEN policy by investigating not only legislation on SEN but also those who are involved in its enactment for pupils in Taiwan and England (see Chapter 3). Moreover, in Taiwan, although PE is not defined as a core subject, in my experience inclusion within PE is embraced by SEN pupils and their parents for social and health reasons. Indeed, it is sometimes considered more acceptable to achieve inclusion in PE (an ancillary subject) rather than in the core subjects (Language, Mathematics and Science) because it is considered less important 'academically' than the latter. I want to investigate if this is also the case in England and how teachers deal with SEN pupils in PE. I approached these issues from a qualitative research perspective (see Chapter 4).

Between 1999-2003 the Taiwan government budgeted more than one hundred million pounds to enhance the educational services to pupils with SEN in primary and junior high school. It made no difference that this was part of a political campaign of the ruling party; it was good news because, for the first time, there was a focus on the needs of pupils with SEN in schools. However, in spite of the budget, there remained concern
surrounding the ability of teachers to deliver an education for pupils with SEN. As Chen (2003) pointed out, teachers faced many difficulties when dealing with children with SEN, such as lack of training, lack of mutual agreement on instruction, the uncertainty of policy and insufficient support from educational authorities. Chen’s research also suggested that more studies were required to shed light on what teachers need to do to achieve inclusion across the curriculum (see Chapter 7).

1.2.2 SEN Policy in England

Since the first school for the deaf in Great Britain was opened by Thomas Braidwood in Edinburgh in the early 1760s (Riddell, 2002: 3), provision for pupils with SEN in the UK has been developing apace and for more than 200 years. The Warnock Report (DES, 1978), however, has been seen as a milestone of development of SEN and the central idea of that report lay at the heart of the Education Act 1981. Its provisions were assumed to provide equal educational services for pupils with SEN. The main and crucial consideration of the Report was to re-define ‘handicap’ as ‘special educational needs’, refocusing attention on the needs of children rather than on their ‘being’ seen as a deficit category. This was seen as a first step toward providing ‘equal opportunity’ for SEN pupils. The Education Act, 1981, also played greater emphasis on the inclusion of SEN pupils in mainstream schools. In this study I will contrast policy development in England with policy implementation for SEN pupils in PE in Taiwan. Through a comparison of educational policy and practice in the two countries, I hope to learn how to facilitate and enhance inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN, and gain a better understanding of how implementation connects with policy.

In England, SEN policy has developed over a longer period and for a wider range of social, economic and cultural reasons than in Taiwan. In Taiwan, the development of
democracy is relatively recent, thus it will not be easy to influence the way in which individuals think about different corporeal conditions including those of pupils with SEN. Furthermore, in Taiwan, most of the literature relating to education policy is written from the perspectives of administration, management and bureaucracy. This study, by contrast, will not only analyze policy implementation from an historical, economic and social perspective, but also compare policy implementation in the two countries through the perspective of teachers and others involved in SEN provision. Hopefully, the findings will provide a reference point for future SEN policy making in Taiwan.


1.3 The Debates on Policy, Equality, Mainstreaming and Inclusion in Physical Education

Policy always plays a central role in the development of education including for pupils with SEN. When we retrace the development of inclusion in PE for people with SEN, it is important to remember that policy is an important element of equality. As Evans and Davies (1993: 23) pointed out:

In our view the failure to address the issue of how and whether equality is being expressed in the educational system is a matter of much greater concern than whether equality of opportunity in education is being achieved.
This study attempts to approach this issue by viewing SEN policy and its implementation within PE. I want to examine how ‘equality’ is and has been expressed in SEN policy, and how teachers, schools and local education authorities (LEAs) create an educational environment which is both equal in terms of opportunities and equitable in terms of being fair within PE for SEN pupils. I centre attention on the relationship between equality, SEN legislation and the National Curriculum and PE in Taiwan and England, and document how ‘equality’ is expressed in the implementation of PE for pupils with SEN. The main aims of this research, therefore, are (1) to examine how ‘equality’ and ‘inclusion’ are expressed in ‘provisions’ for SEN (including statutory and discretionary regulations, for example, laws, legislation, and educational curriculum); (2) explore how teachers, LEA Advisors, pupils with SEN and their parents think about, and act out, policy for SEN; and (3) compare the policy frameworks in the two countries in order to provide guidance on the policies needed if pupils with SEN are to receive a meaningful experience in inclusive PE settings.

The inclusion of pupils with SEN in mainstream schools has become a focus of debate in education systems across the world (Rose, 2001: 147). This trend can be seen as an advocate of equality for SEN pupils. Penney and Evans (2005: 21) suggest that:

Any analysis of policy in PE must consider not only how past policy on education has helped frame and form contemporary PE but also how institutional, local, national, international, and global circumstances either alone or together, intersect in this process.

This study, therefore, draws attention to the international development of inclusion in education from a cross-cultural perspective on SEN policy and its implementation in the two countries.

In Taiwan, SEN policy was mainly influenced by trends in the USA. Greenwood and French (2000: 209) pointed out:
It seems the placement shift today is widely based on economic and social motivation and not on appropriate education for all school-aged students.... With the implementation of the mainstreaming or Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) concept, the greatest percentage of students with disability first begun this exodus into ancillary subjects such as physical education, music and art.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, the concept of LRE states:

Individuals with disabilities are educated with individuals who are not disabled and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular physical education environment occurs only when the nature and or severity of disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved in a satisfactory way.

(OSE/RS, 2002, quoted in Winnick, 2005: 15)

This trend of attempting to extend the possibility of educating SEN pupils alongside able-bodied pupils has also occurred in Taiwan. However, the concept of inclusion was not introduced in Taiwan until 1995 by the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995). In England, in contrast, a broader concept of SEN has been in place since the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) recommended that medical categories should be replaced by the concept of ‘special educational needs’. The document Excellence for all children: meeting special education needs (DfEE, 1997) and the following Meeting special educational needs: A programme of action (DfEE, 1998) further highlighted the concept of inclusion and the implementation of ‘mainstreaming’ for SEN pupils. The National Curriculum (1999) then set principles for teachers to include SEN pupils including in PE (see Chapter 5). I want to investigate whether the concept of inclusion influences provision for SEN pupils in PE in the two countries. Moreover, in
Taiwan, many teachers across the curriculum now face pupils with SEN in their classrooms but they may be unclear as to what strategies to adopt for inclusion within PE. I want to investigate if teachers in England provide a more inclusive PE for SEN pupils than teachers in Taiwan and if they encounter fewer difficulties when teaching SEN pupils in PE. My research will overview and assess the current condition of inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN, through the voices of teachers and significant others involved in the provision of SEN in the two countries.

Furthermore, more and more pupils with SEN are being placed in classes in mainstream schools (Black, 1999, in Bailey, 2001: 118). Whether this is beneficial for pupils with SEN and all other pupils has to be looked at carefully. The key element in inclusion for pupils with SEN is the teacher. Jowsey (1992: xv) stated: '... All teachers, therefore, are now teachers of children with special educational needs'. Her comment reflected the trend of 'inclusion' and challenges facing teachers to deal with SEN pupils. If we want to probe the implementation of policy on inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN, then teachers' opinions will be of central importance. Sudgen and Wright (1996: 121) have highlighted the magnitude of the challenge:

What are the major issues in teaching PE to children with special educational needs? The simple answer to this is that issues are exactly the same as for all children, with special educational needs teaching not being seen as something different and distinct from other forms of teaching, but as an extension of good professional practice.

Bailey and Robertson (2000: 62) further argued that although primary teachers now teach pupils with a different range of ability, we need to assess if they achieve 'good professional practice' when dealing SEN pupils in PE. If teachers are equipped with sufficient knowledge and skills to engage in instruction with SEN pupils, is it more likely that
inclusion is achieved? Barton (2003: 21) has argued that 'the position of teacher education in relation to its contribution to the development of inclusive thinking and practice on the part of student teachers is of fundamental importance'. Slee (2001: 120) further stated: 'teacher education faculties might consider the possibility of interdisciplinary studies of exclusion and inclusion with a view to weaving the preparation for "inclusive" teacher's right across the fabric of their teaching-training curriculum'. The main questions I ask in this study can thus be stated as follows:

1. How do educational policies create an equitable environment for SEN pupils in PE?
2. Do teachers receive sufficient support to include SEN pupils in PE?
3. How do teachers, LEA advisors and SEN pupils and their parents think about SEN policy within PE?

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

Having raised the above mentioned questions relating to SEN policy and implementation, I will structure this thesis in the following way. In Chapter 2, I review the relevant literature relating to SEN policy in the two countries including the Special Education Act 1984 in Taiwan (MOE, 1984), the Warnock Report (DES, 1978), the Education Act (DES, 1981), and the Education Reform Act (DES, 1988) in England. I also review the literature relating to the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and interrogate how the notions of equality and inclusion have featured within them. Moreover, I discuss the debates that have accompanied equality, inclusion and mainstreaming within policy for pupils with SEN. Finally, I review the current research on SEN and explore the difficulties facing teachers when dealing with SEN pupils in PE.
Chapter 3 addresses the theoretical framework of the study. I use a 'micro' and a 'macro' perspective to view the relationships between SEN policy and its implementation in England and Taiwan. With reference to previous research, I construct a heuristic model to explore the relationships between policy formation and policy implementation using Bernstein's (1990) theories of knowledge production and reproduction. Furthermore, I focus on the process of knowledge reproduction within schools from a sociological perspective. I investigate the teachers' conceptions of inclusion, and their ideas for SEN pupils and the meanings they give to 'disability' and 'ability' (Evans, 2004).

In Chapter 4, I outline the research methods, research strategy and technique of data collection. I argue the case for the use of qualitative research methods to approach the research questions. I outline the eight case studies carried out in both countries, four in England, four in Taiwan. The specific technique of data collection included interview, observation and documentary analysis. I interviewed teachers, LEA Advisors and SEN pupils, and observed PE lessons and made field notes, in England and Taiwan in November 2004 and May 2005.

In Chapter 5, I investigate SEN policy, legislation and the National Curriculum in England, and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. My aim here is to understand the legislative context of policy for SEN. We see that policy making in Taiwan was more 'serendipitous' than it was 'rational' whereas the reverse of this was evident in England. The model of policy for SEN in Taiwan was orientated towards a medical model, while the social model was applied in England. Furthermore, 'inclusion' in policy for SEN in Taiwan was 'implicit' in the discourse whereas in England it was 'explicit'.

In Chapter 6, I analyze the interview data of the LEA Advisors in the two countries and attempt to understand how they interpret SEN policy within PE. I consider the LEA as mediators translating SEN policy from central Government to schools and
teachers. The main themes that emerge from the data are addressed and I focus attention on the accommodation of SEN pupils in PE and how their needs are dealt with in schools by teachers and parents.

In Chapter 7, I analyze the interview data from teachers, field notes and documents and records of SEN pupils. I investigate the implementation of policy on SEN within PE in the primary schools. The data reveal that teachers encounter serious difficulties when trying to include SEN pupils in PE largely due to the constraints of the National Curriculum in the two countries.

In Chapter 8, I draw together the themes from Chapters 5, 6 and 7 for a better understanding of SEN policy in Taiwan and England. I discuss the limits and possibilities of teachers’ endeavours to deal with pupils with SEN in PE. I also examine how teachers view SEN pupils as embodied learners and how this affects their relationships with SEN pupils in PE.

In Chapter 9, I draw attention to how I theorized SEN policy, and its implementation. The strengths and weaknesses of the knowledge production and reproduction model on SEN policy will be discussed. I suggest that the model does not adequately explain the nature of pedagogical changes. I, therefore illustrate how it might be refined using Bernstein’s (1996) concepts to allow teachers and others to explore the possibilities of SEN pupils being included in PE by the different pedagogical practices of the National Curriculum.

In Chapter 10, the main conclusions of the thesis are addressed first. I then reflect on the research design, data collection and analysis with reference to the theoretical frame. I summarise the main findings and justify the research questions. The limitations and future directions of the research are discussed. Finally, a summary is given to end this chapter and this thesis.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH LITERATURE ON
POLICY AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

2.1 Introduction

National policies for SEN are usually expressed through a series of provisions, including laws, legislation and the National Curriculum, as Governments attempt to realise their ideas on education. These provisions not only regulate the basic educational rights provided for pupils including those with SEN but also restrict or facilitate the development of policy implementation for LEA Advisors, teachers and parents. National policy on SEN reflects current thinking and social change over time. Thus, in this chapter, first, I will focus on the development of policy and associated educational curriculum; the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and the National Curriculum in England, for pupils with SEN. I will analyse these provisions from the perspective of the sociology of education and review the official and academic literature on them, hopefully, to obtain a better understanding of policy contexts for SEN in the two countries. A detailed analysis of SEN policy is provided in Chapter 5.

Second, when reviewing the relevant literature relating to equality for pupils with SEN in PE, it becomes clear that we can not just focus on the national policy level. What goes on inside schools, the nature of PE and sport and their effects on teaching SEN pupils also have to be considered. I will distinguish between sport and PE and consider how each relates to the teaching of SEN pupils.
Third, I will clarify the concepts of 'equality' and 'inclusion' in relation to PE for pupils with SEN, although I will address this in more detail in Chapter 5.

Fourth, whether inclusion is successful or not in PE may depend amongst other things, on the skills and experience of teachers. Westwood (1997) advises caution in ignoring the complexity of inclusion and the current abilities of teachers in this subject area. Teachers, it seems, must play a crucial role if inclusion is to be achieved in PE. Later, I will address the initial teacher training and the in-service training received by teachers for SEN (see section 2.5 and Chapter 7).

Finally, I will review the literature on SEN research both in Taiwan and England. Before that, however, I will address issues of policy, its legislative provision and the National Curriculum for SEN in terms of the relevant research literature in the two countries.

2.2 Policy Contexts in Taiwan and England

2.2.1 The Legislative Context for SEN in Taiwan

In Taiwan, there has been a variety of legislation, for example, the 9 Year Citizen Compulsory Education Act (MOE, 1968) and Special Education Act 1984 (MOE, 1984), which was amended in 1997 and 2001, to regulate appropriate education for children with SEN and ensure that pupils with SEN are in the 'least restrictive environments' (see Chapter 1). In this section, I will examine how this legislative context is currently developing, how official and academic literature have 'received' and commented on it, and how the legislation relates to the daily life of SEN pupils in schools. My observations and experiences of 'inclusion' as a teacher in Taiwan suggest that there still are many obstacles which have to be overcome before pupils with SEN will feel included in PE.

The Special Education Act 1984 (MOE, 1984) is the most important legislation
for pupils with SEN in Taiwan. Its main subjects include pupils with ‘physical and mental’ impairments and ‘gifted’ pupils. The Act (1984) established 11 categories of ‘physical and mental’ impairment to identify pupils if they needed statements of SEN (see Chapter 5). The Act was amended in 2001 but still applied medical categories for SEN pupils, whilst, in England, the Education Act 1981 adopted a broader concept of ‘special education needs’ for SEN. The Act (1984) set the goal to include SEN pupils in primary and junior schools. It can be seen as the first attempt to provide an inclusive education for SEN pupils. However, there remained many gaps between policy and implementation. Before the Education Act was amended in 1997, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) highlighted that the provision faced problems and required a new vision for SEN. The report pointed out that there were six problems that had to be overcome:

1. There was no professional department either in government or LEAs to deal with SEN.
2. The budget for SEN in high schools, junior high school and primary school was determined by LEAs, according to the law, but the LEAs did not allocate the budget properly.
3. The staff for SEN were non-professional.
4. There were few professional teachers for SEN.
5. There was no proper instrument for evaluating SEN.
6. There were few facilities for SEN and the criteria of placement only considered the degree of impairment of pupils and is inflexible. (MOE, 1995: 20-28)

The report, which was the first and only survey of SEN in Taiwan, provided the crucial information for the placement of pupils with SEN in either special schools or mainstream schools. It outlined the barriers and problems that were likely to be experienced in the implementation of policy for pupils with SEN. These problems might continue to exist
even though the Special Education Act 1984 has been amended twice. In my experiences the notion of inclusion for SEN pupils has not been accepted by the LEAs and schools; their focus often extends no further than payments, for example exempting tuition fee in schools, to those children with SEN (MOE, 1995: 17). The budgetary aspects of SEN allocation are crucial elements in the implementation of policy for SEN and the creation of an equal educational environment. Because the EPMI report offers an official central Government perspective on SEN, I will later examine the relation between its recommendations, subsequent amendments of the Special Education Act 1984 and the opinions of local education authority (LEA) Advisors (see Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). First, however, I will review the academic perspective on provision for SEN. The following paragraphs draw on reviews of the Special Education Act 1984 and its implementation undertaken by Huang (1996). He drew attention to how the conditions of work for pupils with SEN led to the amending of the Special Education Act 1984. Firstly, he found that the distribution of the budget for SEN was unbalanced between special schools and mainstreaming classes in mainstream schools whose budget is set by the LEAs. Furthermore, there was no budget and no specific department of assessment and placement for pupils with SEN in LEAs. 70% of SEN students were placed in mainstream classes but the majority of teachers had not received training to teach them. Finally, he reported that the related support service for pupils with SEN was inadequate. Parents could not appeal to central Government if their children did not receive the appropriate service. Nor did the LEA practise the principle of LRE especially with regard to facilities in schools. He also pointed out that the provision reflected the ambiguous text of the policy and could not compel LEAs to provide more service to pupils with SEN. This suggestion echoes those of the official EMPI report. The financial issue is the main concern in the two reports; training for teachers and relevant staff did not address the needs of SEN pupils; and the
facilities of schools were not adequate to meet their needs. Huang (1996) also reported that the LEAs did not implement provision appropriately. I want to know whether 10 years on these problems still appeared and how LEAs now implement policy for SEN.

According to Huang’s analysis, the situation described above may no longer exist in some LEAs. For example, by contrast, since 1999 the education department of the City government has organized special educational resource centers to provide expert information and service, for example, there are tutors, who are academic staff of Universities in Taipei City, to offer their knowledge and experience to assist teachers in teaching pupils with SEN. Furthermore, the stated aims of the City government (TCGED, 2004) are to provide care for underprivileged children; arrange and set up counseling plans, set up ‘tour counseling’ and provide expert information and service; set up special education to promote the quality of special education; combine medical expert service groups to provide service; provide transportation for students who are not able to go to school on their own; give individuals with SEN chances to enter higher education and propagate appropriate PE and develop the multi-gifted and talented. On the surface then, the Taipei City government seems to have in place an appropriate policy for pupils with SEN but it needs to be examined carefully. The purpose of this study is to examine this policy from the aspect of teachers’ ability to ‘propagate appropriate PE’.
Table 2.1: The relevant legislation for SEN in Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Features and Contents for SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 9 Years Citizen Compulsory Education Act 1968</td>
<td>Providing special education and appropriate educational opportunities for children with physical impairment, mental impairment and genius (Article 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citizen Education Act 1979</td>
<td>Providing special education for pupils with physical impairment, mental impairment and learning difficulty (Article 14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Special Education Act 1984                  | 1. The Act entitles people with physical and mental impairment the right to be educated to full individual development.  
2. There are three stages for pupils with SEN including pre school, primary school and junior school, and senior high school.  
3. The training and educating of teachers for SEN are to be provided by teachers' colleges and universities.  
4. There are eleven categories for pupils with SEN.  
5. Compensation will be provided by government for tuition reduction and buying individual equipment. |
| The Special Education Act (amended) 1997        | 1. There are twelve categories for SEN.  
2. Parents who have children with SEN should be involved in committees of schools for consulting over service for SEN. |
| The Special Education Act (amended) 2001        | 1. The education service will be provided for children with SEN who are three years old.  
2. The LEAs should regulate the reducing numbers of able bodied pupils in a class in which mainstreaming is practised. |

This series of legislation has provided the context in which the specific legislation relating to SEN (see below) has developed in Taiwan.

The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines for SEN

In 2001, the Ministry of Education in Taiwan was authorized by the Citizen Education Act (1979) to amend the curriculum for primary and junior high schools. In so doing, it established the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines to replace the National Curriculum as one reflection of the needed educational reform. The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines reflected central Government's idea of education and inevitably the ideology of the ruling party but adapted to the trends of education worldwide. Although the Guideline made no explicit reference to SEN, it contained two main aspects, 'curriculum integration' and 'school-based curriculum development' which were of direct relevance to the development of inclusion. The purpose of ‘curriculum integration’ states that schools were to carry out instruction with teams of teachers from different subjects. The curriculum of
schools was no longer to be constrained by the National Curriculum guidelines but could be practised and based on the circumstances of the school, the resources of community, expectations of parents and needs of students. Although the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines did not emphasize inclusion for pupils with SEN, the content of the new Curriculum Guideline urged schools and teachers to provide a curriculum for all pupils including those with SEN. Whether the curriculum was modified to include all students, however, was to depend on the ability of teachers and the support of LEA. At the time of study, the new Curriculum Guideline had been practised for more than five years and teachers, schools and LEAs may have found a practical model to follow its recommendations. During this time, there has been a renewed focus and emphasis on pupils with SEN. I therefore sought to examine the new Curriculum Guidelines as a piece of ‘school-based curriculum development’, to assess whether they met the aim of inclusion and if schools could modify the curriculum for all pupils including those with SEN.

Teachers are a significant element within inclusion. Unfortunately, the new Curriculum Guidelines made no provision for additional resources, such as handbooks or other guidelines, for teachers of PE or any other subjects to implement inclusion for students with SEN. By contrast, in England, the National Curriculum (1999) sets out three principles for teachers when dealing with SEN pupils (see the next section). How teachers address inclusion in PE with and without practical resources in Taiwan and England respectively, and how teachers seek the resources that they need for inclusion will be addressed in this study. As Liu (2000) found, there is no coursework related to special education for general education teachers in the graduate programme of Universities in Taiwan. It is, therefore, unsurprising that teachers find it difficult to deal with pupils with SEN. In these circumstances, the role of the LEA is even more important in assisting teachers and providing resources to schools and teachers when they are involved in
in-service training for SEN. Yet the LEAs are often faced with a dilemma when they allocate the budget for schools and mainstreaming schools, because special education is both time-consuming and costly. Nor is an immediate ‘effect’ or ‘outcome’ readily available to present to the school governors when they want to seek re-election. Whether there are ways to overcome the financial problems of supporting SEN and for central Government to assist in this role will be analyzed and explored in the subsequent chapters.

2.2.2 The Legislative Context for SEN in England

In the UK the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) has been identified ‘as a watershed in thinking about provision for disabled children’ (Riddell, 2002: 6). The central idea of that report lay at the heart of the Education Act 1981. Its provisions were assumed to provide equal educational services for pupils with SEN. However, after interviewing secondary school pupils with SEN, Burgess (2003) suggested that much had yet to be achieved and that adapting all activities and providing appropriate equipment and training for teachers were now the important parts of achieving PE for SEN in secondary schools. Moreover, Smith (2004) found that, whilst PE teachers wanted to provide pupils with SEN with ‘equal opportunity’, they could not always achieve this in practice. In the course of this study I will review the Warnock Report and the 1981 Education Act along with more recent policy texts and discuss the educational provisions that were delivered by them and their relationship with inclusive practice in schools.

Tomlinson (1982: 26) has argued that the State provision for special education in England and Wales can be dated either from 1874 when the London School Board established a separate class for the deaf, or from 1893, when the Elementary Education Act revealed the local authorities had a duty to provide separate education for blind and deaf children. However, before the passage of the 1981 Act, special education in England and
Wales was largely governed by the Education Act 1944 and its attendant regulations amended by the Education Acts of 1970 and 1976 (National Union of Teachers, 1984). The 1944 Education Act established 11 categories of ‘handicap’ and greatly extended the duties of LEAs (Goacher, Evans, Welton and Wedell, 1988: 1) and children falling into any one of them were placed in special schools. The assessment and identification of ‘handicap’ was considered from a medical perspective of individual inability rather than a perspective of relationship between the individual and society. But the Act attempted to adopt a different policy for SEN. Pupils who were either blind, deaf, epileptic, physically handicapped or serious aphasic had to be educated in special schools. Others could attend regular schools if there was an appropriate environment for them. It was, however, difficult for ‘regular’ schools to accommodate and teach SEN pupils with inferior facilities as there were insufficient trained teachers after the war years. As Hegarty (1994: 84) pointed out: ‘making special educational provision in regular schools was not accorded high priority when resources were strained to provide a basic education for the majority’. In 1971, the significant change of provision for pupils with ‘handicap’ was that the responsibility for their education was transferred from the health authority to the education authority (Bibby and Lunt, 1996: 1). This was potentially the first step to involve pupils with SEN with a rehabilitative rather than ‘educative’ purpose.


The 1981 Education Act and its associated Regulations and Circulars might, therefore, be seen as the expression of the government’s policies regarding the identification and education of a certain section of the pupil population of England and Wales, namely those children with special education needs. In this sense, the Act could be seen as a starting point for a series of changes and
innovations in special education.

The main and crucial consideration of the Report was to re-define 'handicap' as 'special educational needs' as the latter considers the needs of children rather than the child as a category of disability. However, many of the ideas of the Report were to be features of the 1981 Education Act which was implemented in 1983. The National Union of Teachers (1984) commented on the scope of the Education Act 1981.

1. The Act adopts the Report's terminology of 'special educational needs' defining the phrase in terms of a 'learning difficulty' which requires 'special education provision' to be made.
2. The Act asserts that authorities should keep a record of children requiring educational provision not normally available in an ordinary school.
3. The Act also covers children who have special educational needs but who do not require a statement. The basic legal responsibility of local education authorities to provide appropriate education for children in their areas applied as much to this wider group of children as to those who will have statements.

(NUT, 1984: 6-7)

Until that period, most countries in the Western world simply advocated integration for pupils with SEN. Wedell (1990, quoted in Bibby and Lunt, 1996: 9) remarked that: 'It was the only Act concerned with the integration of pupils with special educational needs in Western countries to be implemented without additional government finance'. Although the legislation of the 1981 Education Act was established earlier than similar legislation in other countries, it did not address problems relating to the allocation of resources. Bibby and Lunt (1996: 6) remarked:

Although the 1981 Act facilitated the integration of pupils with special education needs into mainstream school, it was permissive rather than prescriptive. There were no clear incentives or financial procedures for
ensuring a similar quality of provision in mainstream schools to that found in many special schools.

Furthermore, Gross (2002: 13) stated:

LEAs are responsible for local funding arrangement for SEN; they can devise a set of weighting for pupils with special needs, with or without Statements, in order to allocate moneys to schools to meet special needs from their own resources via the delegated budget.

More than twenty years on, are those same problems of implementing policy for SEN still to be found? This study will explore the economics of provision for SEN.

The 1988 Education Reform Act brought about widespread changes to the education system and it also affected the provision for SEN. Bibby and Lunt (1996: 11) pointed out: 'The National Curriculum and a national assessment framework and Local Management of Schools (LMS) changed the context for making special educational provision'. Two problems were caused by these two elements of policy for SEN pupils. First, the National Curriculum established a framework of assessment for all schools in England and Wales and intensified the emphasis upon performance. In this context, schools potentially become less willing to involve pupils with SEN because they can affect the whole performance of the school. The budget of locally managed schools depends on the number of pupils which schools attract. Thus it may occur that there are more pupils with SEN in a mainstream school but it lacks adequate provision for them. As Wedell (1993: 2) pointed out: 'the Audit Commission and HMI found that, in a small sample of headteachers interviewed, 52% judged that the resources to meet pupils’ SEN were insufficient, although 69% claimed that they were not limiting their admission of pupils with SEN'. Although subsequent Education Acts have been amended, problems for SEN seemly exist but in a different way. According to the report of the Audit Commission (Gillen, 2002: 18):
Many mainstream schools are ill-prepared for an increase in students with SEN or disability, many pupils with SEN face barriers within them and are often excluded from certain lessons and social activities and many schools are deterred from accepting students with SEN because they fear that they will affect their position in the league tables.

In practice then, there remain barriers in the schools that may thwart the intentions of the Warnock Report and the 1981 Education Act for SEN. There are ‘gaps’ between policy and its implementation. However, the Education Act 1981 did adopt the intentions of the Warnock Report and I will examine the relationship between the Act, relevant legislation and policy implementation in schools for pupils with SEN.

Moreover, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 came into effect in September 2002. The purposes of the Act are to improve the standard of education for children with SEN and to provide the equal access of education provision for people with SEN under the Disability Discrimination Act. In addition, the Act laid the duty on LEAs and schools to increase the accessibility for disabled children.

In summary, there are two obvious stages of development in provision for children with SEN in modern England and the turning point was the Warnock Report (DES, 1978). Before the Report, there was a desire to separate children with ‘disability’ from others and place them within categories with reference to their deficits. The purpose of education was to cure or correct pupils’ deficits. After the Report, there were growing obligations to this group with caring for their ‘special’ needs a high priority. Subsequent legislations entitled LEAs and schools with a duty to plan provision for pupils with SEN and provide needed resources to attempt to achieve inclusion.
Table 2.2: The contents and features of the Education Acts for SEN

(The Education Act 1944 – 1981 were from the National Union of Teachers, 1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Contents and features for SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Education Act 1944       | 1. The Act placed a duty on local education authorities (LEAs) to cater for 'handicapped' pupils within their general obligation to provide primary and secondary schools.  
2. Eleven categories of pupils were defined in the Act that replaced the 1921 Education Act which offered four categories.  
3. The Act emphasized the role of special schools in meeting the needs of disabled children unless their handicaps were not serious.  
4. The Act prescribed that assessment of children's disabilities should be made by a medical officer. |
| The Education Act 1970       | The Act abolished the LEA's power to classify children as inappropriate for education at school on grounds of mental disability, and in doing so transferred the responsibility for the education of severely educationally subnormal children to LEAs. |
| The Education Act 1976       | The needs of pupils requiring special educational treatment were to be met in ordinary schools, unless this was impracticable or unreasonably expensive. |
| The Education Act 1981       | 1. The Act defined that a child has special educational needs if 'he' has a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for him.  
2. The Act placed a duty on LEAs to identify those children with special educational needs and to make special educational provision for them.  
3. The LEAs, after carrying out an assessment of a child, shall make a formal statement of the child's special educational needs and informed parents of their right.  
4. The Act gave parents the right of appeal against the special educational provision. |
| The Education Reform Act 1988| Pupils with special education needs, specified in a statement, may be excluded from the application of the provision of the National Curriculum; or applying those provisions with such modifications as may be specified in the statement. |
| Excellence for all children  |                                                                                               |
| The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 | Highlight the duty for schools and LEAs to educate children with SENs in mainstream schools.  
It is unlawful for the body responsible for a school to discriminate against disabled persons. |

**The National Curriculum**

The National Curriculum for England which was introduced in 1988 and revised in 1992, 1995 and 1999, is a statutory guideline for teachers, pupils, parents, employers, and their wider community to understand the skills and knowledge that young people can gain at school. It also provides a framework for meeting the special educational needs of...
young people. One of the most important features of the National Curriculum is inclusion, which gave children with SEN entitlement to an inclusive PE curriculum.

Barton (1993: 49), however, has suggested that we need to ask these questions of the National Curriculum: 'Is the curriculum enabling? Does it deal with difference from a theoretically appropriate stance?' Barton (ibid.) also noted that the NCPE was overemphasizing individualism and competitiveness in the early 1990s and needed to modify its content if it was to achieve inclusion for SEN pupils. However, intentions toward inclusive education are changing. As Vickerman, Hays and Whetherly (2003: 53) pointed out: in 'the current UK government's citizenship agenda, pupils are to be educated to have mutual understanding and respect for individual diversity as part of their involvement and participation within a socially inclusive society'. This notion appeared in the National Curriculum for Physical Education.

An entitlement to learning must be an entitlement for all pupils. This National Curriculum includes for the first time a detailed, overarching statement on inclusion which makes clear the principles schools must follow in their teaching right across the curriculum, to ensure that all pupils have a chance to succeed, whatever their individual needs and the potential barriers to their learning may be.

(DfEE/QCA, 1999a: 3)

The statutory inclusion statement also set out three principles for the development of an inclusive curriculum:

1. Setting appropriate learning challenges: 'Teachers should aim to give every pupil the opportunity to experience success in learning and to achieve as high a standard as possible'.

2. Responding to pupils' diverse learning needs: 'When planning, teachers should set high expectations and provide opportunities for all pupils to achieve, including boys and girls, pupils with
special educational needs, pupils with disabilities, ...'.

3. Overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individuals and group of pupils:

'A minority of pupils will have particular learning and assessment requirements which go beyond the provisions describe in section A and B and if not addressed, could create barriers to learning. These requirements are likely to arise as a consequence of a pupil having a special educational need or disability or may be linked to a pupil’s progress in learning English as an additional language'.

(DfEE/QCA. 1999a: 28-30)

In view of the above principles, PE teachers are expected to utilize their knowledge, skill and understanding to modify the National Curriculum from earlier key stages to meet the needs of pupils with SEN to achieve their potential. These principles provide the guideline for PE teachers to facilitate inclusion for pupils including those with SEN. The third principle emphasizes the need to set up different assessment for pupils with SEN and others to achieve. It avoids generating learning problems for pupils with SEN and protects the rights of able-bodied pupils. In addition, Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly (2003: 51) remarked:

The 1992 National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) identified four key principles in relation to equality that still hold true today as guiding principles that should be considered when including pupils with SEN within mainstream PE. These are entitlement, accessibility, integration and integrity, and have acted as the corner stones upon which the most recent curriculum in PE has been built.

The quotation above reminds us of the principles of the 1992 National Curriculum for Physical Education and these will form a basis for exploring its suitability for pupils with SEN as we study the field of PE within education policy.

To fulfill the requirements of the National Curriculum there are guidelines (see
Chapter 5) for subjects, including PE, for class teachers, subject coordinators and teaching assistants to follow and design the curriculum for pupils with SEN. The guidelines are also provided to LEAs to assist schools and teachers in the development of the National Curriculum. However, the National Curriculum for Physical Education (1999) also introduced an eight-level scale of description of pupil performance as criteria for teachers to evaluate pupils including pupils with SEN. Smith and Thomas (2005: 232) point out:

It might be also argued that these levels fail to outline how teachers should amend the criteria to more adequately account for the variations between the performances of pupils with and without SEN and disabilities and thus enable them to convey to those students their achievements.

On the surface then, although there are clear guidelines and support structures for SEN pupils in England, there are few criteria for evaluating the performance of pupils with SEN. Later, I will examine the relationship between the National Curriculum and its implementation in schools in the context of physical education (see Chapter 7).

As mentioned earlier, teachers are reputedly the key element in the inclusion of pupils with SEN at the school level. The National Curriculum guideline seems to be the main resource for teachers when planning, teaching and assessing the curriculum for pupils with SEN. Long before the arrival of the NCPE, the National Union of Teachers (1984: 19-20) had pointed out that:

We also recommend that teachers appointed to specialist posts whether working in special schools, ordinary schools or peripatetic services should hold a specialist qualification in the teaching of children with special educational needs. Union policy states that the most desirable career profile for these specialist teachers is that they should:

(1) Successfully complete an approved course of training as a teacher;

obtain at least two years' experience in ordinary schools;
(2) obtain sufficient preliminary experience of handicapped children, preferably in a special school, up to maximum of about one year;
(3) undergo special training for teachers of children with special educational needs.

But do the National Curriculum guidelines help teachers deal with SEN pupils in classrooms? Do teachers need more training to deal with all pupils with SEN? Are they familiar with the eleven categories of SEN pupils as defined by the Education Act 1944? Have they received adequate training to deal with the diversity of pupils with SEN? Gillen's (2002) report pointed out that the Department for Education and Skills has allocated £30m to train England’s 450,000 teachers to deal with children with SEN. But both the National Union of Teachers and the General Teaching Council believe that the money is not nearly enough (ibid.). This research will investigate whether teachers, LEA Advisors and others involved in SEN provision feel that sufficient resources are provided for teachers to practise inclusion as it is intended in the National Curriculum.

2.3 Physical Education, Sport and Pupils with SEN

‘Debates about how to reduce barriers to participation in Physical Education (PE) have been an issue of some significance within PE circles throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s’ (Theodoulides, 2003: 15). In this section, I will scrutinize the differences between PE and sport and assess how each potentially affects teachers’ capacity to include pupils with SEN in PE.

2.3.1 Physical Education and Sport

It has been seen as ‘common-sense’ for people to view physical education and sport as synonymous. Indeed, Capel (2000: 132) has argued that it is because PE
practitioners themselves are not sending clear information about what PE is that politicians and media often reinforce the view that PE and sport are the same. For example, after the Olympic Games, the media reviewed the performance of national athletes with reference to the nature of PE in schools. Politicians then raise it as a policy issue as to how to achieve greater results next time. PE then is seen as synonymous with sport. When dealing with inclusion in PE, we have, however, to clarify the difference between physical education and sport as it is one of the most significant elements in achieving inclusion. The National Curriculum Physical Education Working Group (NCPEWG) defined physical education as different to sport as:

Sports cover a range of physical activities in which adults and young people may participate. Physical education on the other hand is a process of learning, the context being mainly physical. The purpose of this process is to develop specific knowledge, skills and understanding and to promote physical competence. Different sporting activities can and do contribute to that learning process, and the learning enables participation in sport. The focus however is on the child and his or her development of physical competence, rather then on the activity.

(DfES/WO, 1991: 7) (my emphasis)

Other official publications in England (see DES, 1985; DfEE/QCA, 1999a; DfEE/QCA, 1999b) also define the unique features of PE and its contribution to the education of pupils. In other words, the concept and content of PE are broader than sport as they involve educational purposes, including knowledge, skill and physical competence, to pupils. Furthermore, in the learning process of PE, the curriculum embraces not only sport activities but also other activities which are not sports, for example, dance. On the other hand, as the Department of Education (DfE, 1995: 2) pointed out: ‘Physical Education should involve pupils in a continuous process of planning, performing and evaluating. This
applies to all areas of activity'. This means that sport activities may be part of PE but not the whole. Penney and Evans (1999: 15) argued that 'sport can be regarded as an important aspect of and vehicle for physical education but physical education is about "more than just sport"'. Further, Capel (2000) provided an example to describe the difference between physical education and sport as follows:

Whereas a gymnastic coach, for example, might simply be concerned with producing the correct pattern of movement for a particular vault, the physical education teacher might focus on assisting the pupils to engage in a process which involves planning their approach (for example, length, speed of run up, angle of approach), performing the action and evaluating the performance (establishing the felling, repeating the movement exactly, varying the movement, adapting the movement through repositioning the hands and so on).

(Capel, 2000: 137)

Thus, it becomes clear that PE focuses on children rather than on the activities of sport and the latter would make it difficult for practitioners to achieve inclusion for pupils with SEN in PE.

2.3.2 Teaching Models and Strategies in PE for SEN

Understanding the difference between PE and sport is a first step toward achieving inclusion in PE. Teachers have to choose what content to use and what methods to employ to include all pupils in PE, but might be restricted by the traditional methods and contents of the National Curriculum. For example, Smith (2004) found that the ‘traditional team game’ in PE classes nurtured exclusion rather than inclusion for pupils with SEN in secondary school. Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke (2005) pointed out that team games were more problematic than individual activities, such as swimming, gymnastics and dance, when including SEN pupils in secondary schools. Other researchers (e.g. Mosston, 1981,
in Meek, 1991: 79; Macfadyen, 2000) have suggested that teaching styles and methodology rather than curriculum content are the main concerns to meet the needs of all children in PE. Jowsey (1992: 8) has advocated the ‘alternative forms of provision’ for teachers to adapt teaching to include SEN pupils in PE, as follows:

Table 2.3 Alternative forms of provision for SEN in PE

(Modified from Jowsey, 1992:8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes of task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrated</td>
<td>No special considerations are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrated plus helper</td>
<td>Provide limited assistance to integrate SEN pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrated but modified</td>
<td>Provide limited assistance and modify the rules for SEN pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parallel</td>
<td>Provide different tasks but in the same environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Separate</td>
<td>Provide segregated activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of alternative venues</td>
<td>Use local leisure centres or special schools to provide special facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contract system</td>
<td>Contract from current education system to attend activity outside schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stevenson and Black (1999) subsequently modified this idea to establish the ‘inclusion spectrum’ for including SEN pupils in PE (see Chapter 6).

Furthermore, Sugden and Wright (1996: 114) stated: ‘Mixed-ability teaching has always been the norm in PE and we have always been faced with children who are experiencing difficulties in this area’. They argue that children with physical disabilities such as cerebral palsy should be able to meet the provision in terms of their movement skills (ibid.). They also pointed out:

Teaching children with special needs is simply an extension of good practice. The effective PE teacher employs practices that emphasise a differentiated approach to instruction and skill level, contained within the learning objectives.

(Wright and Sudgen, 1999: 28)
Does the National Curriculum in Taiwan and England, their curricula and teaching methods, influence teachers' ability to include SEN pupils in PE? I will explore these matters in Primary schools to see what strategies teachers adopt in PE for SEN and the factors which influence their capacity to achieve inclusion.

2.3.3 From a Medical Model to a Social Model of SEN in PE

Historically, the development of physical education and sport for pupils with SEN was driven by a medical perspective and this was reflected in policy making and in definitions of 'SEN' (see Chapter 3). Bailey pointed out:

In terms of medicine, the medical model appears to be a professional orientation which is highly focused on pathology, not normalcy, on sickness, not wellbeing, on the nature and actiology of the presenting problem itself, not on the individual who has the problem, on dealing with the specific pathology in a centred way, not on the social or ecosystem which surrounds the problems, that is, the patient, his or her family, social and financial circumstances, values and attitudes.

(Bailey, 1998: 49)

In this model, sports play a pivotal role in providing physical therapy to achieve rehabilitation and recreation for people who have physical impairment (Wu, 1999). In this perspective, PE inevitably becomes part of rehabilitation for SEN in special schools. This perspective was reflected in most of the research in the UK in 1960s, which focused on individuals who were categorized by diagnoses and how to cure/correct their impairment (Vulliamy and Webb, 1995). Pyfer (1986) pointed out that between 1930 and 1969 research on disabled children was focused on evaluation and correction of postural problems and on identifying the specific motor problems which were to be improved (in Fitzgerald, 2006: 753). By contrast, as Westwood (1997) points out, a social model of SEN within the
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curriculum means that no longer can we emphasize the ‘disability’ of pupils but instead the role which teachers and other able-bodied pupils can play in their education. Vickerman, Hays and Whetherly (2003: 50) explained: ‘The “social model” views disability in terms of the result of the interaction between people’s physical, mental or sensory impairments and how the social environment impacts on them’. In support of this, they argue that the most important factors within inclusion in PE are teachers and their instruction.

On the other hand, a number of researchers (e.g. Morris, 1991, in Fitzgerald and Jobling, 2004; Hughes and Paterson, 1997) have argued that the social model does not pay sufficient attention to the real experiences of people with disability. They argued that we need further research on issue around the embodied identity of pupils with SEN or disability. The social model focuses attention on the social construction of ‘disability’ and the relationships between SEN and society, rather than on the individual themselves. Their work suggests that it should also be concerned not with impairment but also the ‘physical capital’ (Shilling, 1998; Evans, 2004) that pupils bring to classrooms.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, policy on SEN in Taiwan has been affected by worldwide trends, particularly from the United States. The tendency in such policy is towards an adapted physical education (APE) model of dealing with SEN, particularly in the North of America. The first department of adapted physical education was established in the National College of Physical Education and Sports in Taiwan in 2002. This trend has also influenced PE in primary schools in Taiwan.

The concept of adapted physical activity was introduced by the founders of the International Federation of Adapted Physical Activity (IFAPA) in the 1970s. It has been defined by some researchers (DePauw and Sherrill, 1994; Sherrill and DePauw, 1997) as:

cross-disciplinary theory and practice that attempts to identify and solve motor problems through the lifespan, develop and implement theories that support
access to sport and active lifestyle, and develop cooperative home – school – community service delivery and empowerment system.

(DePauw and Doll-Tepper, 2000: 136)

Auxter, Pyfer and Huetting (2001: 3) explained:

Adapted physical education is the art and science of developing, implementing, and monitoring a carefully designed physical education *instructional* program for a learner with disability, based on a comprehensive assessment, to give the learner the skills necessary for a lifetime of rich leisure, recreation, and sport experiences to enhance physical fitness and wellness.

Furthermore, Winnick (2005: 4) defined APE as:

An *individualized* program involving *physical* and *motor fitness*, fundamental *motor* skills and patterns, skills in aquatics and dance, and individual and group *games* and sports designed to meet the unique needs of individuals (my emphasis).

Early research on SEN reflected this way of thinking. Its concerns for adapted physical activities followed a medical model and were focused on comparisons between people with disability and non-disability to prove its positive effects in physical activities for those with disability (Pyfer, 1986, in Doll-Tepper and DePauw, 1996: 3). Guided by this model in the 1980s, researchers from different sport science disciplines attempted to improve the performances in sports of athletes with disabilities. Inclusion is one of the central themes in this theory. Although initially it focused on solving the motor problems of people with disability and social integration, it now concentrates on disability rights and social justice (DePauw and Doll-Tepper, 2000) and subscribes to a social model. In Taiwan, however, most policy for SEN within PE or relating to sport is still categorized as 'adapted physical
education'. The term ‘adapted physical education’ has become synonymous with PE and sport for people with SEN or disability in Taiwan. But does it help teachers deal with inclusion and the needs of SEN pupils? How do their actions compare with teachers in England where APE does not prevail? These questions will be explored in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

In my experience, it is easier to establish positive relations between able bodied pupils and pupils with SEN at the stage of Primary schooling in PE and sport. One of the most important concepts in SEN is that of the ‘Least Restrictive Environment’ (LRE). In PE, able bodied and SEN pupils have to overcome the barriers of physical education and sport facilities to play and learn together if they are to respect each other. It may be easier at this stage to create an equal environment for both able bodied and SEN pupils to become productive members of society. However, whether social inclusion occurs will be largely due to the teachers’ instruction, all other things being equal. Thus, this study will examine policy implementation for pupils with SEN and examine relevant provisions in the National Curriculum expressing equality in PE. By interviewing LEA Advisors, teachers, parents and pupils and via documentary analysis I will explore the relations between policy, provision, the National Curriculum, LEAs and schools and pedagogical practice for SEN. However, all these facets are derived from the concept of ‘equality’. Next, I will investigate the elements which potentially influence/create an equal environment to SEN.

2.4 Equality and Inclusion within PE for Pupils with SEN

It is important to recognize that equality for pupils with SEN in PE is both socially and morally right in any modern society, and that schools offer pupils an ideal opportunity to learn mutual understanding and respect for difference and diversity.

(Vickerman, Hays and Whetherly, 2003: 49)
To achieve these ends, this study intends to begin by engaging with the field of policy for SEN. This section will first clarify the concept of equality then explore the relationships between inclusion and policy implementation.

2.4.1 Concerning Issues of Equality for SEN

'Equality has featured as an item on the educational agenda since the early 1970s when studies began to identify social class as a key area of educational disadvantage' (Thomas, 1991: 56). Such research relating to race, gender and pupils with SEN have had an impact on legislation and related provision. It has raised consciousness and broadened the concept of inequality and educational disadvantage for SEN and was reflected in the Warnock Report (DES, 1978). But what is 'equality'? Williams (1962: 120) suggested that the notion of equality is invoked by the question of 'distribution of, or access to, certain goods'. But 'equal access' may not be the same as 'equal opportunity'. Although there are more and more pupils with SEN in the mainstream setting we have to examine if they just 'fit in' or are 'included' in the arrangement of schools. Reflecting on the meaning of 'equal' opportunity may enable us to consider the needs of pupils with SEN and to review the merits of contemporary policy.

Byrne (1985: 99) compared equality and equity with reference to the Oxford English Dictionary which defines equality as 'the condition of being equal in quantity, amount, value, and intensity etc. ... the condition of being equal in dignity, privileges, and power'. Equity on the other hand is defined as 'the quality of being equal or fair; impartiality'. She also implies that equality and equity are complementary rather than alternative concepts. Thus, we should bear in mind that proponents of educational equality have two aims:

First, they have aimed at ensuring that any child's prospects for educational
achievement should be unaffected by the social class or educational background of his or her parents. Second, they have aimed at narrowing the gap in educational achievement between more and less academically talented children, by giving priority to devoting educational resources to the less talented.  

(Brighouse, 2000: 4)

But how could these concepts help narrow the gaps in physical development between disability and ability, especially for pupils with physical disability? Has education policy created an environment of educational equality for pupils with SEN?

2.4.2 Legislation

When we study the issue of equality relating to educational policy for people with SEN, we can not restrict our view to the development of policy in only two countries. As Penney (2002: 11) states:

When addressing issues of equality, equity and inclusion we cannot restrict ourselves to the “immediate” contexts of physical education and school sport. Rather, these contexts need to be recognized as being in a dynamic relationship with the wider social, cultural, political, and economic contexts.

We also need to investigate the development of legislation at an international level. As Robertson, Childs and Marsden (2000: 51) pointed out, the United Nations’ (UN) statements on equal opportunities have been influential world wide.

1. The UN Convention on the right of the child (UN 1989) Article 2 states that all rights shall apply to all children without discrimination on any ground and specifically mentions disability (that is, special educational needs). Article 23 advocates that education should be designed in a manner conductive to the child ‘achieving the fullest possible social integration’.
2. The UN Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons
with Disability (UN 1993). Rule 6 (of 22) clearly identifies integrated education as the vehicle for equalising opportunities, noting that countries should ensure that the education of people with disabilities is an integral part of the educational system.

3. The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, the UN’s education agency) Salamanca Statement (UNESCO 1994). This document invites countries to respond to a framework of action based on a clear commitment to inclusive education. Point 7 is unequivocal:

The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, wherever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have. Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles of and rates of learning and ensuring quality to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnership with their communities. There should be a continuum of support and services to match the continuum of special needs encountered in every school.

(UNESCO, 1994, quoted in Robertson, Childs and Marsden, 2000: 52)

The voice of inclusion for SEN in schooling from the international community has helped inclusion to become policy in many countries including in England and Taiwan. Inclusion is a basic consideration of equality for pupils with SEN. After we explore the meaning of equality, this study will therefore examine how ‘equality’ is expressed in and connected to inclusion in England and Taiwan.

In Taiwan, the Constitution (NA, 1947, Chapter 13) guarantees the principle of equality of educational right for all people. It provides educational opportunities to every child. Early Taiwan educational policy is founded on a ‘meritocratic principle’. It set out to produce an elite who would contribute to all in society. However, the concept of education has changed as the efforts of voluntary organizations and parents of children with SEN, and the advocacy for inclusion for SEN heightened worldwide. Although the Constitution entitled rights for all to be educated, there was no provision for people with SEN until
1984. The Special Education Act 1984 was established as a reflection of a world trend to improve the quality of life for people with SEN, but the relevant provisions were not implemented. In 1997 the Act was amended, and other provisions were added, for example the Special Education Enforcement Rules, which detailed the way in which central Government and LEAs were to deal with pupils with SEN. The new provisions offered the basic right of opportunity for people with SEN to an education.

As already mentioned, in Britain, the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) was a major landmark in thinking about special education needs and many of its recommendations appeared in the 1981 Education Act (CroU and Moses, 2003: 732). The Report set out to review the provision for children with 'handicap'. It dismissed the concept "handicap" and instead instituted the concept of "special educational needs" (SEN). Robertson, Childs and Marsden (2000:50) outlined the key principle of 'right' and 'equality' inherent in the Warnock Report as follows:

- Pupils with special education needs are not different from other pupils. Indeed, many children (20 percent) experience difficulties in learning during their education.
- Therefore, the aims of education should be the same for all pupils.
- Wherever possible, pupils with special educational needs should have these needs met in mainstream school.
- Mainstream teachers should assume responsibility for meeting these needs.
- Pupils with special educational needs, and their parents, should be involved in decision-making about school provision and placement.
- Pupils with special educational needs to be assessed appropriately.

Furthermore, Goacher, Evans, Welton and Wedell (1988: 4) state:

The Warnock Committee pointed out in its report that children could not be fitted neatly into handicap categories, and that their special needs were often more complex than a single category would indicate. Furthermore, the
educational needs of a child could not usually be derived from a given category of handicap...the Warnock Committee recommended that the system of handicap category should be replaced by a more flexible and interactive definition of special educational need.

These ideas were expressed in the 1981 Education Act, the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001. Blair (2001: 133) described the development of entitlement of rights for SEN as follows:

However, since 1981 pupils with disabilities have been able to benefit from provisions that address any Special Education Needs (SEN) they may have. The relevant provisions are now in the Education Act 1996 as amended by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Discrimination Act 2001 (SENDA). Statutory SEN provisions establish a qualified right to education in mainstream school. They also grant a right to the resources required to make this possible as long as this is compatible with the efficient education of other pupils in the school and the efficient use of resources. The definitions of SEN and Disability overlap and many pupils with SEN would, potentially, have been able to make claim under the DDA but for the fact that schools were left out of its scope. This position is reformed by SENDA. Pupils now have a right not to suffer discrimination as well as a right to the resources necessary to meet their special educational needs.

Reflecting these principles, the Physical Education in National Curriculum for England stated:

Equality of opportunity is one of a broad set of common values and purposes which underpin the school curriculum and the work of schools. These also include a commitment to valuing ourselves, our families and other relationships, the wider groups to which we belong, the diversity in our society and the environment in which we live.

(DfEE/QCA, 1999a: 4)
However, Evans and Davies (1993: 24) reminded us: ‘A National Curriculum may be a positive step in the direction of ensuring that a basic entitlement is established in PE but would be no guarantee of equity’. The relationship between policy intention and practice in schools needs to be examined carefully.

According to the development of provision for pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England, beside those with severe ‘disability’ or multiple learning difficulties who are educated in special schools, all other pupils with SEN have a right to be accommodated within mainstream schools (in England) and those that have received additional resources (in Taiwan). However, it is not enough just to provide an equal opportunity to access mainstream schooling. Campbell (2002: 12) remarked: ‘“inclusion” is not simply about equality of access, but also equality of circumstance, participation and outcomes’.

If teachers do not obtain the necessary resources and support to bring about inclusion, the schools will not evolve an environment for SEN and the idea of inclusion will not be achieved. Before discussing this proposition, I first want to clarify the definitions of ‘mainstream’ and ‘inclusion’.

2.4.3 Inclusion, Integration and Mainstreaming

As mentioned earlier, mainstreaming and inclusion are the main strategies in policy for pupils with SEN to experience equality. Mainstreaming is considered to occur when students can meet ‘traditional academic expectations with minimal assistance’ (Friend and Bursuck, 1996, quoted in Ito, 1998: 1). Farrell (1998, quoted in Fitzgerald, 2006: 754) stated that mainstreaming is ‘about a disabled student spending part of the school day alongside non-disabled classmates in a mainstream setting’. Mainstreaming, then, can be seen as the process of moving SEN pupils from special schools into mainstream schools. However, Stainback and Stainback (1996) defined ‘inclusion’ as the
placement of all students with disabilities in general education classrooms with necessary support given within these classrooms (quoted in Ito, 1998: 1). Farrell (2003: 80) adapted the content of the Meeting Special Education Needs: A programme of Action (DfEE, 1998) to advocate that the concept of inclusion should include:

the participation of young people in the full range of social experiences and opportunities once they left schools; the participation of all pupils in the curriculum and social life of mainstream schools and in learning which leads to the highest level of achievement; and the placement of pupils with SEN in mainstream schools.

Ainscow (1999: 190) described the difference between the terms 'integration' and 'inclusion' as:

While many different positions were reported, a common view was to see integration as the movement of pupils from special provision into the mainstream, and inclusion as being about the degree of participation of pupils into mainstream activities and experiences.

However, Armstrong (2003: 4) remarked:

Inclusion is concerned with countering oppressive and marginalizing values and with understanding how these connect to practices and policies wherever they take place and in whatever form.

Barton (2003: 12) provided more explanations:

Inclusion is not about assimilation or accommodation of individuals into an essentially unchanged system of educational provision and practice. It is not fundamentally concerned with the inclusion of categorized pupils such as disabled pupils. It is more than this. It is not about placement or the removal of
an individual from one context into another. It is not about dumping children into what are essentially extensions of their former segregated experiences. Inclusive education is not about the reform of special education nor is it a sub-specialism of special education. Inclusive education is about why, how, when, where and the consequences of educating all learners. It involves the politics of recognition and is concerned with the serious issue of who is included and who is excluded within education and society generally.

To summarise, inclusion may involve a wide range of educational factors and it is hard to achieve an agreement of definition. However, the definition of ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ provided above may reflect the differences between ‘equality’ and ‘equity’. ‘Inclusion’ is an idea likely to provide more than ‘equal opportunity’ to SEN pupils. This study, therefore, will consider whether schools and teachers achieve ‘inclusion’ for pupils with SEN within PE in Taiwan and England.

It has been argued that ‘societies are to be judged by the way in which they treat their non-productive members, those who are limited or disadvantaged in some way’ (Kelly, 1990: 32). If we examine policy in terms of the education provided for pupils with SEN, then equality should be an underlying element of the policy. Kelly pointed out, ‘What it must advocate, therefore, is that every child must have every opportunity to develop as a fully human, autonomous being, and that society must make the resources available for this to be possible’ (Kelly, 1990: 33). I will therefore address the difference in approach to mainstreaming and inclusion in the two countries.

In Taiwan, the main reasons for the development of practice and policy on inclusion are to be found in the influences from the U.S.A., trends in the international community and the need to reform special education (Liu, 2000). Particularly, most of the concepts related to mainstreaming and inclusion are derived from the U.S.A. When we study policy in Taiwan, we have to consider the development of policy for pupils with SEN.
in the U.S.A. The words, mainstreaming, inclusion and integration, do not appear in the content of the Special Education Act 1984 in Taiwan nor in the Individual Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1997) in the U.S.A., but a definition of categories and administration of placement are included for SEN. The Special Education Act 1984 provides guidelines for central Government and LEAs to follow in the implementation of policy for SEN and the idea of mainstreaming and inclusion are implicit in it. The Special Education Act 2001 states ‘The curriculum, teaching material and instruction have to be adapted for pupils with SEN (Article 5) and the LEAs have to set up regulations of accommodation for pupils with SEN when they are educating in normal classes (Article 14). It is implied that pupils with SEN will be accommodated in mainstreaming schools that are resourced to take them. Nevertheless, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines neither mentions the idea of mainstreaming and inclusion directly in words. By contrast, the National Curriculum in England directly addresses the inclusion statement for all pupils including those who have learning difficulties in every stage and in each subject, and guidelines are provided for teachers to instruct and include pupils with SEN. Furthermore, the Special Educational Need and Disability Act 2001 requires mainstream education to cater directly and explicitly with SEN. These are the main differences in the provision in terms of expressing the concept of inclusion.

In Taipei City, beside four special education schools, there are 47 primary schools in which there are classes resourced for pupils with SEN; 9 primary schools have hearing impaired classes; 5 schools have 5 speech and visual impaired classes in the primary school level. This represents a partial inclusion of pupils with SEN in the public schools in Taipei City. Parents can choose the nearest primary school which includes special education or resourced classes in which their children can study. Some pupils choose to study in mainstreaming classes as their parents think they have only mild impairment and
they wish them to have the opportunity to be with able bodied pupils. At the same time, schools, which include special or resourced classes, may practise inclusion in specific subjects, such as PE, music or art. However, in England, we find that all primary schools are mainstream schools and teachers have to ‘practise’ inclusion if they accept pupils with SEN.

As a PE teacher in Taiwan I questioned whether current policies were bringing about inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN. In Taiwan, the Special Education Act 2001 set limits to the number of none-SEN pupils in a class which practised mainstreaming and entitled the LEAs to fix the quantity of that number. Taipei City Government, for example, expects shots to reduce the none-SEN pupils in a class by up to 5 where SEN pupils are present. But this alone does not guarantee ‘inclusion’, as teachers may not know how to cope with a whole class including pupils with SEN. Although the LEA of Taipei City expected schools to reduce the amount of none-SEN pupils by the maximum of 5, they rarely reduced more than 1 none-SEN pupil from each mainstreaming class.

On the other hand, in England, teachers in primary schools have to teach all subjects including PE. This is not always the case in Taiwan. In most schools, there are specialists to teach subjects, such as PE, music and art. Although the systems of education are different, the problems teachers face may be similar in the two countries. The training of teachers is a key element in achieving inclusion. Indeed, in many studies teachers expressed their lack of confidence to accommodate pupils with SEN because of insufficient knowledge and training relating to SEN or disability (see Hergaty, Pocklington and Lucas, 1981, Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003 in England; Huang, 1996, Chen, 2002 in Taiwan).
2.5 Teacher Training for SEN

Although the education systems are different in Taiwan and England, there are many similarities in initial teacher training (ITT), especially the routes to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). There are a variety of training routes for people who want to become primary teachers in these two countries. People can choose to study a degree in education or they can take the programme of postgraduate certificate of education (PGCE) after they complete their study in universities. But the content of initial teacher training relating to SEN is different as the education systems and the idea of inclusion embedded within them are different (see Chapter 5). In England, as the Special Educational Needs: Code of Practice (DfES, 2001: 44) pointed out, 'All teachers are teachers of special educational needs'. Trainees have to be aware of the role of the Special Education Needs Coordinator (SENCO) and seek advice when they have pupils with SEN in their classes. By contrast, in Taiwan, the courses of ITT for trainees who want to become SEN teachers are provided by specific universities. Specifically, there is a college which provides a PGCE in PE relating to SEN. However, there is nothing relating to SEN in general ITT provision, for schools do not accept pupils with SEN unless they obtain extra resources from central Government. On the other hand, in my experience, the LEAs provided a good deal of in-service training in PE for SEN and most training courses provide general knowledge of SEN.

As mentioned earlier, Sugden and Talbot (1998, quoted in Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003: 52) have pointed out that '95 percent of teaching pupils with SEN is merely an extension of existing mixed ability teaching'. Two further points arise from this statement. On the one hand, it means that we need to reconsider the meaning of inclusion in PE. On the other, that inclusion for all pupils is not impossible but the priority is that teachers have to be equipped with a positive attitude, open mind and sufficient knowledge.
of SEN. Teachers seemingly need more training and support to achieve inclusive instruction. Vickerman's (2000, quoted in Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003: 52) research suggests that this is beginning to happen in the UK:

Twenty-four responses were received from ITT institutions and early findings indicate that the profession is moving in the right direction. For example, 87.5 percent of all ITT PE providers support the notion of inclusive education as an integral aspect of their course programme; over 94 percent of trainee PE teachers supported the notion of a child's right to an inclusive education.

Although teachers might be better prepared to face SEN there is evidence that many feel they need further support relating to instruction that is practical and useful in classes if inclusion is to be achieved. Porter and Lacey (1999: 27) found that almost half of the teachers in their study considered more staffing or smaller classes were required for improvement in provision; 38% of teachers thought training and increasing staff skills were important and 21% of teachers think changes in the curriculum and its organization would be helpful. This suggests that the provision for SEN is not adequate, at least from the perspective of teachers' needs. Thus, the issues of initial teacher training (ITT) and continuing professional development (CPD) seem to be significant elements when teachers are concerned to include pupils with SEN in mainstream school (in England) or mainstreaming classes (in Taiwan).

Parental involvement is also an important factor for teachers when dealing with inclusion. Rathbone (2001, in Gross, 2002) found that although the majority of parents believed they could provide vital information about their child's SEN needs, schools did not use their information and nearly half of parents in their survey did not feel involved in any review of the progress of their child. Thus we need to consider what role parents play in the process of inclusion for teachers and schools. Do teachers and schools want parents
to be involved in the goal of inclusion? These issues are explored later in this study (see Chapter 7).

2.6 Research on SEN

In this section I will review available research on SEN in Taiwan and England, focusing specially on that related to SEN policies.

2.6.1 Research on Inclusive Education in Taiwan

There are an increasing number of studies concerned with SEN provision and practice in Taiwan. For example, I used the key words 'inclusive education' to search the relevant studies on the web of dissertations and thesis abstract system of the National Central Library in Taiwan. There are 133 formal dissertations and theses related to SEN from 1995 to 2003. There are two studies of policy for SEN (see Liu, 2000; Tsai, 2002), two studies about PE for SEN (see Chen, F. S., 2002; Chen, L. T., 2002) and others related to practice of SEN. Due to the influence of the USA and elsewhere, when making policy and legislating for SEN in Taiwan, the central idea has been the achievement of 'inclusive education' (Tsai, 2002). Some researchers have focused on 'inclusive education' by investigating the attitude of practitioners toward it in schools (see Lin, 2004, Ho, 2003, Cheng, 2003 and Yang, 2001). Working within a positivist paradigm, these researchers utilized questionnaires to survey the opinions of teachers, headteachers and principals of schools, analysing data using quantitative methods. Notwithstanding the limitation of such research, a variety of perceptions of inclusive education are reported among teachers, headteachers and principals of schools, along with teachers' need for more support to deal with inclusion for SEN pupils. It was also found that parents who have children with SEN
supported the idea of inclusion. They expected their children to obtain more learning opportunities if inclusion was promoted by all practitioners.

Some researchers have employed qualitative research methods, case study and interview, to approach this field to explore the experience and insight of teachers who are responsible for inclusion for SEN (see Su, 2000 and Shiu, 2002). Su’s (2000) in-depth interviews with teachers of primary schools in Taipei City revealed that teachers in practice refused pupils with SEN in their classrooms because they lacked training in special educational needs and bringing about inclusion for all pupils increased their workload. However, in principle teachers accepted pupils with SEN in their classrooms because their training, their experience related to SEN and empathy for them suggested they ought to. In contrast in England, as Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly (2003: 48) pointed out: ‘the Teacher Training Agency (2002) revised standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status and the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) Inspection Framework (OFSTED 2002) have enhanced their focus on the scrutiny, competence and implementation of inclusive Physical Education (PE) for pupils with SEN’.

Tsai’s (2002) survey of policy implementation of inclusive education in Taipei City involving questionnaire and interviews with practitioners in the primary school found that there are different perceptions of policy and implementation for inclusive education among practitioners of different education backgrounds. He also pointed out that able-bodied pupils’ parents preferred their children included with pupils with physical disabilities rather than those with emotional disorder and that inclusive education needs more support if is to develop in Taipei City.

Beyond these studies, there is little research related to policy implementation for SEN. However, the above provide some indication of the opinions of teachers, parents and policy makers toward inclusion in primary schools and insights for a study of SEN in
Taiwan. They reveal that teachers need more support and training to deal with inclusion in Taiwan but we do not know the detail of what they need or how LEAs allocate resources for SEN. This study will explore the relationships between policy and implementation for SEN from the perspective of practitioners in schools, the LEA Advisors, pupils with SEN and their parents. By investigating practice in Taiwan and England, this study might provide a more comprehensive understanding of policy and practice for SEN in PE in both countries.

2.6.2 Research on SEN in England

Again a search for relevant research literature was carried out. Here I will concentrate on those studies related to policy for SEN relevant to my study which focuses on how educational policies are implemented in England.

As already noted, the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) and the subsequent 1981 Act are considered milestones for special education development as well as the research related to SEN. Before the Warnock Report, studies focused on the diagnostic classification of SEN children (see Cave and Madison, 1978, Wedell and Roberts, 1981, in Vulliamy and Webb, 1995). However, the Report and subsequent Act shifted this perspective. As Wedell (1985: 1) noted ‘this Act gave “official” recognition to the concept of “special educational need”, and to the concern of special education with meeting children’s needs rather than with categorizing them’. Thus, as Vulliamy and Webb (1995: 262) remarked:

Thus the focus of research needed to shift from descriptive studies of children’s conditions and disabilities to studies of the ways in which various educational needs might best be met.

After the Report and the Act, more research adopted a critical approach to special education and started to move away from the individual perspective of SEN (Hill, 1995),

51
more attention was directed toward the improvement of school life for SEN pupils by focusing on policy implementation. Qualitative research methods were now used to survey the opinions of teachers (see Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas 1981; Riddell, 2000; Croll and Moses, 2003; Smith, 2004; Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke, 2005). As noted already, inclusion is one of the most significant concepts in SEN policy but it is not always evident in practice. Inclusion seems to be ‘rhetoric’ when related to policy for SEN. Feiler and Gibson (1999: 148) argued that there is a dearth of empirical evidence to convince teachers that education for all in a mainstream setting is appropriate and achievable. They argue: ‘teachers may be prepared to support children with milder SEN but, as for those with severe behavioural difficulties, rhetoric about education for all may well go unheeded’. They suggested that the benefit of inclusion needs to be underpinned by research evidence to convince practitioners to practise education for all. However, other researchers have indicated that teachers do not always approve of inclusion of SEN pupils (see Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas, 1981; Croll and Moses, 2003; Smith, 2004; Fitzgerald, Stevenson and Botterill, 2004; Morley, Bailey, Tan and Lucas, 2005), but acknowledge that there are difficulties to be overcome before inclusion can be practised. They reveal that school teachers are unable to provide needed individual attention to pupils with SEN in large classes as they have to take responsibility for both none-SEN pupils and SEN pupils (Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas, 1981; Pijl and Meijer, 1994). Rose’s (2001) study gauged the opinion of teachers and headteachers in primary schools about the necessary conditions for greater inclusion. He found that the classroom support in the form of a teaching assistant, for example the learning support assistant (LSA), was considered a critical element of successful inclusion. Inclusion was likely to work if pupils with SEN were accompanied by support staff. Teachers also said they need more training and knowledge of SEN. Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas (1981) found that the majority of teachers had
received no practical example of how to deal with SEN pupils in initial training related to SEN; Fitzgerald, Stevenson and Botterill (2004) revealed that many teachers were sceptical about CPD to effectively support their PE teaching for disabled children. In addition, Smith’s (2004) survey found that secondary PE teachers did not practise inclusion for SEN pupils although they expressed their commitment to provide an ‘equal opportunity’ for pupils with SEN. He also indicated that the use of traditional team games in PE did not facilitate inclusion of pupils with SEN. Although teachers were willing to accommodate pupils with SEN in their classes, their knowledge of instruction for SEN was insufficient and poor. Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke’s (2005: 84) survey of secondary teachers exploring perceptions of including children with SEN and/or disabilities in PE revealed that the level of participation for children with SEN and/or disabilities was ‘affected by the activity area, level of support and training opportunities available’ (ibid.) for teachers. Moreover, the TTA (Teacher Training Agency, 1998, in Miller and Porter, 1999) has produced documents (National Standards for Special Education Needs (SEN) Specialist Teachers: Consultation and Options for the Delivery of Training for Special Educational Needs (SEN) Specialist: Consultation) relevant to teachers involved in SEN. One (the National Standards for Special Educational Needs Specialist Teachers: Consultation) sets out proposed standards for specialist teachers of SEN; another (the Options for the Delivery of Training for Special Educational Needs (SEN) Specialist: Consultation) outlines possible options for the delivery of training. However, Miller and Porter (1999: 56) have argued that ‘the documents don’t provide a realistic way in which teachers might build up meaningful areas of “specialism”’ and ‘the proposals need to identify the clear expectations of those teachers entering specialist areas of education and those continuing work in the field’. More in-depth studies are needed if teachers are to achieve inclusion.
The Warnock Report (DES, 1978) also highlighted the importance of parental involvement within SEN (Tomlinson, 1982). Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas (1981) have argued that the parents of SEN children are positive about interaction with ‘mainstream’ schools. Riddell (2000) argued that parents of children with SEN would gain more ‘right to appeal’ if their children were taught in mainstream schools and they received unsatisfactory services. Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas (1981) urged schools to interact with parents appropriately and to consider parents’ needs as well as pupils. These studies do not, however, reveal how parents interact with schools and teachers and what services they need.

Wedell’s (1993: 2) research surveyed the allocation of resources to SEN: ‘the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) found that, already in the late 1991, 15% of a sample of 81 LEAs reported that schools had made cuts in special needs co-ordinator posts and in learning support departments.’; ‘the Audit Commission and HMI found that, in a small sample of headteachers interviewed, 52% judged that the resources to meet pupils’ SENs were insufficient, although 69% claim that they were not limiting their admission of pupils with SENs.’ Riddell (2000) also has indicated that in future the allocation of resources should depend on the professional assessment of SEN by LEAs and the support which could be provided by schools. In 1998, Estelle Morris, Schools Standards Minister in the Labour government, launched a scheme, ‘Meeting Special Educational Needs’. It is a programme for action, confirming the vision and key principles underlying the Green Paper *Excellence for All Children* (Gordon, 1999). A key action of this programme was to increase investment to £21 million in 1999-2000 for promoting SEN and the training of teachers for pupils with SEN. Has this programme improved SEN provision by improving the training of teachers? These are issues to which I will later return.
Riddell (2002) carried out four cases studies in local authorities in England and Scotland to explore and compare the processes by which national policies are transferred to local settings. She argued that the LEAs are the key players in the process of policy practice. She found that the English policy framework placed a greater emphasis on the role of service consumers (e.g. parents and SEN pupils) compared with Scottish policy as the latter is set up to minimize the role of service consumers. This study will also examine the relationships between LEAs and primary schools and the way in which policy is re-contextualised between them.

2.7 In Summary

This literature review has revealed that there is momentum towards inclusion for dealing with SEN pupils in PE, however, how inclusion is ‘expressed’ in law, legislation and the National Curriculum to influence teaching SEN pupils within PE in the two countries needs to be further examined. Second, it suggests that we need a framework to view SEN policy and its implementation within PE not only from a legislative perspective but also from the point of view of teachers and pupils in schools. Finally, it suggests that qualitative research methods might be productively used to address questions which have emerged from the literature and research on SEN.

1. Taiwan is officially referred to as ‘Republic of China’ where Mainland China is termed ‘the People’s Republic of China’.

2. ‘As used in special education, it (integration) refers to the education of pupils with special needs in ordinary schools. Integration provides a “natural” environment where these pupils are alongside their peers and are freed from the isolation that is characteristic of much special schools placement’ (Hegarty, Pocklington and Lucas, 1981: 11).
3.1 Introduction

So far the preceding chapters have discussed the social context of policy and current research for pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England, and highlighted the debates of equality and inclusion that were expressed in the school curriculum in the two countries. The research methods will be discussed in Chapter 4. Before that, on the one hand, we need to understand the cultural contexts of policy for pupils with SEN; on the other, we have to probe the nature of policy and the actions which are affected by it. This chapter will introduce the theoretical framework of this study used to 'make sense' of the policy analysis in the two countries. It constitutes a heuristic model to explore policy and its implementation for SEN pupils within PE by using Bernstein’s (1990) theory of knowledge production and reproduction. Moreover, I employ a sociological perspective to investigate how teachers view SEN pupils’ (dis)ability in PE. The theoretical framework also led me to choose the most appropriate methodological strategy with respect to my research questions. I will begin by reviewing how others have approached research on educational policy between two countries and how they have conceptualized the relationships between policy and practice.
3.2 Comparing Policy on SEN in Two Countries — Developing a Cross-Cultural Perspective

Although there are different education systems and legislations in Taiwan and England, policy for SEN is inevitably one of the most important policies in any country. Whilst this study accordingly explores and compares different policy perspectives for SEN in PE, one critical question arises: how are we to compare policy for SEN in two countries with such different histories, cultures and policy systems? Kirp (1982) suggested that policy frameworks co-exist with each other in a state of dynamic tension:

They are pursued by different policy actors for different reasons. They have distinctive potentialities and equally distinctive pathologies, and tend to fall in and out of favour with policy-makers over time. Choosing among these policy frameworks affect the policy system and, vitally, the supposed beneficiaries.

(Kirp, 1982, quoted in Riddell, 2002: 12)

Thus one of the purposes of this study is to identify the social context and legislative perspective for SEN in the two countries. In this context, ‘’policy’’ is not understood as something separate from the complex lives of people, including LEA officers, teachers, pupils, parents, schools and local communities’ (Armstrong, 2003: 39). This study, accordingly, applied a ‘cross-cultural perspective’ (Armstrong, 2003) to compare policy implementation in the two countries as a means of better understanding the processes of social reproduction that occurs within policy. It differs from some traditional approaches to comparing policy based on statistical analysis which tend to have little to say about the social, cultural and economic environments (e.g. Lin, 2004, Ho, 2003, Cheng, 2003 and Yang, 2001) in which policy is embedded. Comparative study requires equivalence:
equivalence focuses on the relationships between a general dimension (Niessen and Peschar, 1982, in Meijer, Pijl and Hegarty, 1994), for example, comparing England SEN policy with Scotland (see Riddell, 1996; Riddell, 2002); it can also ‘adopt a critical stance towards taken-for-granted assumptions within one’s “own” national setting’ (Armstrong, 2003: 35), for example, comparing different countries (see Meijer, Pijl and Hegarty, 1994; Armstrong, 2003).

A cross-cultural approach also helps us to understand the issues, such as ‘human rights’, ‘social justice’ and ‘equality’ which are sometimes considered to be the essential elements of policy for SEN, in different cultural contexts by viewing the process of policy making and implementation. Armstrong argued:

A cross-cultural perspective attempts to take into account both the cultural and political legacies of historical change and the underlying processes and values within a contemporary national context. Such an approach is powerful in terms of the possibilities it opens up of trying to understand different societies, their complexities and what we can learn from them.

(Armstrong, 2003: 49)

As most policy for SEN in Taiwan is affected by trends worldwide, we might find some similar developments of policy for SEN between Taiwan and England especially the initial intention and rehabilitative purpose, in the early years of schooling. However, although policies for SEN are formed by different education systems and different political systems, we can perhaps learn from the context and process of policy production in the two countries. This may be a reference point for our understanding of the reproduction of policy for SEN. The opinions of LEA Advisors, teachers, parents and pupils with SEN may enhance our understanding of SEN policy by providing evidence of their real experiences. I attempted to avoid using the ‘gap’ model advocated by Fulcher
(1989), to compare and contrast policy and practice at a national level in the two countries. As Fulcher (1989: 245) mentioned ‘the “gap” model describes the failure of national or government policy as due to a “gap” between policy and implementation: it is a political theory and it contains a reductionist model of politics’. In contrast, the model proposed here (following Fulcher, 1989) seeks to compare SEN policy in PE rather than to investigate if there is a ‘gap’ between policy and implementation for SEN in the two countries. Thus, this study will examine the process of policy production and reproduction in social context (see Figure 3.2, p. 73) from a cross-cultural perspective and explore ways of improving PE in practice for pupils with SEN.

3.3 Developing a Policy Framework for Pupils with SEN in PE

3.3.1 Policy Matters and Sociological Perspectives on SEN

Policy is everywhere and affects our life deeply. Penney and Evans (2005: 21) provide a vivid description for this phenomenon:

The time that the school bell rings and the children arrive, the length of school day, the number of pupils in the classroom, their sex and social class, the quantity and quality of the resources (human and physical) available for teaching, the content of curriculum, even the colour of the paint on the sports hall walls – all may be the products of policy.

When we study the topic of pedagogy for pupils with SEN, we can not avoid giving consideration to policy. Fulcher argues that:

Policy is the product, whether written (laws, reports, regulation), stated or enacted (for example, pedagogic practice), of the outcome of political states of play in various arenas.

(Fulcher, 1999, quoted in Armstrong, 2003: 5)
Thus, while we attempt to explore educational policies for SEN, we first have to emphasise and consider the process and nature of policy within the wider social context and how it affects our life.

However, 'Policy is clearly a matter of the "authoritative allocation of value"; policies are the operational statements of values, statements of prescriptive intention' (Kogan, 1975, quoted in Ball, 1990: 3). But whose values are validated in policy and whose are not? It needs to be examined carefully. Thus 'the authoritative allocation of values draws our attention to the centrality of power and control in the concept of policy' (Prunty, 1985, quoted in Ball, 1990: 3). From this perspective, the issue of emphasizing whose 'value' is the central element in studying SEN policy. Value will bear on the allocation of resource and determines who gets what, where and when. Thus 'policies cannot be divorced from interests, from conflict, from domination or from justice' (Ball, 1990: 3). All these elements will be explored in my study and discussed in the subsequent chapters. Next, I turn to explore the relationships between policy and implementation in schooling.

Riddell and Brown (1994: 1) pointed out that there are two factors which influenced the development of policy for SEN in England. One was reconceptualizing learning difficulties as not being intrinsic to the child but as arising in the context of interaction with his or her environment. Another derives from educational policy and legislation of the 1980s and early 1990s, which established centralized control over the curriculum between schools through the vehicle of parental choice and weakened the power base of local authorities. By contrast, the development of policy in Taiwan was influenced by the trend of inclusion for SEN worldwide and the advocacy from academic and humanistic organizations. However, the direction of policy making for SEN depends on the social context in a country and worldwide influences. Both may influence the
definition of SEN. As Lunt (2002: 39) pointed out:

In the UK the shift in conceptualization of children's needs from individual 'handicap' to 'special educational needs' led to a shift in focus from the child to the school, and to an examination of ways in which schools could better meet a wider range of pupils' needs.

Obviously, policy makers have to consider the needs of subjects who are involved in policy, with appropriate design of policy projected towards an ideal society. When studying educational policy for SEN, it is therefore important to locate the definitions of SEN in their social context. For example, the term 'handicap' was initially considered with reference to a notion of the able-bodied. The 'handicapped' were those lacking physical or mental functions accepted by society. This policy focused on how to improve or 'cure' the impairments of SEN pupils in order to adapt to live their future life in mainstream society. Over the last two decades, the idea of 'special educational needs' has replaced 'handicap' and reformed policy for SEN. Society and schools have had to re-adjust to this new definition. We, therefore, review different definitions for SEN as they underpin policy with direction and value orientation. As Oliver (1988: 18) remarked, there are four accounts of the way social policies have developed; a humanitarian response, social investment, the outcome of conflict between competing groups and social control. He suggested:

Each account, when applied to disability, carries with it a basic definition and understanding of the nature of disability. The definitions underpinning policy initiatives are then clearly important for they shape the direction and nature of such initiatives.

(Oliver, 1988: 16)

I attempt to view the development and context of definitions for SEN related to policy
following Oliver’s suggestions. First, humanitarianism and rehabilitation were the main purposes of policy for SEN and practised by segregation in the special schools in the 1950s in England and Taiwan (see Chapter 2, the Education Act 1944 in England and the development of policy for SEN in Taiwan). At this time the notion of SEN was not only a humanitarian but an economic concern, an attempt to reduce the ‘burdens’ on society of those with SEN who are not part of the workforce. During that period, a medical perspective underscored the main vision of pupils with SEN and the direction and orientation of policy was inevitably influenced by it. Second, ‘social investment in special education was seen as both a means of reducing the burdens of pauperism through training children to be independent, and enabling more and more children to become part of the industrial workforce’ (Oliver, 1988: 18). Policies for SEN were seen as a social investment, especially in developing countries. But this ‘value’ was based on a vision of the needs of the most ‘able-bodied’ people, not those with SEN. Third, Oliver’s (ibid.) ‘notion of conflict and vested interests can also be used to explain the development of special education’. He argued that the initial development of segregated special education in the UK reflected the vested interests of mainstream school sectors because they gained benefit from it. The ‘vested interests’ of the medical profession, educational administrators and educational psychologists also supported segregated SEN for their own ends. In Oliver’s view, ‘The 1944 Education Act represents the dominance of the medical profession and subsequent developments culminating in the 1981 Education Act sprang from the gradual challenge to this dominance by educational administrators and educational psychologists’ (ibid.). Fourth, Oliver raises the spectre of SEN serving the purposes of social control. He asks:

To what extent, therefore, is the establishment of special educational provision an expression of the wish to control a deviant section of the school
population?

(Ford, Mongon and Whelan, 1982, quoted in Oliver, 1988: 28)

He argues that if the answer is affirmative then pupils with SEN will be accommodated within special schools. Before the Warnock Report (DES, 1978), children with 'special educational need' were categorized and placed in special schools. Although the trend in education for SEN has shifted from segregation in special schools to inclusion in mainstream schools, the focus has remained on the value of the able-bodied in society and assumes people with SEN are 'deviant' members in society. However, the issue of whose 'value' is embedded in SEN policy is central in Oliver's work and this has helped me examine the policy context in my study from a critical perspective.

3.3.2 The Analyses of Macro and Micro Structures within Policy and Its Implementation

Penney and Evans (2005) have argued that the relationship between central Government and school policy making and implementation has traditionally been perceived as being hierarchical. Policy defined or 'made' by central Government and expressed in laws, legislation and provisions is implemented by educational practitioners whose role is defined by the statutory guidelines in the chain of policy. Consequently, the relationships between policy and implementation might be considered as 'linear in form' (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992: 7). For example, Penney and Evans (2005) make the following remark on the relationship between government and schools in respect of education policy in the UK:

At the heart of the renewed debate were the matters of how we think about 'policy' and their inter-relationship. Traditionally, the emphasis has been on a firm distinction – between two arenas, two sets of individuals, engaged in
separate and fundamentally different activities, and related sequentially and hierarchically to one another. From this perspective agencies and individuals associated with central government are viewed as having an essentially direct and determining influence over what happens in schools. Teachers are portrayed as a final link in a chain of decision making, positioned in a passive role, to act on the whims of powerful others outside schools. Meanwhile pupils remain out of view, rarely deemed worthy of comment in relation to the ‘how’ or ‘who’ of policy. The image is one of a transmission of this thing called policy to those whose task it is to translate it, in an essentially direct manner, into that other thing we called practice.

(Penney and Evans, 2005: 23)

In this perspective, the roles of teachers and pupils seem always to be marginal in the policy process and their voices are rarely heard. If we addressed the policy relationship between government and schools from this perspective we might be inclined to review schools and teachers as ‘simply’ administering the policy they ‘receive’ from government and LEAs. However, we could not tell whether policy was implemented ‘appropriately’ or how it is modified or changed as the voices of teachers and pupils are not heard. Alternatively, we might view the relationships between policy and implementation rather differently. However:

National policy may have wider effects on schools than, say, a local education authority’s decisions, but this does not mean we should resort to a top-down model of policy filtering from government level through a state apparatus.

(Fulcher, 1989: 245)

Penney and Evans (1999) offer a view of policy which emphasizes a more fluid and complex view of the policy-practice relationship between practitioners in school and government agencies. They stated: ‘Some researchers (see for example Hoyle, 1986; Sabatier, 1993) have promoted a “bottom up” view of the policy-practice relationship,
emphasizing the active role of the practitioner in the development of policy and curriculum change and the degree to which many policies in education are influenced and shaped by what happens in schools' (Penney and Evans, 1999: 19). However, Penney and Evans advocate a view of policy and implementation which privileges neither a ‘bottom up’ nor a ‘top down’ analysis. Instead, they see the relationship between policy and implementation as rather like a chain (see Figure 3.1). I will view the relation of policy from neither a top-down nor bottom up perspective. In my study, I wanted to investigate how LEAs implemented the National Curriculum and SEN provision and if they provided needed resources to schools and teachers to deal with inclusion for SEN. I also wanted to see whether government policy could provide the needed service and support to parents and pupils with SEN. On of the important perspectives was to view implementation from the perspective of teachers, parents and pupils with SEN and whether they received the appropriate resources. However, I was also attempting to see if they changed or modified policy in its implementation. Ainscow (1999: 193) remarked with reference to his survey of the policy development process:

Should the policy development process be top-down or bottom-up? Should the policy inform practice? Or should practice inform policy? The emerging view from participants was that the answer to each question is “both”. … Equally, best practice should help shape policy, but in the same way policy should influence practice.

Thus, on the other hand, the relationships between policy and implementation are analysed not only by ‘linear in form’, ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’, but also by micro and macro perspectives. As Armstrong (2003: 5) pointed out ‘Rather than referring to a simple top-down process, policy needs to be understood in the wider social context in which it occurs and in terms of its relationship to people’s lives’. From this perspective,
this study would hear the voice of pupils with SEN and their parents to consider whether policy on SEN met their needs.

When I reviewed the literature on policy for SEN, I discovered that a number of studies have focused on theoretical analyses of legislation and provision contained in policy documents, from a macro perspective (see for example, Riddell, 1996; Riddell 2002 in England, Liu, 2000; Tsai, 2002 in Taiwan). In parallel, others have focused on implementation of policy reflected in schooling that are based on a micro perspective (see for example Rose, 2001; Croll and Moses, 2003; Smith, 2004; Morley, Bailey, Tan and Lucas, 2005 in England; Chen, F. S., 2002; Chen, L. Y., 2002 in Taiwan). As Penney and Evans (1999: 20) pointed out: ‘Deconstructing the divide between macro and micro analyses have been key characteristics of work in education policy sociology’. Although both dimensions, macro and micro, need to be developed theoretically (Hammersley, 1993), this study attempted to utilize empirical investigation to build connections between them from a sociological viewpoint. As Hammersley (1993: 159) remarked:

Macro theories can, of course, be applied to explain micro-scale phenomena which fall within their categories... Conversely, micro theories can be used to explain macro phenomena, as when the policies of a government are ascribed to the personality of a prime minister or head of state.

Consequently, although ‘policy issues are not usually expressed in terms of a single policy framework; indeed they are more commonly described in terms of composite policy frameworks’ (Riddell, 2002: 13), ‘the way in which a policy problem gets defined says a great deal about how it will be resolved’ (Kirp, 1982, quoted in Riddell, 2002: 12). Furthermore, this study adopted a critical attitude towards the study of SEN policy and PE, as Barton stated:
Two main arguments are often used to justify the involvement of disabled pupils and young people in physical education and sports generally: that it will enhance the development of a more integrated society and that it could be the means to better status and a good standard of living. Both of these perspectives need to be critically analyzed.

(Barton 1993: 51)

This study, therefore, examined the provisions for SEN and the relationships between equality and inclusion in PE by interviewing pupils and their parents and LEA Advisors. However, every issue in the study was an expression of policy and affected by policy. They are closely and inevitably connected with each other. The relationships among each level have to be examined carefully in order to explore the dynamic process of policy implementation for SEN.

I represent the policy and implementation as a ‘chain’ as follow:

![Figure 3.1 Model of policy implementation in PE for SEN](image)
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This model is an attempt at trying to illustrate the 'flow' of policy in an area which neither exaggerates the 'top down' or 'bottom up'. It tries to provide a view to examine the process of policy and its implementation not only by policy makers themselves but also the opinion of subjects who are the subjects of policy for SEN.

3.3.3 Considering the Process of Policy and Implementation as the 'Duality of Structure'

In the previous section, I have identified policy for SEN from macro and micro perspectives and attempted to view and analyse it by a flow model. I will discuss policy and its implementation further from a sociological perspective.

One of the most important issues for sociology is 'trying to enlarge our understanding of human and social processes and acquire a growing fund of more reliable knowledge about them' (Elias, 1978: 17). Thus, most contemporary sociologists attempt to address issues relating to the relationships between people (agents) and the society (structure) they form, for example, Giddens' (1984: 25) concept of duality of structure. Elias (1978) argued that:

One can understand many aspects of the behavior or actions of individual people only if one sets out from the study of the pattern of their interdependence, the structure of their societies, in short the figurations they form with each other.

(Elias, 1978: 72)

As Green (2002: 66) pointed out, the main 'characteristic of figurational sociology is the assumption that people and their activities are best viewed in terms of the networks of social relationships (or figurations) of which they are always and inevitably a part'. Thus figurational sociology focuses on the interdependent relationship between individuals and society and it avoids any tendency to 'conceptualise the individual and society as two
diametrically opposed polarities' (Murphy, Sheard and Waddington, 2000, quoted in Smith and Green 2004: 594). Nevertheless, because 'a large part of thinking ... cannot be correctly understood, as long as its connection with the social implications of human life are not taken into account' (Goudsblom and Mennell, 1998, quoted in Green, 1998: 130), a figurational approach might provide a better way to view the complicated relationships behind human beings. A figurational approach reminds us to examine policy as a sociological network which are composed by government, LEA, school, teacher, pupils with SEN and their parent. As Armstrong argued:

Policy is paradoxical, the product of struggles and contradictions. It is made at many levels in society through legislation, social and political structures, institutional and institutionalized practice and discourses and through the struggles which take place in classrooms, staff rooms, meetings of governors, parents and trades unions, the media – all are arenas in which policies are made, re-interpreted and transmitted.

(Armstrong, 2003: 5)

However, if we consider policy as a complex social process to be made, it might be appropriate to view this process as one expression of the ‘duality of structure’ to which Giddens (1984) refers. Giddens’ conception of ‘the duality of structure’ articulates the relationships within and between the production and reproduction of society (Kirk, 2003: 172). As Giddens (1984: 25) explained:

Analyzing the structuration of social systems means studying the modes in which such systems, grounded in the knowledgeable activities of situated actors who draw upon rules and resources in the diversity of action contexts, are produced and reproduced in interaction.

If we view the relationship between policy and the individual in the social system, then
we see that knowledge of policy is reproduced through the interaction between individuals who are involved in the policy process. Policy for SEN constrains the development of SEN and simultaneously improves the development of SEN by interacting with the individuals within policy itself. For Kirk stated:

The notion of the ‘duality of structure’ refers to the ways in which individuals in interaction with others make sense of and in so doing construct, and at the same time are constructed by, a complex interplay of social processes.

(Kirk, 2003: 172)

According to Giddens, social structures simultaneously constrain and enable social action. Kirk (2003: 173), following Bernstein (1990), attempted to deal with the challenges of the duality of structure and he has produced a complex model of the social construction of pedagogic discourse. This perspective positions the concept of ‘discourse’ as central to the analysis of policy. ‘Discourse, as containing a theory which informs practice, means that we act on the basis of our ideas about how something works and what we want to achieve’ (Fulcher, 1989: 9). Ball (1990: 17), furthermore, remarked that discourse designates the conjunction of power and knowledge. Foucault (1971) argued:

No body of knowledge can be formed without a system of communications, records, accumulation and displacement which is in itself a form of power and which is linked, in its existence and functioning, to the other forms of power. Conversely no power can be exercised without the extraction, appropriation, distribution or retention of knowledge, on this level, there is not knowledge on one side and society on the other, or science and the state, but only the fundamental forms of knowledge/power...

(Foucault 1971, quoted in Ball, 1990: 17)

In this perspective, ‘discourses are, therefore, about what can be said, and thought, but
also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority’ (Ball, 1990: 17). Armstrong (2003: 1) argued that there are three discourses which have impacted the development of special education; they are ‘exclusion and segregation’, ‘normalisation’ and ‘inclusion’. The different discourses also influenced the different strategies of placement for pupils with SEN, from special schools (also see Chapter 2, the 9 Years Citizen Compulsory Education Act 1968 in Taiwan and the Education Act 1944 in England) to mainstream schools in England and mainstreaming classes in Taiwan. Reflecting this change for SEN pupils in schools, the National Curriculum became more inclusive and teachers’ instructions have to meet diverse pupils’ needs. However, to better understand the educational changes that have occurred in SEN policy within PE, the relationships between policy and implementation potentially can be conceptualised as a process of discourse production and reproduction. I followed Bernstein’s (1990, in Kirk, 2003: 174) assumption that knowledge is produced and reproduced across three fields of action, a primary field of production of discourse, a secondary field of the reproduction of discourse, and a third recontextualizing field, to modify the structure of policy and implementation (see Figure 3.2).

In my study, I attempt to explore the interaction between structure, provision and the National Curriculum for SEN in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan, and individuals, teachers and parents and pupils with SEN, in schools. The primary field is the location where policy for SEN is created. Much of this work is done in the legislative department, in Universities and in other international knowledge production agencies such as the UN (the United Nations). The secondary field is the place where the new ideas for policy implementation for SEN in schools relating to PE teachers, pupils with SEN and their parents when they follow the policy for themselves, is reproduced. In this field, I explore not only the opinions of PE teachers and parents but
also the voices of pupils with SEN; because ‘pupils are continuously shaping their sense of selves as learners at the intersection of home, school and peer group socio-cultural influence and relationships’ (Pollard and Filer, 2004: 2). The voice of SEN pupils about instruction has to be seen as part of the process of reproduction along with those of parents, teachers and others in schools. Thus, the opinion of pupils may reflect the influence of teachers enacting policy for SEN. The recontextualizing field is the mediation of the ‘gap’ between policy and its implementation, and much of this work is done by policy making agencies, such as LEAs and curriculum writers.

The relationship of policy and implementation is both constraining and enabling. Neurath (1983, in Robertson, Childs and Marsden, 2000: 48) remarked: ‘We are like sailors who have to rebuild their ship on the open sea, without ever being able to dismantle it in dry-dock and reconstruct it from the best components’. This nicely described the phenomenon of educational reform and policy for SEN. Although policy change achieves new aims for SEN in PE, this study attempts to find ways of establishing a bridge between policy and its implementation.

Figure 3.2 attempts to depict this complexity, although it implies a ‘top down’ view of policy and, therefore, perhaps limits investigation as to how policy is made and remade in each of these contexts, it is a starting point: a heuristic device for exploring the relationships between different sites/action and types of action.

In Chapter 5, I plan to discuss the primary field, focusing on the social contexts of policy for SEN in Taiwan and England. In Chapter 6, I will discuss the recontextualizing field of discourses which relate to LEAs and their interpretations of SEN policy. In Chapter 7, I will discuss the secondary field and examine how teachers and pupils deal with SEN within PE.
3.4 Bernstein’s Theory of Pedagogical Discourse

3.4.1 Bernstein’s Classification and Frame

In the previous section, I have employed a model to explore the process of knowledge production and reproduction relating to policy for SEN using Bernstein’s theory of pedagogical discourse. I will now use Bernstein’s concepts of ‘classification’ and ‘frame’ to understand the finer detail of how policy is transmitted into practice in the
school and classroom context.

Bernstein's theory is derived from linguistics, code and classical sociology theories. As Sadovnik (2001: 2) stated: 'Bernstein's sociology drew on the essential theoretical orientations in the field — Durkheimian, Weberian, Marxist and interactionist — and provided the possibility of an important synthesis'. It is impossible to detail his work in this study but I will concentrate on his understanding of pedagogic discourse and how it is applied in my study.

Bernstein argued that formal educational knowledge can be realized by three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation (1971: 47). He argued that 'Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught' (ibid.). He distinguishes two types of curriculum, collection and integration, by using the concept of classification and frame. 'Classification refers to the degree of boundary maintenance between contents' (Bernstein, 1971: 49) and is concerned with the insulation between knowledge areas and subjects. Strong classification refers to a curriculum that has strong insulation between contents; otherwise, weak classification refers to blurred insulation between contents.

Whereas classification refers to the categorization and organization of knowledge into a curriculum, frame is concerned with transmission of knowledge through pedagogy. 'Frame refers to the strength of the boundary between what may be transmitted and what may not be transmitted, in the pedagogical relationship' (Bernstein, 1971: 50). Furthermore, 'Frame refers us to the range of options available to teachers and the taught in the control of what is transmitted and received in the context of the pedagogical relationship' (Bernstein, 1971: 50). This is to say, frame refers to the degree of control teachers and pupils have over the transmitted and received knowledge in
pedagogical practice.

The third system, evaluation, can be seen as ‘a function of the strength of classification and frame’ (Bernstein, 1971: 50) as ‘Knowledge thus tends to be transmitted ... through strong frames which control selecting, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge’ (Bernstein, 1971: 57).

Bernstein’s concept of classification and frame provides us with one way of investigating how knowledge is transmitted in school. I will apply his concepts to the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and the National Curriculum in England. His thesis can not only help us explain the structure and process of school knowledge, transmission and practice but also examine the present National Curriculum for SEN and PE teaching of teachers in primary school in the two countries.

Díaz (2001: 92) argued that ‘the structuring of pedagogic discourse is, perhaps, Bernstein’s most important theoretical contribution, a device for the understanding of the dialectic between power, knowledge and the subject’. Bernstein suggested that knowledge is transmitted by pedagogic discourse which comprises two types: instructional and regulative discourse. Singh (2001: 253) argued that ‘Instructional discourse is the knowledge that is selected, organised, and defined in evaluative criteria, for the purposes of teaching and learning’; ‘Regulative discourse establishes the order within the instructional discourse. It generates principles of selection, organisation, pacing and criteria of skills, concepts and information’. Thus the regulative discourse outside school likely dominates the instructional discourse inside school. Bernstein contributed to a greater understanding of how schools reproduce their own knowledge relating to teacher, pupils and their activities in school. In this vein, my study will apply the model (see Figure 3.2) to SEN policy and try to link ‘microeducational process to the macrosociological levels of social structure and class and power relations’ (Sadovnik,
I also intend to understand the cultural context around SEN pupils in primary schools and explore the possibility for them to be included in PE lessons when knowledge relating to inclusion is reproduced.

However, when we study SEN, for pupils with physical disability, we cannot ignore the way in which their bodies create differences between them and able-bodied pupils in school. Although Bernstein’s early sociological work, for example his discussion of social class differences in language, focused on the social class differences between working class and middle class children, he did not have much to say about how class (or any other social difference for that matter) is embodied (see Evans, Davis, 2004).

In the next section, I will say more about teachers’ experience, the bodies of SEN pupils and their activities (such as the process of inclusion within PE) and the relationships between them.

3.5 Sociological Perspectives on Teachers and SEN Pupils within PE

In this section, I will focus on the sociological perspectives that have previously addressed the process of knowledge reproduction in policy implementation relating to SEN (see Figure 3.2). Although Bernstein’s theory articulates the relationships between curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation and the relations of power and social class within educational processes in school, my study will focus on teachers and their instruction of PE and the embodied perspective of pupils with physical disability when they are placed in PE lessons. Here I will consider both teacher and SEN pupils from a sociological perspective to investigate teachers’ experiences relating to sport and PE, and the nature and meaning of ‘disability’ and ‘ability’ (Evans, 2004) and the relationships between teachers and pupils with SEN and their activities (such as the process of inclusion within
PE). However, first I will outline the development of different paradigms within SEN, focusing on the models which have dominated the field of SEN for the last two decades and then consider how they affect education and PE.

3.5.1 Teachers' Experiences Relating to SEN and Pupils with SEN

The main aim of this study is to compare policy and its implementation for pupils with SEN within PE. Throughout I will explore the relationships between legislative provision, the actions of LEAs and teachers in schools, discourse as it pertains to the field of SEN, and the education provided for SEN pupils. As already mentioned, teachers play a prominent role in including SEN pupils within PE. Bernstein (1971, 1999) argued that power relations between teachers and pupils can be expressed in terms of the strength of frame and can be either hierarchical or horizontal. From outside of schools, there are laws, legislation and the National Curriculum to regulate the relations between teachers and pupils; inside schools, teaching methods, conceptions of teaching and learning and levels of resourcing might constrain or enable teachers’ opportunities to deal with SEN pupils; for example, teachers’ experiences and knowledge relating to SEN pupils and PE and sport, and the help received from colleagues in school, and the National Curriculum for Physical Education may all influence their capacity to achieve inclusion. However, although ‘Bernstein’s work on pedagogic discourse was concerned with the production, distribution and reproduction of official knowledge and how this knowledge is related to structurally determined power relations’ (Sadovnik, 2001: 4), his work concentrated more on pedagogic discourse and its relationship to symbolic control and identity. This study sharpens the focus on the context of teaching. We also have to examine the networks of interdependency in which teachers are involved in the making and delivery of policy to evaluate its implementation especially as it relates to teacher and
the process of inclusion within PE. In this way, the discourses which are related to teachers, pupils with SEN and PE will be better understood and the process of reproduction of policy making can be explored.

Echoing the three levels of production, recontextualization and reproduction outlined in model ‘Policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction’ (p. 73), Smith and Green (2004: 598) suggested that there are three dimensions for secondary PE teachers to explain and understand their ‘thought and practices’ relating to PE for pupils with SEN; they are the personal dimension, the local dimension and the national dimension. In this study, I attempt to employ their ideas to explore the primary teachers’ experiences within PE for pupils with SEN in the secondary field of the model.

First, the personal dimension of teachers includes their biographies and identities of PE and initial teacher training and continuing professional development. Smith and Green (2004: 599) pointed out that in the findings of recent research (Green, 2000; Curtner-Smith, 2000, in Smith and Green, 2004), many teachers considered sport, particularly team games as important features of their lives and self-identities (‘I love sport and team games’) because they come from ‘a fairly traditional games background’ (Smith and Green, 2004: 598). In my experiences, this is the case for PE teachers in Taiwan especially in secondary and high schools. This ‘love of sport’ and ‘team games’ in particular, forms a significant dimension of teachers’ thinking about PE and sport. Teachers, unsurprisingly, apply their past experiences when providing PE instruction. But teachers in primary schools (in England) tend not to have such a developed background in sport compared with PE teachers in secondary schools. So how do they deal with PE, especially for pupils with SEN? Furthermore, primary school initial training is very different to secondary school training in the UK. In particular, little time is given to
training in PE. In contrast, in Taiwan, most PE teachers in primary schools, particularly in a city, are specialists. Thus, does the initial and continuing professional development of teachers in primary schools affect teachers' conception of SEN pupils, or are there other elements that impact their ideologies towards PE and inclusion? This study will explore the personal perspectives of primary teachers and the effect on their ability to achieve inclusion in PE.

Second, the local dimension for teachers includes their teaching experiences and relationships with other colleagues. Teachers face the needs of pupils with SEN and of other able-bodied pupils when they attempt to implement inclusion in mainstream schools (in England) or mainstreaming classes (in Taiwan). Yet they may lack the experience and guidelines to modify the National Curriculum for Physical Education (in England) and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines (in Taiwan), and have insufficient training, to meet the needs of SEN pupils (see Chapter 2). Thus, assistance provided by the LEAs in the form of the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) or the PE coordinator (PECO) and the learning support assistants (LSA) are very important for teachers if they are to include pupils with SEN. In my first meeting with LEA Advisors in England, they mentioned that SENCOs and LSAs were likely to be the main or only resources available to help teachers meet the needs of SEN pupils. But how much help are the SENCOs and LSAs to teachers? Do they constrain teachers' motivation to seek further resources? Do they encourage teachers to develop initiatives to deal with SEN? These complicated networks need to be explored in order to gain a better understanding of teachers' and pupils' actions.

Third, the national dimension refers to the NCPE and other education policy. As mentioned earlier (see Chapter 2), the NCPE might constrain teachers' teaching to meet the needs of pupils with SEN. The level and quality of information available for teachers
in the NCPE, may determine whether they are able to adjust the criteria and evaluate the achievements of SEN pupils. This element will also be explored in my study to reconsider the relationships between teachers, NCPE and pupils with SEN.

These three dimensions relating to teachers' perceptions and experiences might provide appropriate ways to examine the problematic interdependency between teachers and others when they attempt to include pupils with SEN in their instruction. This study will scrutinize this relationship through interviews with teachers and others such as parents and LEA Advisors (see Chapters 6 and 7).

3.5.2 Reconceptualising the (Dis)Ability of Pupils with SEN

Osborn et al. (2003, in Hughes, 2004) conducted a study related to secondary learners and educational systems in the United Kingdom, France and Denmark. The aim of their study was:

to elucidate the relationship between national culture, individual biographies and classroom practice in creating the context for learning, and the significance of national educational cultures and the encroaching pressures of globalization for pupils' different patterns of engagement with school and with learning.

(Osborn et al., 2003, quoted in Hughes, 2004: 395)

In Hughes' (2004) review of Osborn et al.'s study, she advocates a contemporary social theory of learning from the voice of the learner. In this view, the voice of pupils with SEN must be heard as they are the main agency of social reproduction of educational policy for SEN. The relationships of instruction within PE between pupils with SEN and teachers will be elucidated (see Figure 3.2) because it represents one of the crucial pedagogic aspects of policy implementation for SEN. From this perspective, this study
not only focuses on policy implementation for SEN but also concentrates on the voice of SEN pupils reflected within the instruction they receive from PE teachers under SEN policy.

However, the voices of SEN pupils can not always easily be heard. Some are too young or too reluctant to express themselves while others might have multiple learning difficulties. Nonetheless I attempted to conduct interviews with pupils in the two countries but with limited success (see Chapter 7). I also tried to view teachers' perceptions of pupils with physical disability. I wanted to explore their personal experiences and knowledge relating to SEN, sport and PE. How teachers perceive the bodies of pupils with physical disability is one of most important elements of inclusion in PE lessons (Fitzgerald, 2006). In particular, I wanted to explore how they perceive and interpret the 'ability' (Evans, 2004) of pupils with SEN, and how this affected the possibility of achieving equality and inclusion in PE.

**The Body, Physical Capital and Physical Education**

The way teachers view pupils with disability is likely to affect their conception of inclusion and instruction in PE. For example, one child may need to use a wheelchair to move. Some teachers might view this pupil as a burden on other pupils when he/she is included in PE lessons; others might view this as an opportunity, an alternative way to move and try to design or modify the curriculum to include him/her. That is to say, the line between 'ability' or 'disability' depends on not only the needs of SEN pupils but also the way teachers view their pupils with physical disability. Thus, when we examine the complicated relationships behind teachers and other agencies which potentially affect inclusion for physical disability pupils, we need to consider teachers' conceptions of SEN pupils' bodies as the attitudes of teachers are likely to give rise to different forms of
Pupils with physical disability are superficially ‘different’ from other able-bodied pupils but what resources or physical capital do they bring to the classroom setting? All bodies are a source of physical capital. Shilling (2003: 111) stated:

The production of physical capital refers to the development of bodies in ways which are recognized as possessing value in social fields, while the conversion of physical capital refers to the translation of bodily participation in work, leisure and other fields into different forms of capital.

Thus, discourse relating to the body of SEN pupils will influence education environments and the policies which are provided for them in the process of transmission of knowledge. Evans (2004) reminds us that children have acquired different levels and forms of ‘physical capital’ outside school, e.g. skills, techniques and understandings which potentially influence teachers and PE teaching in schools. He pointed out: ‘In fact, the “physical capital” that children acquire outside school is fundamentally involved in the reproduction of the differences that provide the basis for inequality in education, leisure and health’ (Evans, 2004: 103). Thus we have to understand how pupils with physical disability are viewed by their teachers and how this relates to the process of inclusion.

Pupils with physical disability can be seen to bring different physical capital from other pupils to school and in PE lessons. How and whether this ‘ability’ is recognised will depend upon the strength of the frame, for example, if ‘knowledge is transmitted in a context where the teacher has maximal control or surveillance, as in hierarchical secondary school relationships’ (Bernstein, 1971), this may be little recognition of pupils diversity. We need to examine if this is the case in primary schools for PE. Can primary school teachers weaken the frames in PE by using their knowledge and experiences to include SEN pupils through a curriculum that is more integrated than
in secondary schools (in England and Taiwan)?

On the other hand, the concept of ‘Least Restrictive Environment’ (LRE) (see Chapter 1) for SEN people implies an intervention in the process of socialization. But to achieve this, schools and teachers may need to create not only an inclusive environment but also understand what impact it has on the bodies of SEN pupils themselves. Pupils possess different levels and forms of ‘physical capital’ on arrival at school. And teachers are there ‘to make a difference’ to their learning opportunities. As Evans remarked:

we may have become so concerned to make children feel healthy, happy and good about their own and others’ bodies that we have overlooked that schools are also there to ‘make a difference’ by eroding the embodied physical differences that are the product of the class and cultures of the family and at home.

(Evans, 2004: 102)

Thus, this study using the above concepts will investigate how teachers view the physical resources (capital) that pupils with SEN have acquired outside schools within their families and elsewhere. I will explore the relationships between such capital, the requirements of the National Curriculum and relevant legislation, and the actions of teachers and peers in primary schools.
4.1 Introduction

Sparkes (1992a: 12) pointed out 'to become a competent and accepted member of a given research community, the individual must not only learn the content of the field but also a particular way of seeing the world that eventually is not only unquestioned but unquestionable'. The previous chapter outlined the theoretical framework which informs this study of policy implementation for SEN. The study has briefly discussed the development of SEN policy, particularly, the legislation of SEN and the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan, and how inclusion is expressed through them in the two countries. This chapter now moves on to address the research method and strategy of this study, and to discuss the research design and techniques of data collection.

This chapter begins by raising the research questions which will be explored throughout this study. These research questions arose from my experience and observation of inclusion in PE for SEN in Taiwan together with the findings of the literature review (see Chapter 2) from a sociological perspective. As Giddens suggested:

Sociological analysis can play an emancipatory role in human society. At the same time, sociological analysis teaches sobriety. For although knowledge may be an important adjunct to power, it is not the same as power. And our knowledge of history is always tentative and incomplete.

(Giddens, 1986, quoted in Barton, 1996: 3)
To explore the questions raised, this study will discuss the features and advantages of quantitative and qualitative research methods to seek an appropriate research method for this study. The research structure, then, will be introduced within the theoretical framework of the research methodology (see Figure 4.1). In addition, the research structure of the study will be organized around the main perspectives of the study including provisions, the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and the opinions of the LEA Advisors, teachers, parents as well as pupils with SEN. The research strategies which are going to be adopted in the study with basic research theory and techniques will be introduced in the fourth section. Furthermore, I will discuss how interview and observation are to be conducted for the LEA Advisors, PE teachers, parents and pupils with SEN in the two countries. The model of data analysis will be discussed too. Ethical issues will be considered in the sixth section. Finally, I will conclude this chapter in the final section.

4.2 The Research Questions

Having been a primary school PE teacher, I doubted that the educational system provided an adequate service for pupils with SEN in PE in schools in Taiwan. In my experience and observation, PE teachers always assign mature pupils to ‘take care’ of pupils with SEN in PE classes enabling them to cope with those who are able-bodied and are the main priority of classes. Teachers did not practise inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN as they, arguably, did not receive proper training and were not equipped with the knowledge needed for SEN. From a primary PE teacher’s perspective, policies for pupils with SEN obviously have strong connection with their entitlement to be educated but not to be equal with other able-bodied pupils. Therefore, there were questions of policy implementation that I intended to raise and probe as Flick (2002: 46) pointed out that ‘the
formulation of research questions in concrete terms is guided by the aim of clarifying what the field contacts will reveal. Accordingly, I raised three questions with reference to Barton’s (1996: 4) ‘emancipatory’ approach to the field of SEN policy: How could LEAs and schools improve the educational opportunities for pupils with SEN? Did educational policy create an equitable education environment for pupils with SEN in PE? What was the relationship between equality and SEN provision in PE in Taiwan and England? My personal observation on SEN policy endorsed by the findings of the literature reviewed also suggested that SEN policy had been toward ‘inclusion’, but its implementation within PE in schools need to be examined. The first intention of this study was to explore the relationship between equality and policy implementation in terms of a ‘provision perspective’. Through documentary analyses, I wanted to explore and compare policy on issues of equality for pupils with SEN in the two countries. The second was to explore how inclusion was expressed in the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. There were two main aspects to this perspective. One was to investigate how inclusion in the National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines was conceptualized and promoted by advisors in LEAs. Another was to examine to what level the LEAs provided in-service courses and support for schools and teachers to bring about inclusion for pupils with SEN. The third asked how PE teachers implemented inclusion in primary schools in Taiwan and England. To this end, the study elicited opinions of teachers to understand how they dealt with inclusion in PE, what obstacles they faced and what support they needed. Finally, I was interested in what parents and pupils with SEN thought of SEN policy and support from the Government and LEAs, what they needed to receive in their daily life and what they thought of the way in which SEN policy was being implemented in PE.

How did I arrive at an approach to addressing these problems? The research
methods and techniques of data collection are introduced below, followed by a discussion of the qualitative research methods used in this study.

4.3 An Appropriate Research Methodology

4.3.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods

Schindele (1985: 5) states: ‘the results and relevance of such research depend largely on the philosophy, aims and methodology that we apply to it’. When discussing research methods, we have to consider the philosophical underpinning of our research, including research questions, research strategy and research technique. According to Schulman (1986, quoted in Sparkes 1992a: 11) ‘the term frequently employed to describe research communities, and the conceptions of problem and method they share, is paradigm’. Patton (1978, quoted in Sparkes 1992a: 12) states, ‘a paradigm is a world view, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world’. It is also a practical way of understanding the ideas that people have about their lives and how they think the world should be. Quantitative research methods are perceived as belonging to a positivist paradigm (Sparkes, 1992a, Creswell, 2003). In the positivist paradigm, quantitative research methods address the relationship between hypotheses and the findings of research as expressed through their frequency and distribution in the results. For Flick (2002: 2) stated:

Traditionally, psychology and social sciences have taken the natural sciences and their exactness as a model, paying particular attention to developing quantitative and standardized methods. Guiding principles of research and of planning research have been used for the following purposes: to clearly isolate causes and effects, to properly operationalize theoretical relations, to measure and to quantify phenomena, to create research designs allowing the generalization of findings and to formulate general laws.
However, researchers are to be objective in the process of research when using quantitative research methods. Usually, quantitative data are analyzed by statistics establishing correlation between variables; 'quantitative research tends to be associated with numbers as the unit of analysis' (Denscombe, 1998: 174). The quality or coherence of its outcomes depend on reliability and validity which are related to subsequent duplication and connection between research questions and research findings, where 'the principles of “deductive reasoning” and “falsifiability” become the hallmark of what is described as the scientific method' (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989: 18) or quantitative research method. Some researchers have applied quantitative research methods to investigate the behavior of single SEN individuals (see Kiernan, 1985) as exemplars of categories of children with diagnostic classifications (see Cave and Madison, 1978, Wedell and Roberts, 1981, in Vulliamy and Webb, 1995) and 'use objective, clear-cut, standardized measures and, as the name suggests, uses experts, such as physicians, to provide defining characteristic, causes, prognosis and methods of treatment' (Fowler and Wadsworth, 1991, quoted in Downs, 2003: 128). Although there are many advantages of a quantitative perspective which has aimed to focused on individuals' difficulties, we need an alternative approach to study SEN pupils and their everyday situations in schools.

Qualitative or interpretive research paradigms constitute study approaches which privilege human meaning in social life based on philosophical assumptions that unite ethnography, hermeneutics, naturalism, phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, constructivism, ethnomethodology and case study modalities. Several methodological strategies may be adopted within an interpretive paradigm including: narrative analysis, phenomenology, ethnography, grounded theory and case study. As Thomas and Nelson (1996: 367) pointed out:
Qualitative research focuses on the 'essence' of the phenomena. The view of the world varies with one's perception and is highly subjective.... The research does not manipulate variables through experimental treatments but takes more interest in process than in product. The research observes and gathers data in the field, that is, the natural setting.... In other words, qualitative research emphasizes induction, whereas quantitative research largely emphasizes deduction.

In such ways 'qualitative techniques aim to develop an appreciation of a given situation in which the researcher is bound to be involved while the quantitative techniques aim to minimize researcher effects by establishing a position of social neutrality and objectivity' (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989: 42).

In qualitative research, researchers are instruments gathering and interpreting data in the process of research. Consequently, quantitative research tends to focus on analysis by taking apart and examining components of a phenomenon, whereas qualitative research seeks to understand the meaning of an experience to the participants in a specific setting and how the components mesh to form a whole (Thomas and Nelson, 1996). As Vulliamy and Webb (1995: 265) remarked 'instead of testing preconceived hypotheses, qualitative research aims to generate hypotheses and theories from the data that emerge, in an attempt to avoid the imposition of a previous, and possibly inappropriate, frame of reference on the subjects of the research'. Moreover, Hegarty (1985: 110) argued that qualitative research is appropriate to a number of topics for SEN. These include clarifying the implications of policy options; exploring the experiences and opinions of individual students and teachers; and providing an understanding of different forms of provisions for SEN. Notably, this study was related to the everyday life of pupils with SEN and attempted to improve the quality of their PE via an analysis of policy implementation. Although research within PE pedagogy is but one small part of research on pupils with SEN, this study set out to add some insight into the development of policy
in Taiwan and England over the last two decades using qualitative research.

To fulfill the purpose of qualitative research in this study I decided to use case study and other techniques such as documentary analysis, interviews and observation. My research focused attention on teachers who were attempting to achieve inclusion in PE for pupils with SEN in primary school as well as pupils with SEN to explore policy implementation in Taiwan and England. An ethnographical approach was utilized to analyse the case studies in their social contexts and to compare cultural perspectives in the two countries, hoping this might be the appropriate way to gather relevant information on policy implementation for SEN, approached from a sociological perspective.

4.3.2 Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research

The procedures of data collecting in qualitative research are different from those of quantitative research, as is the way of defining credibility, validity and reliability. Kirk and Miller (1986: 9) pointed out that ‘Qualitative research is an empirical, socially located phenomenon, defined by its own history, not simply a residual grab-bag comprising all things that are “not quantitative”’. Conventionally, quantitative research methods endeavour to achieve an ‘objective’ view of the world, usually in one or two ways, by describing processes of experiment or investigation so that others may replicate the study; and/or by reporting results in terms of theoretical variables and relating them to relevant theories. Criteria of ‘objectivity’ in terms of reliability and validity are conventionally regarded as more problematic with respect of qualitative research. Thus one critique, often expressed in terms of reliability, is that qualitative research is lacking in ‘objectivity’. Girtler remarked:

If I now prepare the publication about my research ... I finally present what is
characteristic. In order to make vivid and provable these characteristic or the characteristic rules from which I 'understand' the social practice to be studied or which I use to explain it, I quote the corresponding passages from my observation protocols or interviews. Of course I quote only those passages which I believe illustrate the characteristics of the everyday world under study.

(Girtler, 1984, quoted in Flick 2002: 219)

Flick (2002: 221) labeled this procedure 'selective plausibilization' and provided two ways to increase reliability in qualitative research:

In general, the discussion about reliability in qualitative research comes down to the need for explication in two respects. First, the genesis of the data needs to be explicated in a way that makes it possible to check what a statement of the subject is on the one hand and where the researcher's interpretation begins on the other. Second, procedures in the field or interview and with the text need to be made explicit in training and rechecking in order to improve the comparability of different interviewers' or observers' conduct.

In interpretive research researchers are the instruments and there are other ways of approaching issues of 'objectivity'. Brown (1988, quoted in Sparkes 1992a: 30) reminds us: 'there are no reliability and validity coefficients for the researcher who is observing and interviewing participants in the natural setting'. Silverman (1993, quoted in Flick, 2002: 220) pointed out 'For interview data, reliability can be increased by interview training for the interviewers and by checking the interview guides or generative questions in test interviews or after the first interview'. Procedures of data collection, data recording and data analysis are, then, presented in ways that try to achieve 'coherence'. Interpretive researchers 'cannot come to a study with a pre-established set of neutral procedures but can only choose to do some things as opposed to others based on what seems reasonable, given his or her interests and purposes, the context of the situation, and
so on' (Smith, 1984, quoted in Sparkes 1992a: 30). To establish credibility through coherence, an account of gathering the data must relate to the purpose of the study, not only providing sufficient evidence but also addressing how to operationalise the research questions.

Whereas in quantitative research, validity is expressed by statistically with respect of the possibility of errors, in qualitative research, Kirk and Miller (1986, quoted in Flick, 2002: 222) summarized it as ‘a question of whether the researcher sees what he or she thinks he or she sees’. A basic problem in assessing the validity of qualitative research is how to specify the link between the relations that are studied and the version of them provided by the research (Flick, 2002: 222); in other words, there are two ways to examine validity in qualitative research, either as an issue of empirical research at that moment or as field research grounded in the assumptions embedded in the reality of the society in which it is located. In this context, Hammersley (1992, in Flick, 2002: 222) outlines the relation between research questions and research grounding in claiming that: (1) the validity of knowledge cannot be assessed with certainty. Assumptions can only be judged for their plausibility and credibility; (2) phenomena also exist independently of our claims concerning them. Our assumptions about them can only more or less approximate these phenomena; (3) reality becomes accessible across the (different) perspectives on phenomena. Research aims mainly at presenting reality not reproducing it. Mishler (1990, quoted in Flick, 2002: 223) provides dimension of ‘validation as the social construction of knowledge’, by which we ‘evaluate the “trustworthiness” of reported observations, interpretation, and generalizations’. In such terms, as Hitchcock and Hughes (1989: 36) contend, ‘if being scientific means being systematic, rigorous, and analytical then qualitative research can meet the criteria of being scientific’.

The processes of gathering data from PE classrooms and the schools in two
countries in this study sought to be systematic and analyses of emerging data rigorous and analytical in order to increase the validity of this thesis. Information was collected on different aspects of the research questions from different groups, including LEA Advisors, PE teachers, parents and their children with SEN in examining policy implementation. It employed a technique to deal with that complexity referred to as 'triangulation'. Flick (2002: 226) explained that: ‘this key word is used to name the combination of different methods, study groups, local and temporal settings, and different theoretical perspectives in dealing with a phenomenon’. He also pointed out:

Triangulation may be used as an approach for further grounding the knowledge obtained with qualitative methods. Grounding here does not mean to assess results but to systematically extend and complete the possibilities of knowledge production. Triangulation is less a strategy for validating results and procedure than an alternative to validation which increases scope, depth and consistency in methodological proceedings.

(Flick, 2002: 227)

Although various methods have their own way of producing knowledge of the social world, ‘each can look at the thing from a different angle – from its own distinct perspective – and these perspectives can be used by researchers as a means of comparison and contrast’ (Denscombe, 1998: 84). Thus, this study utilized triangulation to analyse data which were from interviews, observation and documents for investigating SEN pupils and attempted to establish a model to compare with documentary analysis of the provision for SEN. Through different approaches, this study, therefore, sought to achieve ‘coherence’ through data connected closely with the research method and the research procedure.
4.3.3 The Research Strategy

The main purposes of this study were to explore educational policy for SEN, looking at how equality and inclusion were expressed within provisions such as the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and to compare their policy implementation. However, as Riddell (2002: 23) comments: 'In translating policies from the statute book to the local level, there are many opportunities for subversion and transformation as local actors interpret and recreate these policies'. I, therefore, concentrated on policies not only at national level but also on how they were to be transmitted by the LEAs and implemented from the point of view of the school and individual, parents and pupils with SEN. I look at that an appropriate method for understanding differences between 'statute book' and 'practice' in SEN policy was to depict the ideas of LEA Advisors and other actors involved with provision for SEN pupils. The study attends not only to documentary analysis but also the opinions of teachers who directly instruct pupils with SEN for which qualitative research methods seemed appropriate, associated with a sociological perspective encompassing economic, social and political dimensions, all of which had a bearing on the lives of the SEN pupils and this study.

To explore policy implementation relating to PE for pupils with SEN in England and Taiwan, an 'advocacy/participatory' approach to knowledge production was adopted. Creswell (2003) argues that such a research approach is orientated towards political action and important social issues such as empowerment, inequality, oppression, domination, suppression and alienation. My research directed attention to pupils with SEN and advocated an action agenda in understanding the position of marginalized people. At the same time, I was drawn to the strategy for generating understandings on themes associated with qualitative research known as 'grounded theory' (Glaser and
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Strauss, 1967). I sought to use a comparative method in collecting data in two countries, using theoretical sampling 'the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967: 45), to explore similarities and differences in policy relating to PE provision for pupils with SEN. I adapted the view that 'Ethnography offers an excellent strategy for discovering grounded theory' (Spradley, 1980: 15), attempting to apply an ethnographic perspective to understanding SEN policy and its implementation as Hammersley and Atkinson (1983: 177) pointed out: 'An important feature of ethnography is that it allows us to feed the process of theory generation with new material, rather than relying on our previous knowledge of cases relevant to the theoretical ideas we wish to pursue'. In my case I attempted to do so, using the documentary analysis, interview and observation. Formal interview schedules (see Appendices A to D) were derived from reviewing research already been conducted in this field and my experience and observation of policy on SEN in Taiwan and England.

The three main aspects to this study are juxtaposed in Figure 4.1. The first refers to provisions for SEN (embodied in the Education Act 1981 and subsequent provision derived from and affected by it, the Education Act 1988 in England and the Special Education Act 1984 in Taiwan); the second is the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan; the third relates the opinions of teachers, parents and pupils with SEN. Each aspect develops and explores the relationship between policy and implementation in PE for pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England. By comparing these three main aspects in the two countries of this study, the concept of policy implementation for SEN in PE was clarified. In hoping that the findings might enrich policy making and implementing in Taiwan, the main techniques of data collection
employed were documentary analysis, interview and observation. Using documentary analysis I examined policy provision for pupils with SEN in Taiwan and England, focusing on official documents and the academic literature. I examined equality and inclusion in PE with the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and documented the relationship between them and the LEAs by analysis of SEN policy texts as well as interviewing the LEA Advisors. At the same time, I explored how 'inclusion' and 'equality' for pupils with SEN was expressed in various ways by LEAs and schools. At another level, interviews were conducted with primary school teachers, as well as pupils with SEN and their parents, in the North of Taiwan and in the Midlands in England and data coded and analyzed in search of similarities and differences among and between policy and implementation in the two countries.
4.4 Developing the Research

This thesis progressed with reference to the research structure outlined in Figure 4.1, the theoretical framework for which was described in Chapter 3 (see p. 67) and whose summary was attempted in the 'policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction' model (see p. 73). The model includes three levels of
knowledge production and reproduction and was used to connect the research questions and embrace both a 'macro' and 'micro' perspective of policy analysis. As the study progressed I modified my research strategy, moving away from grounded theory towards this model.

The schematic procedures outlined in Table 4.1 indicate that interviews with LEA Advisors and teachers were conducted first. Subsequently, I contacted LEA Advisors in England and Taiwan in order to identify possible interviewees and sent the initial contact letters to them with follow-up phone calls to ensure the interviews were held on time. Interviews of teachers, LEA Advisors, parents and SEN pupils were then carried out, using tape recording and note taking, also during observation. The final stage of empirical work was data analysis and identification of themes relating to SEN policy implementation. The formulation of interview and observation procedures will be outlined in the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage and Time</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2004.10</td>
<td>1. Design the interview for LEA Advisors, teachers, SEN pupils and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To amend the interview items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Send the formal letters to headteachers and parents in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interview with teachers and the LEA Advisor in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2005.03</td>
<td>1. Send the formal letter to headteachers and a LEA Adviser in Taiwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interview with the LEA Advisor and primary PE teachers in Taiwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Observe PE lessons in Taiwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2007.05</td>
<td>1. Transcribe data from tapes into words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Analyse data to discover themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Writing up the thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 Selecting Settings and the Cases

Case study procedures were employed to investigate relationships between SEN policy and its implementation, focusing on detailed connections between LEA Advisors, teachers, SEN pupils and their parents and other practitioners. As Denscombe (1998: 31) pointed out:

One of the strength of the case study approach is that it allows the researcher to use a variety of sources, a variety of types of data and a variety of research methods as part of the investigation.

This study employed documentary analysis, interview and observation. It was important to decide the number of cases and how they were to be selected for study (Hammersley, 1992, in Denscombe, 1998: 32). Initially, for this case study, I decided to select one LEA in each country without knowing how many primary schools in each had pupils with physical disability. The location selected in each country was entirely pragmatic as they were convenient to reach and contact. Fortunately, LEA Advisors in the Midlands in England and in the North of Taiwan expressed their willingness to assist me to find the schools in which there were pupils with physical disability. I had ‘no real choice’ in this process (Denscombe, 1998: 35).

The Advisory Teacher in England was female with 3 years experiences, whilst the male in Taiwan had been in post for 2 years (see Chapter 6). Both of them were around forty years old and were responsible for SEN provision in all primary schools in their Authority. The Advisory Teacher in England agreed to seek primary schools in which there were pupils with physical disability appropriate to my research purposes. She identified and provided 13 pupils with physical disabilities in 12 schools in November 2004. One school had two pupils and the others had one with physical disability in each.
She then contacted those schools and sent the consent letters which I had prepared to headteachers and parents. Subsequently, I rang these schools to talk through my research with headteachers seeking to interview those teachers who were responsible for those pupils with physical disabilities. Eventually four primary schools gave permission for conducting interviews with their teachers and for observations in PE lessons after further contact with headteachers and teachers. The latter were all female, one with three years, the others' between 10 and 20 years teaching experience and taught PE lessons themselves. One pupil in each was then selected by me in each of those schools which consented to my research.

I followed the same approach in collecting data from primary schools in April in 2005 in Taiwan. Initially, I contacted a LEA Advisor in the North of Taiwan to explain my intention and to gather information about the accommodation of pupils with physical disability. He agreed to arrange an interview with me and named 4 primary schools in which there were pupils with physical disability in mainstreaming classes. I then contacted the headteacher at the school where I had been a PE teacher. She contacted the schools and asked their headteachers to allow me to interview their colleagues. I then contacted the PE teachers who were responsible for those pupils with SEN. Two were female and two were male. All of them were professional PE teachers. In Table 4.2, I have categorized and detailed the information concerning schools, teachers and pupils where interviews took place. All names are pseudonyms.

At my first meeting in November 2004 with LEA Advisors in England, a SEN Advisory Teacher and an Advisory Teacher for children with physical disabilities, it was suggested that I adopt a questionnaire instead of interview with parents as they might be more willing to respond to this method. However, Lesley, one of the primary teachers in England, in informing me that it would be difficult to contact Jason's (a pupil with SEN)
parents led me to question the viability of giving parents a questionnaire. Eventually, 
because of the difficulty in contacting parents, I was able to informally interview only 
one parent of one SEN pupil in Taiwan, the content of which will be discussed in Chapter 
8 (p. 206).

Table 4.2 The interviewed schools in Taiwan and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>school 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils in a school</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>school 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN pupils' name and characters of SEN</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral palsy</td>
<td>Wheelchair User</td>
<td>Operation on an angle</td>
<td>Cerebral palsy</td>
<td>Cerebral palsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Name, Gender</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience of teacher</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>12 Years</td>
<td>20 Years</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report of SEN pupil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postscript</td>
<td>School’s activities instead of PE lessons during the period of observation</td>
<td>No obtained consent letter from his parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Composing the Interview

Interview was the major technique used for gathering data in this study as it was 
considered to be a critical instrument in evaluating policy implementation for SEN with 
reference to teachers, LEA Advisors and SEN pupils who were involved in those policies.
Denscombe (1998: 110) pointed out:

The use of interviews normally means that the researcher has reached the decision that, for the purposes of the particular project in mind, the research would be better served by getting material which provides more of an in-depth insight into the topic, drawing on information provided by fewer informants.

With reference to the aims and issues introduced early, there were four aspects to be explored in interviews with LEA Advisors and teachers: (1) concept of inclusion and equality; (2) provision; (3) the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and (4) PE teaching for SEN pupils. To make sure the data gathered were appropriate to the purposes of research I adopted semi-structured interview technique with teachers and LEA Advisors in order to explore their ideas as they related to policy and how it had touched their lives.

Compared with structured interviews which ‘involve tight control of the format of questions and answers’ (Denscombe, 1998: 112), semi-structured interviews are more flexible for both interviewer to prepare the questions and interviewees to reply. As Denscombe recommended:

With semi-structured interviews, the interviewer still has a clear list of issues to be addressed and questions to be answered. However, with the semi-structured interview the interviewer is prepared to be flexible in terms of the order in which the topics are considered, and perhaps more significantly, to let the interviewee develop ideas and speak more widely on the issues raised by the researcher. The answers are open-ended, and there is more emphasis on the interviewee elaborating points of interest.

(Arksey and Kinght, 1999: 7) further pointed out:
Interviewers (in semi-structure interview) are free to follow up ideas, probe response and ask for clarification or further elaboration. For their part, informants can answer the questions in terms of what they see as important; likewise, there is scope for them to choose what to say about a particular topic, and how much.

This study utilised semi-structured interviews to elicit opinions of those who involved in SEN policy and its implementation with the aim of ‘discovery rather than checking’ (ibid.), based on the questions I had designed relating to SEN policy implementation, with reference to the research questions. The schedules used with LEA Advisors, teachers, SEN pupils and their parents are to be found in Appendices A to D.

4.4.3 Observation

For the purposes of observing what goes on in PE lessons I engaged in ‘passive participation’ (Spradley, 1980: 59). I was present at the scene of action but did not ‘participate or interact with other people to any great extent’ (ibid.) to reduce any reactive effect on the PE lessons. What was included in my observations? Denscombe (1998: 143) recommended:

- Frequency of events. A count of the frequency with which the categories/items on the observation schedule occur.
- Events at a given point in time. At given intervals (for instance, 25 seconds) the observer logs what is happening at that instant. This might involve logging numerous things which happen simultaneously at that point.
- Duration of events. When instances occur they are timed, so that the research gets information on the total time for each category, and when the categories occurred during the overall time-block for the period of observation.
- Sample of people. Individuals can be observed for predetermined periods of times, after which the observer’s attention is switched to another person in a rota designed to give representative data on all those involved in the situation.
However, I could not record or recall all information, all objects and all activities in PE lessons which I observed. To avoid ‘overload’ (Spradley, 1980: 55) in observation, I focused on observing only SEN pupils, teachers and LSAs and their activities in PE, initially observing and recording as much as I could in the first lesson to discover what events I might subsequently want to focus on. There were four dimensions to my focus in PE lessons. The first focus was the interactions between teachers and SEN pupils. How did teachers instruct PE for SEN pupils? How did SEN pupils respond? The second focus was the relationships between the LSAs and SEN pupils. What did LSAs do for SEN pupils in PE, and how? Third, what was the relationship between teachers and LSAs in PE lessons? Finally, I focused on the interactions between SEN pupils and other able-bodied pupils. All activities were in natural settings, observed and recorded longhand in a note book.

4.4.4 Children with SEN as Respondents in the Case Study

Although ‘in surveys of the general population, children have been usually regarded as out of scope and samples are usually drawn from the adult population, with a minimum age of 16 or 18’ (Scott, 2000: 98), this study attempted to interview pupils with SEN in primary schools. According to Roberts (2000: 225):

A number of market research organizations have panels of children ... It is not only researchers with an interest in childhood who have an interest in children. The media, business people, politicians and policy-makers all have an interest in the views, the voice or the perspective of the child.

Thus to involve children in research is a growing trend as my research was interested in not only children themselves but in their opinions. Lewis and Lindsay (2000, quoted in Norwich and Kelly, 2004: 45) recognized that ‘there is a need for varying approaches to
enable children and young people to contribute to and participate in decisions about education provision and individual education plans'. Norwich and Kelly (2004: 45) considered that seeking children's perspectives has been a growing trend over the 1990s and several researchers (for example, Sheldon, 1991; Caffyn and Millet, 1992; Cooper, 1993; Armstrong et al., 1993; Norwich, 1997; in Norwich and Kelly, 2004) have researched children's perspectives with relevance to special education. Nevertheless,

While inclusive educational policies continue to generate intense debate, there is comparatively little systematic research on its many facets. One important facet of the inclusion question is children's own perspectives on their special educational provision.

(Norwich and Kelly, 2004: 43)

This study, therefore, intended to elicit the opinion of pupils with SEN about their experience related to PE instruction and policy. In Norwich and Kelly's (2004) study subjects were boys and girls aged 10-11 and 13-14 with statements of special educational needs for moderate learning difficulties. Most children can express their opinions appropriately. In this study, I wanted to involve pupils with physical rather than intellectual learning difficulties as the former might express their opinion more easily than the latter in the primary stage of schooling. However, I acknowledged that to elicit the opinions of pupils with physical difficulty might be difficult because they were more than likely to be found with multiple learning difficulties. However, this study attempted to involve pupils with SEN as interviewees because 'Children provide reliable responses if questioned about events that are meaningful to their lives' (Scott, 2000: 99).

The research techniques I used with two SEN pupils in England and four SEN pupils in Taiwan (see Table 4.2) with physical disability were also semi-structured interview and observation, the former focused on their personal feelings about PE lessons
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and teachers. Interviews took place in school, once permission of parents and teachers had been obtained. Observations were intended to explore how pupils with disability were involved in and experienced their PE classes and focused mainly on their interaction with teachers and peers. Analysis of observations, interviews and documentary analysis of official records and teaching diaries kept by teachers are presented in Chapter 7.

4.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of arranging collected data systematically and to present what this study has discovered. Delamont (1992: 151) reminds us that "analysis" of qualitative data is a process that continues throughout the research: it is not a separate, self-contained phase. The data analysis within this study by interview, field notes and documents then was searching for:

... any interesting patterns... whether anything stands out as surprising or puzzling; how the data relate to what one might have expected on the basis of common-sense knowledge, official accounts, or previous theory; and whether there any apparent inconsistencies or contradictions among the views of different groups or individuals, or between people's expressed beliefs or attitudes and what they do.

(Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983: 178)

First, I was looking for description which answered the basic assumptive questions: the expression of equality and inclusion within policy and its provision for SEN from the documentary analysis. In this stage, I analysed the legislation of SEN in Taiwan and England and how equality and inclusion were expressed in the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. I used a historical perspective to analyse the social, cultural and economic development of policy relating to
SEN in the two countries. I then analysed the National Curriculum to compare the differences and similarities between England and Taiwan to influence PE teaching for SEN pupils. The findings are presented and discussed in Chapter 5.

Second, ‘In the case of interview data, an important part of this editing process is to record the spoken words and then to transcribe them’ (Flick, 2002: 166). In order to identify emerging themes from data on policy implementation, LEA Advisors, teachers and SEN pupils, I transcribed the recorded tapes. Furthermore, I needed to decide upon a way of analyzing interviews. ‘If a standardized open-ended interview is used, it is fairly easy to do cross-case or cross-interview analysis for each question in the interview’ (Patton, 1990: 376). Thus data collected were grouped together with reference to answers from different interviewees and data resources to common questions and the central issues of the study. Each aspect of interviews with the LEA Advisors, PE teachers, and pupils with SEN were considered alongside field notes and documents using the descriptive, analytical framework to uncover relationships between policy and its implementation.

Third, I developed coding categories to analyse teachers’ interviews which included their conceptions of inclusion and equality, the influence of the national curriculum, training and instruction in PE for SEN and attitudes toward resources, including LSAs. In this stage, I analysed interview data, field notes and documents with reference to:

1. Teachers’ attitudes toward teaching pupils with SEN.
2. Teaching methods toward include pupils with SEN.
3. Assistance available to teachers for inclusion of pupils with SEN in PE.
4. Ideal training for PE for SEN.
5. Learning experiences of pupils with SEN within PE.
6. Difficulties for teachers when including pupils with SEN in PE

7. PE Curriculum design for pupils with SEN.

8. Teachers' experiences of teaching pupils with SEN.

9. The concept of inclusion and teachers' experiences of dealing with pupils with SEN within PE.

10. The support available outside and inside schools.

From this initial coding, themes emerged which are discussed in Chapter 7.

The final stage of data analysis is interpretation. Patton (1990: 375) described interpretation as:

explaining the findings, answering 'why' questions, attaching significance to particular results, and putting patterns into an analytic framework. It is tempting to rush into the creative work of interpreting the data before doing the detailed, hard work of putting together coherent answer to major descriptive questions.

In the 'search for meaning and understanding' (Arksey and Knight, 1999: 150) on policy implementation for SEN in two countries it was not easy to compare interpretations of data collected from different countries and social contexts. I was comforted by the notion that 'A cross-cultural approach helps to do this because it enables us to understand the relativity and contingency of conceptualizations such as “human right” and “social justice” and “equality” (Armstrong, 2003: 35). As Poppleton stated:

The interpretation of findings in a cross-national study is much the most difficult part of the researcher's task. It assumes the possession of contemporary knowledge about how systems are constructed; historical knowledge of how they come to be what they are; anthropological knowledge of the mores and customs embodied in them; and sociological and psychological frameworks of reference in order both to contextualise the
Within such a cross-cultural perspective, I explicitly sought to interpret policy and its implementation as a process of knowledge production and reproduction (p. 73) from the accounts of those whom I interviewed and observed in the two countries.

### 4.5.1 Generalisation

The strength of case study is that it allows us to deal with the complexity of policy and its implementation. In this study, ‘the case’ included one LEA and four primary schools, in each country. Denscombe (1998: 36) has identified three questions that social researchers are likely to confront when doing case study. They are:

- How representative is the case?
- Isn’t it possible that the findings, though interesting, are unique to the particular circumstance of the case?
- How can you generalize on the basis of research into an instance?

The education systems of England and Taiwan are different. However, LEA Advisors have the same responsibilities to operationalise legislation of SEN to primary schools and teachers and monitor appropriate resourcing for SEN pupils and their parents in each country. For example, the LEA Advisor in Langston Authority, at least on the surface, promoted ‘inclusion’ in the same way as LEA Advisors in other Authorities in England, while the LEA Advisor in Chunghwa City operationalises policy for SEN pupils in the same way as those in other Authorities in Taiwan. Although the area and population of a county/city may vary, its advisors are subject to the same legislation and the National Curriculum. Although there were different sizes and type of primary schools in England
and Taiwan, policies for SEN pupils in each country were dominated and framed by their LEAs. However, because this study involved only one LEA Advisor in each country, there were bound to be limitations as to their representativeness by gender, age and education background (see Chapter 10).

Moreover, as Table 4.2 reveals, School 1 in England, in which there were two classes in each year stage, was relatively 'big' when compared to others with typically less than two classes in each year stage. In Taiwan, in contrast, schools with two classes in each year stage, like school 1, would be considered small and others had four classes or above at each year stage. But even those were only middle-size schools; large schools, with ten or so classes in each year stage, were not included in this study as there were none with pupils with physical disability within them when this study was conducted. Thus, the findings in this study can only be generalised to other small and middle size primary schools in Taiwan.

As to Descombe's third question, SEN policies and their implementation have been set in their social contexts discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5. A cross-cultural perspective has been used to compare them in England and Taiwan but judgment of each in context, with awareness of their different politics' history and culture, must remain paramount. Moreover, the main subjects of this study are pupils with physical disability. The findings of this study can not be generalised to other categories of SEN pupils, as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 10.

4.6 Ethical Considerations

Whilst we do research in a quest for truth we also have responsibility for the subjects in our study. Cavan (1977: 810) defined ethics in research as:
a matter of principled sensitivity to the rights of others. Being ethical limits the choices we can make in the pursuit of truth.

Bogdan and Biklen (1982: 49) considered two issues related to ethics, with informed consent and the protection of subjects from harm uppermost in their thinking. They are:

1. Subjects enter research projects voluntarily, understanding the nature of the study and the dangers and obligations that are involved.
2. Subjects are not exposed to risks that are greater than the gains they might derive.

There were four ethical considerations in my study. The first related to contacts with the interviewees before conducting interviews. Written consent was obtained from all participants before the investigation and their right to withdraw from this study was given/issued simultaneously. I explained the purpose and how I would conduct the interview to SEN pupils and their parents. Second, participants were reminded again of their rights. Interviews took place in a familiar environment, such as the office or the classroom. SEN pupils were accompanied by their parents or teachers and other practitioners when being interviewed. If they became uncomfortable during interview, they were withdrawn and their teachers and parents were informed. Third, the data provided by interviewees were subject to the Data Protection Act and treated with complete confidentiality. All collected data, writing material and audio tapes, were stored in a safe place. The audio tapes were destroyed when completely transcribed and the names of participants were removed from written data in order to ensure anonymity. Finally, before the research process began, I had obtained ethical clearance from the University and acquired an enhanced Disclosure from the Criminal Records Bureau of
4.7 Conclusion

'The philosophical assumptions and interests that drive qualitative forms of inquiry are different from those that inform research conducted in positivist and postpositivist paradigms' (Sparkes, 2002: 39). This study attempted to approach the field of policy implementation for SEN using qualitative research methods with documentary analysis, observation and interview as the main tools. The philosophical assumption is based on qualitative principals. Previous research (see Chapter 2) revealed that there are gaps between the intention of policy makers and practice in school reflected in the allocation of resources, practitioners’ training and policy transmission from LEAs to schools. This led me to explore the perspectives of policy makers and to probe deeper into the problems of policy implementation. Two questions arise as to whether the samples in this study were representative in the two countries. Flick (2002: 5) stated:

These central criteria in qualitative research are whether findings are grounded in empirical material and whether the methods have been appropriately selected and applied to the object under study.

Unlike the products of quantitative research methods, the persuasiveness of qualitative research findings does not rest on measures of statistical significance and duplication but upon provision of sufficient detail to ‘make sense’ of the whole issues or problems. Throughout processes of interaction with relevant subjects - the LEA Advisors, teachers, parents and pupils with SEN - I sought to tell a tale of policy implementation for the latter in primary schools. As Firestone comments:

The persuasive strategies of the two kinds of research are very different. The
quantitative study must convince the reader that procedures have been followed faithfully because very little concrete description of what anyone does is provided. The qualitative study provides the reader with a depiction in enough detail to show that the author’s conclusion 'make sense'. For that reason, discussion of procedures is not emphasized. Too much attention to procedures can get in the way of the narrative line which attempts to build a concrete impression of the phenomenon study.

(Firestone, 1987: 19)

This is not to imply that there is lack of procedure in qualitative research methods. Indeed, this study attempts to achieve 'coherence' between its research purposes, questions raised, research methods and results. As Woods (1985, quoted in Sparkes, 1992b: 280) recognizes, 'The point where rich data, careful analysis and lofty ideas meets the iron discipline of writing is one of the great problem areas of qualitative research'. I used qualitative research methods to examine problems which have long existed in policy for SEN and its implementation and to describe this phenomenon with the aid of policy implementation and field of knowledge production and reproduction models (p. 73). I set out to understand the real experiences of pupils with physical disability and to document what SEN policy means to people who are involved in its implementation.
CHAPTER 5

THE FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION: ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION OF SEN IN TAIWAN AND ENGLAND

5.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters have introduced the theoretical structure of this study and outlined the relationships of knowledge production and reproduction as they relate to policy for SEN, particularly to the issue of equality and inclusion. In this chapter, in order to focus on the primary field of knowledge production and reproduction (see p. 73), I will examine official documents, for example, legislation for SEN and the National Curriculum, which were issued from central Government and its appointed curriculum writers, to explore how equality and inclusion were meant to be enacted and expressed.

In Taiwan, the Special Education Act 1984 (MOE, 1984) is the primary legislation for SEN. I will utilize historical and documentary analysis to view its development (including amended versions in 1997 and 2001), and the legislation which was derived from it, such as the Special Education Curriculum Implementation Regulations (MOE, 1998) and consider their impact on policy for SEN. In addition, I will also analyse the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) (see Chapter 2) which was influential in the development of SEN from 1980s to 1990s in Taiwan and raised central Government's awareness to deal with SEN. The Report is an important reference point for SEN policy analysing the difficulties relating to finance, teacher training and school facilities for SEN pupils in schools (see
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This chapter will concentrate on its recommendations and examine central Government’s intention to develop policy for SEN since 1995.

At the same time, in the UK, the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) prompted the idea of ‘special educational needs’ to head up the legislation. It lay at the heart of the 1981 Education Act and redefined pupils with SEN instead of categorizing them. It also urged the Government to concentrate on SEN. Subsequent legislation, for example, the Education (Special Educational Needs) Regulations, 1983, the 1988 Education Reform Act, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001, Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs (DfEE, 1997) and the follow-up document, Meeting Special Educational Needs: A programme of Action (DfEE, 1998), extended the Government’s policy for SEN and for those who endeavoured to improve provision for SEN. The Report and this sequential legislation are prominent references for studying policy for SEN in England. I will review them and compare the legislative context of SEN in Taiwan, especially relating to equality and inclusion, exploring how these concepts are expressed in policy.

In addition, I will analyse the curriculum in the two countries. On the one hand, in Taiwan, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines enacted in 2001 for primary and junior high schools is one of the most prominent and controversial policies reflecting education reform because it challenged traditional ways of thinking about content and assessment in education. In Bernstein’s terms, it changed both the ‘classification’ and ‘framing’ of curriculum (Bernstein, 1971). Given its emphasis on ‘curriculum integration’ (see Chapter 2), the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines seemed to provide pupils with special educational needs a new opportunity to be included in mainstream provision. In reality, however, most teachers in their interviews thought that the new Curriculum Guidelines were no different from the previous National Curriculum and, at times, prevented PE
instruction for SEN pupils (I will explain this contradiction in Chapter 7). Here, however, I will examine the content of the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines, and its effects on teachers and the teaching of SEN pupils.

On the other hand, in England, the National Curriculum (1999) has served as the main statutory guideline for SEN on inclusion. Its perspective on SEN was profoundly affected by the 1988 Education Reform Act, and the 1997 Green Paper. I will examine the development of the National Curriculum, particularly, the National Curriculum for Physical Education and its relation to inclusion for SEN.

I begin, however, with an analysis of the laws and legislation of Taiwan that accompanied the Special Education Act 1984, along with the reports issued by academics and central Government at the time. I will, then, analyse the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and their influence on SEN, and examine the development of legislation and the National Curriculum for SEN in England. Finally, I will summarise and compare the legislative contexts and curriculum perspectives in Taiwan and England and identify emerging themes, including similarities and differences between these two countries.

5.2 Analysing SEN Policy in Taiwan

5.2.1 Policy, Legislation and Equality for SEN

The initial reason for establishing a Special Education Act 1984 was that central Government believed that separate regulations were needed to accomplish policy for SEN (Executive Yuan, 1984). Indeed, before the Act was formally established, the Ministry of Education had already enacted some regulations for pupils with SEN to meet their needs. Institutes and classes for SEN were already in existence in Taiwan. For example, a physical impairment class was established in 1961 in a school in south Taiwan. In 1974, a new regulation, ‘The Standards of Assessment and Assistance for Special
Children’ (MOE, 1974), was used to identify the degree of hearing, vision, mental and physical impairments pupils had against listed criteria which were judged and categorized by teachers. However, in 1974, the first special teaching unit was established for teachers’ in-service training at the National Taiwan Normal University for current teachers; it had no brief to train new teachers for SEN. The regulations above were established for practical purposes when teachers had pupils with SEN in their classes; they were separate from each other and there was no legislation of training new teachers for SEN.

Although there had been a physical impairment class since 1961, the Special Education Act was not established until 1984. The Act originally contained 24 Articles. It defined ‘talented and physical and mental impairment’ and set out to establish ‘equal opportunity’ in education and employment/work. It stipulated that schools needed to provide a flexible curriculum for SEN pupils and permitted them to shorten or extend periods of study. Special schools or classes were encouraged to provide an individualized curriculum for SEN. The Act, however, was amended radically in 1997 to clarify the responsibilities of central Government and Local Education Authorities. It set recruiting criteria of Learning Support Assistance (LSA) for children with physical and mental impairment and provided right of appeal for their parents. It entitled colleges and universities to establish special education departments to train teachers for SEN. In particular, it stipulated the minimum percentage of central Government’s budget (not less than 3 percent of the national education budget) to be spent on SEN. Central Government intended to overcome the barriers of policy implementation for SEN by shifting responsibility from itself to LEAs by providing needed financial support. This legislation reflected the recommendations of the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) (see Chapter 2).

For pupils with severe disability, the Act asserted that schools could recruit a
learning support assistant (LSA) for SEN. As we will see, however, this is not always the case in reality for schools (see Chapter 7). The *Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report* (MOE, 1995) also suggested that there was a budget shortfall for SEN. The Act seemed to push central Government to achieve the official budget rate (at least 3 percent of total education budget) for special education. Table 5.1 reveals that the budget for special education was 3.72 percent in 2001, rising to 4.03 percent or more in following years. On the surface at least the financial needs for SEN were met in the Act and the intention of Government was to fix the budget specifically for SEN. But this did not mean the budget for SEN was sufficient. The rate is only an indication of the amount which central Government spent on SEN. It can not be analysed in detail. One of the LEA Advisors interviewed argued that there was not sufficient funding and that resources were the key to implementation of policy for SEN (see Chapter 6).

**Table 5.1** The special education budget as a percentage of Ministry of Education Funding (modified from the Report of Budget of Special Education, Special Education Unit of Ministry of Education, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget of special education</th>
<th>Budget of Ministry of Education</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>150,091</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>153,075</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>145,790</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>140,126</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>141,568</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>145,356</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy for SEN is underpinned by the Special Education Act 1984 and relevant legislation. At the same time, knowledge about equality is generated by the Act and will be formulated and translated by the LEAs. Central Government had legislated for SEN partly because it was persuaded by parents of SEN pupils and some legislators of the need for action on SEN. But it also reflected that the government accepted the rights of SEN pupils and intended to create an ‘equal’ environment for them. The Act expressed the way in which the central Government now wanted to treat pupils with SEN (physical and mental impairment). In the UK, Brighouse (2000: 9) pointed out that family background and economic circumstance seem to be the main reasons for educational inequalities. In Taiwan, the Government needed not only to reduce the impact of different economic backgrounds for SEN pupils but also create and promote inclusive circumstances for SEN pupils, their peers and practitioners. Central Government saw the need to legislate for SEN and promote SEN in a variety of ways. To this end it created the Human Rights Advisory Committee in 2000 responsible to the President’s Office. It emphasized that human rights are a key element in government policy. This committee was authorised to effect policy for SEN and promote the idea for including SEN. Unfortunately, this rhetoric was not reflected in any document relating to SEN or any website or publications.

Inclusion and SEN legislation

The Special Education Act 1984 was established for both talented and SEN pupils. It was intended to enhance the opportunities of talented pupils and pupils with mental or physical impairments and provide them with equal opportunity to attend schools, to develop themselves and make a useful contribution to the labour process (Article 1). It stipulated that, for pupils with mental and physical impairment, government
should provide a rehabilitation service and occupational education (Article 2). These commitments seemed to respect the notion of ‘social investment’ for SEN which Oliver (1988, see Chapter 3) observed. However, the Act also stipulated that schools should provide an ‘adapted curriculum’, teaching material and teaching method for pupils with mental and physical disability and that they should attend and graduate from primary and junior schools at more flexible ages than other children. (Articles 3 and 4). It also announced that the facilities of special schools and mainstream classes were to be individualized for SEN pupils. The Act sought to provide an adequate and equal basic environment for SEN pupils in schools. Not everyone believed that this would bring about change. Dr. Wu, professor and the director of the ‘special education unit’ in Taiwan Normal University expressed his opinion of the Act in the Min Sheng Daily (1984). He questioned whether the Act represented progress in improving human rights in Taiwan and argued that many barriers needed to be overcome before SEN could be met. At this time (1990s), official discourse on SEN still focused on the ‘rights’ of pupils but in separate and segregated provision. The Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) pointed out that the development of policy for SEN was heading towards ‘inclusion’ even though there was no article indicating ‘inclusion’ in the Special Education Act 1984 or amended versions in 1997 and 2001. However, the subsequent Special Education Curriculum Implementation Regulations (MOE, 1998), Article 9, suggested that there are several teaching methods, for example, dividing groups, mentoring or peer assistants to achieve the individual educated ‘setting’ of SEN pupils. This stipulation was derived from the Special Education Act 1997 and it respected the implementation of individual education plans (IEP) for SEN. There is, however, a conflict between the concept of ‘inclusion’ and ‘individual educated purpose’. There are ambiguities between the Act and the Report. On the one hand, the Special
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Education Act 1984 urges schools and teachers to achieve the ‘individual purpose’ for SEN, or set individual goals for SEN. The teaching methods it mentions focus on segregation. On the other hand, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) pressed the educational environment for SEN towards inclusion. Moreover, Article 5 of the Special Education Act 2001 mentions that schools have to provide rehabilitation and ‘cure’ for SEN. The policy reflected a medical model as pupils with SEN were considered to need ‘proper’ treatment, rehabilitation and ‘cure’. This seemed to suggest that the Government considered pupils with SEN a ‘burden’ on society and the medical perspective needed to be adopted. There is little evidence to suggest that policy for SEN reflected a social model although the Act mentioned that schools should modify and adjust their curriculum and teaching material for SEN pupils, and the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) had pointed out the Government needed to create an ‘inclusive’ environment for SEN.

5.2.2 The Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report and PE for SEN

Unlike the Special Education Act 1984, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995: 86-94) suggested that the government needed to provide proper PE instruction to enhance SEN pupils’ health. The Report outlined that the Ministry of Education would announce a plan to establish an Act of physical education for SEN enhancing teachers’ training, curriculum design and equipment. This plan has not yet been completed. The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines potentially play a crucial role for SEN pupils on PE teaching (see the next section). The Report, however, suggested a complete lack of provision in PE for SEN on teachers,
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curriculum and assessment. At the same time, it suggested that PE should be improved by developing teaching material, raising PE teachers' awareness, including conducting in-service training for SEN, and encouraging academic research. In this report, we found that the government had already identified the factors that hinder SEN in schools and intended to overcome them. But in reality, primary teachers still struggle to deal with SEN pupils and discern the policy for SEN. They have to follow textbooks to instruct pupils including those with SEN. They do not know how to adjust criteria of assessment for SEN pupils and they do not have the proper assistance if their schools are small (see more detail in Chapter 7). Although the Report was published in 1995, the barriers it mentioned are still evident in primary schools. This does not mean that the Government ignores the needs of SEN pupils or is reluctant to improve the PE environment for them. However, policy for SEN does need to be examined by those agents who are involved in it, such as LEA advisors, teachers and SEN pupils so that they can better understand the need of pupils.

5.2.3 The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and SEN in Taiwan

The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines is one of the most important enactment reflecting recent education reform and has been seen as a radical revolution of curriculum in Taiwan for primary and junior high schools. The Guidelines blur the insulation between subjects, or contents in Bernstein's (1971) words, adopting 'learning areas' instead of a traditional subject based curriculum; it also tries to blur the boundary between knowledge of what may be transferred and what may not be transferred. I will analyse the Guidelines to assess how they frame (Bernstein, 1971) relationships between teachers and taught, and how these changes influence SEN in primary schools in Taiwan.
The changing structure of the curriculum

1. The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines blurs the insulation of content

The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines attempts to re-configure the content of the curriculum around learning areas rather than subjects. There are seven learning areas within the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. The contents of the learning areas are broader than previously specified in the subjects, for example, the learning area of health and physical education replaced physical education and its content focuses not only on sports and motor skills but also health management and lifestyle choices. The content of the learning area is not to be restricted but is left open for teachers to meet the pupils’ needs which are also based on their communities and schools. In previous subject based curriculum, pupils were expected in PE to obtain knowledge, skills and understanding through sports, and teachers evaluated pupils by means of the three perspectives to compare each pupil and access whether they achieved the goals given in each stage. In the new Curriculum Guidelines for the learning area of health and physical education, teachers are expected to design their instruction and to evaluate whether pupils achieve their ‘competence indicators’ in each learning stage. On the surface this represents an ideal curriculum to meet the different needs of each pupil including those with SEN. But the time allowed for the learning area of health and physical education is less than three hours for the ‘PE’ section per week, and teachers have limited contact with each pupil as there are normally around 30 pupils in one class in primary schools. The new Curriculum Guidelines, however, theoretically provide a good opportunity for SEN pupils to be included in the learning area of health and physical education. The reality of the situation is explored in Chapter 7.
2. Weakening the boundary of knowledge transmission

The new curriculum represents a shift from a ‘collection’ to an ‘integrated’ curriculum (Bernstein, 1971). At least in theory an ‘integrated code requires teachers of different subjects to enter into social relationships with each other which will arise not simply out of non task areas, but out of shared, co-operative, educational tasks’ (Bernstein, 1971: 62). When implementing the ‘learning areas’, both integration and team teaching will be required. The relationships between teachers will shift radically. Conflicts may arise between teachers if they are not equipped with the abilities to teach more than one subject, or ‘integrated’ knowledge across fields. Moves toward an integrated curriculum might help meet the needs of pupils in the primary and junior schools. But in Taiwan it may also cause tension between teachers, particularly class and subject teachers. Traditionally, there are subject teachers and class teachers in junior high schools and in some primary schools, mostly in urban areas. Within the PE curriculum guidelines, teachers are required not only to teach specific subjects but also teach across subjects in a learning area. In addition, the assessment of ‘learning areas’ focuses on the ‘competence indicators’ which pupils can achieve. Therefore, more qualitative evaluation methods have to be adopted instead of traditional paper tests and the description of performance assessment will be applied in PE. Theoretically, a ‘mark’ denotes by a number for pupil can no longer be employed. This adds to the workload of teachers. The Guidelines also encourage or ‘enforce’ teachers to work cooperatively. All these changes disturb teachers’ power within the existing structures of their schools. However, teachers have discretion to choose teaching materials and methods when they embrace SEN pupils in PE lessons. Some teachers whom I interviewed used their expertise and abilities to design curriculum for including pupils with physical disabilities in their lessons, although they achieved different degrees of success which cannot be reduced to enactment of
Curriculum Guidelines. It depended individually either on their background, for example, in long-term sport training and experience of sport or enthusiasm. For example, teachers with expertise in particular sports might include SEN pupils in activity designs in PE lessons more so than those without sport expertise. And teachers who have commitment to including SEN pupils would endeavour to design a curriculum in PE appropriate to them (see Chapter 7).

3. A greater emphasis on curriculum design

The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines also stipulated that schools need to have a curriculum development committee to develop school-based curriculum to meet the needs of schools, community, parental expectation and pupils' needs. That is to say, schools have more control over their own curriculum than before but have to consider relevant factors, especially parental wishes. The Curriculum Guidelines also empowered parents to be involved in the curriculum development committee and stipulated that schools shall provide their school curriculum plan to parents within two weeks of the new semester having started. Again, on the surface, this represents a positive development for SEN pupils as their parents have an opportunity to understand and influence the strategies employed by teachers and schools.

**SEN within the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines**

Although the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines do not mention 'inclusion' explicitly, it is implicit in its core rationale. For example, the component A: ‘Humanitarian attitudes’ include self-understanding and respect for others and different cultures. This would urge schools to make an appropriate curriculum with respect of inclusion and to concentrate more on pupils with SEN than before. There were some
tensions between the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and its implementation for SEN pupils in schools as follows:

1. **A more flexible curriculum design for SEN but still limited in practice**

   The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines stipulate that the curriculum plan has to be notified to parents before the beginning of the new semester. This, if implemented, would provide a good opportunity for teachers and parents to review the curriculum together and assess if it is suitable for pupils with SEN. Teachers are also expected to cooperate with each other to design a curriculum for pupils and receive suggestions from their colleagues when they are trying to design a curriculum for SEN. However, every school is expected to choose a version of a textbook for learning areas including PE. If schools do not choose a textbook which is approved by the Ministry of Education and sold on the open market then teachers have to edit teaching material themselves and the content then has to be approved by the LEA. In my experience, all learning areas, including PE, in schools adopt textbooks. This restricts the material teachers can use for SEN which contradicts the central ideal of 'opening' up the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. I will examine how teachers deal with this matter later (see Chapter 7).

2. **Has teaching and assessment improved for pupils with SEN?**

   In the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines, the assessment is based on the achievement of individuals and adopts more qualitative evaluation than the assessment provided by the previous National Curriculum. This seems ideally suited for pupils with SEN because, theoretically at least, they do not have to meet the same criteria as other able-bodied pupils and can set their own achievement goals. The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines do not, however, provide any guidelines for teachers to help them evaluate
SEN pupils. In PE, some teachers interviewed did not know how to evaluate SEN pupils and applied the same criteria for all pupils including pupils with SEN; others gave SEN pupils ‘basic’ grades when attending PE lessons (see Chapter 7).

3. Does the implicit statement of inclusion nurture an understanding of pupils with SEN?

The Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines attempt to achieve ‘inclusion’ in their core rationale in an indirect way. In England, the National Curriculum makes ‘inclusion’ an explicit requirement and directly stipulates that schools should meet the specific needs of individuals, such as pupils with SEN (the National Curriculum, 1999). Indicating inclusion for SEN in the curriculum is intended to provide a guarantee to meet the needs of all pupils. As the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines does not indicate inclusion, schools and teachers might ignore the needs of SEN pupils or pay little attention to how to include them in lessons. Most teachers I interviewed in Taiwan stated that the Grade 1-9 Curriculum had made no difference to how they treated pupils with SEN (see Chapter 7).

In conclusion, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines potentially could provide an inclusive environment for pupils with SEN in PE lessons. First, one of its core rationales focuses on respecting others and different cultures. This urges teachers to promote ‘inclusion’ of pupils in their instruction and every day life. Second, the assessment of PE lesson is more flexible than before. Teachers, then, could use broader material and flexible teaching methods to try to include SEN pupils. The new curriculum guidelines emphasize a school-based curriculum design. Schools, teachers and parents of SEN pupils and their communities could generate an environment for inclusion. These are all potential benefits for SEN pupils within the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. In Chapter 8, I will investigate whether and how the guidelines for SEN materialise as practice.
5.3 Analysing SEN Policy in England

5.3.1 Policy, Legislation and Equality for SEN

In England, the 1981 Education Act introduced the concept of 'special education needs'. It was a most important development for SEN as it represented the way in which provision should be made from that time on. It also imposed particular duties on local education authorities (LEAs) and schools with regards to special education provision. The Act was largely consequent upon the Warnock Committee of Enquiry Report (DES, 1978). Warnock (1978) stated that the purpose of the Committee was:

> to review educational provision in England, Scotland and Wales for children and young people handicapped by disability of body or mind, taking account of the medical aspects of their needs, together with arrangements to prepare them for entry into employment; to consider the most effective use of resources for these purposes; and to make recommendations.

(Warnock, 1978: 1)

The most important recommendation of the Report was to raise the concept of SEN above the use of medical categories, and its subsequent recommendations, such as LEAs’ duties, assessment and parents’ rights, were now to be constructed around this idea. The Committee believed that ‘no child, however great his disabilities, was regards as uneducable’ (Warnock, 1978) and refused to distinguish pupils between handicapped and non-handicapped in order to provide ‘special education’ to all of them. The concept of SEN was heralded as an important challenge to the traditional label of ‘handicap’. The 1981 Education Act then stipulated a clear definition, largely derived from the Report, of those who needed SEN provision. This was to be seen as a vital legislative attempt to provide an ‘equal education environment’ for pupils with SEN. The Act also stipulated that LEAs provide parents the right to appeal against a statement if they did not recognise
the result of an assessment of their children's needs. In section 8, paragraph (1):

Every local education authority shall make arrangements for enabling the parents of a child for whom they maintain a statement under section 7 to appeal...

The adoption of a social model rather than a medical model for SEN in the Act stipulated duties for LEAs and schools to create an 'equal environment' and to obtain the best value of the considerable resources for SEN. In this vein, the Special Education Needs Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) provided practical advice to LEAs and schools as to how they should consider SEN pupils as a 'social consideration'. For example, it suggested that the assessment process of study should always be 'fourfold' (SEN Code of Practice, 5: 6) for SEN pupils in primary schools. Teachers should focus on 'the child's learning characteristics, the learning environments that the school is providing for the child, the task and the teaching style' (ibid.). It reminded teachers to recognize that some difficulties in learning for SEN can be caused by the school's learning environment or teacher/child relationships. This also suggests that provision of teaching for SEN should preferably be considered from a social model. However, although the Warnock Report mentioned teacher education as one of its three priority areas, the Act contained no reference to this area of practice. Yet teacher education, including initial teacher training (ITT) and in-service training, are essential for teachers to deal with SEN pupils. Later (in Chapter 8) I will explore how teachers receive their training for SEN.

5.3.2 Inclusion: the Green Paper Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs

The Warnock Report had discussed integration and its benefits for SEN. But the
Committee did not initiate the idea to include disabled pupils in mainstream school. In contrast, the Report drew attention to the importance of special schools (NUT, 1982). However, section 2 of the 1981 Act stipulated that the LEAs must ensure a ‘statemented child’ was educated in a mainstream school. This was seen as ‘integration’ rather than ‘inclusion’ as it merely represented the way in which a pupil with SEN was to be placed. After 1997, the Green Paper *Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* (DfEE, 1997), published by the Department of Education and Employment (DfEE), promoted the idea of ‘inclusion’ and set a goal to attempt to achieve inclusion for pupils with SEN in mainstream schools. For example, section 4 of the Paper stated:

> We aim to increase the level and quality of inclusion within mainstream schools, while protecting and enhancing specialist provision for those who need it.

*(DfEE, 1997)*

In the Paper, the New Labour government established targets for SEN and expressed commitment towards inclusion and support for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Salamanca World Statement on Special Needs Education 1994. The Paper covered a wide range of policy for SEN and some sections specifically addressed practitioners in schools, as outlined below.

1. **Policy for SEN attempts to achieve inclusion**

   In section 4 of the Green Paper, the Government expressed its desire to achieve inclusion as more schools would be expected to accept children with SEN. More children, currently placed in special schools, were to be educated in mainstream schools by 2002. As we will see in Chapters 7 and 8, there is little or no evidence to suggest that, in the perspectives of teachers and LEA Advisors, there were more SEN children being
educated in mainstream schools. Although the percentage of children with statements was increasing from 1.9% in 2000 to 2.1% in 2004 (LEA in Leicestershire, 2005), it was difficult to say that there were more SEN pupils educated in the mainstream schools.

The Paper emphasised that special schools would change their roles to cater for a wide and complex range of SEN and would be supported by mainstream schools. In my case studies, however, most teachers did not think there was assistance for them from special schools for their teaching. Furthermore, one Advisory Teacher expressed the view that the number of special schools had increased in recent years in England while Government policy was intended to move SEN pupils' placement towards mainstream schools (see Chapter 8).

2. Regional Provision for SEN

The Green Paper acknowledged that LEA provision was variable and depended on funding levels. On the one hand, some Authorities could seek external support, for example, parental funding support, but it was difficult for small Authorities to provide pupils with very specialised provision, for example, specific equipment. This is also the case in Taiwan where small schools can not apply for a learning support assistant (LSA) for SEN pupils. On the other hand, schools could obtain resources from LEAs for SEN according to their location, in urban or rural area. In Taiwan, although LEAs followed the same law and legislation both in urban and rural areas, policy for SEN was translated differently by LEAs and large schools received more support than small schools (see Chapter 7).

3. Assistance for teachers to include SEN pupils

The Green Paper describes the relationships between practitioners for SEN in
mainstream schools as follows:

Headteachers of mainstream schools usually delegate responsibility for overseeing the day-to-day operation of a school's SEN policy to the SEN co-ordinator (or SENCO). The SENCO oversees the school's provision for SEN, including the work of learning support assistants (LSAs), advises and supports fellow teachers, and liaises with parents. The SENCO also contributes to the in-service training of school staff.

(DfEE, 1997, section 6, paragraph 1)

The headteacher, SENCO and LSA are the main assistants inside schools for teachers to deal with SEN pupils. As we will see, however, most teachers agreed that LSAs provided useful assistance in coping with SEN pupils but received only basic training not specifically related to SEN pupils. They felt that they wanted more specialised training on SEN, so that they could assist teachers with teaching, not merely 'caring' for SEN pupils (see Chapter 8).

4. Teachers' training for SEN

The Paper announced new standards for teachers in meeting the needs of SEN pupils. Newly qualified teachers were expected to 'understand their responsibilities under the Code of Practice; be capable of identifying children with SEN; be able to differentiate teaching practice appropriately' (DfEE, 1997, section 6, paragraph 5). The Teacher Training Agency (TTA) was encouraged to develop initial teacher training courses to meet the new standards. However, most teachers I interviewed thought that their ITT training for SEN was too general and insufficient, as was in-service training for the needs of SEN in PE lessons (see Chapter 8).
5.3.3 The National Curriculum for Physical Education, Inclusion and SEN

A major feature of the 1988 Education Reform Act was the introduction of a National Curriculum which became ‘progressively obligatory in all maintained schools from September 1989’ (Fowler, 1990: 9). The National Curriculum not only enacted the core subjects and set attainment targets for 5-16 year old pupils but also allowed children with SEN to be educated with a modified curriculum or with exemption from part of the National Curriculum. But section 17-19 ‘exception by regulations’, provided no detail for teachers to modify or exempt the National Curriculum for SEN; it contained principles, such as avoiding unsafe or injurious physical work, and authorised that headteachers direct the National Curriculum for those pupils with or without statements. The Act was an important beginning for the Government to consider SEN pupils’ needs within the National Curriculum. But it had little to say about PE so we now turn attention to the National Curriculum for Physical Education and its treatment of inclusion.

In 1992, the National Curriculum for Physical Education in its ‘Attainment target and programmes of study’ stated:

The text of the end of key stage statements, programmes of study and example is written and designed to make the physical education curriculum accessible to as many pupils as possible with little or no interpretation or modification for pupils with special educational needs. It is not possible to exemplify every element of the programmes of study for the full range of disabilities that pupils may have. Where specific activities may need modifying or substituting, some examples of how this could be done are given.

(DfES/WO, 1992: 1)

There are no specific words in this text to clarify the concept of inclusion. But teachers now needed to make PE lessons accessible to as many as possible including pupils with
SEN. Although the idea of inclusion in the NCPE remained implicit, teachers were now expected to design their instruction for SEN. The Physical Education Non-Statutory Guidance (NSG) (National Curriculum Council, 1992) along with the National Curriculum provided teachers with some support and guidance to meet the needs of SEN pupils in their PE lessons. In section E- Special Education Needs, the NSG suggested that 'Physical activities are best planned when based on sound knowledge of the pupils' 'abilities' (NSG, 1992). It also instructed teachers how to analyse tasks of sport or activities for pupils with different kinds of needs, such as sensory or motor problems. It offered clear guidance but was only appropriate for teachers with a background in sport or PE. The teachers I interviewed expressed their desire to understand the abilities and limitations of SEN pupils (see Chapter 8). However, they also felt that they had not received sufficient ITT and CPD relating to PE for SEN. Nonetheless the NSG provided a useful reference point for teachers to include SEN pupils in PE lessons.

In 1995, the Department for Education launched the revised National Curriculum. The new version of the National Curriculum stipulated that it ‘provides teachers with much greater flexibility to respond to the needs of pupils with identified special education needs’ (DfE, 1995). However, the National Curriculum (1995) mentioned little for SEN and it did not exceed the previous National Curriculum to provide provision for SEN.

The National Curriculum for Physical Education (1999) promoted the idea of ‘inclusion’ to provide effective learning opportunities for all pupils including pupils with SEN. The main features of the development of the National Curriculum (1999) are outlined in Table 5.2
Table 5.2: The contents and features of the National Curriculum for Physical Education for SEN (from the National Curriculum 1992, the National Curriculum 1995 and the National Curriculum 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The National Curriculum</th>
<th>Contents and features for SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National Curriculum 1992</td>
<td>The text of the end of key stage statements, programmes of study and examples is written and designed to make the physical education curriculum accessible to as many pupils as possible with little or no interpretation or modification for pupils with special educational needs. It is not possible to exemplify every element of the programmes of study for the full range of disability that pupils may have. Where specific activities may need modifying or substituting some examples of how this could be done are given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Curriculum 1995</td>
<td>There are six main sections for pupils with SEN in the Physical Education Non-Statutory Guidance including definition of pupils with SEN in physical education, matching tasks and resources to pupils’ need, teaching techniques, interpretations of the programmes of study, modifications and substitutions to specific activities and supporting teachers and pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Curriculum 1999</td>
<td>There are three principles for inclusion including setting appropriate learning challenges, responding to pupils’ diverse learning needs and overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individuals and groups of pupils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I analysed their contents relating to inclusion as follows:

I. The National Curriculum for Physical Education: an 'explicit' conception of inclusion

The National Curriculum (1999) established a broad conception of inclusion for SEN. This urged teachers to consider the needs of every pupil and provide opportunity for them to be included. It challenged teachers as they now needed specific knowledge to identify SEN pupils’ needs. They needed to provide an appropriate curriculum in every subject including PE. Although the teachers interviewed expressed their desire to learn more about SEN, the limitation of time and the variety of SEN were major barriers to them achieving this (see Chapter 7).
2. An incomplete ideal of inclusion?

The National Curriculum for PE (1999) stipulated that teachers should provide a curriculum for pupils with physical disability through ‘adapted, modified or alternative activities or approaches to learning in physical education and ensure that these have integrity and equivalence to the National Curriculum and enable pupils to make appropriate progress’ (DfEE, 1999: 34). This seems to encourage teachers to develop more inclusive PE instruction for SEN with other able-bodied pupils and ‘adapt’ rather than ‘create’ instruction for inclusion. In contrast, in Taiwan, although teachers are not asked and are not expected (in legislation) to design curriculum for SEN within PE, they sometimes seemed more creative than their UK counterparts (see detail in Chapter 7).

3. A collection code curriculum for SEN within PE

While the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan moved the curriculum towards integration, the National Curriculum (1999) in England retained a collection mode and was subject based. In primary schools, teachers have to teach every subject including PE. There are six areas of activity in the NCPE, games, gymnastic activities, dance, athletic activities, outdoor and adventurous activities and swimming. This places a major responsibility on teachers to design a more inclusive curriculum for SEN pupils within PE. As we will see in Chapter 8, teachers seemed to adapt their curriculum within PE for SEN pupils.

5.4 In Summary

5.4.1 The Legislative Perspective

The primary legislation and reports for policy on SEN in the last two decades in Taiwan and England can be chronicled as follows:
Serendipitous vs. Rational

An examination of the legislation and relevant reports for SEN in Taiwan and England and their relationships in policy making suggests that in Taiwan the process was more ‘serendipitous’, in England was ‘rational’. In England the process of policy making seemed to follow a planned line of development. In Taiwan, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) provided an official review and scheme of policy for SEN as it examined Government’s policy and explored the possibilities for future action. It also outlined policy for SEN towards inclusion. However, neither subsequent legislation nor the new Curriculum Guidelines made much mention of inclusion, although the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines made implicit reference. In contrast, in England, the Warnock Report (1978) and the Green Paper (DfEE,
1997), explicitly defined a conception of SEN and inclusion. These two prominent ideals have dominated the development of policy for SEN in the last two decades and were at the heart of subsequent legislation, the 1981 Education Act, and the National Curriculum (1999). As we will see in Taiwan, however, the more serendipitous process of policy making, has given rise to some growing tensions between LEAs and schools, and among teachers as they try to deal with SEN pupils, because policy is ambiguous and discrepant.

A policy model for SEN: medical model vs. social model

Policy for SEN can be identified initially by its definition of people with SEN. In Taiwan, ‘pupils with physical or mental impairment’ is a legal term to define those pupils with ‘special education needs’, the term used in England. Both terms indicate virtually the same group of pupils but the definition orientates provision towards either a medical or social model for SEN. For example, in Taiwan, the Special Education Act 2001 stipulated 12 categories which identify pupils with physical or mental impairments and provision was provided by central Government to those who were in those categories. Rehabilitation was one of the primary goals for pupils with ‘physical and mental impairment’. In England, the Education Act (1981) stipulated that ‘special education needs’ replaced the medical category and adopted a broader definition of pupils with SEN. No mention is made of rehabilitation, only provision of more opportunity for SEN pupils. The National Curriculum (1999) for Physical Education stipulated inclusion for all pupils including pupils with SEN as the Government expressed its intention to provide an equitable environment for all pupils. In Taiwan, the Education Act (2001) and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines made very little mention of how schools and teachers should include SEN pupils with their able-bodied pupils. Yet LEAs are expected to promote and implement inclusion in primary schools (see in Chapter 6).
5.4.2 The Curriculum Perspective

**Inclusion for SEN: implicit vs. explicit**

In England, the National Curriculum (1999) stipulated three principles for inclusion: setting suitable learning challenges, responding to pupils' diverse learning needs and overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individuals and groups of pupils (DfEE, 1999: 28). These principles have to be implemented alongside the SEN Code of Practice (1999, amended in 2001) for teachers to meet the needs of all children, including pupils with physical disability. The policy for dealing with SEN pupils is explicit; it is inclusion. By contrast, in Taiwan, there is no clear definition of inclusion in the Acts and the Curriculum Guidelines. However, the ideal of inclusion is pervasive in academic debates relating to special education. This reflects a trend worldwide and towards the ideal of inclusion but it is not yet expressed in policy for SEN in Taiwan, although the interviewed LEA Advisor thought SEN policy was towards inclusion in the North of Taiwan. As already mentioned above, the National Curriculum for PE in England seemed to provide more information, such as principles for adapting curriculum and for PE teachers on 'inclusion' than the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. However, teachers in Taiwan sometimes seemed to be relatively more creative in PE instruction under serendipitous implicit legislation.

**Teaching SEN in PE, type of method: subject specialist vs. class teacher**

In Taiwan, most PE lessons in primary schools are taught by subject specialist teachers in all but very small schools. Many PE teachers also have administrative responsibilities and sometimes have to teach other subjects. The majority have PE or sports expertise and only teach PE in their schools. In contrast, in England, most PE lessons in primary schools are taught by class teachers who also have to teach all other
subjects. A cursory view of teachers' work in their schools or of their backgrounds does not allow us to say that PE lessons for SEN in Taiwan are better than in England, or vice versa. We have to investigate how teachers interpret policy on SEN in context before we can assess the quality of the education for SEN in England and Taiwan. Later (Chapter 7) we will examine teachers' conceptions of inclusion and their strategies in PE for dealing with SEN pupils. In the next chapter, however, we will look at how policy in the recontextualizing field was interpreted and translated at local education authority level through interviews of LEA Advisors in Taiwan and England.
CHAPTER 6

THE FIELD OF RECONTEXTUALIZATION: THE LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY (LEA) AS A CONTEXT OF INFLUENCE FOR SEN

6.1 Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the recontextualizing field is a mediator between the primary and secondary fields of knowledge production and reproduction (see p. 73). In my study, local education authorities (LEAs) act as mediators translating policy on SEN from central Government to schools and teachers. Although the education systems are different in Taiwan and England, in both of LEAs are responsible for interpreting policy on SEN and making provision for SEN pupils, their parents and teachers. In this chapter, I will report the main themes that have emerged from data analysis of SEN policy and its interpretation by highlighting differences and similarities, in terms of inclusion and equality, in the approaches of LEA Advisors in the two countries. These themes relate to the accommodation of SEN pupils in PE classrooms and how LEA Advisors deal with the needs of schools, teachers and parents.

6.2 The Advisory Teacher and LEA Advisor

In Taiwan, an Advisor of the LEA (ALEA) is referred to as the Advisor of Special Education Unit (ASEU) in the Education Department of the LEA. The ALEA,
whom I interviewed in Taiwan, held the national qualification issued by central Government to those who are recruited as civil servants. He was appointed by the head of the Education Department of the city government in 2004 and before becoming an ALEA had worked in the Education Department for several years as an administrator. In England, unlike in Taiwan, there is no specific, national examination to qualify as an Advisory Teacher (AT). For example, in my study, the Advisory Teacher was recruited from teaching to support specific SEN pupils in schools by the LEA in 2003. She provided support to those with physical disability and teachers involved in provision of SEN, such as special education needs coordinators (SENCOs), physical education coordinators (PECOs) and teachers. Although the titles and job specifications of LEA Advisors are different in Taiwan and England, in both contexts SEN policy included pupils with physical disability. In both countries, Advisors were familiar with models of PE that could be used in PE lessons in primary schools to support SEN pupils, for example, ‘adapted physical education’ and the ‘inclusion spectrum’. They also provided teachers’ in-service training for PE to help them deal with SEN pupils in PE.

6.3 Findings and Discussion

Both LEA Advisors, in Taiwan and England, were interviewed to explore their views on SEN policy, particularly on issues of equality and inclusion relating to PE. My intention at this stage was to explore how Government policy on SEN was recontextualized and translated to schools and how Advisors anticipated dealing with the needs of SEN pupils and helped teachers to achieve inclusion. My analysis of their responses identified emerging themes which were categorized under eight headings, as follows.
Theme 1: The SEN Statement

The SEN statement is the legal document issued to a pupil who is to be provided SEN provision. Before we discuss the opinions of the LEA Advisors in Taiwan and England, I will clarify briefly the difference between statements in the two countries. In Taiwan, the term ‘physical and mental impairment certification’ (PMIC) is used to refer to pupils who in England would be used with statements of SEN. At interview, some teachers suggested that parents did not want their children to receive ‘physical and mental impairment certification’ even though their children needed SEN provision in schools as it would label and confirm that their children had ‘physical or mental impairment’. PMICs seemed to categorise their holders and confirm their disability but did not provide detail of provision. Unlike PMIC in Taiwan, statements of SEN in England explained what provision should be made and how schools and teachers could help pupils also indicating the medical cause, such as cerebral palsy, that necessitated SEN provision. In this sense, the different ways of identifying SEN pupils, seemed to reflect a medical model in Taiwan while in England the statement seemed to reflect a social model.

LEAs both in Taiwan and England stipulated that children should be screened as young as possible to determine their SEN. For example,

There are two ways to discover that if children are SEN. First, teachers will observe their pupils in the pre-school stage such as in kindergartens. Then they will suggest that parents make further assessment if their children seem to have SENs and then inform the LEA. Second, we stipulate that the clinics should inform the LEA of the possible cases if their young patients, particularly, pre-school children, are likely to have SEN. (ALEA)

Children can obtain statements from their pre-school, or their families can seek help from the psychologists. If they are falling behind the expectations in their classes then the schools will ask psychologists to come to observe and give them a proper statement. (AT)
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The AT in England drew attention to the significance of the differences in provision for pupils with or without statements.

If the pupil is statemented then their schools will budget the financial plan for them, for example, 20 hours adult support per week. For those pupils without statements but need SEN provision, there is a psychologist who will come to observe them regularly and make suggestions. (AT)

The ALEA in Taiwan made little mention of pupils who were with or without statements. My observation and interviews in schools suggested that pupils without PMIC would be permitted to go to the resourcing classes to receive extra support in mathematics and numeracy but the schools would try to persuade their parents to make further assessments to obtain statements.

In England, if parents of SEN pupils are not satisfied with or doubt the result of statements, they have the right of appeal. The AT pointed out that parents sometimes appealed repeatedly, much to the frustration of LEA administrators. In contrast, the ALEA in Taiwan made little mention of appeals against a statement even though the Special Education Act 2001 gave parents of SEN pupils the right.

Assessment for children who are likely to have SEN is the predominant element in statementing. In Chapter 7, I will report on documentation, including statements (PMIC in Taiwan) of SEN pupils, the annual reports of SEN pupils and assessment records throughout the case studies to gauge the assessment of children and how it helps or hinders schools and teachers to recognize the needs of SEN pupils.

Theme 2: The Placement of SEN pupils

Once SEN pupils are accommodated in primary schools it is initially for LEAs
to provide and allocate resources to them. Both LEA advisors argued that this was very important for SEN pupils and their parents as 'equal opportunity' should be available whether or not they choose to attend special or mainstream schools. Both LEAs provided segregated accommodation, special schools and inclusive accommodation in mainstream (or mainstreaming) schools for SEN.

In Taiwan, there are two types of provision in mainstreaming schools for SEN, in special classes and resourcing classes (see Figure 6.1). They were established by Article 10 of the Special Education Equipment and Practitioners' Required Standards (MOE, 1984), derived from the Special Education Act 1997. The ALEA in Taiwan pointed out:

There is at least one resourcing class (for pupils with physical and mental impairment) in every school in the city and it depends on the scale of school to increase the number of resourcing classes. There are two teachers in one resourcing class. ....It is necessary to have special classes in each district, because there are only four special schools which are located in different areas and sometimes they are not very convenient for SEN pupils to attend. However, some parents do not want their children to go to special schools and hope their children could interact with other pupils often in special classes.

In his opinion, those with profound SEN who attended mainstreaming schools should be placed in special classes instead of attending special schools. Those pupils with mild SEN or physical difficulties should attend the mainstreaming schools and be placed in the mainstream classes. However, those SEN pupils placed along with other able-bodied pupils in mainstream classes needed to partly attend resourcing classes to receive extra lessons to enhance their learning to catch up with their peers in core subjects or do the physical exercise advised by a physical therapist. These lessons were provided by teachers of resourcing classes and were designed to meet individuals’ needs. The ALEA also explained that special classes and resourcing classes were established as much to
meet parents' needs as for using the resource for SEN efficiently. For example, there are normally two to four mainstreaming schools with special classes in a district. These schools are equipped with specific facilities and with specialized teachers for specific SENs, such as physical and sensory difficulties, or attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (AD/HD). These special classes are able to act as resourcing and consulting centres in their districts. He mentioned that special and resourcing classes had sufficient provision for SEN pupils, and met the needs of most pupils with SEN.

In England, pupils or, rather, the parents of children with SEN can choose to be accommodated in special schools or mainstream schools in the primary phase (see Figure 6.1). This choice has to be negotiated with the LEA as to where the child is best placed. However, the Advisory Teacher in England described the process of accommodation of SEN pupils as follows:

If a child has SEN then he will have a 'statement'. The statement will provide a proposal on what kind of provision will meet the child's needs. Parents have to sign the statement and send it to the school where they want to go. If the County thinks the school is not appropriate then they have to negotiate with parents. Most parents will look at 2 to 4 different schools and make their minds to choose one which would be the most appropriate. (AT)

Both LEA Advisors attempted to provide a variety of school options to meet the needs of SEN pupils and the policy of placement in the two countries was towards inclusion, although the legislation did not explicitly indicate 'inclusion' for SEN pupils in Taiwan. There were similarities between the two countries in provision for those with physical difficulties for following recommended exercises in PE. For example, both pupils with physical difficulties in the two countries usually followed the activities recommended by physical therapists in PE lessons, as appropriate. In Taiwan, pupils were supervised by
resourcing class teachers in doing exercises, while in England, they were supervised by class teachers and did their activities in PE lessons (see Chapter 7).

The AT in England, however, drew attention to an apparent contradiction in the LEA's policy on 'inclusion'. She stated that the number of special schools had increased in the Midlands in England in recent years.

Interestingly, more children are pushed into inclusion and going to the mainstream schools. [in contrast] Here we've got a programme to regenerate and modernize the special schools.... There are six special schools and they have been developed. There are two brand new special schools since last year. I think we will have another new special school by next year...when the government nationally wants children being included rather than separated; it is an unusual one here. (AT)

She thought 'the authority here recognized that inclusion is not the way for every child, but parents could choose' (ibid.). This meant that there was a increasing population in special schools while children with SEN were encouraged to attend mainstream schools. She also believed that parents were beginning to assess where the most appropriate placements were for their children. Some of them considered their children were not well accommodated in special schools because they wanted their children not only to increase their social contact with other pupils but achieve the 'better education' which they felt was offered in mainstream schools. She mentioned that there was a scheme called 'job placement' for SEN pupils to study in special school for 1 or 2 days of a week and then spend the rest of the time in mainstream schools. This was an 'adapted' accommodation to meet the needs of those parents who considered their children were influenced positively by the experiences in both settings. In Taiwan, the ALEA saw special classes in mainstreaming schools as alternative placements for those parents who wanted their children neither to be labeled as having 'disabilities' nor to be accommodated separately.
Unlike in England, parents could choose either mainstream schools or special schools if their children had SEN. However, the opinion of the Advisory Teacher in England suggested that inclusion was not easy to achieve. Although the mainstream school setting for SEN pupils was meant to be inclusive, if parents did not think their children were receiving appropriate provision in an inclusive setting, it was possible for them to opt out of this system and choose to attend special schools instead.

As mentioned before, the SEN statements (or PMIC in Taiwan) are crucial for pupils with SEN as the appropriate placement and provision will be made for them in schools. Legislation for SEN in the two countries made little mention of dealing with pupils who do not have statements or their parents who do not want to receive the PMIC in Taiwan even though their children are likely to have SEN. For these, teachers might invest time in them without assistance from their schools. This is potentially a hindrance to teachers trying to include pupils with SEN statements.
Figure 6.1 Types of accommodation for pupils with SEN in primary schools in Taiwan and England

Theme 3: The Way to Promote Inclusion

Initially, both the LEA Advisors interpreted 'inclusion' in their own ways.

For example, the ALEA in Taiwan stated:

Inclusion is an idea for me to provide an equal environment and opportunity including facilities, teachers and teaching for SEN pupils to be taught with
able-bodied pupils.

Although the Special Education Act 1984 and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines made little mention of inclusion, he translated it into ‘equal environment and opportunity’ for SEN pupils. In contrast, in England, the Advisory Teacher only referred to inclusion with reference to the ‘Salamanca Statement’ which was issued by the UNESCO (1994) when asked what inclusion means to her. In her view of inclusion should be defined in statutory legislation.

Both LEA Advisors promoted ‘inclusion’ in primary schools, although in Taiwan ‘inclusion’ was only an implicit element in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. Primary schools are usually ‘large’ in Taiwan throughout the six year stages; there are normally more than three classes in a year stage around 30 pupils in a class. It was not possible for the Advisor to promote inclusion himself as he needed to deal with more than 10,000 SEN pupils from pre-schools to high schools (the numbers were provided by the LEA Advisor in Taiwan) while the Advisory Teacher in England visited schools and dealt with around 10 schools herself.

I was going to schools to talk to teachers and PE coordinators about how pupils could be included in PE lessons. (AT)

The ALEA in Taiwan suggested that schools used meetings with parents, for example, the parents’ day, to inform them how their children could interact with SEN pupils. However, he believed there was a barrier to promoting inclusion in schools.

I have to admit that the promotion of inclusion has not been implemented very well. Because there were a lot of new teachers in schools every year. We need to promote inclusion continuously and repeatedly. (ALEA)
He pointed out that many primary teachers had retired in recent years and there are new teachers in schools every year. He had to promote the concept of inclusion repeatedly among school teachers. His comments remind us that inclusion seemed neither to be practised well in the primary schools nor to be promoted well among teachers in ITT in Taiwan.

The LEA Advisors in both countries led workshops for teachers to share their experience about SEN and to provide information on inclusion. For example,

Last workshop, the LSAs came along with teachers to share their experience of including pupils with SEN in PE lessons, to provide ideas and circulate information on inclusion. (AT)

There are workshops for the resourcing class teachers every month. They are from different schools and get together to share their experience or raise awareness about SEN. (ALEA)

In England, workshops on SEN seemed to be aimed at helping teachers to share experiences and swap information about SEN and inclusion. But in Taiwan, the workshops on SEN were provided only for resourcing and special class teachers, not PE teachers. If PE teachers wanted to attend in-service training for SEN then they had to attend those that were designed specifically for them. This was not the case for teachers in England who were class teachers who also taught PE lessons (see Chapter 7).

Theme 4: Approaches to Achieving Inclusion in PE

There were learning support assistants (LSA) for teachers to deal with SEN in Taiwan and England but their role was different. In England:

There are a lot of assistants including LSA in schools. The LSA might help
individual pupils.... The system has not changed in our area but different authorities do this in different ways. Here, the headteachers decide how to use them and they are flexible to give assistance to teachers. (AT)

In Taiwan:

The primary schools could apply for LSA and it depended on pupils’ needs. It is flexible. But there is fixed expenditure for schools to apply for LSA and it needs to be approved by the LEA. (ALEA)

The ALEA in Taiwan pointed out that there were LSAs in all schools where there were SEN pupils with profound disability, including small schools, but all applications for LSA had to be examined by the LEA. Potentially, the LSA would provide assistance for one child with SEN, as she or he was appointed for the purpose of meeting the specific SEN pupil. By contrast, in England, the LEA Advisor stated that the LSAs would assist different SEN children in different classes depending on the children’s needs, for example, one LSA could assist a SEN pupils with his/her PE lesson then assist another pupils in other lessons or classes.

In Taiwan, the advisor also mentioned that a PE advisory team\(^2\) provided assistance for PE teachers in the primary schools. However, he did not think this arrangement was working effectively.

The PE advisory team provided a service for PE teachers or normal class teachers relating to PE instruction. I don’t think the PE advisory team properly meets the needs of teachers on SEN within PE. The ‘adapted physical education’ is one of the issues which will be viewed when they visit schools. They do not focus on PE for SEN. We planned to practise ‘adapted physical education’ in the special schools. Honestly, we did not concentrate greatly on PE for SEN in the primary schools. (ALEA)
However, both Advisors made little mention of training for LSAs on PE teaching or how they provided assistance to SEN pupils and teachers. The AT in England pointed out that the LSAs merely provided assistance to SEN pupils on changing clothes or moving in and out of PE lessons. She mentioned that:

The LSAs go out for four days training which covers a variety of SEN and basic training ... but not particularly for pupils with physical disability. In the future, we hope to provide training for those LSAs who are involved in the assistance of pupils with physical disability in PE teaching. (AT)

Both Advisors suggested that teachers could find further assistance for PE inside their schools. In England:

There are PE coordinators and SENCO in schools. The class teachers could talk to both of them.... (AT)

In Taiwan:

For general inquiry, we hope teachers could ask resourcing class teachers....the resourcing class is the consulting center of SEN in every school. We hope resourcing class teachers provide their expertise to assist other teachers as they have full information on SEN pupils and they know what they need. (ALEA)

However, the ALEA in Taiwan thought that the greatest change in implementing inclusion is 'cultural influence'.

There is a radical competition between pupils to obtain good grades in studying for attending good high schools and universities. The only way to judge a successful life for pupils is whether they receive a good grade or not. If teachers want to modify or adapt their curriculum for SEN pupils, they have to modify the assessment as well as the curriculum. It would mean
applying different criteria for SEN pupils and others. It is hard for teachers to make individual education plans (IEP) for SEN pupils as the curriculum and assessment are fixed and are expected to be 'fair' for all pupils. (ALEA)

In my experience, the situation described above characterises secondary rather than in primary schools, particularly, in the core subjects. Non core subjects, such as PE, in primary schools, seemed to be less influenced by competition between pupils, but teachers still struggled to assess SEN pupils in their PE lessons in Taiwan (see in Chapter 7). In contrast, this competition exists in England as well as in Taiwan but assessment is expressed in different ways. For example, annual reports on students in the primary schools include assessment of performance in physical education but this assessment is not given a grade as in the core subjects. It describes children's competence and performance in PE lessons by level of achievement. This seems a useful way to assess SEN pupils in PE but it does not mean that 'inclusion' in PE is either implemented easier or encounters less barriers in England. However, the Advisory Teacher pointed out that increasingly teachers had to apply 'risk assessment' procedures for SEN pupils in PE lessons, not only to prevent injury risk for SEN pupils but also themselves from the appeal of parents. As a result they were becoming less willing to include SEN pupils in PE lessons.

In order to improve PE for SEN, the ALEA in Taiwan argued that the LEA should concentrate on resourcing classes and enhance cooperation between PE teachers and resourcing class teachers.

We worry about those who are placed in mainstreaming classes as their PE lessons are instructed by PE teachers. Most PE teachers focus on able-bodied pupils and pupils with SEN are not their main interest so they will be excluded in the curriculum. The resourcing class teachers should provide assistance in PE lessons in which there are SEN pupils. (ALEA)
The relationship between resourcing teachers and PE teachers is somewhat problematical, however, and there is sometimes conflict and confusion between them, as we will see in Chapter 7.

Theme 5: SEN Training for Teachers

Both Advisors considered that initial teacher training (ITT) was not sufficient for teachers to deal with SEN but each placed a different emphasis on this issue. In Taiwan, the ALEA stated:

I do not think it (dealing with SEN) can be improved by ITT. It is about the individual personality to become a teacher and a teacher should have a positive attitude towards SEN. But I believe the ITT institutions should raise awareness of the conception of equality to raise new teacher by building a positive attitude toward SEN. (ALEA)

In England:

Now there were a variety of ways to become teachers. Because some people just go for education degrees to do full time training to be teachers, others do their degrees in specific areas... it is very minimum, really minimum (training relating to SEN in ITT). There used to be five hours. Around one hour with how to support children with cerebral palsy, physical difficulties and the rest for general learning difficulties. (AT)

Both advisors believed that ITT placed little attention on including SEN in PE even though there are university programmes dedicated to preparing teachers for SEN in Taiwan, and there is general training in ITT for SEN in England. In view of this gap in training, the ALEA in Taiwan stated that administrators, particularly headteachers and SENCOs, were important for implementing and promoting inclusion and reported that, in the future, in-service training relating to inclusion would be compulsory if candidates
wanted to become a headteacher and SENCO. In England, the Advisory Teacher simply hoped that SENCOs, PECOs, LSAs and teachers would receive better in-service training for SEN in the future.

Both Advisors believed that there were adequate in-service training opportunities on SEN for teachers.

We've got a lot of in-service training on SEN. Usually, if we have any information on training, we will send information to schools including PE. (AT)

There is a lot of in-service training on SEN and I think there are too many for teachers to attend. (ALEA)

The AT in England pointed out that the cost of releasing teachers to attend such courses was often prohibitive.

Schools have to pay someone to replace teachers and it is a big problem. Schools usually spend nearly 150 pounds to release a teacher to be in a class. ... There is a lot of training available for teachers. But as I have said it all depends on funding. (AT)

The high cost of a replacement teacher prevented some schools from releasing teachers to attend in-service training as the priority expenditure of schools is the salary and maintenance expense. However, in order to address this problem, the Advisory Teacher provided in-service training on PE for SEN after school hours for those teachers who wanted to receive training. This was not the case in Taiwan as the cost of replacing a teacher in a class is not expensive. The ALEA in Taiwan, however, reported little about in-service training on SEN because he believed there was enough training provided by the LEA and, in addition, lectures relating to 'adapted physical education' were provided
by universities; and teachers could choose any one they wanted to attend. However, by contrast the teachers felt they lacked information on in-service training of SEN, as I shall report in Chapter 7.

**Theme 6: The Administration of the LEA**

Both of the LEA Advisors felt that the funding of SEN was important to schools where the provision for SEN pupils was made.

The Special Education Act stipulated the budget for SEN in LEAs is no less than 5% of the whole education expenditure. I do not know how other authorities deal with it. In this city, we concentrated more on SEN pupils than talented pupils as their funding is together. (ALEA)

Funding is always important for SEN. (AT)

The ALEA in Taiwan also pointed out that the budget of LSAs and schools was independent of each other but the total amount provided for LSAs was fixed. In England, the budget for LSAs was provided annually by the county and separated from the schools' budget.

In both countries advisors thought that if teachers needed assistance they initially could find it in their schools to help, such as SENCOs and resourcing class teachers.

Usually a class teacher could talk to the SENCO as there is a SENCO in every school.... They could get assistance from here when we confirm what kind of assistance they need.... (AT)

For a general inquiry, we hope teachers could ask resourcing class teachers....the resourcing class is the center of SEN in every school. We hope resourcing class teachers provide their expertise to assist other teachers as
they have full information of SEN pupils and they know what they need.
(ALEA)

The relationships between LEAs and school teachers in the two countries seemed to be hierarchical, advisors hoping that teachers might find the assistance in their own schools first. In this respect, it seemed to reflect the mode of accountability of administrative justice mentioned by Riddle (2002: 13) who commented that the model of bureaucracy in policy framework is hierarchical and promises accuracy and consistency. LEA Advisors thought that teachers in primary schools should seek assistance from SENCOs and headteachers first and teachers, in turn, were used to this mode of ‘service’. In Chapter 7 we find that teachers were prepared to seek assistance inside schools but it was unusual for them to go to LEAs directly for help.

In Taiwan, SEN pupils are usually transferred from kindergarten to primary, then to secondary schools. In England, the advisory teacher commented:

It is a nightmare in this area. We’ve got infant schools, children from 4 to 7 and it is key stage one. It is complicated here as children will transfer from infant, junior, high schools to secondary schools. They will transfer four times. We’ve got primary schools which contain key stage 1 and 2, than high school. It will be three transfers. So we’ve got lots of transition. (AT)

There is little evidence of transition affecting teachers or SEN pupils, though it did potentially affect the former’s understanding of the latter. In Chapter 7, we will see that teachers found it useful to gather advice on their SEN pupils from their previous teachers.

Theme 7: The National Curriculum for SEN within PE

Neither LEA Advisor made much mention either of the National Curriculum or the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines for SEN having any relevance to PE. The LEA
Advisor in Taiwan, however, recognized that the issue of respecting different cultures was included in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and it was necessary for respecting different abilities of SEN and other able-bodied pupils.

I think the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines are better than the previous curriculum as its learning areas are practical and useful for SEN pupils. I agreed that the issues relating to 'respecting life' and 'respecting different culture' may be good for SEN. I do not think all teachers are aware of the new Curriculum Guidelines and implement it well. (ALEA)

He also suggested that teachers of special and resourcing classes should be included in relevant meetings on curriculum design.

We ask that teachers of special class and resourcing class should be included in the curriculum development committee in every school. They could draw attention to the curriculum design for SEN. (ALEA)

At the same time, the LEA Advisory teacher in England stated that there were other references which schools could draw on to help them with SEN in PE.

The National Curriculum is compulsory. But there are other references for schools and teachers to give them advice to deal with SEN, for example, PE/SPORT - Meeting SEN in the Curriculum. (AT)

She mentioned that this reference was popular in schools especially in PE teaching. She also referred to the principles of inclusion in the National Curriculum (1999) which stipulated that teachers apply previous key stage criteria to assess SEN pupils if their progress was behind pupils of the same age.

The responses of both advisors suggested that they found it hard to intervene in
the teaching processes for SEN, particularly for SEN in PE. Both of them mentioned relationships between assessment and teaching in PE and how hard it was to change criteria of assessment for SEN pupils. In this sense, potentially, both the National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines stipulate what kind of knowledge should be transmitted in schools and this is controlled by the assessment system. However, the National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines also seemed to constrain teachers when they attempted to include SEN pupils. The variety of ways in which they deal with this and how they try to include SEN pupils in PE is documented in Chapter 7.

Theme 8: The Models of PE for SEN

Two models of PE featured in the thinking of LEA Advisors in Taiwan and England. The former invoked the conception of ‘adapted physical education’ to refer to PE for SEN. For example,

Central government has provided a plan for implementing ‘adapted physical education’ including information on teaching methods and using equipment. (ALEA)

However, he also acknowledged that:

‘Adapted physical education’ is not practised well because the relationship between PE teachers and resourcing teachers is not cooperative. (ALEA)

By contrast, in England PE, like all other subjects, has to affect inclusion for pupils with SEN (see the National Curriculum, 1999). The LEA Advisory Teacher identified the ‘inclusion spectrum’ as the reference point for dealing with SEN within PE. This model of physical activity for SEN pupils was promoted in in-service training, although most
teachers in their interviews made little mention of it. The Advisory Teacher also mentioned that the ‘inclusion spectrum’ was to be modified once questionnaires which were sent to primary teachers had been completed and analysed. The model was formed practically of a survey completed in 2006 to identify the advantages when teachers dealing SEN pupils in PE.

It (the ‘inclusion spectrum’) was promoted in the late 1999 and early 2000. We gave training and some equipment to advise teachers on how to include SEN pupils in PE. ... I think when the questionnaires get back we will recognize the needs of children and review the inclusion spectrum again. (AT)
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**Figure 6.2** The inclusion spectrum (from Stevenson and Black, 1999: 18)

Both LEA Advisors in England and Taiwan mentioned specific models of PE practice for SEN pupils. In Taiwan, in my experience, most in-service training of PE for SEN makes reference to ‘adapted physical education’ in their title. The idea of ‘adapted physical
education' was synonymous with 'PE for SEN' but teachers when interviewed seemed to know little about what it meant and how to apply it to SEN pupils. In contrast, in England, the 'inclusion spectrum' seemed to offer a more effective form of teaching SEN with its five modes (see Figure 6.2) although, once again, teachers interviewed made little mention of it.

Both Advisors believed that there were models of PE available for teachers to deal with SEN pupils in PE. But as we will see, teachers seldom mentioned such models, although these in Taiwan did refer to 'adapted physical education' but could not elaborate on what it meant in practice. Teachers in the two countries did, however, seem to be applying certain principles of the 'inclusion spectrum' even though they had little knowledge of it. The Advisory Teacher in England described the reality of PE for SEN pupils as follow.

Sometimes, teachers might give them (pupils with physical disability) responsibilities so that they will be present but not be included in physical activities; they will, for example, be asked to be a goal keeper, referee or umpire …. (AT)

This was also the case in Taiwan.

6.4 Conclusion

In England and Taiwan LEA Advisors attempted to provide an 'equal' and 'inclusive environment' for pupils with SEN, particularly in PE lessons. There are differences in policy relating to placement, assistance, models of PE and training for SEN for teachers. When translating legislation into practice LEA Advisors devised their own
strategies to deal with cultural, social and political factors which bear on their efforts to link policy and its implementation in schools.

1. All interviews and case studies took place in mainstreaming classes which were supported by resourcing classes in mainstreaming schools in Taiwan.

2. The PE advisory team consists of teachers from university or college and primary schools. The members of the team have expertise in PE. The team visits schools regularly to provide their suggestions after viewing the PE lessons and interviewing teachers and pupils including pupils with SEN
CHAPTER 7
THE FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE REPRODUCTION:
TEACHING FOR INCLUSION: PUPILS WITH SEN IN PE

7.1 Introduction

The secondary field of knowledge production and reproduction (p. 73) is the location where the 'idea' of PE for SEN is again recontextualized as practice by teachers, and is intended to reflect the way in which policy within PE for SEN pupils is to be implemented in primary schools. In this field, policy and provision of PE for SEN pupils is an expression of all those who are involved in 'inclusive settings': teachers, SEN coordinators, PE coordinators, learning support assistants (LSA) and headteachers. Teachers and others may either follow LEAs' 'interpretation' of SEN policy to SEN pupils or apply their own ways of instructing in PE lessons. In this chapter, I will report the main themes that have emerged from the data, including interviews with teachers, documents relating to SEN pupils and field notes of observation of PE lessons in Taiwan and England. Later I will relate these themes to the main aims and core questions raised in this thesis.

7.2 Findings and Discussion

Before we discuss the themes that have emerged relating to teachers and SEN pupils in PE, I want to draw attention to how pupils with SEN were accommodated in
classes from their teachers’ viewpoints. As implied in Figure 6.1, pupils with SEN (mild and moderate physical disability) are placed in mainstream schools in England, mainstreaming classes in Taiwan. Their primary school teachers seemed to have little opportunity or choice to decide whether or not pupils with SEN were placed in their classes (in England) or PE lessons (in Taiwan). For example, teachers in England stated,

Because she is a year 4 girl she needs to stay with her age group. She should be in my class. (Mary)

My class is a year 1 class and there is only one class in this stage. So I do not have a choice. (Karen)

Lucas came into this school and I will be the next teacher. ...so it was not so much choice. (Rachel)

As a primary school teacher, I am very aware that we have to teach everyone including pupils with SEN. (Lesley)

Mary and Karen further pointed implicitly to their lack of knowledge of SEN to deal with SEN pupils in PE.

I just play the role of class teacher. You know, I am not a SEN specialist. The special needs teachers are in charge of the whole special education needs. (Mary)

I am a class teacher and I have to prepare to deal with SEN. Obviously, the whole emphasis now is on inclusion. (Karen)

The three PE teachers in Taiwan made little mention of SEN pupils’ accommodation in their classrooms. In my experience, in Taiwan, primary PE teachers taught those classes which were arranged for them by school administrators. PE teachers have little or no
choice over pupils in their lessons. As Linda stated,

I do not have a choice. Once Jack (a pupil with SEN) was placed in my PE, I must accept him. (Linda)

In England and Taiwan, then, every primary teacher has to accept the opportunity to teach pupils with SEN, including in PE lessons. PE for pupils with SEN was taught by class teachers in England and specialist PE professional teachers in Taiwan. We might, thus, expect there to be different effects on teaching pupils with SEN in each countries. In England, where class teachers teach PE we might expect relationships between teachers and pupils with SEN to be closer than in Taiwan where they are taught by specialists. At the same time, teachers’ knowledge of PE for SEN pupils might be more sophisticated in Taiwan than in England because of their specialist training. In Taiwan, particularly in cities, teachers tend to be graduates from PE or sport universities. We need to examine how teachers in both countries deal with SEN pupils in PE and the effects of differences in provision on PE teaching.

Theme 1: Teachers’ Attempts to Achieve Inclusion in England and Taiwan

All teachers in England interpreted ‘inclusion’ in their own, practical ways and expressed a desire to include SEN pupils in their PE lessons. When responding to questions relating to what inclusion means to them, for example, Rachel replied:

The main thing I want to achieve with him is I don’t want him to feel different, I know he is different in a certain way but I want him to feel just like any other child with his brain ... just active, I want him to be doing as many activities physically he can like all the other children. For the other children to see him as part of class and including him as well. ... I suppose to see him gradually to be more involved in PE. (Rachel)
Inclusion is talking about how we can get through to each child including those with SEN. (Mary)

It (inclusion) is talking about provision for them in the whole school curriculum .... (Karen)

Inclusion means to change part of everything for children with SEN ... and make them confident to go with other children. (Lesley)

Rachel and Lesley also had their own, idiosyncratic ideas of inclusion. Rachel was trying to let SEN pupils feel they were no different from others and to being included as part of the class; Lesley wanted to change the environment for SEN pupils. Their actions seemed to reflect the social model for SEN. In contrast, the LEA Advisory Teacher in England referred to the idea of ‘inclusion’ contained in the ‘Salamanca Statement’ outlined by UNESCO (1994). She believed that ‘inclusion’ was defined by the medical model implicit in the Statement (see Chapter 6).

In Taiwan, one teacher, Linda, tried to ‘design a curriculum’ to make her SEN pupils feel that they were no different from other pupils. Another teacher, May, stated:

Every pupil is to be treated equally including SEN pupils. ... I don’t think she is different from other pupils. She only uses a wheelchair instead of her legs.

The other two teachers held similar opinions on inclusion.

It is to say to include SEN pupils in learning and physical activities as they should not be excluded. As they are members in a society, SEN pupils need to learn how to interact with other able-bodied pupils. (Lin)

I think inclusion is to provide an equal environment for pupils with SEN and to treat them the same as other pupils. The most important purpose is to include SEN pupils in our society. For example, placing them in the mainstreaming classes. ... I don’t think he is a burden as his difficulty is
acceptable for me in PE. (David)

Linda saw inclusion as ‘designing a curriculum’ for SEN pupils, while others concentrated on providing an ‘equal environment’ for SEN. The SEN Advisor in Taiwan also defined inclusion in these terms of ‘equal opportunities’. Lin and David saw SEN pupils as members of society and believed they should learn how to live with others as early as possible. This reflected one of the core issues of the Special Education Act 1984 in Taiwan which set out to create an ‘equal environment’ in education and employment/work for pupils with SEN. These teachers were concerned with ‘equal opportunity’ for SEN pupils, although there was little direct mention of the idea of ‘equality opportunity’ in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines for pupils with SEN. In England, however, the primary school teachers’ understanding of inclusion seemed to be different from PE teachers in the secondary schools described by Smith (2004). In his study, he argued that secondary PE teachers’ understanding of inclusion often reflected ‘those made in recent official pronouncements’ (Smith, 2004: 45) such as statements from UNESCO (1994) and the National Curriculum (1999) which concerned ‘equal opportunity’ and ‘inclusion’. The secondary PE teachers seemed to define ‘inclusion’ with reference to the ‘statutory’ definition. The primary school teachers in my study seemed to translate ‘inclusion’ and how they wanted to deal with SEN pupils in their own ways. However, Smith’s study in England revealed that most teachers in his study expressed their commitment to inclusion either explicitly or implicitly but some held the view that ‘able-bodied’ pupils were still the main concern in their instruction. The four primary teachers in my survey expressed the same concern. For example, in England,

I think it is better to teach, you know 29, the other children, to improve the whole class.... (Mary)
If you concentrate on him (the SEN pupil), you will lose what was happening with the other 25 children. It is not worth it. (Karen)

In Taiwan, Lin and David also identified the 'able-bodied' pupils are their main 'objects' of attention.

I don't think I did enough for Joe in PE. It is not possible to take care of him specifically as I needed to cope with the whole class. ...In my opinion, SEN pupils need specialists, particularly with a medical background, to help them in PE. ...It would be better to teach them one by one. (Lin)

Honestly, I gave little consideration to Charles' needs (his legs) when I designed the PE curriculum. (David)

Their opinions endorsed the observation made by Smith (2004) that in the eyes of most secondary school PE teachers SEN pupils should be excluded from PE because of their difficulties, although teachers gave their commitment to inclusion. Teachers did not want to exclude SEN pupils. But translating inclusion theory into practice was made difficult for them because of the lack of sufficient support inside and outside schools. However, they faced different obstacles to secondary PE teachers who, it seems, adapt sports and team games within the PE curriculum to include pupils with SEN (Smith, 2004), although they still considered it difficult to achieve inclusion. The prominent differences between pupils in primary and secondary schools are pupils’ ages and the physical activities which are employed by teachers. These are important factors when dealing with inclusion in PE. As Karen in England commented: ‘you’ve got to remember that children like to include themselves, because children naturally love to be physically active, it is not usually something peculiar to this young age’, and in Taiwan, Linda claimed, ‘...Jack is year 2 now and everything so far is all right for him. When he is growing, his peers may tease
him about his legs...'. This might suggest that young pupils pay less attention to the 'physical differences' between themselves and pupils with SEN than older pupils. It does not mean that SEN pupils in primary schools are easier to include than those with SEN in secondary schools. Teachers in primary schools might take advantage of young children's 'natural desire' to include SEN pupils in mainstream PE (Meek, 1991). But inclusion also depends on the strategies teachers adopt in terms of their physical activities and teaching methods to include SEN pupils. Later (see Theme 5) I will analyse the activity areas for primary school teachers within the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. However, teachers in England identified a number of problems, including a lack of curriculum design, and physiotherapy in PE lessons, preventing children from being included.

She is not able to carry out the instruction fully because of her legs. (Mary)

He was mainly doing his physio exercise in the PE lesson; PE was a perfect slot and the only time to do that. (Rachel)

He could take part in PE, we could encourage him to be going through the parts he could do. (Karen)

In Taiwan:

We need to follow the content of the PE textbook. ... I can not do what I want to do. (Linda)

Parents bought PE textbooks for their children and we must teach the content of them. ... I am not familiar with cerebral palsy. (Lin)

From the above descriptions, it can be seen that the teachers perceived there to be problems of including SEN pupils in their lessons. They could not design the curriculum
to meet special needs. In England, Mary felt that she was hindered from achieving inclusion and she did not design a PE curriculum for SEN pupils. She felt that pupils with SEN were ‘placed’ in her PE lessons and ‘integration’ rather than ‘inclusion’ was to be practised. Other teachers, for example, Karen, seemed not to know how to design a curriculum for pupils with SEN, and Rachel, felt that her SEN pupil needed to do his physical therapy exercise in PE. These factors were seen as obstacles preventing pupils with SEN from being included in PE lessons.

In Taiwan, two teachers, Linda and Lin, pointed out that they had to follow the PE textbooks when designing their PE curricula. This seemed to constrain them from devising their own ways to deal with SEN pupils in PE. Although one teacher, May, thought that she would follow the PE textbook to generate new ideas to include Sue (a pupil with SEN) as much as possible, for example in the unit on ‘funny volleyball’ (This unit was contained in the PE textbook but there was no guideline for including pupils with SEN. In the video, which was provided by a resourcing class teacher in the school, May generated a way for Sue to be included by using a big and light ball to play volleyball with other able-bodied pupils). Not all teachers, however, wanted or agreed with her desire to include SEN pupils by modifying the PE textbook. Other teachers, Lin and David, seemed like Mary in England to simply ‘place’ pupils with SEN rather than ‘include’ or integrate them in their PE lessons. Later in the fifth theme, I will analyse the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and their effects on teachers’ endeavors to deal with SEN pupils in PE.

Debates on ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ have been outlined in Chapter 2. As Barton (2003) argued, inclusion is not ‘assimilation’ or ‘accommodation’ for SEN pupils into the existing education system; it is about how to provide an ‘emancipated education’ for SEN pupils and others. Yet two teachers in each country thought that they should
concentrate on able-bodied pupils. Implicitly ‘integration’ for SEN pupils was the adopted strategy rather than ‘inclusion’. On the other hand, although the other two teachers in Taiwan refereed to inclusion by ‘equal opportunity’ and thought SEN pupils should be ‘treated equally’, their PE teaching has to be examined to see if they achieve these ideas. In the next section, I first will explore teachers’ strategies to include pupils with SEN in PE.

**Theme 2: Teachers’ Strategies to Include Pupils with SEN in PE**

**Applying models in PE lessons**

In the previous chapter, we saw that the LEA Advisors drew attention to the availability of the ‘adapted physical education’ (APE) model in Taiwan and the ‘inclusion spectrum’ in England to help teachers to cater for SEN pupils in PE lessons. Although teachers in England made little mention of the ‘inclusion spectrum’ explicitly they seemed to apply the ‘opening mode’ of the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (Figure 6.2) in their PE lessons. Interestingly, in Taiwan, two teachers, May and Linda, applied the ‘inclusion spectrum’ although they were unaware that they were using such a model in their PE lesson. For example, Linda recalled that she designed a game in which pupils did not need to use their legs in her PE lessons in which all pupils, including SEN pupils, took big posters upon which they drew numbers (1 to 5) and sat on the same number of their own poster, for example number 1, following Linda’s directions to touch the rest of the numbers with their hands. She commented:

He (SEN pupil with artificial limbs) had a lot of fun in the lessons and other pupils did the same game as the game was designed for everyone. ... This is the only curriculum I am satisfied with. I don’t think I did well in other lessons. I feel sorry for him. (Linda)
In this game, Linda seemed to apply the ‘open activity’ mode in the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (p. 163) as everyone played the same game without modification. Another example in Taiwan, May tried to include her SEN pupil in a relay game. She explained:

Sue (SEN pupil, who needed to sit in a wheelchair) could put a relay stick on her legs in the wheelchair and joined the game with other pupils. Her peers realized her needs and wanted to give her assistance. (May)

In this case, May seemed to apply the ‘modified activities’ in the ‘inclusion spectrum’ as everyone played the same task with changed rules. Sue used her wheelchair instead of her legs and put the relay stick on her legs. This was a modified relay game for Sue to play with other able-bodied pupils. In neither of these examples did teachers mention the ‘APE’ model for SEN pupils in PE lessons but they did apply the modes (opening activity and modified activity) in the ‘inclusion spectrum’ in their curricular design. We can not say these two teachers achieved ‘inclusion’ in all their PE lessons but they provided good examples for including SEN pupils in some. The other two teachers in Taiwan, however, approached SEN pupils in a different way.

I would ask his opinion if he wanted to attend PE lessons, if not, he could be excluded from the physical activities but he has to attend the warm up section then watching the main part of PE. (Lin)

When we did the basketball, he could not do all sections as he can not run fast. He could do the section with his hands. He usually watched if the section of PE is not appropriate for him. (David)

These two pupils with SEN could do no more than attend part of their PE lessons or watch other able-bodied pupils in those lessons which were not ‘suitable’ for them to
attend. From the descriptions above, teachers in Taiwan seemed to achieve either different degrees of ‘inclusion’ or ‘integration’. May and Linda seemed to want to include their SEN pupils by experimenting with their PE curricula. They felt they succeeded in some lessons although they did not think that ‘good experiences’ happened regularly. They were trying to provide an ‘equal environment’ for SEN pupils. Lin and David, however, seemed only to ‘accommodate’ or ‘fit in’ their SEN pupils in PE as they did not modify or adapt their curricula. Lin also considered that it was better to exclude SEN pupils than include them. In contrast, the teachers who were interviewed in England gave few examples of how they could teach SEN pupils in PE in their interviews. It was not that they lacked experience of SEN pupils in PE. My observation of their PE lessons revealed that, basically, two SEN pupils in each class could take part in physical activities as their disabilities were mild (one with cerebral palsy another with club foot). Neither teacher modified the curriculum for SEN pupils, instead they tried to ensure that they did the same activities as others, although they sometimes received assistance from LSAs. Their PE lessons seemed to be modified or adapted little for SEN pupils. At best they could be seen to apply the ‘open activity mode’ in the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (p. 163). Unfortunately, observation of Helen and Lucas, pupils with severe physical disability, could not be carried out as Helen’s class suspended PE lessons during my observations1, and Lucas’s parents would not consent to me observing him. In the interviews with Helen’s teacher, Mary, however, informed me that Helen ‘could not join PE lessons fully because of her legs’. Rachel, Lucas’s teacher, claimed ‘he is mainly doing his physio exercise in the PE lesson because he cannot join us with a lot of running’.

In this theme, it is difficult to determine whether teachers in Taiwan applied the model of ‘APE’ or not. Although all teachers mentioned ‘APE’ in their interviews, there was little attempt to define ‘APE’ or demonstrate how they could apply the ‘advice’
which was provided by the LEA and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan.

**Teaching techniques to include pupils with SEN**

Beside the strategies mentioned above, grouping pupils and peer tutoring were the most common and practical methods for teachers to use in PE lessons. How teachers sort their pupils with SEN into pairs or groups with able-bodied pupils will affect processes of inclusion. Able-bodied pupils usually want to win in competitive activities between groups. For example,

If pupils were divided into groups, there would be no one with Joe (SEN pupil) as he would let the group fail in competition. (Lin)

To ease the competition between pupils in the physical activities, in Taiwan, May argued:

It is very important for the able-bodied pupils to not care to lose or win in a competition or a game when Sue (SEN pupils) is in the same group with them. (May)

May claimed that she would emphasise enjoying the process of competition rather than the result of competition in her PE lessons. In order to let pupils understand Sue’s needs, she also used peer tutoring for pupils with SEN. For example, in the swimming lessons, she assigned two pupils to assist Sue to achieve her personal target in PE lessons, allowing her to cope with the other pupils. But peer tutoring was not always applied in PE lessons. In Taiwan, Lin argued that:

It was hard for peers to assist Joe in PE lessons because they need to understand Joe and to be familiar with the curriculum, but the curriculum changed often. For example, it is dangerous for other peers to assist Joe in
gymnastic lessons. (Lin)

In contrast, none of the teachers in England made any mention of how SEN pupils were sorted into pairs or a group in PE lessons. In my observation,

... Lesley called pupils’ names into groups including Jason (SEN pupil)....
(Field notes, 21.01.05)

Calvin found his partner quickly when the teacher asked pupils to find partners to do the next section. Actually, he found his partner by himself.
(Field notes, 02.02.05)

Calvin could not find a partner himself then Karen assigned a girl to him.
(Field notes, 23.02.05)

These two observed SEN pupils in England were in the early stages (Year 1 and 2) of school. They seemed to have little problem finding partners and to group themselves, or to be arranged by teachers. In my experience of PE teaching in Taiwan, when grouping pupils in year 4 and above, there would be a problem of ‘assigning’ able-bodied pupils to partner SEN pupils and they would seldom find other pupils willing to join them. My observations in England and Taiwan suggested that peer tutoring for SEN pupils is a way for teachers to cope with the majority of pupils in PE lessons if they do not have assistance. But this strategy could not be adopted with young SEN pupils or applied in all activities in PE lessons, for safety reasons.

If we consider the strategies of teachers to deal with SEN lie along a spectrum (see Figure 7.1) then inclusion could be divided from ‘integration’: accommodating SEN pupils in an unchanged curriculum; then moderately including: employing an adapted curriculum, to fully including: radical curriculum change for pupils with SEN. Each
position may overlap with another and teachers might achieve different degrees of inclusion when they deal with SEN. Thus, we may find that teachers achieve either below the moderate inclusion or high inclusion from the above descriptions of their understanding and the obstacles they faced in real situation. My observation in England also suggested that LSAs could become either assistants or obstacles for teachers to deal with inclusion in PE lessons. For example, because teachers in Taiwan did not have LSAs in their PE lessons they needed to learn how to cope with the whole class themselves. Sometimes, they would try to adopt experimental curricula for SEN pupils. On the surface they attempted to include SEN pupils although it was hard to achieve inclusion. In contrast, their counterparts in England received assistance from LSAs. They seemed to lack the motivation to employ a radical curriculum for SEN pupils as LSAs were providing assistance to them to help pupils fit in to existing curriculum. However, in both countries teachers received other forms of assistance from inside and outside schools to include SEN pupils as we will see in the next section.

![Inclusion Spectrum Diagram](image)

**Figure 7.1** The inclusion spectrum of a teacher’s attempt to achieve inclusion in PE

I will return to this model in Chapter 8 to discuss its limitation and potential when teachers employing the teaching model of ‘inclusion spectrum’ (see Chapter 6, p. 163) to
include pupils with SEN in their PE lessons.

**Theme 3: Helping Teachers to Deal with SEN Pupils in PE**

This theme has emerged from a variety of data, some from the interviews with teachers and others from field notes and documents provided by the schools and were related to SEN pupils, such as their annual reports and individual education plans (IEPs).

Most teachers in England approved of learning support assistants’ (LSA) contribution and importance when they were asked questions relating to supporting SEN pupils in PE lessons. LSAs usually play not only the role of ‘babysitters’ for SEN pupils, for example, helping them to change clothes before and after lessons and assisting in PE lessons but in assisting teachers to provide learning experiences and in letting teachers focus on the other children in PE lessons.

Because she can look after her and you can take care of other children... she is very important for me. (Mary)

When he was with his wheelchair, if I was completely tired helping sort and getting him from A to B, making sure he was attempting to do something he should be then you will lose what’s happening with the other 25 children... she is very helpful. (Karen)

They help me in the sense that I can deal with the rest of the class. And they will help the exercise when he needs to do that activity. (Rachel)

It was clear from my observation that teachers needed assistance in their PE lessons, for example,

The PE lesson was started with a warm up activity. All pupils were dancing with music and following Lesley including Jason. The LSA came to Jason to assist him to change clothes and he joined again when he finished changing.
The LSA was with Jason when he was placed into the group which used a springboard to cross a balance beam and land on the mattress. When Jason completed his movement, the LSA praised his landing. (Field notes, 25.01.06)

When I arrived at the hall, some pupils were running and some of them were changing. Karen was assisting Calvin to change clothes and took off his trousers and helps him put on his calliper. (Field notes, 02.02.05)

After the demonstration, every pupil needed to cross the barrier and show their ending poses. The LSA always follows the group which Calvin belongs to. (Field notes, 02.02.05)

When I entered the hall, I saw Calvin run into the toilet. Ms Wells told me that Calvin was unhappy today and he did not want to stay in the hall. Ms Wells (LSA) held Calvin's hand to meet the headteacher when Calvin went out to the toilet. ... PE lesson was started but K did not come in .... (Field notes, 23.02.05)

The LSAs are also the main resource for teachers, especially for the 'beginner' teachers, to learn and understand the needs of pupils with SEN as they have often been with SEN pupils since they attended the schools. Rachel acknowledged that,

when you have not been long teaching yourself it is very difficult and then when I knew I was to have him I was not sure what to do really. But then the old teachers in the school they are more experienced, they say they had no experiences either, so almost like everybody is in the same boat really because this is a very new thing having children with physical disability they have never been in the mainstream before.... they have been with him since reception, they will know him better than I do, especially when he is first starting in class, so they will be very helpful. (Rachel)

... some of the teaching assistants (LSA) have been right with her five years. So they know her five years. They are very aware of what she needs. (Mary)
In contrast, teachers in Taiwan made little mention of LSAs as they either were not available in the small schools or only for transporting the SEN pupil to school.

The main job of the LSA is to assist Sue to move up and down stairs.... If I asked she would come for swimming lessons. (May)

Sue was accompanied by the LSA to go swimming pool. She moved Sue from a wheelchair into water and Sue’s partner in the pool assisted her. The LSA sat beside and watched the swimming lesson. (Field notes 13.05.05)

One teacher, Linda, pointed out that she needed assistance for SEN pupils in her PE lessons.

The resourcing class teachers were absent today. You saw that he needed to go to the toilet anyway in the PE lesson. (Linda)

The resourcing class teachers in the school told me that there was no LSA in their school as the school was too small to apply for such assistance. But the resourcing class teachers normally assist Linda in PE if they were free at that time. The other two teachers interviewed in Taiwan did not think they needed the LSAs in their PE lessons as they were confident of coping with SEN pupils. When I observed PE lessons in England, I saw that LSAs could inadvertently contribute to exclusion because teachers seemed less inclined to want to design a curriculum for SEN pupils when they could be simply ‘fitted in’ to the existing curriculum with the assistance of the LSAs. LSAs seemed to reduce teachers’ incentive to try to include SEN pupils and they concentrated on the able-bodied pupils who were their main concern in PE. In addition, in England, one LSA, Judy, in her interview mentioned that she had received four days training before becoming a LSA but not for SEN. Her jobs were to assist Calvin (the SEN pupil) to wear callipers and she
concentrated on his safety in PE lessons. She stated:

In classroom, I watched his behavior; in PE, I watched his steps and his safety.
(Judy)

Another LSA, Sophia, had not received any training for SEN pupils and her knowledge of them was derived from the class teacher whom she assisted. Both LSAs have received basic training for dealing with children but not specifically for SEN pupils. Neither of them had received training for SEN pupils in PE.

Other assistance for teachers to learn to deal with SEN in PE came from the other teachers and PE coordinators. In England and Taiwan when teachers encountered problems they usually consulted SEN coordinators and headteachers inside schools. Physiotherapists, based in local hospitals, were called periodically to view pupils with physical disability and were the most likely source of understanding for teachers seeking to learn and understand the physical needs of pupils with SEN outside schools. For example,

He (the physiotherapist) came every half term, not regularly but just to keep things going and that's a good opportunity to ask him questions of Lucas and we can discuss what he can do. He told us a lot about that. (Rachel)

The LSAs have been trained. They looked after Helen and help her following the recommendations of the physiotherapist. (Mary)

Sue went to the resourcing class once or twice a week for physical therapy. I would like to receive advice from the physiotherapists as they are professional. (May)

Teachers in England held differing opinions of the support offered by LEAs. Two
teachers, Karen and Rachel, felt that LEAs did not provide sufficient support, such as funding to schools, to include SEN pupils.

I think the LEA they certainly don’t help us with funding, because the school has to find a lot of money to have him here. That seems very unfair because obviously the money is all for one child while it could be spent on the entire school. The LEA provided some funding but they have not provided any teacher enough to include him properly. So they actually, in a way ensure inclusion but not providing funding, we need to do that. (Rachel)

Most teachers in England did not approach the LEA if they faced problems with SEN pupils. There were two reasons for this. On the one hand, they were unaware of funding levels and other resources and could not determine if LEAs had adequate resources or not. On the other hand, they felt that their voice as class teachers would not be heard within the bureaucracy. They were also reluctant to cause unnecessary problems. As Rachel claimed:

The list of numbers (LEA’s phone number) is in the book and we could go on and find them but we don’t. (Rachel)

In contrast, teachers in Taiwan made little mention of the LEA. But one teacher who was also a SENCO argued:

I believe that the LEA has provided a lot of service and resources for teachers to deal with SEN but the information did not circulate very well. I think they need to improve this. (David)

As previously mentioned, teachers in England did not receive information relating to funding or other resources for SEN pupils. But in Taiwan, David, a SENCO, could
contact the LEA and was more aware of what assistance could provide and how to apply for resources for SEN pupils than other class teachers. Accordingly, he considered that the LEA should work to promote their service. In addition, two other teachers in Taiwan mentioned that parents were important resources for them to learn how to deal with SEN pupils.

I talked to his parents to try and understand him. (Linda)

The most information I received about Sue was from her parents, particularly from her mother. (May)

These two teachers had built good relationships with the parents of SEN pupils and parents also were willing to contact teachers and schools about their SEN children. Furthermore, in both countries, 'statements' provided teachers with official information about SEN pupils particularly in terms of difficulties outlined in terms of medical, psychological and physiotherapy perspectives. For example, in England,

Medical and physiotherapy advice indicate Jason to be independently mobile, with a somewhat unsteady gait. ... Medical and physiotherapy advice further indicate that Jason can manage both steps and stairs with supervision. (Final statement of Jason, 2004)

Medical advice indicates that Calvin has talipes equino-varus often known as club foot. Psychological advice indicates that ... he is likely to need additional supervision in PE. (Proposed Statement of Calvin, 2003)

In Taiwan,

Motor skills: Due to the spinal bifida and medical advice indicate that Sue will lack abilities to crawl, stand and walk. She needs to use a wheelchair to move but her hand control skill is developing well. (Evaluation report of Sue,
... following the advice of the physiotherapist to do exercise herself and assign pupils to assist her. (Provision report for SEN of Sue’s school)

Beside SEN ‘statements’, physiotherapists also provided examination reports to inform teachers what practices they could provide in PE lessons which were included in pupils’ individual education plans (IEPs) and annual reviews.

The IEP is specific to SEN pupils and sets targets for subjects, including PE, stipulating what teachers need to do to provide. In England, IEPs were made by class teachers but with little mention relating to what activities in PE for SEN pupils, although physiotherapists made recommendations. For example, Calvin’s IEP (2004, 2005) had simply stated on PE: ‘to play with peers in a non-aggressive way’. But his annual review stated:

The physiotherapist is due to visit school shortly to observe Calvin in a PE lesson. He can negotiate stairs confidently, but he is less stable on his feet than other children and he may have difficulty going up and down mobile steps in a crowd of children’.

(Annual review of Calvin, 2004)

Although physiotherapists pointed out the physical problems of pupils with SEN teachers did not translate them into practice. They both lacked relevant knowledge to do so and were often occupied by more immediate and personal problems. For example,

Calvin went in the headteacher’s office because he did not want to attend PE lesson. ... Judy (LSA) told me that Calvin was unhappy today and he had a problem getting on with the group. ‘He does not know how to play with other children’. (Field notes, 28.02.05)
The other two schools in England had few plans in their IEPs for SEN pupils in their PE lessons. The fourth school was unable to provide Lucas's IEPs as his parents did not give permission to access it. Although his teacher, Rachel, informed me that he mainly did his physiotherapy exercises in PE lessons, we could get no further information relating to his IEP. In contrast, in Taiwan, IEPs were made by resourcing class teachers who discussed with PE teachers what SEN pupils should do in their PE lessons. For example, according to Jack's IEP, Linda had raised a problem and discussed this with resourcing class teachers. She thought that it was difficult for Jack to take part in roller jumping in PE and after the discussion Jack's roller jumping lessons were modified so that he could use his hands instead of his legs. In another case, Sue, a pupil with SEN, practised the activities recommended by her physiotherapist herself during breaks between classes assisted by able-bodied volunteers who recorded the process daily. Her PE teacher, May, did not provide extra exercises for her in PE lessons. The other two PE teachers, Lin and David, made little mention of IEPs as they seldom contacted resourcing class teachers.

There are two main resources to assist teachers to deal with SEN pupils. In England the LSAs assist teachers in PE lessons directly. Teachers also draw information relating to SEN pupils from other teachers, SENCOs, PECOs, headteachers and physiotherapists in England and Taiwan. The experiences of colleagues, of teachers, physiotherapists or parents are, however, seen to be useful but limited. On the one hand, for teachers in England, LSAs were seen to be an important assistance for teachers in coping with other, able-bodied pupils, inadvertently, fostering exclusion rather than inclusion in PE, reducing possibilities for SEN pupils. On the other hand, knowledge and experience gained from physiotherapists, teachers' colleagues and SEN pupils' parents were useful as they related to SEN pupils' learning histories and individual needs. However, the IEP is a formal document for SEN pupils offering guidance for teachers on
how to design individual curricula for SEN pupils in all subjects. Unfortunately, most IEPs in Taiwan and England were concentrated on main subjects, such as language, mathematics and science. It seemed that physiotherapists’ advice was not closely connected to PE. The latter was either provided in annual reports in England or there was lack of communication between resourcing classes and PE teachers in Taiwan. It did not mean that teachers did not want to include SEN pupils in PE but rather that they did not have relevant knowledge to implement physiotherapists’ ideas. PE teachers not only needed to understand their SEN pupils but knowledge of how to include them in PE. In the next section I will explore teachers’ preparation for SEN in PE and how they worked in practice.

**Theme 4: Preparation for Primary Teachers Relating to Inclusion of SEN Pupils in PE**

Most teachers interviewed in England and Taiwan did not know of any in-service training relevant to dealing with pupils with SEN in PE. One teacher in England who was also a SEN coordinator had attended some seminars to gain such knowledge. Another, who was a coordinator in Taiwan, had rich experiences of training for SEN but claimed they were not for PE. When questioned about what kind of in-service training they wanted to receive relating to PE, most teachers expressed their willingness to acquire more specific knowledge of their SEN pupils and skills of teaching. In England:

I’d like to know more about his condition and what it involves like say, about knowing what he can do and what he can’t do so I know where he is and what I can provide. (Rachel)

I like watching good lessons really picking up an idea ... or watching a good teacher performing gymnastics. (Mary)
I attempted to know his level in PE and I like to make sure what he can achieve physically. (Lesley)

In Taiwan,

I think I need to know more about curriculum design. It will let me know what kind of curriculum is appropriate for him and what we can teach in PE. (Linda)

I need the training to guide and design curriculum for SEN pupils and how to modify the content of the PE textbook for them. (Linda)

I want to know her abilities and what she can do or can’t do in PE then I could provide the best teaching. (May)

Compared with in-service training, initial teacher training (ITT) is more important for teachers to conceptualize their ideas in dealing with pupils with SEN. However, Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke (2005:102) have pointed out that both ITT and CPD are very limited in this respect for secondary PE teachers. This seemed also to be the case for primary school teachers. Moreover, Caldecott, Warburton and Waring (2006: 45) pointed out that training, including PGCE, in the prescribed activities of the National Curriculum PE in England is limited, especially at the primary and junior school levels. Their survey also reports that the total hours of training are low. For example, in PGCE programmes, only one half hour was available within one year courses for activity areas which included athletics, outdoor and adventurous activities and swimming (Caldecott, Warburton and Waring, 2006: 48). Although they made little mention of training for dealing with pupils with SEN in PE, two of the teachers in my study in England considered that initial teacher training (ITT) was too general and could not deal with SEN in PE effectively.
Initial teacher training (training for SEN) is very general. (Rachel)

When I was doing my initial training, it (SEN) was part of that, how you would be a teacher.... but not specific for PE. (Karen)

In Taiwan, teachers made little reference to their initial teacher training but one teacher, May, claimed that initial teacher training was too general and was little help to her when teaching SEN pupils. In England, I interviewed a trainee teacher, Abby, who was completing her Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) in one of the research schools. In her GTP Booklet, a qualified teacher standard relating to SEN stated:

They understand their responsibilities under the SEN Code of Practice, and know how to seek advice from specialists on less common types of special education needs. (GTP BOOKLET 2.6: 7)

Abby stated:

There were common lessons of PE in college but there was not a specific lesson for SEN students in PE. (Abby)

She also considered that ‘it was better to have specific training for SEN pupils within PE’. In addition, two teachers in Taiwan also described their experience of dealing with SEN.

I have taught Sue (SEN) from Year 2. She had an operation on her head and she must be very careful in PE lessons. (May)

I taught a pupil who had physical difficulties in 1985 when I was a class teacher. I also taught PE myself then. (David)
But teachers in England also thought that it is difficult to learn the variety of SEN in PE and that it would be impractical as SEN pupils were so few in the primary schools.

That is a difficult one, isn’t it? ... I mean if saying SEN, you are talking about a vast arena really, aren’t you? ... So the training you receive to deal with physical impairment would not relate to all SEN children. (Karen)

The problem is that [disabled children, so many have problems, don’t they]? ... It would depend whether it could be all conference training or whether it is going to be specific training. I mean it is the first time I have a child with cerebral palsy, so it’s something I am learning about as well. ... It is very difficult, because [each individual child’s need is different]. (Lesley)

Next year Helen is moving to year 5 so it will be the year 5 teacher to teach her next year. It will not really be appropriate to do further training as we have so few of these children. (Mary)

In this respect, teachers seemed to encounter two fundamental issues when including pupils with SEN in their PE lessons. First, the range of pupils with physical difficulties is wide; they each have a different order of difficulty and their needs vary. Second, teachers teach specific SEN pupils for not more than one year as they usually deal with a specific age group in primary schools. In their personal plans of CPD, to acquire more knowledge of able-bodied pupils is the priority. This is also the case in Taiwan where PE teachers have SEN pupils only occasionally in their PE lessons. It is, therefore, not considered to be a pressing need to learn to teach SEN pupils.

In addition, teachers seemed most concerned with children’s safety in PE. As one teacher commented in England ‘because of the nature of disability, a lot of it is commonsense... If you have your own child you don’t put your child in a situation of risk’ (Karen). The first challenges that teachers face when dealing with SEN pupils are: what are the abilities of SEN pupils and what potential risks must they bear in mind.
Teachers lacked relevant training and sufficient knowledge to deal with these challenges although they provided care in the best way they could for their SEN pupils. As Rachel and Karen in England stated:

The only training I have got is for moving and handling because he needs a lot of moving around everyday. (Rachel)

If you did something involving foot work ... you should prepare as much as you could imagine. (Karen)

This theme has revealed that ITT and in-service training both in Taiwan and England is not sufficient for teachers to deal adequately with SEN pupils in PE. Teachers anticipated what 'inclusion' could be like and knew how it could be achieved from in-service training but most of them have received only general training for SEN. Without such training the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan played an important role for teachers in the provision of PE for SEN, as we shall see below.

**Theme 5: The National Curriculum for Physical Education and Inclusion for SEN**

Capel (2000: 139) has argued that:

Physical education should benefit every pupil in the group regardless of ability and enthusiasm for the subject; therefore an emphasis on sport and with it an emphasis on competition and competitive success can result in finite resources being used for few elite performers rather than being available to encourage participation in physical activity for all.

Smith (2004) has further indicated that emphasis on traditional team games in the NCPE might make it more difficult to include SEN pupils in PE. One of his suggestions is that
pupils with SEN are more likely to be fully included in those physical activities in which they are able to move in ways that best suit their own physical capabilities and in which they are more able to control the intensity and duration of those movements (Smith, 2004: 48). Moreover, Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke (2005: 102) also endorsed this point and stated: ‘team situations were viewed as the most difficult areas for inclusion’, that is to say, pupils with SEN could be included in individualized physical activities (such as dance and gymnastic) rather than vigorous activities (such as team games or team competition). In terms of my observations, in England, primary teachers placed emphasis on individualized, rhythmical physical activities, such as dance, gymnastic and games (for example, the bean ball throwing game) for year 1 and year 2 pupils, although some moderate and uncompetitive ball games are also applied. For example,

I think children worked at their own levels in gymnastics. They could find their own levels. It was good for Helen. (Mary)

He enjoyed PE I think. You see Jason worked around the dancing and follow the rules properly. That was a big fact. (Lesley)

In contrast, in Taiwan, PE for year 1 and 2 pupils seemed to also include more individual and rhythmical physical activities than at other stages, and class teachers usually taught PE themselves, as teachers do in England. The PE lessons of Year 3 or above, however, in Taiwan were usually the responsibility of professional PE teachers who regularly pursued team games and sports. For example, during my observations of David’s PE lesson, he instructed handball to Year 6 pupils for 4 weeks. Lin instructed football and table tennis to Year 4 pupils during my observations. Both of them taught basic skills and rules of the sports first and then taught pupils how to play formal games. These two schools seemed to confirm Smith’s view that SEN pupils are excluded in traditional team
games as, in both these contexts, they usually spent time ‘watching’ although they played a part in those phases which did not require them to move radically, as in practising sections. For example,

David spent around 10 minutes to explain the rules of hand ball and the next section of practice. ... Pupils were divided into groups. Charles joined the group and tried to shoot a ball as others did. Although his legs can’t move properly his hands can throw a ball well. (Field notes, 05.05.05)

Today’s lesson is football. ... Lin reminded pupils the tips to kick a football. ... All pupils have to run to the goal and picked up footballs and ran back. This would be a big challenge for Joe. ... He only sat on the floor and watched. In the second term, nobody talks to him and he still sat on the floor. (Field notes, 26.04.05)

The purpose of PE is different from sports, as has been discussed in Chapter 2. It has an inherently educative purpose (Penney and Evans, 1999). However, in England, there are six areas of activities which have to be taught in Key Stage 1 and 2; dance, games, gymnastic, swimming and water safety, athletic and outdoor and adventurous activities. Pupils have to be taught knowledge, skills and understanding through them. In contrast, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan make little mention in PE relating to activity areas that should be taught by teachers. The new guidelines adopted ‘competence indicators’ for teachers to design their instruction instead of five areas of ball, dance, gymnastic, martial art and folk activities, which were stipulated in the previous version of National Curriculum. In this respect teachers in Taiwan are now free to design their PE curriculum. But this was not the case in their practice.

Teachers in England, however, attempted to modify or adapt their curriculum for pupils with SEN,
I don’t change from what all the other children need to learn. I will adapt as much as possible as I can to include his needs, mainly you can do that. But I wouldn’t let the other children all suffer by not covering what they need. I am simply adapting what I am doing to make sure he can be included. (Rachel)

I don’t change my lesson planning for her, for one child. Obviously she joined the adapted lesson if necessary. (Mary)

Obviously then you have to bear that in your mind. If you are doing something involving foot work and mobility, although he is quite quick, his disability obviously limits how he can move. But you have to be looking. (Karen)

Although the national curriculum doesn’t contain advice on how to teach for inclusion, it would not tell me how to include those in need. It will simply tell me what the children are and what their learning experience should be. It would not say how I achieve the goal, so it is up to me to find ideas to make them learn. (Karen)

Mary and Karen supported the National Curriculum with its provision of brief guidelines and adapted their ideas for the needs of SEN pupils in PE. But two teachers in Taiwan did not think the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines offered better advice than the previous National Curriculum.

I think it is the same as the previous National Curriculum, and there are no differences. (Linda)

I think there is no difference for pupils with SEN between the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines and the previous National Curriculum. (David)

In their view the new curriculum guidelines seemed to provide neither a ‘proper’ curriculum nor instruction guidelines for teachers to teach SEN pupils in PE. David argued that the indicators of competence in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines were a good idea for able-bodied pupils but not for SEN pupils as there was no flexibility for
The National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines provide basic principles for teachers to design PE lessons for pupils with SEN and other able-bodied pupils. Each teacher had the opportunity to achieve a different degree of inclusion within the frame set for them by the curriculum (also see theme 1). 'Traditional team games' might exclude while folk dance or gymnastics might include SEN pupils. But all of these activities might have equal potential to exclude or include, depending on teachers' ability to translate them into effective practice. In England, on the one hand, teachers had to follow the National Curriculum in modifying or adapting their practice for SEN pupils while, on the other, this seemed to restrict their imagination as to how they might achieve full inclusion. Their counterparts in Taiwan, however, needed to follow the 'competence indicators' in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. Some of them were unable to do anything to include SEN pupils in PE because there was little reference made to dealing with SEN
pupils in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. Teachers such as Linda and May sometimes generated good ideas for including their SEN pupils. But this did not occur regularly because, as Linda pointed out, 'we have to follow the PE textbook... I can’t do what I want to do in PE'.

Assessment is also an important factor influencing PE teaching for SEN pupils. As Piotrowski and Capel (2000: 99) argued:

Assessment has always been an integral part of good teaching in physical education. Effective physical education teachers identify clear learning objectives and gather evidence on the extent to which those learning objectives are achieving.

In this view, the assessment of PE guides teachers in accomplishing their aims in PE lessons. It also affects PE teaching for pupils with SEN. In Taiwan, three teachers said they would evaluate pupils by focusing on pupils’ ‘learning attitude’ in PE, particularly SEN pupils. For example,

I assessed him on his attitude rather than his performance (skills acquisition) in PE. His is always keen in PE lessons and this makes him different from others. (Linda)

I would set different criteria for pupils in PE. ... I also emphasise the learning attitude. I would never give a high grade to a pupil who does not have good learning attitude. (May)

I would apply different criteria for him in PE. I would concentrate more on his attitude than competence. (David)

But Lin took a different stance when assessing SEN pupils.

I adapted the criteria of assessment for him in PE. But I did not give him a
high mark, around 70 (the full mark is 100). I gave him the middle grade. It was not fair for other pupils if he got the high grade. (Lin)

Compared with other teachers, Lin emphasized ‘skills’ rather than ‘learning attitude’ as he thought this would be ‘fair’ for other able-bodied pupils in PE. He emphasized ‘skills’ more than knowledge or attitude in PE so that a pupil with SEN could not achieve a high grade. My observation, in fact, suggested that teachers adopted one of two ways of assessment to evaluate SEN pupils in PE in Taiwan. Some, like May, focused on knowledge and attitude more than skills to evaluate their SEN pupils. Others, like Lin, evaluated SEN pupils with adapted criteria and focused on skills, as for all other able-bodied pupils. In contrast, teachers in England evaluated SEN pupils in a different way from teachers in Taiwan. As Rachel claimed,

Not on paper really for PE, obviously in your head you’re watching all the time but we don’t need to do the full assessment on paper because the focus is on literacy and numeracy really. Only at the end of year do we report on PE, we write what they can do in PE. ... PE is like other subjects such as history. They are not the top of the list. (Rachel)

Assessment of PE for SEN pupils in England was flexible while teachers in Taiwan were required to apply a ‘grade mark’ rather than merely a ‘description’ of assessment. Although the results of assessment had to be displayed numerically or in written form in the two countries, teachers needed to follow the National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines to evaluate what SEN pupils could do. Because SEN pupils were not equipped with the same physical ‘abilities’ as their able-bodied peers, some teachers in Taiwan emphasized ‘learning attitude’ or ‘knowledge’ when evaluating SEN pupils instead of ‘competence acquisition’ in PE. These criteria were not included in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines although teachers attempted to try to find a way in which the
SEN pupils could be evaluated 'fairly'. Teachers in Taiwan, such as Linda, May and David leant in this direction in evaluating pupils in PE reflecting the views of the LEA Advisor in Taiwan (see section 6.3) who pointed out that there was radical competition between pupils to get high grades. Teachers, therefore, emphasized fair assessment and evaluation. As I saw it, parents were positive towards PE as they thought it a subject in which it was easier for their children to obtain high grade than other, core subjects. In recognition, PE teachers were inclined to set non-physical criteria for evaluation, such as 'learning attitude'. On the one hand, pupils could get their grade fairly from different components of assessment; on the other, pupils with low physical performance and SEN pupils could also obtain high grades in PE. In contrast, teachers in England seemed not to pay much attention to assessment as they could only record what SEN pupils could do in their annual reports. On the surface this gave teachers in England more opportunity to deal innovatively with SEN pupils though, ironically, they were less creative than their counterpart in Taiwan.

**Theme 6: Pupils with SEN and Physical Education**

The research set out to understand SEN pupils' everyday lives in primary schools and to understand their opinions of their PE lessons and how they felt in PE. As Fitzgerald and Jobling (2004: 77) pointed out 'there is a lack of consideration given to young disabled children within the physical education research context'. They advocate 'student-centred' research to enable young, disabled children to express their experiences and views on physical activities. Pupils with SEN are an important object of policy concerning the implementation of inclusive settings within PE. My data are limited, however, and I was able to interview only two SEN pupils in England (the other two were not available interviewed as one did not have PE lessons in the period of my research and
the other was not allowed to do so by his parents), and four SEN pupils in Taiwan. These children were all under 12 years old and some of them had multiple learning difficulties. They could not reply easily to questions relating to PE curricula, or express complicated feelings. These interviews were carried out both formally and informally, sometimes in their classrooms with teachers or LSAs; others after PE lessons or by phone. Most of them expressed interest in PE lessons. For example, in England,

I like dance it in PE. It was funny. (Jason)

I like dance because it has fun. (Calvin)

In Taiwan,

I like doing ball games in PE lessons. I feel happy in PE lessons because I can play. (Charles)

PE is my favorite subject, and I played with other children. (Sue)

I like playing baseball in PE lessons. (Jack)

Their great pleasure in PE was the 'fun' of playing. But one SEN pupil in Taiwan, Joe, expressed that he was not very interested in PE and he stated:

I did not do anything in PE. ...I could not tell my family what happened in PE lessons. ... Because I did not do anything in PE, I don’t have a best friend in PE. (Joe)

When asked a further question of if he wanted to join in PE, he stated:

Yes, I want to join them because I got bored in PE. I always watch in PE
Joe was a Year 4 SEN pupil. My field notes revealed the reasons why Joe was ‘bored’ in his PE lessons.

All pupils ran with footballs to a goal and back. I think this is difficult for Joe because he has cerebral palsy, and he can not run so fast as other pupils. Lin assigned Joe to collect footballs. When he finished collecting footballs, he sat on the floor to watch 2:20pm…. Until 2:44pm, at the end of this PE lesson, Joe still sat on the floor to watch others. He did not join them. (Field notes, 26.04.05)

The pupils were divided into pairs to kick a football to each other. Lin assigned a pupil to Joe and he looked happy today. … Joe always kicked a football out to his partner, and his partner chased the football back to Joe. Compared with other pupils, they spent a lot of time chasing a football because Joe can not kick a football properly. (Field notes, 28.04.04)

In Joe’s PE lessons, there was very little modification of the curriculum for him and PE was designed for the most able-bodied pupils. He was ‘placed’ in the PE lessons rather than being ‘included’. Compared with Joe, Sue was very interested in PE. She stated,

I like to play basketball and volleyball. I also like to play funny baseball… I like May (her PE teacher) very much. She is a good teacher and she taught me a lot in PE such as swimming and volleyball.

Sue showed great enthusiasm in her PE lessons. The main reason for this might be that her teacher, May, modified the curriculum so that Sue was included with other pupils (see section 7.2). Sue could feel included in PE where she knew that May modified the curriculum for her.
I used a sand volleyball instead of volleyball when May taught volleyball. Because May thought that the sand volleyball was light and good for me to play... We played volleyball, basketball, funny baseball, swimming and dodge ball (I did not play) this semester. They were all included in the PE textbook. (Sue)

The field notes also revealed that Sue attended PE lessons as much as she could.

Sue joined a circle in the pool. They were warming up for the swimming lesson. I noticed that Sue wore a floating board on her back to assist her and other children did not have. ... children were divided into pairs to blow out a pin pong ball on water when walking in water. Sue did as the others although she and her partner moved slowly. ... May started the next section for other children when Sue's group still walked in the water to blow out a pin pong ball. ... Sue joined the others when she finished the previous part. (Filed note 20.05.05)

The other two SEN pupils in Taiwan made little mention of their PE and gave simple descriptions of it. In England, however, Calvin, a Year 1 pupil, was too young to express himself and Jason, a Year 3 pupil, had verbal difficulties so that, although they enjoyed their PE lessons, they were unable to verbalise their feelings.

The pupils interviewed in Taiwan and England made very little mention of competence or knowledge they acquired in PE. They seemed to want to be involved in PE for 'fun' rather than acquire skills and competence. Teachers designed the curriculum of PE with reference to the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. One of their intentions was to build and develop specific skills and competence. As Karen in England stated 'you tried to build the skills in terms of that was important to be included in PE', that is to say, when teachers designed content and activity within the National Curriculum, able-bodied pupils were potentially their main concern as those to be taught to acquire competence and knowledge of PE. It
was problematic for teachers to design a curriculum for both SEN and able-bodied pupils. As discussed in the second theme, 'Teachers' strategies to include SEN pupils in PE' and the fifth theme, 'The National Curriculum for Physical Education and Inclusion for SEN', teachers attempted to include SEN pupils in their PE by using different teaching methods and assessments. However, they still felt uneasy about their attempts to achieve inclusion. In the next chapter I will analyse policy of SEN and its implementation theoretically using a knowledge production and reproduction model (Figure 3.2). I will examine how the discourse of SEN is configured in the National Curriculum and by the LEA and the effects of this on SEN pupils in contexts of PE.

7.3 Conclusion

From this analysis of emerging themes we see that teachers interviewed in England and Taiwan re-interpreted 'inclusion' in their own, idiosyncratic and practical ways. However, their PE teaching was influenced by their knowledge relating to SEN and the support available from in and outside schools, both of which were limited. When dealing with SEN pupils in PE teachers were also constrained by the requirements of the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan.

1. I visited the school which Helen attended on 9th and 23rd in February and on 3rd in March. The PE lessons which I intended to observe did not occur. I was told that there might be PE lessons after the Easter holiday, but there were none again.

2. 'The graduate teacher programme (GTP) is a programme of on-the-job training allowing graduates to qualify as a teacher while they work' (TDA, 2007). Trainees are taught in schools with the support of experienced teachers. The PGCE and BEd routes into teachers are the more usual routes into teaching.
CHAPTER 8

FURTHER ANALYSIS OF SEN POLICY WITHIN PE AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

8.1 Introduction

The main aim of this study is to understand the relationship between education policy on SEN and its implementation within PE for pupils with SEN in primary schools in Taiwan and England. I have attempted to view policy and its implementation using a 'policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction' model, as outlined in Chapter 3, Figure 3.2, to deal with the dynamic relationships between knowledge of SEN within PE policy and its implementation. Using this model in the preceding chapters the emerging themes of: legislation and the National Curriculum; local education authority (LEA) interpretation of policy; and primary school teachers' actions have been explored by means of documentary analysis, interview and observational data. In this chapter I will further analyse the themes that emerged in Chapter 5 to Chapter 7 for a better understanding of cultural and social production and reproduction of SEN policy. I will focus on recontextualizing aspects of SEN policy as it moves from official policy discourse to LEAs and schools and the difficulties experienced by teachers when dealing with SEN pupils in PE.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, this study has attempted to illustrate the 'flow' of policy and to view policy and its implementation as a chain. It focused on not only central government 'official discourse' concerning SEN in both countries but also
considered policy implementation in LEAs and among teachers in primary schools. Policy seemed to be a top-down process that tended to affect teachers' understanding of inclusion and their teaching of SEN pupils within PE. This chapter will begin by analysing how concepts of equality and inclusion were expressed at a national level in the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and influenced policy. Second, I will focus on the recontextualizing of SEN policy within LEAs before transmission in primary schools where it influences provision for SEN pupils in PE. Third, with reference to teaching SEN pupils in PE in primary schools I centre attention on how the concept of 'inclusion' and 'equality' influences practices. I highlight difficulties experienced by teachers trying to achieve inclusion within PE and attempt to examine how teachers' views of SEN pupils as embodied learners affect their relationships.

8.2 Who is Valued in Policy for Pupils with SEN

8.2.1 The Development of a 'Legitimate Discourse' within Policy for SEN

In Chapter 5 I outlined how SEN policy has placed responsibility on teachers to include SEN pupils in primary school PE. However, legislation for SEN in Taiwan and England has been driven by those who are able to define what is to count as 'legitimate knowledge' for primary teachers. Some researchers (such as Riddle and Brown, 1994) have argued that the main concern of SEN has shifted in recent years from an emphasis on children with SEN to contexts of interaction between children and their environments. Others, for example, Armstrong, 2003, have stated that this discursive shift has been driven by three elements: 'exclusion and segregation', 'normalisation', and 'inclusion'. These academics have shown how discourse on SEN has developed from a medical model toward a social model. Inclusion was to be seen as a social model where
legislation was provided to make it possible in schools for pupils with SEN. In this vein it is pertinent to examine SEN legislation in both countries to understand what counts as 'legitimate knowledge' of SEN and how it is to be transmitted in schools.

In Taiwan, as mentioned in Chapter 5, the Special Education Act 1984 implicitly moved towards 'inclusion' for pupils with SEN and set out to provide an equal education environment for them, although the Act still applied a medical perspective to identify SEN pupils within 12 categories. In addition, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) introduced a policy towards 'inclusion' in order to improve PE teaching for SEN pupils (see section 5.2.1). This persuaded LEAs to promote 'inclusion' and helped the discourse of 'inclusion' to spread in primary schools. In contrast, in England, the way of categorizing SEN pupils in the Education Act 1944 was replaced by the Education Act 1981 by the term 'special educational needs' reflecting the influence of the Warnock Report (DES, 1978). Furthermore, in 1997, the Green Paper Excellence for all Children (DfEE, 1997) was published to promote the idea of 'inclusion' and set the goal of including SEN pupils in mainstream schools. The development of SEN legislation in England towards a 'social model' attempted to create a more inclusive environment for pupils with SEN in schools, though this is not to say that its primary school teachers achieved it in PE. In Taiwan there was a conflict between the Special Education Act 1984 and the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) in terms of their orientation toward medical or social models. This may be one of the reasons why some teachers in Taiwan viewed SEN pupils from a medical perspective, leading them to exclude them in PE (see Chapter 7). In Taiwan, a discourse of 'inclusion' originated in the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) which was issued by the Ministry of Education, while in England the Department of
Education and Employment (DfEE) defined 'inclusion' discourse and how it should be interpreted in schools. In Taiwan, although the discourse of 'inclusion' was promoted by LEAs, there was no specific guideline to indicate how it was to be implemented for pupils with SEN in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. In England, inclusion was explicitly articulated as a goal in the National Curriculum (1999) and there were guidelines as to how it should be realised. In both countries, then, a discourse of 'inclusion' was produced by official departments of government. This legislation dominated development of SEN policy and created 'legitimate discourse', characterised by 'inclusion' and 'equal environment', for those who implemented SEN policy in their primary schools, including LEA advisors, headteachers, teachers and LSAs. These discourses not only enabled the idea of 'inclusion' to pervade primary schools but also regulated the 'rules' and 'values' attached to inclusion. In Bernstein's terms (1990: 183), a 'regulative discourse' was embedded in an 'instructional discourse' and primary school teachers' understandings of 'inclusion' and 'equal environment' were affected by them. For example, teachers stated that their goal was to 'include pupils with SEN' in England and to 'treat pupils with SEN equally' and to 'design a curriculum for pupils with SEN and other able-bodied pupils' in Taiwan (see Chapter 7). In both countries teachers included pupils with SEN in their PE lessons whether or not they had received sufficient training and provision, following the National Curriculum for PE in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan. Rules as to how to deal with inclusion were translated and informed by LEAs and guided by the National Curriculum in both countries. I will return to this issue later in this chapter. First, I want to address the different opinions of parents and teachers towards SEN policy on inclusion.

Both LEA Advisors in England and Taiwan believed that primary schools had already provided for inclusion of pupils with SEN and other able-bodied pupils (see
Chapter 8

Chapter 6) and that primary teachers had to deal with pupils with SEN in their PE lessons. Such actions in both countries merely provided potential 'equal access' for SEN pupils in school but they did not guarantee ‘inclusion’. When SEN policy discourse privileged ‘inclusion’ it was seen as ‘right’ for pupils with SEN to be ‘included’ in schools and the voices of teachers and parents who sought ‘exclusion’ tended to be ignored (see Chapter 6 and Chapter 7). For example, the advisory teacher in England stated that there was an increasing number of special schools in England and parents with children with SEN who were beginning to consider that their children might be better served by attending special instead of mainstream schools. They were neither against inclusion in mainstream schools in principle nor were they against inclusion policy but they did question its ‘value’ for pupils with SEN. However, this study did not investigate parents’ opinions (see Chapter 4), though one interview with the mother of a SEN pupil in Taiwan revealed that she was concerned only with how her child could overcome his physical impairment, irrespective of the school context. Parents in Taiwan and England seemed to have little understanding of what policy for SEN was and how they could obtain assistance inside and outside schools. Moreover, in both countries, some teachers (such as Mary and Karen in England and Lin in Taiwan, see Chapter 7) pointed out that ‘able-bodied pupils’ were their main concern in PE lessons. Indeed, Lin in Taiwan believed that ‘exclusion’ was better than ‘inclusion’ for pupils with SEN in PE. He also thought that practitioners who had medical backgrounds would be more useful than other teachers for pupils with SEN in PE. In my experience teachers who held the same idea about pupils with SEN as Lin’s were reluctant to express their opinions as PE discourse favoured inclusion; they did not think their opinions would be accepted or acknowledged by their education authority. In contrast, in England, all teachers interviewed had LSAs to assist pupils with SEN in their PE lessons. Mary and Karen pointed out that LSAs were essential if they were to look
after pupils with SEN as able-bodied pupils were their main priority in PE. Their PE teaching which did not always achieve 'inclusion' seemed to orient towards 'integration'. Although 'legitimate knowledge' privileged 'inclusion' teachers felt it was difficult to include SEN pupils in their PE lessons. In Taiwan some teachers, such as Lin, still viewed pupils with SEN as medical concerns. In England, the provision made to facilitate 'integration' inadvertently made teachers more dependent on the assistance of LSAs.

Policy was not implemented straightforwardly so that it resulted 'in unintended as well as intended consequences' (Taylor, et al, in Fitz, Davies and Evans, 2006: 3).

8.2.2 The National Curriculum and SEN within PE

The National Curriculum defined what was to count as 'legitimate knowledge' for teachers when dealing with pupils with SEN. As legislative discourse it instructed teachers how they should teach and what they should teach pupils, including those with SEN. We have discussed the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan using Bernstein's concept of 'frame' (1971) in preceding chapters (see Chapter 3, Chapter 5 and Chapter 7). I now want to use his concept of 'regulative' and 'instructional' discourse to examine the effects of the National Curriculum on PE teaching for pupils with SEN in the two countries.

The National Curriculum in England established an explicit goal for all subjects of achieving inclusion. This reflected central governments' intentions expressed, for example, in the Green Paper Excellence for all Children (DfEE, 1997) which stipulated inclusion in all formal schooling. However, the National Curriculum did not provide a definition of 'inclusion' (see Chapter 5), though the National Curriculum for Physical Education (1999) set out principles for teachers to plan to 'modify' or 'adapt' curriculum for pupils with SEN in PE (see Chapters 2 and 5). In England when teachers were asked
about curriculum design they claimed, ‘I don’t change from what all the other children need to learn, I will adapt…’ (Rachel) or ‘I don’t change my lesson planning for her …’ (Mary) (see Chapter 7), tending to operate at the accommodation extreme of the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (see Figure 7.1) in their PE teaching. In contrast, in Taiwan, the concept of inclusion was implicit in the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. There was no specific content relating to pupils with SEN within PE in the Guidelines. Although LEAs promoted the ‘APE’ model, PE teachers neither defined this model nor knew how to apply it in PE. However, two of them, Linda and May, brought their ‘good experience’ of designing curricula to their teaching (see Chapter 7) allowed them to imagine what ‘inclusion’ should look like, even though they could not achieve it routinely.

According to Bernstein transmission of knowledge is always affected by the strength of framing. In England, the strength of framing on what and how teachers teach in PE was strong. ‘Inclusion’ was to be enacted explicitly to generate instructional discourse through the National Curriculum. Teachers were expected to ‘modify’ or ‘adapt’ curriculum for pupils with SEN in PE but seemed to achieve only ‘accommodation’ or ‘integration’. In Taiwan, in contrast, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines neither mentioned ‘inclusion’ nor regulated how PE teachers taught pupils with SEN and PE teaching for pupils with SEN was more varied than in England and could be positioned at both extremes of the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (see Figure 7.1). Some teachers, such as Linda and May, achieved inclusive teaching while others, like Lin and David, achieved ‘accommodation’ or ‘integration’, as did their counterparts in England. However, for PE teachers, the issue of ‘inclusion’ was defined not only by legislative ‘legitimate knowledge’ but also by LEAs at the recontextualizing level. For this reason, we need to analyse how SEN policy was recontextualized within LEAs in the two countries and the effect of this process on implementation.
8.2.3 Recontextualizing SEN Policy to PE

SEN policy in Taiwan and England was recontextualized rather differently in LEAs in the two countries. In both, however, it tended to be a top down process and none of the teachers felt that they were involved in its making. Teachers interviewed in both countries were reluctant to contact LEAs and anticipated that their opinions would not be heard in LEA bureaucracies. However, LEAs acted as mediators in promoting SEN policy in schools and provided resources for teachers. Both LEA advisors pursued inclusion by placing pupils with SEN in mainstream schools in England and mainstreaming classes in Taiwan and provided in-service training for teachers. Moreover, for PE teaching, they referred to the ‘APE’ model in Taiwan and the ‘inclusion spectrum’ in England (see Chapter 6) respectively, as the model teachers should apply to pupils with SEN. As outlined in Chapter 2, in Taiwan, Adapted Physical Education model was influenced by developments in the USA and elsewhere and has become the main recontextualized ‘discourse’ for dealing with pupils with SEN within PE in schools. In England, in contrast, the LEA advisory teacher referred to the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (Stevenson and Black, 1999: 18), as the model to be used by teachers. Both advisors felt that they had provided a model for their teachers to deal with pupils with SEN in PE who otherwise had insufficient experience to teach and assess them themselves. However, although the APE model calls on a variety of disciplines in Taiwan, it tended to be driven by a biological perspective (see Chapter 2). SEN pupils were categorized with reference to their ‘disabilities’ as outlined in the Special Education Act 1984. This led teachers to believe that they were insufficiently equipped with medical or biological knowledge to teach them in PE lessons. In contrast, in England, although the advisory teacher claimed to be promoting the ‘inclusion spectrum’ it was not well known to teachers (see Chapter
They viewed PE like any other subject, such as mathematics or science, as one in which they had to include all pupils, giving far less attention to medical perspectives than their counterparts in Taiwan. However, both Advisors in Taiwan and England considered that teachers needed guidelines and more knowledge of SEN for which the ‘APE’ model and the ‘inclusion spectrum’ were their reference points when designing PE curricula. Although LEAs provided relevant in-service training in APE, primary PE teachers in Taiwan paid only lip service to the model; they neither knew what APE looked like nor how to apply it in practice, it had merely become synonymous with the ‘physical activities’ made available to pupils with SEN. At the same time, primary teachers in England made little reference to the ‘inclusion spectrum’ and did not apply it in their PE lessons (see Chapter 7). Neither LEA advisor indicated how ‘assessment’ of SEN pupils should be dealt with in PE lessons so that there was a gap, in both Taiwan and England, between policy and its implementation. The ‘APE’ model and the ‘inclusion spectrum’ were merely the ‘reference’ points for teachers to deal with pupils with SEN within PE. They were not obligated to apply them. However, for LEAs the challenge was not simply to place pupils with SEN in mainstream schools in England and mainstreaming schools in Taiwan but to get teachers to ‘include’ pupils with SEN in their PE teaching (see Chapter 7).

In-service training for SEN was provided for teachers to enhance their knowledge, for which that gained during ITT was insufficient. In Taiwan and England, teachers wanted to acquire more knowledge and to see good examples of teaching pupils with SEN. In England Rachel wanted to know more about the limitations and possibilities of pupils with SEN and Mary wanted to watch ‘good lessons’; in Taiwan, Linda wanted to know more about designing curriculum and May wanted to better understand the ‘ability’ of pupils with SEN. These teachers had received inadequate training and
insufficient knowledge. SEN policy maintained its top down character and there were little evidence of information or experience being passed from teachers to LEAs.

8.3 Inclusion for Pupils with SEN in PE

In this section, I want to return to the issue of PE teaching for pupils with SEN and analyse the constraints and possibilities facing teachers trying to achieve inclusion in PE. Although Riddell (2002: 44) argued that it is difficult to measure ‘inclusion’ as there is no clear definition of what it is to achieve it as a goal, some (see Ainscow 1999, Armstrong, 2003 and Barton, 2003) have attempted to view it generally as the degree of participation in mainstream activity by pupils with SEN. In this study, I cautiously identified ‘inclusion’ in PE for pupils with SEN by their ‘involvement’ in or whether they were ‘accommodated’, ‘integrated’ or ‘included’, using the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (Figure 7.1, p. 177) to assess teachers’ attainment of inclusion. However, factors affecting teachers’ attainment of inclusion in PE are often determined outside school, for example, by the National Curriculum regulating their PE teaching and inside school, by the availability of LSAs and by teachers own intention and activities. I now want to analyse the constraints and possibilities of inclusion in PE teaching beginning with the PE curriculum.

Ideally, inclusion within PE does not mean simply adapting a curriculum for pupils to take part in PE lessons but creating one for everyone, including those with SEN. In my experience in Taiwan some teachers believed that ‘inclusion’ meant simplifying physical activities for SEN pupils in PE, a strategy which affected other able-bodied pupils’ learning. For these reasons they often chose not to make changes in their PE lessons. Some teachers in this study, indeed, merely ‘accommodated’ or ‘integrated’ SEN
pupils in parts of their PE lessons because they could not do all that other, able-bodied pupils could do (see Chapter 7). For example, Lin stated:

If I modified the curriculum for him (the pupil with SEN) and applied it to the whole class, then the curriculum would become too easy for the able-bodied pupils, and they would be bored in PE lessons.

Strategy of making PE curricular practices ‘easy’ seemed to be commonplace in England but took different forms to those evident in Taiwan. The National Curriculum (1999) provided principles for teachers to follow to achieve inclusion:

...The National Curriculum programmes of study set out what most pupils should be taught at each key stage.... This may mean choosing knowledge, skills and understanding from earlier or later key stages so that individual pupils can make progress and show what they can achieve.

(DfEE/QCA, 1999a: 28)

Most teachers interviewed in England pointed out that they ‘adapted’ their PE curriculum for pupils with SEN (see Chapter 7), assuming that applying ‘earlier’ stage of activities was a fitting means of achieving inclusion. This, like the idea of providing ‘simple’ activities in Taiwan for pupils with SEN seemed to be considered an adequate means of helping them make ‘progress’ alongside able-bodied pupils. In essence they implicitly applied a ‘normalised’ paradigm (Armstrong, 2003) to SEN in physical education even though policy and provision pressed them towards inclusion.

In England, the National Curriculum stipulated ‘inclusion’ explicitly and set out principles for teachers to adapt curricula for pupils with SEN. Pupils with SEN were to be ‘accommodated’ or ‘integrated’ in PE and my research revealed that they joined in most activities along with other, able-bodied pupils (see Chapter 7) but were not guaranteed
'inclusion' as teachers lacked knowledge and information to design curricula such as might effect it. In contrast, in Taiwan, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines only implicitly mentioned inclusion having little to say about pupils with SEN and PE. PE for pupils with SEN, therefore, depended on individual teachers’ knowledge and enthusiasm and the encouragement they received to promote inclusion from their LEAs. For example, Linda and May attempted to design their own PE curricula for pupils with SEN and other able-bodied pupils who were able to occasionally experience ‘inclusion’ while other teachers, Lin and David, simply either ‘accommodated’ or ‘integrated’ SEN pupils in PE or let them take part in selective elements. In short, PE teaching for pupils with SEN in Taiwan depended on teachers’ individual enthusiasm in a context where the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan were more ‘open’ than the preceding National Curriculum. In Bernstein’s terms, the Curriculum Guidelines had shifted toward a ‘competence’ model of pedagogic practice (Bernstein, 1996) where ‘physical education’ was replaced by ‘health and physical education’ as a learning area in primary and secondary schools. This change represented an opportunity for SEN pupils to be included in the Guidelines for PE emphasizing competence rather than performance, respecting differences and making more connections with ‘health’ in PE teaching. Teachers, however, thought that the Curriculum Guidelines were no different from those of the previous National Curriculum, particularly, for pupils with SEN. My observational and interview work in primary schools in Taiwan revealed that there were no practical instruction and assessment guidelines for teachers for dealing with pupils with SEN in PE although LEAs promoted the idea of inclusion and the APE model. Teachers neither experienced any ‘difference’ in policy nor received provision to assist them in PE teaching so that the notion of their meeting expectations in the new Curriculum Guidelines of teaching PE to pupils with SEN was somewhat incoherent.
There were further constraints on teachers achieving inclusion. Traditionally, in Taiwan there had been five areas; ball, dance, gymnastics, martial art and folk activity around which teachers were required to design PE lessons in the earlier National Curriculum. Teachers were used to designing curriculum around these areas which were included in PE textbooks. Although the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines stipulated competence indicators in PE and encouraged teachers to design the curriculum themselves they still made heavy use of textbook versions of PE. It was not easy for them to design their own curriculum and assessment for each activity area for pupils with SEN so that their PE teaching followed textbook guidelines designed for able-bodied pupils. In contrast, in England, six areas, dance, games, gymnastics, swimming and water safety, athletics and outdoor and adventurous activities, have to be taught at Key Stage 1 (age 5-7) and 2 (age 7-11). There were no PE textbooks for teachers in primary schools where they were expected to design a curriculum for pupils with SEN and other able-bodied pupils. Those interviews, however, had no experience of ‘inclusion’ and merely ‘integrated’ pupils with SEN in PE. They lacked a clear vision of inclusion and seemed to have little time to explore professional journals or other literature for ideas.

Another important factor affecting inclusion within PE inside schools was the availability of ‘others’ to support teachers with SEN pupils. In England LSAs were provided to assist teachers who concentrated on their able-bodied pupils, ironically, inadvertently excluding SEN pupils in PE. Karen and Lesley, ‘placed’ pupils with SEN rather than ‘included’ them in their lessons (see Chapter 7), lacking clear ideas about inclusion and tending to view PE for SEN pupils within a ‘normalising’ paradigm requiring merely ‘adapting’ a curriculum for them.
8.4 Ability or Disability for Pupils with SEN in PE

So far I have examined processes of knowledge production and reproduction of SEN policy and its implementation in PE. Inevitably, I have explored how teachers’ experience and knowledge relating to SEN pupils influenced their PE teaching. In this section, I turn my attention to teachers themselves to analyse the relationships between their experiences of physical activities, their concept of ‘the body’ and their approach towards pupils with SEN. Evans (2004: 99) has argued that ‘ability’ is ‘a dynamic, sociocultural construct and process’, suggesting that Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’ (1992, in Evans, 2004) might be useful in exploring of how teachers perceive and define ‘ability’. In this study I wanted to investigate how PE teachers’ understandings of pupils with SEN are influenced by their experiences of sport and conceptualisation of the ‘bodies’ of pupils with SEN. Although teachers in England and Taiwan acknowledged ‘inclusion’ as an important policy for pupils with SEN they were unable to translate it effectively into practice. Having discussed the constraints and possibilities of policy for teachers’ achievement as inclusion in their PE teaching in the preceding part of this chapter, I now want to analyse how their view of pupils with SEN as ‘embodied subjects’ influenced the value given to them and how they approached such pupils in their teaching. First, I want to examine teachers’ personal experiences relating to sports and physical activities and their education background and how these affected their teaching of pupils with SEN.

8.4.1 Teachers’ Experiences of PE and Sport for Teaching SEN pupils

Smith (2004) has argued that secondary school PE teachers’ teaching can be deeply affected by their personal experience of ‘traditional team games’. In my study
when responding to questions relating to their long-term experience of sports and physical activities, the teachers reported first, in England,

I am a sporty person. I play tennis, squash, and badminton. I can play all racket games.... (Mary)

PE is not my specialist subject. I have a general knowledge of it. (Karen)

I have been doing swimming and badminton. Recently I do swimming. (Lesley)

I only got PE training through teacher training. I am not a PE specialist. It is just one subject I teach every week. I have no specific knowledge of this. (Rachel)

Those in Taiwan revealed their more specialist antecedents:

I did jogging for a long time but I've stopped now. (Linda)

I graduated from the sport college and my major was hand ball. ... I am also a coach of volleyball team in this school. My hope is to get children to love a sport then they will do it longer. For example, volleyball is popular in secondary schools. This is why I choose to coach volleyball. (May)

PE was my major when I was a student in University. I am familiar with all kinds of sports. In my opinion, SEN pupils need specialists, particularly with medical backgrounds, to help them in PE. (Lin)

I have no specific experience of sport but I have supervised many sport teams including volleyball, basketball and athletics. (David)

Unlike Smith's (2004) study which revealed that 'traditional team games' were connected strongly with secondary PE teaching, my study revealed that the few primary teachers with whom I had contacted in England have few experiences of sport and a weak
identification with ‘traditional team games’. Mary and Lesley had limited personal experiences relating to sports; Karen and Rachel felt that they had insufficient knowledge of PE. My field notes revealed that they offered many individual activities, such as dance and gymnastics and that their PE teaching was not dominated by ‘traditional team games’.

In contrast, the teachers who I interviewed in Taiwan had quite different experiences and educational preparation to those in England. May and Lin were graduates from sport universities and PE specialists. Their experience of PE as ‘traditional team games’ was rather similar to that of the secondary PE teachers in Smith’s study. However, Lin wanted to exclude pupils with SEN from PE as he thought that he had insufficient medical knowledge to teach them, while May was keen to involve pupils with SEN in her PE (see Chapter 7). Linda had no long-term experience of sport but still wanted to design an inclusive curriculum for SEN pupils. David had a lot of coaching experience and employed many ‘traditional team games’ (as revealed in the field notes) in his PE. His teaching seemed very much affected by ‘traditional team games’ coaching experiences and his pupils with SEN merely took part in suitable components of PE lessons, with difficulty. While there was little relationship between teachers’ PE teaching and their experience of physical activities in England, in Taiwan, those with PE specialist backgrounds, such as May and Lin, seemed to go from one extreme to the other on the ‘inclusion spectrum’ (p. 177) in their provision for SEN pupils. In England, primary teachers were generalist class, as well as, PE teachers, none of them were PE specialists. For them it was one subject amongst others pupils with SEN to be included. Their past experiences had little effect on their PE teaching for SEN pupils. In Taiwan, in contrast, most but not all PE teachers were specialists in primary schools, though even Linda, who had limited PE education background, attempted to design a curriculum for inclusion, even though she had little experience in sports. But Lin, a graduate from Sport College,
thought pupils with SEN should be excluded from PE. One was driven to the view that PE teaching to SEN pupils in Taiwan seemed partly to depend on teachers’ enthusiasms both for particular conception of appropriate activity and regulating their obligations to lead these with such conditions.

8.4.2 The Body, SEN pupils and PE

I now want to explore how teachers’ views of the ‘bodies’ of pupils with SEN might lead to their inclusion, integration or accommodation in PE. In England, teachers described SEN pupils as follows:

She is not able to carry out the instruction fully because of her legs. (Mary) (my emphasis)

He could take part in PE, we could encourage him to be going through the part he could do. (Karen) (my emphasis)

He enjoyed PE I think. You see Jason worked around the dancing and his ability to follow rules, safety rules as well. (Lesley) (my emphasis)

...I know he is different in a certain way but I want him to feel just like any other child with his brain.... (Rachel) (my emphasis)

In Taiwan, they said:

He could not run although he told me he could but he is uncomfortable on his artificial legs. (Linda) (my emphasis)

I don’t think she is different from other children but she is using a wheelchair instead of her legs. ... in the future, I will consider providing a stick for her to move in PE. (May) (my emphasis)

It is the best way for him (the pupils with SEN) to be separated from other
able-bodied pupils because of his disability and to apply specific equipment in PE. ... I don’t think that pupils with SEN following the same curriculum with other able-bodied pupils is equality. Equality should be based on the different ability of SEN pupils. (Lin) (my emphasis)

It is quite hard for him to be included with his legs. ... When we did the basketball, he could not do all sections as he can not run fast. He could do the section with his hands. He usually watched if the section of PE is not appropriate for him. (David) (my emphasis)

In order to understand teachers’ views on the bodies of pupils’ with SEN within PE we need to examine ‘what counts as a legitimate body and the legitimate use of the body in society’ (Shilling, 2003: 126) as this influences how they define pupils’ ‘ability’. Definitions of the ‘body’ not only determine who is to be accommodated but how pupils are to be educated in PE. To understand this definition, I first want to outline how the ‘body’ of SEN pupils is represented in legislation on SEN and the National Curriculum in Taiwan and England and the possibilities for teachers to reconceptualize them. In Taiwan, the Special Education Act 1984 used 12 categories to identify pupils with SEN, pointing out that rehabilitation should be provided to ‘cure’ SEN pupils (see section 5.2.1). Their bodies were seen as ‘a “problem” or “deficit” located within the individual that requires “fixing”’ (Alton-Lee, et al., 2005: 99). In England, in contrast, there was little explicit information related to the ‘bodies’ of pupils with SEN in the Education Act 1981. The National Union of Teachers, however, pointed out that the Act abolished the old medical categories of SEN and urged LEA to consider SEN pupils’ abilities and disabilities in order to meet their needs in terms of appropriate provision (NUT, 1984: 9). This could be seen as a ‘holistic’ view of ‘the body’ of SEN pupils. However, they have different ‘body conditions’ compared with other pupils in PE whether or not legislation adopts medical categories. The bodies of able-bodied pupils tend to be seen as ‘legitimate bodies’ with
legitimate use in PE lessons, thus, the possibility arises for teachers to ‘negatively’ view those of pupils with SEN within PE lessons, inevitably affecting their teaching. We can not say whether SEN legislation influenced teachers’ conceptions of SEN pupils on limited evidence of this study. Some teachers, however, did adopt a medical view and only Lesley in England and May in Taiwan did not view the ‘bodies’ of SEN pupils ‘negatively’. For all others, pupils’ ‘difficulties’ were viewed as ‘deficits’, they were seen as incomplete, biological entities to be excluded in lessons, considered to lack the physical capacities to be included. Though a discourse of inclusion in contemporary policy has presaged acknowledgement of the relationships between pupils with SEN with their environment, there was little evidence of a shift in the attitude of teachers. As Alton-Lee et al. (2005: 99) pointed out:

The social constructionist model sees disability not so much the result of a person’s impairment, but as a product of social factors in the contexts in which s/he participates that create barriers and limit opportunities for equal participation.

Rhetorically, at least, SEN policy has pressed PE teaching towards inclusion, the National Curriculum in England concentrating on how to ‘include’ pupils with SEN in PE by ‘adapting’ the curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan containing implicit reference to inclusion. Both texts seem to advocate a social model of SEN within PE although a medical model was still used to categorize SEN pupils in Taiwan. However, most teachers in this study were unable to include pupils with SEN in PE because the process of learning and context is mainly physical (DfES/WO, 1991: 7). Teachers focused attention on the limits of the ‘bodies’ of pupils with SEN and their limitations in PE rather than contexts created by their own actions as reflected for example in the justificatory statements that ‘she is not able to carry out the instruction fully because of
her legs’ (Mary) and ‘it is quite hard for him to be included with his legs’ (David). Some teachers, merely, ‘integrated’ pupils with SEN by letting them participate in parts of PE lessons, such as those where they could use their hands. There seemed to be conflict between ‘inclusion’ (a sociological perspective) and the view that PE knowledge is inherently physical (a biological perspective). Shilling (2003: 91) has discussed this tension, between the limitations of naturalistic and social constructionist approaches to the body and called for a ‘realignment of sociology and biology’ is this respect. These arguments have relevance to this study where there were two examples of attempted connecting between these perspectives. May, in Taiwan, took Sue’s movement limitation associated with her wheelchair into consideration when designing a PE curriculum, trying to overcome her biology to make sure that she was included in PE. Linda also applied this principle when asking all pupils to sit on the floor to play a game (see section 7.2). Neither abandoned a biological view of the bodies of SEN pupils but tried to convert their physical difficulties into a resource to be included in PE. Other teachers merely tried to integrate or accommodate their pupils with SEN, adopting a ‘deficit’ view, simply viewing PE from a biological perspective. There is insufficient data to say that May and Linda achieved a ‘realignment’ of biological and sociological perspective on the body of pupils with SEN but they had begun to realise these two views in their PE teaching.

Most of the teachers interviewed in Taiwan and England thought they had achieved, or were trying to achieve, ‘equality’ for pupils with SEN. But Lin in Taiwan thought that to include SEN pupils in PE was not ‘equality’ for them. He also pointed out that ‘equality’ was not independent from the ‘ability’ of pupils with SEN in PE. SEN pupils (with physical difficulty), therefore, could be included in subjects, like mathematics or history, with able-bodied pupils but not in PE because their education had to be expressed physically.
I don’t think that pupils with SEN imply the same curriculum with other able-bodied pupils is equity. It should be based on the different ability of SEN pupils. For example, he can be included in mathematics or languages. He should be excluded in PE with able-bodied pupils (Lin).

We can only speculate on whether most teachers in Taiwan hold the same opinion as Lin’s. In my experience most question whether including SEN pupils in PE is fair to both SEN pupils and other able-bodied pupils. Their opinions reflect a medical model of SEN but also echo concerns as to how ‘equity’ is to be expressed and achieved.
CHAPTER 9
DISCUSSION

9.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3 I outlined a theoretical framework for understanding SEN policy. It attempted to view both the production and reproduction of SEN policy; to connect structures, such as SEN legislation and the National Curriculum to individuals, such as the LEA Advisors, teachers and SEN pupils by examining official discourse on SEN and its implementation within PE in England and Taiwan. An empirical investigation was presented in Chapters 5 to 7 which sought to verify how ‘theory without research was nothing, and vice versa’ (Fitz, Davies and Evans, 2006: 1). In this chapter, I will critically draw attention to how I theorized SEN policy in relation to how it was implemented. The strengths and weaknesses of the knowledge production and reproduction model presented for SEN policy will be discussed. Finally, I will suggest that the model does not focus sufficiently on the nature of pedagogical change. Using concepts from Bernstein (1996), I will, thus, illustrate how it might be refined to allow teachers and others to explore the possibilities of SEN pupils being included in PE by different pedagogical practices within the National Curriculum.

9.2 Theorising Inclusion in SEN Policy

Policy analysis is not only about the workings of policies and their deeper agenda. It is also a value-laden activity which explicitly or implicitly makes judgments as to whether and in what ways policies help to ‘make things
better’ – acknowledging of course the contested nature of these judgments.

(Henry, 1993, quoted in Penny and Harris, 2004: 98)

To generate such ‘judgments’, however, I did not take it for granted that policy implementation would follow policy intentions. Forming a view of the process of translating policy into practice, I needed Ball’s (1993, in Ball 2006: 44-45) notion that policy texts are complex products rather than compromises; policy is both ‘productive of “text” and interpretive of it’ (Gale 1999, quoted in Penney and Harris, 2004: 98). SEN policy, accordingly, is enabled and constrained by itself. Ball (1993) also suggested that in policy analyses we need ‘not an understanding that is based on constraint or agency but on changing relationships between constraint and agency’ (in Ball 2006: 48). To this end, I used the policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction model derived from Bernstein, represented in figure 3.2, to explore the dynamic relationships between SEN policy and its implementation in England and Taiwan.

Examination of the legislation relating to SEN policy in the last two decades in both countries suggested that the trend in dealing with SEN pupils has shifted from medical to social perspectives (see Chapters 4, 7 and 8). Although medical categories are still used to identify pupils with SEN in Taiwan, in both countries, provision for them has gradually changed from focusing on individual ‘deficits’ to be ‘corrected’ or ‘cured’ to focus on environmental limitations in meeting their needs. These changes related to emerging ideas of inclusion as a discourse of dealing with SEN pupils. From the emerging themes in preceding chapters, it may be seen that inclusion is embedded, explicitly and implicitly, in legislation, including that on the National Curriculum. The promotion of that equality provides a more inclusive environment for SEN pupils in primary schools has been studied by researchers of the National Curriculum and its
influence on SEN pupils in England (for example, Vickerman, 2002; Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003; Theodoulides, 2003; Smith, 2004). Despite their work, it is still unclear how power and control flow through SEN policy and influence the teaching of SEN pupils in PE. For a better understanding of SEN policy and its implementation, this study has tried to elaborate inclusion as an embodiment by exploring the relationships between curricula, classroom and school organisation and resource provision and the perspectives of teachers and pupils in England and Taiwan.

Inclusion involves a wide range of educational factors (see Chapter 2) and its definition varies. For example, it not only has been defined as an idea 'about the participation of all children and young people and the removal of all forms of exclusionary practice' (Barton, 1998, in Armstrong, 2003: 3) but also as 'a set of principles, values and practices which involve the social transformation of education system and communities' (Armstrong, 2003: 2). Most teachers interviewed believed that inclusion for SEN pupils meant providing an equal educational environment, including equal access and equivalent teaching quality for SEN pupils and able-bodied pupils (see Chapter 7). Other researchers had already explored relationships between the NCPE and teachers’ actions when dealing with SEN pupils in PE (e.g. Theodoulides, 2003; Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003; Smith, 2004; and Smith and Green, 2004). Although these studies addressed the possibilities of and constraints on teachers achieving inclusion they say little of the dynamic relationships between legislative structure and its agents when inclusion of SEN pupils is sought in PE. To explore such relations, I have analysed SEN policy in terms of its recontextualization in the primary and secondary fields of production and reproduction in terms of what Bernstein (1990) has referred to as the way in which instructional discourses are embedded in regulative discourse of pedagogy. Analysis of how inclusion and equality have been expressed in
official discourse and accompanying legislation and how such concepts have been expressed in primary schools in England and Taiwan, allowed me to develop an heuristic model to explore connections between macro (state) and micro (school/teacher) perspectives on SEN policy and its implementation in PE. For example, in the primary field, the concept of inclusion was privileged in all official discourse and dominated the way in which provision was to be made for SEN pupils, including in PE. The goal of inclusion was recontextualized by LEAs within the terms of relevant legislation (e.g. the 1981 Education Act in England and the Special Education Act 1984 in Taiwan), both entitling SEN pupils a place and defining rules for their placement in primary schools and particularly by their LEA Advisors who attempted to provide assistance, for example, in the form of LSAs to teachers in schools. In England, LEA Advisors promoted inclusion within what has been described as the ‘inclusion spectrum’ while in Taiwan the ‘APE’ model was intended to help PE teachers during their ITT to deal with SEN pupils and during in-service training designed to enhance their knowledge of SEN. Legislation was meant to ensure equal access to mainstream education for SEN pupils, achieving appropriate pedagogic practice aimed at achieving ‘equity’, enhancing the quality of teaching for SEN pupils included in PE. In the secondary field, teachers actually reproduced the concept of inclusion within PE as a synthesis of curriculum, teaching methods, PE textbook guidelines (in Taiwan) and physical activity controlled by the statutory texts of the National Curriculum and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan (see Chapter 7). When teachers dealt with SEN pupils in PE lessons they had to convert this synthesis into a way of meeting SEN pupils’ needs along with other able-bodied pupils.

In tracing ‘inclusion’ through the three fields of the model we can see how a particular conception of inclusion was produced within an official discourse on equality
and reproduced to influence teaching of SEN pupils in PE. SEN policy may be explored as a top-down and bottom-up process and connected the official discourse of inclusion and its practice or absence in primary schools. This heuristic model has enhanced our knowledge of how inclusion is expressed in SEN policy, what provision is made for it and how it is practised within PE. However, it has strengths and weaknesses and these will be analysed in the next section.

9.3 The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Policy Implementation and the Field of Knowledge Production and Reproduction Model

9.3.1 Strengths

One of the strengths of this model is its originality. It provides a way of analysing the dynamic relationships between SEN policy and its implementation within PE. The discourse of inclusion and equality can be viewed as a process of knowledge production and reproduction by which we can trace the way in which National Governments have dealt with SEN pupils over the last two decades in England and Taiwan. This thesis is, in this sense, an original, comparative study of SEN policy and its implementation in two countries.

Another strength of this model is its capacity to view SEN policy and implementation within a cross-culture approach. In a cross-cultural perspective, SEN policy-implementation is set within its social contexts, in this case, in two countries. For example, we have demonstrated that the relative power of LEAs and National Curricula to influence or determine PE teaching for SEN pupils differed in the two countries. In England, educational policy and legislation in the early 1990s weakened the power base of LEAs, centralising control of the curriculum (Riddle and Brown, 1994, see Chapter 3). In the UK PE teaching for SEN pupils is dominated by the National Curriculum. Within
its strong frames, LEA Advisors promoted an ‘inclusion spectrum’ (Stevenson and Black, 1999) PE teaching model among teachers, even though it was not mentioned in NC guidelines, and the teachers interviewed paid little attention to it. In contrast, in Taiwan, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines made little mention of teaching SEN pupils in PE and method of doing so seemed to be driven by LEAs. The ‘APE’ model seemed to be rooted in the thinking of primary PE teachers, reflecting the influence that LEA Advisors had on them regarding SEN. In this way state control of the National Curriculum in England appeared to have stronger influence on PE teaching for SEN pupils than the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan.

Finally, the model provides an alternative way of viewing provision of SEN policy in PE. Traditionally, research has investigated production of policy itself. Very little attention has been given to how, or whether, legislative provision achieves inclusion. For example, Rose’s (2001: 147) study contended that primary teachers and headteachers believed that LSAs were the main means of enabling SEN pupils to access lessons, but he did not document the process. Others (e.g. Vickerman, 2002; Motley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke, 2005) pointed out that ITT and in-service training was not sufficient to enhance teachers’ understandings of SEN pupils in PE but did not investigate or speculate upon what kind of training teachers needed for dealing with SEN pupils, their studies merely focusing on investigating whether or not SEN training provision was sufficient for teachers. In contrast, the heuristic model used in this study not only permitted investigation of the provision of PE to SEN pupils but also allowed me to attempt to highlight what degree of inclusion PE teachers achieved when inclusion is recontextualized within policy and provision. Using this model, we have a better understanding of the difficulties and opportunities inherent in the provision for teachers to teach SEN pupils within PE in England and Taiwan.
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9.3.2 Weaknesses

The model attempted to connect micro and macro perspective of SEN policy and implementation and emerging themes were generated in the primary, recontextualizing and the secondary fields. Although this heuristic model attempted to avoid viewing teachers and SEN pupils as simply the ‘receivers’ of SEN policy, it inevitably had to examine it by tracing its implementation in terms of teachers dealing with SEN pupils in PE. It provided little evidence of how the actions of teachers influenced LEA Advisors or ultimately governed policy on this issue.

Another weakness of this study is that the model did not provide a way of helping teachers to achieve inclusion in PE. While one of the main purposes of this thesis was to better understand the teaching of SEN pupils in PE, the model has little to say either about teachers/ SEN pupils interaction or how teachers thought about inclusion or how they might include SEN pupils in PE in the primary schools, largely because it has focused more on issues of power and control and knowledge production and reproduction in pedagogic processes. In order to address this limitation and gain some purchase on how inclusion was practised in PE in England and Taiwan, I drew on other sociological concepts around ‘ability’ (Evans, 2004) and ‘the body’ to explore relationships between teachers’ conceptions of inclusion and the treatment of SEN pupils in PE (see Chapter 8). Although research on ‘ability’ and ‘the body’ is not reflected in the model itself, using concepts from this literature with the framework of the model, allowed me to further probe the secondary field to explore the limits and possibilities of including SEN pupils in PE. While other researchers on SEN policy have merely revealed that teachers confronted difficulties to include SEN pupils in PE (see Theodoulides, 2003; Vickerman, Hayes and Whetherly, 2003; Smith 2004; Morley, Bailey, Tan and Cooke, 2005), these notions point toward a more systematic framework for viewing SEN policy on teaching.
SEN pupils in PE.

9.4 Recontextualizing Inclusion within Different Pedagogical Practices

Although Government legislation has advocated inclusion and sanctioned attempt to achieve it for SEN pupils in PE, provision, particularly in terms of the National Curriculum, both in England and Taiwan, has maintained focus on able-bodied pupils. This was the main discursive constraint on teachers trying to include SEN pupils in PE. ‘The punctuation of time, use of space, ability groupings, material culture, text books, forms of assessment and patterns of interaction among peers and between teachers and pupils’ (Ivinson and Duveen, 2006: 110), were routinely defined with reference to able-bodied pupils. In the secondary field of PE teaching in primary schools it was seen that teachers confronted a variety of challenges when providing for SEN pupils. While these challenges can not be understood without reference to the National Curriculum in the two countries, as the study progressed, issues of how teachers included SEN pupils in PE became both more important and prominent. We have seen how teachers in England and Taiwan not only followed statutory and LEA requirements but also recontextualized ‘inclusion’ by tailoring their own cultural and social perspectives to their understandings of how SEN pupils were to be included in PE (see Chapter 7). For Bernstein, recontextualization ‘is a form of mediation which points to the transformation of knowledge between sites or groups of people’ (Ivinson and Duveen, 2006: 109). This not only occurred in the recontextualization field where LEA Advisors interpreted SEN policy for schools but also in the secondary field where teachers recontextualized their concepts of inclusion within PE teaching. They recontextualized legislation, the National Curriculum and information provided by LEAs, along with their own knowledge relating
to PE, SEN pupils and teaching experiences to create forms of inclusive PE teaching, or not. ‘Inclusion’ was both enabled and constrained by the power and control embedded in SEN policy. This may be further explored by applying Bernstein’s concepts of ‘classification’ and ‘frame’ (1971) to view the relationships between the idea of inclusion and its practice and to understand how knowledge of SEN pupils within PE was transmitted between the National Curriculum and teachers.

I have mentioned that teachers have to deal with a synthesis that includes curriculum, teaching methods and physical activity when teaching SEN pupils (see section 9.2) constrained by legislative definitions of what counts as PE, or ‘classification’ in Bernstein’s terms. For example, in England, the National Curriculum defines the content of PE in terms of six areas of physical activity to be taught (see section 7.2). When teaching SEN pupils PE teachers are expected to ‘adapt’ the current curriculum for able-bodied pupils to meet their needs. ‘Classification’ between component parts (activity areas) is strong. Teachers have not much choice as to how to teach SEN pupils in PE. In Taiwan, in contrast, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines has established the broader learning area of ‘Health and Physical Education’ (HPE) rather than PE. In theory there were good opportunities (i.e. more flexibilities derived from a broader concept of PE) to promote inclusion within PE for SEN pupils. However, the content of HPE was limited by the textbook knowledge which teachers used to design most PE curricula (see section 7.2). Teachers in the two countries were constrained by the National Curriculum in different ways but in both knowledge of inclusion within PE for SEN pupils had to be accommodated in the curriculum of able-bodied pupils rather than generating new curricula for both. What counted as valid transmission, or ‘frame’ in Bernstein’s term, dominated teachers’ teaching. In England, following the recommendation of the National Curriculum to provide an ‘adapted’ PE curriculum, teachers had little choice as to what
they taught in PE. In the meantime, LSAs' presence in PE allowed teachers to concentrate on able-bodied pupils, increasing opportunity for SEN pupils to merely 'fit in'. In contrast, in Taiwan, the time devoted to HPE was divided into 'health' and physical education, though this separation made HPE no different from its previous articulation as PE, according to teachers interviewed who thought that there was no difference when dealing with SEN pupils before and after the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines.

Where, then, are the opportunities to overcome these constraints when teaching SEN pupils in PE? In Chapters 5 and 8, I compared the features of the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan and their impact on teaching SEN pupils in PE. Theoretically, the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan provided teachers more flexibility when dealing with SEN pupils than the National Curriculum in England because of their orientation toward a competence curriculum (see section 8.3). I now want to discuss this issue further.

Bernstein later (1996) refined the concepts of classification and frame 'into a notion of two main models of pedagogic practice, performance and competence' (Fitz, Davies and Evans, 2006: 6). Some researchers have discussed these two models of pedagogic practice and their possible influences in PE (see Evans, Davies and Penny, 1999; Penney and Harris, 2004; Evans and Davies, 2004), exploring relationships between power and control within these two different types of pedagogical practice. Fitz, Davies and Evans (2006: 6) distinguished these two models by:

Time, space and discourse (whether content was presented as subjects or themes), evaluation, control, pedagogic text (whether the learner's output or what teacher sees it as signifying), autonomy and economy.

We can now highlight the main features of the two different models as Table 9.1.
## Table 9.1 The features of performance and competence modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Performance model</th>
<th>Competence model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Clearly marked subject areas</td>
<td>Theme, projects, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space and Time</td>
<td>Strong sequencing and pacing</td>
<td>Weak sequencing and pacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Focus on the gap between pupils and the criteria for defining difference</td>
<td>Focus on personal intentions, disposition, relation and reflexivity, on similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Performance to be graded in hierarchical order</td>
<td>Focus on pupils’ cognitive and social development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Modified from Fitz, Davies and Evans, 2006: 6-7)

On the surface, the competence curriculum model now officially privileged in Taiwan seems to be the more appropriate for enacting inclusion within PE. For example, the content of HPE in Taiwan is broader than it is in the NCPE in England (see Chapter 5) offering more chance that SEN pupils will be included in content and activity expecting to relate more to ‘health’ knowledge than merely focusing on skills in PE. Furthermore, in a competency driven curriculum teachers have more discretion over times and spaces for including SEN along with able-bodied pupils in PE; SEN, along with other pupils, may be evaluated by personalized recognition and competence regardless of their skills in PE (see Chapter 7). In contrast, the National Curriculum in England reflects a performance model with features nearer to those outlined above. This is not, however, to say that the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan is a pure form of competence pedagogic practice, although PEH has replaced PE and teachers tended to evaluate SEN pupils according to non-skill criteria, such as learning attitude or knowledge competence. Inclusion in PE for SEN pupils is a complicated process and further research is needed to explore in much greater detail how competence and performance models are operationalised in PE with what effect on the learning opportunities of SEN pupils.
9.5 Incomplete Inclusion for SEN Pupils within PE

This study set out to examine how ‘equality’ was expressed in SEN policy and implemented within PE in primary schools in England and Taiwan. We have seen how the official discourse of ‘inclusion’ is primarily concerned with ‘equal access’ so that SEN pupils can be placed alongside able-bodied pupils in mainstream schools in England or mainstreaming schools in Taiwan without guaranteeing more inclusive teaching and learning. Although LEAs provided LSAs to assist teachers in PE and aimed to enhance their knowledge of SEN pupils through in–service training, these interventions simply relieved pressures on ‘caring’ for SEN pupils in PE lessons but did not much help to improve teaching. Ideally, provision of SEN policy would not only provide equal access for SEN pupils but equality in the form of good quality learning in PE. In this vein, there seemed to be a conflict between government legislation (e.g. the Green Paper Excellence for all children: Meeting Special Education Needs, 1997; the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) and the National Curriculum in England and Taiwan. While a discourse of inclusion was propagated in Government legislation its implementation in schools was regulated by the National Curriculum. For example, in England, the Green Paper (DfEE, 1997) stated:

Inclusion is a process, not a fixed state. By inclusion, we mean not only that pupils with SEN should wherever possible receive their education in a mainstream school, but also that they should join fully with their peers in the curriculum and life of the school. For example, we believe that - taking account of any normal arrangements for setting - children with SEN should generally take part in mainstream lessons rather than being isolated in separate units. But separate provision may be necessary on occasion for specific purposes, and inclusion must encompass teaching and curriculum appropriate to the child's needs. Many schools will need to review and adapt their approaches in order to achieve greater inclusion.
Teachers were expected to adapt or modify the NCPE for SEN pupils. Consequently, inclusion was recontextualized as integration rather than inclusion in PE. In Taiwan, the *Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report* (MOE, 1995) confirmed that SEN policy was towards inclusion but the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines (2001) did not reflect this idea and there were no texts to define how teachers could achieve inclusion in PE so that teaching SEN pupils and the promotion of inclusion depended on individual teachers’ enthusiasm and LEAs’ activities. In England, the National Curriculum seemed to reflect a rather limited idea of ‘equal access’ rather than ‘equity’ for SEN pupils in PE, while in Taiwan the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines reflected neither equal access nor equality for them.

Indeed, the idea of inclusion seemed to be an afterthought in both the National Curriculum in England and Taiwan. These texts were designed to educate children to be ideal able-bodied citizens. SEN pupils were not the main focus of attention. In England the specific concept of inclusion was not given explicit curricular form until the NCPE (1999) (see section 5.3.3), the relationships of power and control which could and may still yet to be seen to be inherent in the National Curriculum worked to prohibit inclusion. In Taiwan, there were no texts or ideas relating to SEN pupils in PE in the National Curriculum before the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines (2001) made implicit reference to inclusion and no principles or recommendations for teaching SEN pupils in PE. Teachers dealt with SEN pupils in PE in their own way and some were more effective at achieving inclusion than their counterparts in England.

Inclusion has been an important idea, now embedded in SEN policy but it is unfinished business. Inclusion is a complex process. It includes values, beliefs and recognition of the needs of pupils with SEN. If it is to be achieved, there will need to be
greater coherence between legislation, provision and the National Curriculum. Only then will it be possible to include SEN pupils in PE.
CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION

10.1 Introduction

In this final chapter, I will reflect the thesis as a whole and its research design with reference to the empirical data discussed in previous chapters, seeking summation of analysis and discussion of its emerging themes. First, I will draw attention to its main conclusions. Second, I will review what it sought to achieve in terms of SEN policy analysis in the light of its objectives. Third, its methodology will be considered and fourth, its limitations of this thesis and possible future directions for research will be considered.

10.2 Main Conclusions

*The development of SEN policy was towards inclusion and attempted to achieve equality*

Brighouse (2000: 3) has argued that the concept of education equality implies that ‘children have a right to have an equal education regardless of their levels of ability or social background’. SEN policy in both England and Taiwan has included an intention to guarantee that SEN pupils may be educated in mainstream schools, regardless of their physical and intellectual difficulties, recast simply as ‘different’ levels of ability from those of others. However, there is no guarantee that and SEN policies provide this kind of education environment to SEN pupils. This thesis has attempted to deal with complex processes of implementing SEN policy in pursuit of the achievement of equality.
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SEN policy and its implementation can be seen as processes of knowledge production and reproduction. The official discourse of SEN legislation is concerned with placing SEN pupils in mainstream schools (or classes) in England and Taiwan and documentary and historical analysis revealed that in both countries SEN legislation was explicitly and implicitly oriented towards the idea of inclusion. Furthermore, in England *Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* (DfEE, 1997) adumbrated the idea of inclusion for SEN pupils. By contrast, in Taiwan, the *Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report* (MOE, 1995) raised the idea of inclusion and examined constraints on including SEN pupils in schools. However, in the two countries, moving SEN pupils from special schools towards mainstream schools reflected a changing discourse. Ways of treating SEN pupils had shifted from medical towards social perspectives. The idea of inclusion was intended not only to reflect the international trend toward such a social perspective in dealing with SEN pupils but also to determine official education action by organizing resource and provision to achieve equality. The idea of ‘inclusion’ consequently influenced teachers when dealing with SEN pupils in schools (see Chapter 7). In England the NCPE (1999) specifically detailed the idea of inclusion and outlined its principles. Inclusion was embedded explicitly in the National Curriculum for teachers to enact. LEA Advisors also promoted the idea of inclusion and provided relevant provision. In Taiwan, in contrast, the idea of inclusion was embedded inexplicitly in the objectives of the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines rather than its texts (see Chapter 5) and inclusion was promoted mainly by LEAs. Primary teachers in both countries realised the importance attached to inclusion and attempted to practise it in PE, though the analyses in Chapters 5 to 7 revealed that its implementation for SEN pupils had yet to be achieved.
SEN policy and its implementation was rendered difficult by the production and reproduction of particular understandings of inclusion

This thesis set as its goal to understand SEN policy and its implementation in terms of the development of equality and inclusion for SEN pupils within PE in schools. Using the ‘policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction’ model relationships between policy-implementation, knowledge production and reproduction, and inclusion were explored. An attempt was made to explore the dynamic relationships between structures, such as that of SEN legislation and agents, such as teachers, the LEA Advisors and SEN pupils, avoiding viewing policy from any one, single perspective. In the primary field for the production of discourse, inclusion was generated by laws and legislation and embedded in the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan with the intention of showing, albeit inexplicitly, the way in which inclusion should be practiced in primary schools. However, when teachers attempted to implement inclusionary practices for SEN pupils in PE they recontextualized them through their own understandings of PE curriculum design and teaching methods (see Chapter 7). As they recontextualized their perceptions of the requirements of statutory legislation into practice, SEN policy became an ongoing process of production and reproduction of knowledge.

Including SEN pupils within PE within the National Curriculum in England and Taiwan

Teachers generally attempted to provide inclusion in the PE curriculum by maximising what they regarded as the feasible limits of SEN pupils’ participation in PE lessons (see Chapter 7). We can not, however, understand the difficulties they experienced when trying to achieve this without reference to their National Curriculums which regulated SEN inclusion in different ways. In both countries, teaching was strongly controlled by its content which was stronger within PE than other subjects. Teachers
dealing with pupils with physical difficulties in PE were more affected by the National Curriculum than say, in mathematics or history because of the physical nature of PE, a subject which transmits knowledge via physical activity (see Chapter 7). The National Curriculum of both countries was, however, designed for able-bodied pupils and translating it for SEN pupils, alongside the able-bodied, was the biggest challenge for their teachers. In England the National Curriculum contained six physical activity areas and directed teachers to adapt or modify curriculum for SEN pupils. In Taiwan, although the APE model was introduced to provide a new paradigm for dealing with SEN pupils, teaching SEN pupils within PE was still constrained by the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines (see Chapters 7 and 8). Teachers in both countries found it difficult to include SEN pupils in their PE teaching whether located within performance or competence curriculum practice models (Bernstein, 1996), though the latter appeared to generate greater opportunities for including SEN pupils in PE within the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan.

*Insufficient Provision for including SEN pupils in PE*

Chapter 7 documented the emergent themes relating to inclusion of SEN pupils in PE, such as the assistance which teachers received from others in or outside schools. This assistance was insufficient for them to deal in inclusionary ways with SEN pupils in PE. For example, though teachers acquired information on SEN pupils from their previous teachers and SENCOs in their schools and physiotherapists outside schools, it did not help them much when teaching PE. Generally, they thought their knowledge of how to include SEN pupils in PE was insufficient and in England and Taiwan they were keen to learn how to design curriculum for SEN pupils within PE and to receive good examples of how SEN pupils could be included in PE lessons, subject to the constraints
of other demands upon their time. Teachers wanted to improve their PE teaching for SEN pupils with more sophisticated and practical approaches, surmounting insufficient current provision and knowledge. They had received few good examples of inclusion in PE from their ITT and in-service training and felt constrained by hierarchical relationships between their LEAs and schools and were reluctant to seek help and resources from the former.

### 10.3 The Objectives

Does formal education provide ‘equal opportunity’ for pupils, including those with SEN, to develop their full potential? This thesis investigated whether SEN pupils are fully included in PE following measures generated by recent SEN policy in England and Taiwan. The first objective of this thesis was to critically examine education policy relating to SEN pupils in Taiwan and England and the current debate surrounding ‘equality’ and ‘inclusion’ within PE. In exploring how the intentions of Governments in both countries for dealing with SEN pupils were expressed in SEN policy and legislation, I took the view that we needed to understand how the concepts of ‘equality’ and ‘inclusion’ were defined and embedded in policy texts and how these, in turn, influenced the practices of teachers in schools.

The second objective was to examine how policy and legislation governed the National Curriculum in Taiwan and England and ‘determined’ what SEN provision was provided and how inclusion was implemented in primary schools. Knowledge intended to help teachers in dealing with SEN pupils is embedded in the National Curriculum. I set out with the view that exploring the National Curriculum in the two countries would help us to understand the gaps between statutory intentions and teaching realities concerning
SEN pupils in primary schools.

The third objective was to generate an understanding of the process of SEN policy recontextualization by analysing the themes which emerged from LEA Advisors, teachers and SEN pupils accounts. This became an important and prominent part of the thesis as soon became clear that policy and its implementation cannot merely be viewed as a process of 'input' in the form of the content of legislation and the National Curriculum offered to schools and teachers and 'output' viewed as how teachers teach SEN pupils in PE. We have seen that SEN policy passes through complex processes of 'recontextualization' by LEA Advisors and teachers which can only be understood adequately by taking a more holistic and dynamic view of relationships that lie between policy initiation and its 'implementation' in everyday practice.

The fourth objective was to understand differences between SEN policy in Taiwan and England so as to provide an empirical and conceptual reference point for future SEN policy making in Taiwan.

To fulfill these objectives, an empirical qualitative research study was undertaken which employed interviews, observation and documentary analysis in case study setting to explore processes of knowledge production and reproduction in SEN policy within PE. In the next section, I will consider the methodology chosen and how it was applied, evaluating the degree to which I achieved the aims of this thesis in terms of my research strategy.

10.4 Methodological Considerations

In exploring the structure of SEN policy with reference to its main agents I employed qualitative research methods to conceptualise its contexts and understand the
meanings and experiences of inclusion to those who were involved in its implementation, LEA Advisors, teachers, LSAs and SEN pupils. In this section, I will discuss the research strategy used and evaluate the degree to which I achieved the aims of this thesis, considering the reliability and validity of data and methods.

10.4.1 The Research Strategy

As outlined in Chapter 5, research strategy and techniques were amended as the study progressed. Although I initially attempted to apply principles of grounded theory, the fieldwork was ultimately navigated using a theoretical framework concerning policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction. Using a model derived from Bernstein' ideas (see sections 3.3. and 3.4), this framework guided data collection and my understanding of emerging themes from different knowledge fields relevant to SEN policy. It acted as an heuristic device for viewing the latter and its attempted implementation from both a top-down and bottom-up perspective. This framework proved useful in conceptualising contexts of SEN policy and viewing processes of knowledge production and reproduction in England and Taiwan. It also guided generation of data concerning SEN policy and its implementation in primary schools in the two countries (see Figure 4.1). The data were collected from multiple sources by interview, observation and documentary analysis within an essentially ethnographic perspective which avoided 'the risks that stem from reliance on a single kind of data' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983: 24) and provided 'the basis for triangulation in which data of different kinds can be systematically compared' (ibid.).

Initially, I planned to elicit the opinions of parents on SEN policy-implementation as well as teachers, Advisors and pupils. In the upshot, only one mother of an SEN pupil in Taiwan was interviewed by the telephone (see Chapter 8). Her
opinions provided valuable insights into how medical information might be used to help reduce the effect of disability in schools and served a powerful reminder that the views of parents of SEN pupils need to be included in SEN policy if we are to achieve inclusion (see Chapter 8).

10.4.2 Evaluation

I noted in Chapter 4, that the original motivation for this thesis lay in the doubts I had as to whether teachers could teach SEN pupils alongside able-bodied pupils in PE in primary schools. I further questioned if teachers had received enough training and were equipped with sufficient, appropriate knowledge to do so. These issues could not be approached using a single perspective across the range of policy matters which were influenced by SEN legislation and discourses of dealing with SEN pupils. Accordingly, the first question was to explore the relationship between SEN policy and implementation in terms of a ‘provision perspective’ (see Chapter 2), examining SEN legislation and the National Curriculum and the social context from cultural, economic and historical perspectives. In Taiwan, I employed documentary analysis to examine the Special Education Act 1984 and its amended version in 1997, 2001, the Republic of China Education of Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MOE, 1995) and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines. In England I applied the same method to examine the Warnock Report (DES, 1978), the Education Acts 1981, the Green Paper Excellence for all children: Meeting Special Educational Needs (DfEE, 1977) and the National Curriculum (see Chapters 2 and 5). The analysis of this legislation was undertaken from a sociological perspective (see Chapter 5).

The second question was to explore how inclusion was expressed in the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan, and in SEN
legislation in the two countries. To answer this question, I used documentary and historical analysis to examine how the concept of inclusion was expressed within the official discourse in legislation and the National Curriculum in the two countries. The emergent themes and analysis (see Chapters 5 and 6) revealed that official discourses of inclusion regulated the way in which SEN pupils were dealt with in schools. The opinions of LEA Advisors and LSAs in both countries were sought in elucidation of this question as they expressed their opinions on inclusion and the actions of schools and teachers in dealing with SEN pupils as the official way of interpreting SEN policy.

The third question was to examine how teachers implemented inclusion in England and Taiwan and became main concern of the thesis, using interview, observation and documentary analysis techniques. For example, teachers’ interviews attempted to articulate their attempts at including SEN pupils in PE, its attendant difficulties, the assistance received inside and outside schools and strategies for achieving inclusion. Observations of PE lessons generated an understanding of teachers, LSAs and SEN pupils in terms of their ‘actual’ experiences of inclusion. Furthermore, I interviewed some SEN pupils to understand their experiences of PE and reviewed documents relating to teachers and pupils as to how inclusion was to be achieved in schools. Unlike other research which has only provided data on teachers (see Rose, 2001; Smith, 2004), this thesis offers a more holistic understanding of inclusion within PE in primary schools encompassing multiple perspectives and using a variety of research techniques.

The fourth question was to explore what parents and SEN pupils thought of SEN policy and the support received from Government and LEAs and what they perceived they might need to receive in their daily lives. This question was not answered adequately for, in light of the difficulty of contacting parents, I withdrew plans to interview them, though persevering interviews with pupils in England and Taiwan. Although those in
England were too young to reply in detail to my questions they provided some account of their experiences of PE and were a useful reference point when I analysed how teachers conceptualised their understanding of inclusion in PE (see Chapter 7).

I also interviewed one student teacher (who was undertaking GTP training) in England. Although her account reflected the current limits in ITT preparation for dealing with SEN pupils in PE and echoed the views of teachers interviewed, there is insufficient data here to make conclusive statements about the adequacy of ITT training both in England and Taiwan.

10.4.3 Reliability, Validity and Triangulation

In establishing the credibility of the qualitative research methods adapted, I first will examine the 'coherence' between the purposes of this thesis and the processes of gathering data. The study set out to understand SEN pupils' lives in primary schools, particularly their PE lessons. The main research sites were four primary schools and PE classrooms in each of England and Taiwan. Although data collected in two schools in England were incomplete (see Table 4.2), procedures for data collection in the two countries were the same, including interviews with teachers, the LEA Advisors and SEN pupils; observation field notes of PE lessons; and documents concerning SEN pupils' IEPs, records of learning and annual reports. In the preceding section, we saw that the themes which emerged from the data were connected closely to research objectives questions. 'Coherence' was achieved insofar as the data fulfilled their purposes.

Second, unlike quantitative research methods in which validity is established by appropriate techniques of statistical analysis, there are two main strategies for checking reliability and validity in qualitative research, 'respondent validation and triangulation' (Delamont, 1992: 158). In this project, the contents of semi-structured interviews were
analysed to present the ‘realities’ of teachers, LEA Advisors and LSAs involved in
provision of PE for SEN pupils in schools. All interviews were tape-recorded and
transcribed and I discussed the information which they generated retrospectively with
interviewees. This provided one set of validation of my interpretation of their views.

Furthermore, the data generated by interview, observation and documentary,
were systematically analysed in a process of triangulation. While different research
techniques contain ‘their own set of assumptions about the nature of the world and the
kind of data that can be produced to increase knowledge about the world’ (Denscombe,
1998: 84), the great merit of using multi-methods is that it enhances our knowledge of
different aspects of that upon which they are focused in this case, in inclusion. For
example, when the theme of ‘Helping teachers to deal with pupils with SEN’ emerged
(section 7.2), data from interviews, observation and documents were used in
understanding how teachers perceived the assistance they received from others in and
outside schools. This multi-methods research technique allowed me to focus on policy
and the realities of SEN pupils when they were placed in mainstream schools or classes
in England and Taiwan, the technique of data triangulation facilitating ‘coherence’ for
research purposes.

10.5 Limitations

This thesis sought to explore the socio-cultural contexts of SEN policy within PE
by examining SEN policy in England and Taiwan. I focused on specific SEN legislation
and documents, for example, the Education Act 1981, the Warnock Report (DES, 1978)
in England and the Special Education Act 1984 and the Republic of China Education of
Physical and Mental Impairment Report (MfET, 1995) in Taiwan (see Chapter 4). In the
last two decades, however, there have been other legislation, laws and official documents relating to the development of SEN policy but I chose to focus only on those which were seen at the inception of my study as significant in the development of SEN policy as milestones in dealing with SEN pupils. It will take further research to explore the importance of other statutory legislation on SEN and its significance for PE.

Second, this thesis set as its goal to understand SEN pupils, particularly those with physical disabilities, in their PE lessons and the difficulties teachers confronted when dealing with them. The findings of this study can only be cautiously generalised to other SEN pupils in other contexts. Furthermore, although most teachers interviewed recalled their ITT training was insufficient to deal with SEN pupils, including one student teacher, it needs further research, including different types of ITT, to focus on the relationships between their training and teaching for SEN pupils. However, although this study has analysed relationships between SEN policy and PE teaching, it says little about how to improve either. For example, this thesis has investigated SEN policy and focused on the development of the concept of inclusion for PE teaching and although this has helped us understand the problematic and historical relationships of SEN policy and its implementation within PE, it provides little information about how to teach better. Furthermore, although we can now better understand how teachers are influenced by both legislative discourse on equality and inclusion and the resources available for SEN pupils in their PE teaching, how they identify and act toward SEN pupils in PE is still unclear. For example, how do teachers configure the 'ability' of SEN pupils in PE and convert their understandings into a PE curriculum? We need further research on these matters.

Third, research on policy is inherently prospective. It provides reference points for making policy in the future but not for making policy immediately. In this vein, we have to distinguish between policy study and policy making. Policy study explores 'past'
policy and attempts to understand its contexts and implementation via a theoretical framework. It investigates policy in a fixed time and space ‘in the past’. This thesis explored SEN policy-implementation over the last two decades in Taiwan and England by using a policy implementation and the field of knowledge production and reproduction model, attempting to view SEN policy and its implementation for SEN pupils within PE in primary schools using Bernstein’s theory of the pedagogic device. The findings will, hopefully, provide reference points for policy makers and curriculum writers when they amend or make SEN policy in the future.

Fourth, the interrelation between LEA Advisors activities and SEN policy was insufficiently clarified. There was little to say as to whether LEA Advisors’ understandings of equality and inclusion influenced process of policy recontextualization and insufficient data to tell how they influenced teachers when they dealt with SEN pupils, or how they conceptualized inclusion. Given the focus of this thesis on the provision (e.g. laws, legislation, and educational curriculum) made available to the LEA Advisors in their official capacities as promoters of inclusion, the full range of factors that influenced their concepts of inclusion and decision making remain in need of further research and are not included in this thesis.

Finally, academic debate on ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’ was discussed in Chapter 2, though it was not the intention of this study to establish the difference between them conceptually. But we did need to know what inclusion referred to in the minds of policy makers, teachers and SEN pupils. I, therefore, attempted to use Barton’s concept of ‘emancipatory’ practice (1996) to distinguish between inclusion and integration in this thesis. The former refers to a situation in which pupils are free from the limitations of education environments, including curriculum, teaching methods and physical activities, to be educated alongside able-bodied pupils in PE lessons. I found that, on the one hand,
teachers attempted to adapt the PE curriculum for SEN pupils in PE lesson as they interpreted inclusion as integration. On the other hand, some teachers (e.g. Linda and May) in Taiwan occasionally designed 'inclusive' new curricula for SEN pupils so that they could take part with able-bodied pupils. However, more research is needed to provide detail of the distinguishing features of inclusion and integration in PE settings.

10.6 Future Directions for Research in PE

In this thesis, I have examined SEN policy and its implementation in England and Taiwan by viewing a combination of social and cultural developments within a wider discourse of inclusion and equality. With a cross-cultural analysis, a broader concept of inclusion within PE in the two countries has emerged. Although we have a better understanding of how equality and inclusion were expressed and practised in SEN policies, there are some issues of equity and social justice for SEN pupils in PE that we still do not understand. In this section, I want to offer a number of future research directions with reference to the findings of this thesis.

First, more research is required on the 'embodiment' of physical education. For example, how do teachers or others, such the LEA Advisors and the other practitioners, conceptualise the embodiment of SEN pupils? how do they explain difference and how do they 'read' the potential brought to classrooms by SEN policy? what kind of teaching methods can improve inclusion in PE and the study of CPD for teachers to enhance the inclusion of SEN pupils in PE? I have only begun to touch on these issues in Chapter 8.

Second, the needs of pupils should come to the fore when SEN policy is made. The opinions of SEN pupils, particularly young pupils, are not always present in or easy to connect with policy itself. But their experiences of PE, their opinions and feelings, are
important when considering their inclusion.

Teachers are central to the process of steering PE teaching for SEN pupils towards inclusion. Achieving successful PE teaching for SEN pupils alongside able-bodied pupils is a complex process. Teachers have to be equipped not only with PE knowledge and teaching skills but also the knowledge of how to deal with SEN pupils. We need to know more about the life history of PE teachers to identify the opportunities and possibilities for including SEN pupils in PE lessons.

10.7 In Summary

The motivation for conducting this study is derived from my experiences of dealing with SEN pupils in PE in Taiwan. To this end, I used qualitative research methods and Bernstein's (1971, 1990) concepts to investigate the process of knowledge production and reproduction relating to inclusion in England and Taiwan. The data were generated from three knowledge fields and the themes which emerged threw light on the relationships between SEN legislation, the LEA Advisors, teachers and SEN pupils. The findings of this thesis provide an alternative way of viewing SEN policy and its implementation within PE in the two countries. This theoretical framework not only constitutes a heuristic model on SEN policy but also is an innovative methodology to analyse policy and its implementation in England and Taiwan.

This thesis revealed that although the education systems are different in England and Taiwan, there were similarities and differences of SEN in the way SEN policy was implemented within PE. In both countries there was development of SEN policy from a medical perspective towards a social perspective due to the influences of international trends advocating 'inclusion' and a greater awareness of 'equality'. Documentary and
historical analysis revealed that the provision (e.g. the placement for SEN pupils; the way of dealing SEN pupils) of equality was changing over time. In the last two decades, the discourse of dealing with SEN pupils has shifted from segregation to inclusion; and the placement of SEN pupils has moved from the special schools to the mainstream schools. This discursive development not only influenced SEN policy and the provision for SEN pupils but also affected the way in which teachers were to deal with SEN pupils in PE in these two countries. Furthermore, interviews with teachers, LEA Advisors, LSAs and SEN pupils and observation of PE lessons revealed that teachers’ attempts at inclusion of SEN pupils was influenced by those factors which included support for them from in and outside schools, and their training relating to SEN pupils and PE. Accordingly, this sociological analysis on SEN policy and its implementation provides a different perspective on policy study for Taiwan for which there is little precedent. Perhaps, the major finding to emerge from this study is that teachers were attempting to put into practice the intentions of SEN policy-maters to include SEN pupils in PE. However, they had to convert current their respective National Curriculum into one for SEN pupils alongside able-bodied pupils. Teaching SEN pupils in PE, therefore, became a matter of recontextualizing a curriculum — the National Curriculum in England and the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan — intended for able-bodied pupils to meet the needs of SEN pupils and achieve ‘inclusion’. Most were unable to achieve this goal, through no fault of their own. Furthermore, it was found that, although teachers in Taiwan operated with an implicitly medical model of meeting SEN, they seemed more ‘able’ and creative in including SEN pupils in PE than teachers in England because they were less directly regulated by the National Curriculum text. Ironically, the absence of detail on teaching SEN pupils in PE had driven teachers in Taiwan to call on their own creative resources when dealing with the challenges of achieving an inclusive PE.
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Appendix A

An interview on policy implementation in PE for pupils with SEN (for teachers)

1. Initial teacher training and in-service training
   A. How long have you taught in this school?
   B. How did you get involved in teaching SEN?
   C. Have you received any training for dealing with special education needs? If so, when and where? (was this a focus on particular “disability”)
   D. Have you received any training for dealing with SEN in physical education?
   E. Does the local educational authority (LEA) provide in-service training for primary school teachers for inclusion in PE?
   F. Does your school or department provide training for SEN in PE? If so, do you think it is useful or not?
   G. Do you experience any problems teaching SEN in PE, if so, where do you look for help and how?
   H. Would you like to receive more training for SEN in PE, if so, what kind of training would you like to attend?
   I. Are there particular strategies that you or your school has to offer in teaching SEN?
   J. Have you had any long-term experience of involvement in sport or other activities? e.g. a member of squad or practice sport, dance or other physical activities outside school regularly.

2. Inclusion in PE
   A. What do you hope to achieve with pupils with SEN?
   B. Does the concept of inclusion influence your teaching?
   C. What does the concept mean to you?
   D. Do you think you achieve inclusion in PE classes?
   E. What does the concept of equality mean to you?
   F. If you are a teacher in a mainstream class (mainstreaming class in Taiwan), do you prepare the curriculum and assessment so that it includes students with SEN? Specifically, how do you prepare for PE lessons?
   G. Do you alter your teaching to include SEN pupils?
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H. Do you think that you have sufficient knowledge to deal with pupils with special education needs?
I. Do you feel you create an equal environment in PE for students with SEN?
J. Can teachers play a role in creating an inclusive environment for pupils with SEN in PE?
K. Do LEAs help teachers and schools create an inclusive educational environment? If so, how?

   A. Does the National Curriculum in England (the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan) help you provide equality for students with SEN?
   B. Are any handbooks or resources provided with the National Curriculum in England (the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan) to guide teachers on how to design curriculum in PE for students with SEN? If so, what are they? Are they sufficient to meet your needs? If not, what are your needs?
   C. Do you think the National Curriculum in England (the Grade 1-9 Curriculum Guidelines in Taiwan) and related provisions are creating a more equal PE environment for children with SEN? Why and How?
   D. How do you evaluate the performance of pupils with physical disability? Do you use the same criteria with other pupils? If not, how do you change the criteria under the National Curriculum? Can you give an example?

4. Parents
   A. Are parents involved in any of your curriculum planning for SEN?
   B. What do you think the role of parents should be in the PE of pupils with SEN?

5. Others
   A. Does any colleague (staff) assist you in PE lessons? If so, do you think his (her) assistant work? Specifically in which way? E.g. to collect teaching material, assistance in the process of PE lessons or other.
   B. What are the main challenges for you in dealing with SEN in PE?
   C. How would you like to see thing develop in the future for pupils with special educational needs?
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An interview on policy implementation in PE for pupils with SEN
(for parents)

Service from School and teachers (PE)
A. Do you receive information from the schools, e.g. about allocation of resources, name of teachers who are responsible to SEN and who are supporting colleagues?
B. Are you involved in classroom teaching for your children?
C. Do teachers accept welcome your involvement and your suggestions for his/her instruction?

Service from LEA
A. Do you know any supporting or service are provided by LEA for your children?
B. What the most needed service from LEA do you need?
Appendix C

An interview on policy implementation in PE for pupils with SEN
(for SEN pupils)

A. What kind of sport do you like? and Why?
B. Tell me about your PE lessons.
C. What do you feel in PE lessons?
D. What is the most interesting thing in your PE lessons?
E. Who are your best partners in PE lessons?
Appendix D

An interview on policy implementation in PE for pupils with SEN
(for the LEA Advisors)

A. How did you become an advisor for SEN?
B. How long have you been an advisor for SEN?

1. Inclusion in PE
   A. What does the concept of inclusion mean to you?
   B. How do you promote the idea of “inclusion” amongst schools and teachers?
   C. Do you think schools/teachers achieve inclusion in PE?
   D. Do you provide any in-service training for teachers relating to inclusion? If so, what kind of training do you provide? general knowledge of SEN or for specific subjects, like PE?
   E. What service do you provide if teachers experience problems of inclusion?
   F. How do you trace the progress of teachers/schools related to inclusion?

2. The National Curriculum
   A. Does the National Curriculum help to provide equality for pupils with SEN?
   B. What is your role relation to inclusion under the National Curriculum?
   C. Do you have a view on that schools or teachers have adequate resources for teaching SEN in PE?
   D. Are there the fixed budgets for mainstream schools to deal with SEN?
   E. How do you allocate budget to the primary schools for SEN?

3. Equality
   A. Do you think schools achieve equality for SEN pupils?
   B. What do you provide to teachers/schools to create an equal environment in PE for pupils with SEN?
   C. What is the process of statement? And how?
4. Parents
   A. What do you provide support or services to parents of all SEN pupils, and
      physical impairment pupils?
   B. How do parents obtain support when they need help to their SEN children?
   C. Do you offer parents instruction in inclusion?

5. Others
   A. Are there other institutes to become partners to assist schools deal with
      SEN?
   B. What do you think the most important issue or challenges facing schools
      and teachers in relation to SEN?
   C. Do you involve in PE relating SEN in primary schools?
   D. How does PE instruction of inclusion continue/connect from primary to
      secondary schools?