

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion within a mainstream primary school: a case-study

Thesis

How to cite:

Bower, Sarah (2006). Deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion within a mainstream primary school: a case-study. EdD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2006 The Author(s)

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

**Deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion
within a mainstream primary school: a
case-study.**

Sarah Bower M2761281
Doctorate in Education
Tutor: Dr Indra Sinka
June 2006

Abstract

The aims of the study are:

To research, and document, deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion, their perceptions of the way teachers view deafness, and to observe the effect of using sign language to educate the children within a mainstream setting.

This study has as its focus 5 deaf pupils who are part of a Hearing Impaired Unit of 20 deaf children within the Greenview mainstream primary school for 700 pupils. I focus on three research themes:

I Inclusion.

Firstly: how do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom?

Secondly: are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of their needs?

II Pedagogy.

Firstly: what educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work?

Secondly: how do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy?

III Communication.

How does the presence of a facilitator, and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation?

The philosophy influencing this study stems from a socio-constructivist perspective, and the three themes of inclusion, pedagogy and communication are revisited in each chapter. This study follows an ethnographic case study methodology, using an adaptation of Stake's (1995) 7 step methodology to address pupil issues, and Wood et al's (1986) Moves Matrix codes to analyse pupil/teacher dialogue. Within its framework, the study uses observation and interview techniques to gain insights, from the child's perspective, as to how one school's 'inclusive' policy is experienced in practice. The study reveals surprising observations, finding that, for example:

Within the theme of inclusion:

Deaf pupils felt they could flourish within a mainstream classroom provided their unique identity and language needs were recognised and valued. They felt comfortable with "deaf aware" mainstream teachers who improved acoustic conditions within the classroom, managed audio equipment to amplify speech and kept background noise low.

Within the theme of pedagogy:

Experienced "deaf aware" teachers actively planned lessons with specialist staff to use a range of strategies suitable for deaf children's learning. These experienced teachers adapted their communication strategies to use a more flexible approach to talking and listening.

Within the theme of communication:

BSL provides good language learning opportunities for the deaf pupils, but this is not always matched by the attitudes of mainstream staff. The mode of communication does not influence pupils as much as the strategy the teacher uses to introduce lessons. Deaf adults are necessary in the classroom to provide deaf children with mature BSL language experience and adult role models.

A summary emerges of the experiences of deaf pupils at Greenview, and the aspects of inclusion that they find most helpful to learning. Such a multi-faceted glimpse into the children's educational experience will be of interest to teachers, parents and all those involved in the disability/inclusion debate.

CONTENTS	
Abstract	ii
List of tables	vi
Chapter 1 –Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.2 Personal Background	3
1.2 Research Rationale	6
1.3 Aims and Objectives	7
1.4 Learning and Language	9
1.5 Methodology	10
1.6 Ethics	12
1.7 Concepts/definitions	13
1.8 Synopsis of thesis	14
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Inclusion	20
2.2.1 Pupils’ views on inclusion	20
2.2.2 Pupils’ views on deaf identity	26
2.3 Pedagogy	33
2.3.1 Pupils’ views of teacher facilitation of pupils	33
2.4 How teachers’ perception of deafness affects pedagogy	39
2.5 Communication	49
2.6 Summary	57
Chapter 3 – Methodology	61
3.1 Introduction	61
3.2 Ethnographic case study rationale	63
3.2.1 Pupils’ perspective	67
3.2.2 Etic and emic issues	68
3.2.3 Ethics	69
3.3 Setting	71
3.4 Participants	72
3.4.1 Pupils	72
3.4.2 Staff	73
3.5 Research procedure	74
3.5.1 Preparation and anticipation	74
3.5.2 Interview methodology	78
3.5.3 From emic issues to etic issues	86
3.6 Triangulation	88
3.6.1 Triangulation and assertion	90
3.6.2 Findings	93
3.7 Summary of Methodology	95

Chapter 4 – Analysis	
4.1 Introduction	97
[Inclusion:]	
4.2 Triangulation of data – research question 1	97
4.2.1 Pupils’ views on inclusion	97
4.2.2 Pupils’ views on acoustic conditions	98
4.2.3 Pupils’ views on deaf identity	100
4.2.4 Pupils’ views on peer group interaction	103
[Pedagogy:]	
4.3 Triangulation of data – research question 2	107
4.3.1 Pupils’ views of teacher facilitation	107
4.3.2 Pupils’ views of teacher moves and responses	108
[Communication:]	
4.4 Triangulation of data – research question 3	118
4.4.1 Pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators	118
4.4.1.1 Role of mainstream teacher	118
4.4.1.2 Role of Teacher of the Deaf	122
4.4.1.3 LSA role	124
4.4.2 Deaf awareness of staff and pupils	125
4.4.2.1 BSL	128
4.4.3 Deaf adults as role models	132
4.5 Summary	134
Chapter 5 – Discussion	
5.1 Introduction	136
5.2 Inclusion	138
5.2.1 Pupils’ views on inclusion	138
5.2.2 Acoustic conditions	140
5.2.3 Deaf Identity	141
5.2.4 Peer group interaction	145
5.2.5 Summary	147
5.3 Pedagogy	147
5.3.1 Pupils’ views of teacher facilitation	148
5.3.2 Pupils’ views of teachers’ moves...	153
5.3.3 Summary	155
5.4 Communication	156
5.4.1 Pupil perceptions of staff as facilitators	156
5.4.2.1 Mainstream staff	158
5.4.2.2 Teachers of the Deaf	161
5.4.2.3 LSAs	164
5.4.3 Deaf awareness	165
5.4.4 BSL	167
5.4.5 Deaf adults as role models	168
5.4.6 Summary	173

Chapter 6 Conclusion	
6.1 Introduction	174
6.2 Inclusion	176
6.2.1 Pupils' views on inclusion	176
6.2.2 Pupils' views on acoustic conditions	177
6.2.3 Pupils' views on deaf identity	178
6.2.4 Pupils' views on peer group interaction	178
6.3 Pedagogy	180
6.3.1 Pupils' views of teacher facilitation	180
6.3.2 Pupils' views of teachers' moves and responses	181
6.4 Communication	183
6.4.1 Pupil perceptions of using staff as facilitators	183
6.4.2 Role of M/S teacher	183
6.4.3 Role of teacher of the deaf	184
6.4.4 LSA role	184
6.4.5 Deaf awareness of staff and pupils	185
6.4.6 BSL	186
6.4.7 Deaf adults as role models	186
6.5 Recommendations	187
6.6 Influence of research on professional development	191
References	193
Glossary	208
Appendices	
A: Background of pupils	209
B: Staff interviewed: background experience	214
C: Research Timetables 1999 -2002	215
D: Interview questions: introductory questions for pupils	217
E: Interview questions: final questions for pupils	218
F: Interview questions: introductory questions for mainstream teachers	220
G: Interview questions: final questions for mainstream teachers	224
H: Completed mainstream teacher interview	225
I & J: Completed observation records	234/236
K 1-5 Tables of Analysis	239
K1: Sample of raw data collected	
K2: Analysis of raw data	243
K3: Analysis of coded observation	245
K4: Analysis of policy documents (coded)	248
K5: Analysis of policy documents (themed)	252
L: Greenview's Communication Policy	253
M: Issues for naturalistic generalisation	255
N: Examples of question and answer: classroom observation	256

Tables	
2.1 Maths age of deaf pupils	44
3.1 Pupils' backgrounds	73
3.2 Frequency of staff interviews	74
3.3 Research schedule 1999- 2000	74
3.4 Summary table of research techniques	76
3.5 Sample table of research findings	86
3.6 Summary of methodological instruments	89
3.7 Summary showing need for triangulation	91
3.8 Correspondence table: teacher elicitation	93
4.1 Coding categories teacher moves	111
4.2 Sample types: teacher moves/pupil response	111
4.3 Sample of coding type per lesson	112
4.4 Coding type per 10 lessons	114
4.5 How each strand of analysis relates to findings	135
5.1 Coding categories: levels of control	150

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Charlton points out in Davie and Galloway (1996):

The notion that children have rights is a relatively recent one, its emergence linked to a broader concern with human rights....

Ron Davie reflects the mood of the moment when he talks about this thinking as 'currently pushing at the frontiers of good practice in education ...'

(Charlton, 1993, in Davie and Galloway, 1996. p.52)

This thesis is about a group of deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion in a primary mainstream (M/S) school. The research was conducted at a time of widespread political and educational change through the evolvement of inclusion of children with a wide range of special educational needs in M/S schools. The historical background of this study is one of segregated education for deaf pupils, often within oralist traditions advocating the exclusion of sign language. Pupils within this study all use sign language as joint languages with English throughout their primary M/S schooling. It is often a language that they experience within an educational context rather than as a home language: for most of the children their home language was neither English nor British Sign Language (BSL). For backgrounds of the pupils see Appendix A. This seven year study with data collection over a three year period (1999 -2002) will be of interest to anyone involved with special educational needs (SEN) and inclusive education.

This chapter lays out the progression of the study with an introduction to the recent history of education of deaf children, and discusses the recent advent of inclusion in primary mainstream schools circa 1999-2002. It observes that era of context and considers what deaf pupils may have to offer if their perceptions are sought. At that time the issue of considering the pupils' voice to support revision of curriculum, policy or political planning at local education authority (LEA) and government level was a particularly rare thing. However, as this thesis shows and subsequent legislation

indicates, the child's voice is now at the heart of participation in service planning and service delivery: Cheminai 2005, Department for Education and Skills (DfES) 2001, DfES 2003, DfES (2004), DfES/OFSTED 2004.

This study researches three main themes (cf 1:3) concerning inclusion, i.e. Inclusion, Communication and Pedagogy. These themes were drawn up because of my own background as a Social Worker with the Deaf for fourteen years, as a signing Teacher of the Deaf (ToD) in mainstream classrooms for ten years, and also because of the educational and political climate current in 1999. At that time, I worked within a mainstream primary school called Greenview within the LEA borough of Greenwood (all names are pseudonyms to protect confidentiality). Greenview had 750 pupils, 20 of whom were classified as hearing impaired or deaf (see below). Within this thesis, Deaf with a capital 'D' indicates recognition of the Deaf as a cultural minority with its own language, BSL. The deaf pupils were part of the school and their mainstream class for the majority of their time, but for small group support especially literacy classes or 'social, emotional and health' teaching, tuition was carried out in a separate classroom, named 'the Unit' for hearing impaired pupils. The Unit was suitably acoustically treated: soft furnishing, acoustic tiles, thick carpet, curtains, insulated walls, furnished comfortably and colourfully, with 'state of the art' acoustic technology to provide specialist support. This represented a completely different environment to the aseptic, noisy, hard furnished, large, crowded, bare environment of the mainstream class.

All five deaf pupils in this study had severe to profound permanent hearing loss and stayed at the school for the full three years of data collection. All the pupils signed whilst they were at school, whether in lessons or at play. Only one of the children learnt sign language as her home language (cf Appendix A). All lessons were supported by a learning support assistant (LSA), otherwise known as a classroom assistant (CA) or ToD, to sign over the mainstream teacher's English delivery of the curriculum. It is the point of view of the deaf pupils that is sought within the research questions, as they examine their experiences within mainstream classes as part of life within a mainstream school for 700 pupils.

1.1.2 Personal Background

I have been involved in education with deaf children in mainstream schools since 1995. Prior to this date since 1984 I worked as a qualified social worker with the deaf, and used sign language for fourteen years in my work; assessing deaf children's emotional, physical and latterly educational needs. Since gaining my qualification as a teacher of the deaf, and an MA in education with the Open University, I have been fascinated with younger pupils, and the facilitation of their communication skills.

Within mainstream classes, I have taught alongside the mainstream teacher using sign language for the last 10 years. Outside the mainstream classroom, for unit lessons, I frequently withdraw the pupils in small groups to support their learning, using facilities either in the unit or wherever space permits. My willingness to use any means to share language grew out of a concern to meet their needs in whatever way I could. I wanted to discover what interested them, and to use my discoveries both in the way I communicated, and in the strategy I chose to teach new concepts. Communication in school is central to deaf pupils' cognitive and emotional development, and I know their own ability to communicate governs their perception of themselves and their world. How much the pupils could govern their own world within a model of inclusion remains to be seen here.

Social scientists who agree with scientific or positivistic methods of social research base their ideas on a philosophy that:

There is an external world, but (also) that the external world itself determines absolutely the one and only correct view that can be taken of it, independent of the processes or our circumstances of viewing (Kirk and Miller 1986, p.14, in Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995).

Hitchcock and Hughes (1995, p.24) firmly argue that to understand a complex situation, for example a teacher who is carrying out research in her own field must base her outlook on many factors within this multi-faceted context. In contrast, they argue that the application of ethnographic or naturalistic approaches constitutes the major alternative research tradition to positivist or post-positivist traditions. Ethnography within educational research, with its qualitative or naturalistic approach, recognises that what goes on within our schools and classrooms is made up of complex layers of

meanings, interpretations, values and attitudes. Qualification of actions, ideas, values and meanings through the eyes of participants rather than quantification through the eyes of an outside observer is the essence of a naturalistic paradigm (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995 p.26). Schools, classrooms and their participants have their own histories and experiences. Foucault (1977) offers a new way of understanding how deaf children, defined as having special educational needs (SEN) within the education system, undergo many experiences as part of institutional practices in terms of the way their deafness is construed. His main interest is in the way individuals are constructed as subjects, and subject to predictable experiences at the hands of professionals. Foucault analyses the techniques of power that operate within an institution and which simultaneously fix on the subject to create 'a whole domain of knowledge and a whole type of power' (1977, p.185).

All naturalistic enquiry seeks the qualification of actions, ideas, values and meanings through the eyes of participants in their own world rather than quantification through the eyes of an observer. This research seeks to carry out such enquiry through the case study approach. The idea of case study represents a commitment to the idea of inclusion, as well as a portrayal of the personal issues of the individual, a legitimate form of enquiry in itself (Walker, 1986, p.189-191). Part of this commitment involves understanding the perspectives of the deaf pupils amongst the voices of the hearing – pupils and professionals – and the more formal policy directive of managing special needs. The pupils' accounts are not essentialised and treated as indicative of how things really are, but are viewed as a complex power/knowledge knot (Foucault 1982) (cf 2.1). There is the assumption that reality is 'holistic, multi dimensional and ever-changing' (Merriam 1988, p.167). Changing attitudes in line with holistic, inclusive values are demonstrated by Mumba 2002, cf 2.2.

At the time of data collection (1999-2003), it was the policy of Local Education Authorities (LEA), subject to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES Green Paper (1998)), to include deaf pupils within a model of inclusion that was usual at that time. Subsequent government policy has further developed strategies for inclusion with policies such as the

government's strategy for SEN (DfES 2004) and the revised OFSTED inspection framework (DfES/OFSTED 2004) aligned to the Green Paper, (DfES 2003). This was designed to ensure the five outcomes of this government policy would meet the wider needs of children and young people. The outcomes to ensure the effectiveness of linked services include: being healthy, staying safe, enjoying and achieving; making a positive contribution and achieving economic wellbeing. As part of this recent development, children are able to make informed decisions about the support they need in the knowledge that schools will listen to them. This will result in personalised learning in schools through the pupils' participation. Further review at school level is met through OFSTED criteria for schools' self-evaluation of SEN and inclusion (DfES/OFSTED 2004). This latest development has broadened the outlook in which deaf pupils are valued within Local Authority (LEA) Inclusion policies. However, at the time of data collection (1999 -2003) curriculum support in the form of Learning Support Assistants (LSAs) was accessed via inclusion on a Special Educational Needs register (subject to the DfES 2001 Code of Practice) The practice of identifying the deaf child as having special educational needs by including them on a register is an example of the way in which Foucault (1977) illustrated how institutional practice constructs deafness as a disability, rather than a difference. This division in terms of identity and subsequent treatment may not be shared with other identities they may have, for example those members of the Deaf Community who see them as part of a cultural and linguistic minority. The historical oralist tradition in the education of deaf children may be at odds with the recognition of the present cultural community they may feel part of. It automatically channels their needs towards special needs education resources [teachers of the deaf who may have no recognition of the cultural world of deaf people and their sign language], rather than through deaf-signing adults who can provide the cultural and linguistic role models they need.

In the eyes of an educationalist, sign language provision may be adequately provided by a Learning Support Assistant (LSA), or mainstream (M/S) teacher, with only elementary training. From the pupils' point of view this does not admit them into the 'real world' of mature, natural sign language. There is a major difference between giving pupils appropriate experience,

and the expectations of the Local Education Authorities. In order to investigate the research questions (cf 1.3), this study looks at Unit Communication Policy, School Special Needs Policy and Local Authority Policy (such as those based on the DfES Revised Code of Practice (2001)) in a wider context, whilst researching and documenting deaf pupils' experiences of inclusion.

1.2 Research Rationale

As the RNID report (2001a) notes, there is an increasing trend towards the education of deaf pupils, including those with severe, and profound, hearing loss and some with additional difficulties, in mainstream schools.

In 1998, of 12,063 deaf pupils in England on whom information was returned:

- 5,821 were being educated in mainstream schools,
- 3,112 were being educated in resourced Units for deaf pupils in mainstream schools,
- 1,859 were being educated in special schools for deaf pupils,
- 1,271 were being educated in other types of special school including deaf/blind units in special schools (Eatough, 2000).

In the UK 75% of deaf pupils fall within the government's strategy for inclusion. In addition, 90% deaf pupils are born to hearing parents. For most deaf pupils, British Sign Language (BSL) is not their native language, while access to deaf culture, and to the deaf community, is similarly restricted. Since the 2001 revised Code of Practice (DfES 2001) outlined guidelines for the 'best practice' in carrying out school responsibilities for pupils with special educational needs, there has been an increase towards introducing a bilingual mainstream setting for deaf pupils.

Pupils are social beings in schools, where group life dominates and takes on great importance. Interaction with others is a driving force in learning and development. For many deaf pupils, for whom signing is their primary language, the contexts of schooling, and the people they interact with,

including deaf and hearing peers, teachers and facilitators, play a crucial role in their lives, and in shaping their identities. Within this thesis, the use of the term 'facilitator' is used interchangeably with the term ToD or LSA, whichever professional is working alongside the mainstream teacher and the deaf pupils to facilitate their learning or support their integration into the mainstream class.

Evidence by Davie and Galloway (1996), Powers *et al* (1999), RNID (2002), Lynas (2002): points to strategies the mainstream teachers can initiate to help deaf pupils in a class, for example, by modifying the teaching approach used, or by changing the teaching context. Another way to respond could be to help the pupil do things differently, or by seeking further advice from colleagues or specialists. The teacher of the deaf should emphasise positive messages, review teaching styles, make clear presentations, consider listening conditions, and review the differentiation of the curriculum, with the needs of deaf pupils in mind. This may also have the effect of improving learning conditions for all other pupils in mainstream schools.

The experience of the pupil is likely to reflect many features of the education system: cultural and social influences impacting on the pupils, environmental factors, pedagogical beliefs and practices from teachers, influences from historical aspects of the education of deaf pupils, and policy initiatives from the government and LEAs. The pupils' view is a personal reflection of a multi-faceted system. Few researchers have asked pupils for their point of view, or for their experiences of being educated in a mainstream setting. Those that have recently, include: Allan (1999), Davie and Galloway (1996), Dyson and Millward (2000), Moore (2000), Collins *et al* (2000); this is especially important in the complex situations these pupils experience (see Power *et al.* 1999, RNID 2001a, RNID 2002).

1.3 Aims and Objectives

This study aims to reflect on which teaching strategies elicit the best response from the pupil, from the pupil's point of view. Although this research aims to take a snapshot of the deaf pupil's experience, there are many factors which are expected to have a bearing.

Since provision by DfES (2001) SEN Code of Practice, more recent changes in legislation DfES (2003), DfES (2004), DfES/OFSTED (2004), have more clearly illuminated the research themes and sub-themes. To this end it was extremely pertinent to use the theme of inclusion as a tool with which to draw out the personal experience of pupils. I had always been fascinated since previous study (Open University course D102)) with Wood *et als* (1986) remarkable work with deaf children: observing and monitoring pupil/teacher dialogue. To that end I felt it appropriate to focus on teacher approach towards deaf children within classrooms and observe using Wood *et al's* technique in addition to my case study approach. This second theme was called Pedagogy. Finally, my long immersion in M/S classrooms using sign language had led me to question how and why this worked in helping deaf children, and so developed research theme and sub-themes around Communication. The themes cover the following areas:

I: Inclusion. The pupils' experience of inclusion at a mainstream school is the critical aspect here, which includes the pupils' views on acoustic conditions in the classes, their ideas about their own deafness, their views on inclusion, working with hearing children, and their views of mainstream teachers regarding inclusion.

II: Pedagogy. This aspect focuses on the pupils' perception of the way their teachers view their deafness, the pupils' view of the teachers' approaches to inclusion, how the pupils see the consistency of approach teachers use, quality of interactive lessons, and whether the pupils are involved in the planning of their educational provision.

III: Communication. The pupils' experience of learning whilst using a signed approach is the critical aspect focussed on here and the pupils' view of the facilitator's participation in the classroom (as to how this facilitates their learning). It also focuses on pupils' views of roles of specialist staff including teachers of the deaf and support staff. These themes were then developed into questions:

Research Questions

I: Inclusion

How do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom? Sub-themes: pupils' views on inclusion, acoustic conditions.

Are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of their needs? Sub-themes: pupils views on deaf identity, peer group interaction.

II: Pedagogy

What educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work? Sub-themes: Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils.

How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy? Sub-themes: Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses.

III: Communication

How does the presence of a facilitator, and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation? Sub-themes: Pupils perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators, M/S, ToD, LSA roles; deaf awareness of staff and pupils; deaf adults as role models.

1.4 Learning and Language

The use of language within learning is a central theme in this study. It has a pivotal role in social constructivist learning theory, the main theoretical influence on this research. The influence of language, and discussion, is paramount to 'making sense' of new materials, and to understanding each new area taught. Teachers make use of a considerable variety of strategies to give pupils new understanding. This does not always help deaf pupils who need structured opportunities to share in whole-class discussions. Language is the medium of thinking and learning, and is created, transmitted and sustained through interaction with other people within the cultures of different social settings. Deaf pupils may need considerable signed support if their main language is British Sign Language (BSL) and through the use of BSL they are to work these situations to their advantage.

The desirability of placing deaf pupils in mainstream schools makes it imperative to examine everyday practices and language use in these settings from the pupil's point of view. There is very little information available on linguistic and social contexts as seen by the deaf pupils themselves. Deaf pupils, like any other pupils, have developmental needs which are embedded in social contexts. They need opportunities to use language to engage with others: with other pupils and adults who can share the language

and make the world intelligible. As language is the medium that structures teaching and learning, then language use is a reasonable place to investigate the sources of problems and successes in deaf pupils' schooling.

In addition, Webster and Webster (1994) point out that M/S teachers need support from specialist teachers to encourage understanding of the fact that:

...the same issues of control, use of questions, repair, personal contributions, and the deliberate teaching of language out of context, are just as important where signing is used.

(Webster and Webster, 1994, p.37)

Questions about the contexts of deaf education emphasise interaction through language. Two related ideas inform this thinking. Firstly, language is a complex abstract system of utterances, forms, rules and functions that have shared meaning. Secondly, pupils cannot and do not develop this complex system completely on their own. They need access to other pupils and adults who know how to use the language conventionally so as to foster their own innate potential for linguistic competence. As deaf pupils communicate with those around them, processes of language acquisition unfold and pupils come to understand and participate in the social world they inhabit with others.

1.5 Methodology

From the start of plans for researching this area, I realised the discussion and findings would cover a number of different aspects of influence, both social and environmental, within a pupil's experience of learning. Assumptions in my methodological framework were compared with McCall's simple model of qualitative case study methodological research (Grieg and Taylor, 1999 p.44). This was done to compare empirical and theoretic levels with my own assumptions. It was felt appropriate to use their approach as a model in which to explore the quality of the relationship between a teacher and her pupil. Certainly Grieg and Taylor's approach used an overall holistic framework which influenced my aims of reflecting data of pupils' life experiences. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) approach illustrated case study samples of data, which guided my practical steps of

initiating an ethnographic approach for school based research opportunities. This entailed a focus on classroom processes according to the experience of the pupil (cf research questions 1.3) (Lutz 1981: 51-64). Socio-constructivist theory is guided by concepts of learning within a social context, especially with a view to the experience of meaningful activity the individual construes within collaborative groups (Vygotsky, 1981, p.163).

The term ethnographic case study is used to apply to this research since the ethnographic concerns with sociocultural context, time and space are crucial:

More than an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a social unit or phenomenon. It is a sociocultural analysis of the unit of study. Concern with the cultural context is what sets this type of study apart (Merriam 1988, p.23).

How I investigated the research questions is established within the Methodology chapter 3. At the level of interpreting the research, there is the qualitative aim of discovering pupils' experience, as:

The participant has his own tacit and declared understandings, the researcher has his own perspectives and interpretations. The relationship is also mediated at cultural level by conventional meaning systems and power relations which are interpreted within social and institutional contexts (Grieg and Taylor, 1999. p.45).

The philosophy influencing this study stems from a socio-constructivist perspective, and the three themes of inclusion, pedagogy and communication are revisited in each chapter. Different aspects of my questions were investigated, in a spiral of understanding (Nias, 1993), or, what I refer to later as a spiral of awareness. This study follows an ethnographic case study methodology, and within its framework I formulated a 'Five Step Framework' (adapted from Stake 1995) to carry out research, sequencing the aspects of research and using the methodologies outlined above. This process started with observation and transcription, and included: interviewing, documentary research, reflexive analysis, triangulation of data, refocusing of research

questions, synthesis of emerging sub-themes. From this complexity of data, 'grounded theory emerged (Glaser and Strauss 1967, Burgess 1982). Grounded theory within this thesis is defined the production of analysis and explanation which is grounded in data the researcher collects, since it requires the researcher to move consciously backwards and forwards between the data and the emerging explanations, analyses and, eventual theory. At this point light was thrown on the local and particular as well as on the wider context in which the children learn. This stage was compared with naturalistic generalisation and interpretation, in line with Stake's (1995) case study methodology. A summary emerges of the kinds of experiences deaf children at Greenview have had as an outcome of the way educationalists have viewed their situation. This reflects social, cultural, environmental, political, historical and educational views. Such a multi-faceted glimpse into the children's educational experience will be of interest to teachers, parents and all those involved in the disability/inclusion debate.

1.6 Ethics

For a full explanation of safeguards explored see ethical code employed of 3.2. As a researcher/teacher one of the ways to ensure I had considered all the ethical implications was to identify all those involved in the study including those not directly being studied (e.g. other pupils) and go through each principle of BERA (2004) to ensure that as much as possible, each ethical risk has been identified. My tutor/supervisor helped with her expertise in this situation. This assisted in my reaching a clear viewpoint of some of the complexities of my research subjects, in particular:

The fact that children understand the world differently at different ages, and that ways of assessing and exploring their knowledge must take account of this (cf 2.4, 2.5). Also that deaf children's learning, understanding and thinking is influenced by environmental conditions, social relationships and cultural conventions (cf 2.4). Finally that their individual abilities are reflected within an area of potential development extended by those around them e.g. *their learning takes place within a social context* (adapted from Grieg and Taylor 1999, p.31). This final implication was to have links throughout my research (cf 5.4).

1.7 Concepts/Definitions

Inclusion

Inclusive education is about responding to diversity, it is about listening to unfamiliar voices, being open, empowering all members and about celebrating 'difference' in dignified ways. From this perspective, the goal is not to leave anyone out of school.

(Barton, 1997. p.223)

Within the context of education using sign language, successful inclusion of deaf pupils depends on careful and effective liaison between the key players: mainstream teachers, specialist teachers of the deaf, and learning support assistants. A great deal of planning, careful collaboration between support staff, mainstream teachers and parents, discussion of appropriate curriculum options, and evaluation of pupils' progress over time is required for integrated placements to work successfully. As one school commented regarding needs:

- more INSET time
- more help for children with SEN
- help for specific learning difficulties children
- how to manage children with behaviour problems
- appropriate syllabus
- differentiating materials

(Dyson and Millward, 2000, p.70)

The ToDs remit involves a great deal of research, before the lesson begins, on the pupils' understanding of concepts. This is done in many different ways: through examples of the pupil's own life experiences if available, through knowing their reading and spelling ages and providing appropriate literature, through asking parents about the pupil's experiences at home, and asking the pupils to bring in artefacts and resources. Similarly, the deaf pupil needs additional visual resources, or practical examples, to show the meaning of new vocabulary being introduced. The ToD would need to design many new resources and use real-life illustrations for the pupils to understand even seemingly ordinary vocabulary.

The aim of 'inclusion' is now at the heart of both education and social policy (Mittler, 2000. p.2).

The words 'inclusion' and 'inclusive schools' permeates through the ethos of the new Index for Inclusion (Ainscow *et al.* 2000), as in the literature review. But the focus of this research is concerned to reflect what happens in practice. What does this mean for the deaf pupils' quality of learning, against the 'raising standards' agenda so often present in whole-school reviews? As the National Curriculum Handbook (QCA 2000) states, the inclusion of an increasingly diverse range of pupils within a school flags the expectation for an increasingly diverse differentiation of teaching within lessons:

Schools have a responsibility to provide a broad and balanced curriculum for all pupils.

The three principles for inclusion are:

- a) Setting suitable learning challenges
- b) Responding to pupils' diverse learning needs
- c) Overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individuals and groups of pupils.

(The National Curriculum Handbook Excellence in Schools QCA, 2000, p.20)

From the deaf pupil's point of view, there has been a shift of thinking within the historical context of education of the deaf from oralism, and segregation of deaf pupils in residential schools, to the present inclusive context of deaf pupils being included and taught, with the assistance of sign language, in mainstream classes. Are we looking at a process that is moving to a goal [of inclusion] or the struggle of an unworkable/poor teaching initiative? Are there conflicting ideologies and practices the pupil is subjected to? Regardless of 'achievability', what educational strategies are in place to make it work? What is the point of view of the pupil in experiencing the outcome between the political and educational context to the reality of practice in the school?

1.8 Synopsis of thesis

Chapter 1 Introduction gives the background to the study, provides the research rationale and the aims and objectives of the thesis. Key sub-themes in chapter 1): The contextual background of the study and personal

background behind the research. This is followed by the aims of the study, research questions and sub themes. A brief resume of main issues follow on from these themes including: language and learning, BSL, methodology, ethics, and definition of main themes: (Inclusion, Pedagogy and Communication). The chapter ends with a synopsis of the thesis.

Chapter 2 Literature Review introduces current literature relating to research questions, key themes and sub-themes of 1.3. This chapter provides a further overview into research giving a brief background to a social-constructivist perspective, insights from literature already viewing the “insiders” or pupils’ voice in education, a historical glimpse into the background of deaf pupils’ education, the deaf pupils’ perceptions of themselves, and pedagogic strategy recommended by special needs advisory educationalists when including deaf children into mainstream classes.

Chapter 3 Methodology introduces the background, and the rationale for choosing an ethnographic case study approach, detailing my research procedure and interview methodology appropriate for the research aims. A five step framework of investigation is introduced (adopted from Stake, 1995), and for research questions 1), and 3) Stake’s descriptors are used in order to evaluate raw data from policy documents, observations and interviews or ‘ideas catalogs’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1990, p.50). Wood et al’s (1986) Moves Matrix methodology is used in research question 2), in order to evaluate teacher/deaf pupil dialogue/pedagogical approach within lessons. The first four steps of the overall five step methodology of this thesis are discussed in Chapter 3. Step four forms part of the analysis of emic (Stake 1995) data, and Wood et al (1986) Moves Matrix data are analysed. Validation/triangulation and findings or ‘naturalistic generalisation’ (Stake, 1995) are considered.

Chapter 4 Step 5, discusses the implications of the research findings over the three overarching research themes, research questions, and sub-themes presented earlier in the thesis. **Chapter 5, Discussion**, includes a discussion of sub-themes and overall outcome of data from policy documents, observations and interviews. **Chapter 6, Conclusion** summarises the findings, in the categories Inclusion, Pedagogy and Communication, with reference back to the research questions and aims. It finishes with a personal reflection of how this research work has influenced my professional practice.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter lays out a critical examination of the three over-arching themes of inclusion, pedagogy and communication and supporting sub-themes within this thesis from a review of the current literature. It explores pupils' voices in literature within the theme of inclusion, focuses on recent legislation and how this has affected the way deaf children are seen by the education system. A section of the chapter considers the history of education for the deaf and current attitudes towards signing from the non-deaf and the deaf culture in the mainstream classroom. Further review looks at research to analyse teacher-pupil pedagogy (teacher approach to teaching) and more specifically the analysis of teacher-pupil dialogue. This chapter ends by appraising the current climate of inclusion via recent national legislation.

Within the context of 1999 – 2002, as part of the research questions (cf 1.3) deaf pupils are seen as participants in a wider educational context: participants as subjects within a classroom, subjects of the teacher's control and knowledge, and subjects tied to their own identity by their self-knowledge: 'These meanings suggest a power/knowledge [knot] which subjugates and makes subject to' (Foucault 1982, p.212). In addition to this experience, pupils' experience of inclusion is centred around the facilitation of inclusion through language sharing. However it is the differentiation and judgement (Foucault, 1977) of children with special educational needs which defines their context and enables progressive stages of curricular integration, latterly a process called inclusion (Allan 1999, p.23). Recently, the DfES (2004) publication has clarified the government's position with a view to further training and support for teachers so that SEN structures can be immersed in all classrooms (Soan, 2005). This is intended to encapsulate many professionals working together to support a child's life: many different aspects under one umbrella. Consequently many professionals may now work together with the child's needs at the centre of all discussions.

As described in the Introduction (cf 1.1), during the time of data collection, deaf pupils were subject to education within the philosophy of the DfES (2001) Code of Practice. At the time, the difference in deaf children's language needs (compared to hearing children's language needs) were seen within a disability model of reference rather than from a point of view of difference (Foucault, 1977: cf 1.1). Foucault (1977) offers a new way of understanding how deaf children, undergo complex experiences as part of education practices that define the way their special needs are construed. His main interest is in the way individuals are constructed as subjects, knowable through disciplines and discourses. Foucault analyses the techniques of power that operate within an institution and which simultaneously fix on the subject to create 'a whole domain of knowledge and a whole type of power' (1977, p.185). The facilitation of inclusion resulted from the children's language needs separating them as pupils, rather than valuing them as 'whole children'.

Legislation, such as DfES (2003) Green Paper, identified all children as having their own point of view, individual needs, and an identity as valued pupils. The pupils' own views are now very much taken into consideration when planning their educational provision. Such an emphasis on listening to children in education has not really come into play until the last few years (subsequent to data collection 1999-2002) with studies focussing on self advocacy, and the right of children to influence their own provision and recent legislation: DfES 2003, DfES 2004. This legislation heralded a subsequent change in philosophy as pupils' voices were sought: Allan 1999, RNID 2001a, 2002, Lynas 2002.

This image of learning as a collaboration draws on theories provided by socio-constructivist models, such as Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1985). It is important that deaf pupils approach learning in more flexible ways so that they may relate topics to their own way of learning. Frequently this involves visual or multi-sensory experiences. In relating new ideas to their present experience, the pupil's learning is not driven entirely by the National Curriculum. In fact the Dearing Report (1994) calls for the curriculum to be more flexible and less prescriptive for pupils with individual needs, so that teachers can tailor the curriculum in line with pupils' abilities and

requirements. As part of this, the assessment cycle is vital to understanding pupil's strengths and weaknesses, with due regard being paid to the individual's needs and circumstances.

A second practical implication for this research is to understand that pupils are at a different stage in thinking from adults. The early years of a pupil's life are critical to the development of language and communication. There are qualitative differences in the way pupils of different ages understand the world around them. Wood (1988) argues that language learning in the school years may be a source of problems, misunderstandings and failure to learn, not because the pupil lacks conceptual learning, but because they may lack the appropriate social conventions, i.e. they do not know how to get their message across (Wood, 1988).

Language and cognition are fused in verbal reasoning. Comprehension problems, which arise because pupils have yet to master specific features of language use and structure, act as a barrier to learning and understanding. Lacking expertise in the processes of creating coherent, 'disembedded' or 'decontextualised' accounts of what they know and understand, pupils may appear intellectually incompetent when, in reality, they are still grappling with the problem of making sense to other people. This process takes time and creates many challenges for both pupils and teachers (Wood, 1988. p.146).

In understanding how deaf pupils need their lessons decontextualised so that they relate to the topic, Hoiting and Loncke (1990) claim that models of language in deaf education have, so far, failed to take account of the following points:

- Deaf pupils are exposed to two or more languages;
- There are two major modalities activated in language acquisition;
- Deaf pupils' experiences of language are typically atypical;

- The languages and modalities have to be organised cognitively in an (as yet) unspecified relationship. (Hoiting and Loncke, 1990, in Kyle, 1994, p.5)

In other words, a great deal of thinking and joint planning with specialists is necessary so that the language used in lessons will be understood by all pupils, not just the hearing ones. The third implication for understanding pupils' learning comes from Grieg and Taylor's (1999) comment that:

The pupil's learning is influenced by environmental conditions, social relationships and cultural conventions. It is important to find out where the pupil is at in terms of experience as well as qualitative differences which are experienced within approximate age groups. (Grieg and Taylor, 1999, p.31)

To gain an understanding of the pupil's perspective, and assess teacher/pupil interaction, normal classroom interactions will be observed in this study, as a way of noting levels, and differences, in understanding, and identifying, social factors and friendships. As deaf pupils communicate with those around them, processes of language acquisition unfold and pupils come to understand, and participate, in the social world they inhabit with others. Two related ideas inform this thinking. Firstly, language is a complex abstract system of utterances, forms, rules and functions that have shared meaning. Secondly, pupils cannot, and do not, develop this complex system completely on their own. They need access to other pupils and adults who know how to use the language conventionally towards fostering their own innate potential for linguistic competence. The use of sign language for deaf pupils' education points to a number of factors where they have significant minority language, and cultural needs, which have hitherto been ignored, or actively discouraged. The question arises as to whether hearing people, who are new to this culture, can provide sufficient depth of linguistic interpretation, or cultural understanding. The oralist legacy of deaf education, and lack of current access for deaf adults to become teachers, introduces an area of social difference, rather than disability, which begs the question, do the deaf have additional, and different needs of identity not shared by other types of disability?

Recent ideas by Lynas (2002) advocate that the previous medical model, instead of reinforcing the idea of deficit within the child (Ainscow, 1999) should now be realigned to a social model according to inclusive educators, that seeks to rethink and challenge the whole school's teaching and learning environment to allow for young learners to feel accommodated. Publications such as the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth, Ainscow, Black-Hawkins, Vaughan and Shaw 2000) offer detailed guidelines on developing inclusive practice towards creating 'inclusive cultures' (Lynas 2002).

The research questions (cf 1.3) are now dealt with in turn within the literature review, and, subsequently, inform the research rationale.

2.2 Inclusion

2.2.1 Pupils' views on inclusion

To understand pupils' experience of inclusion at a mainstream school it is necessary to first paint a broader picture of the background to inclusion, and to consider pupils' views on deafness, on inclusion and on the roles of mainstream teachers, teachers of the deaf and support staff. At the time of data collection (1999-2002), the government's strategy for SEN was in its infancy, current thinking (2002) was yet to demonstrate that:

All children have the right to a good education and the opportunity to fulfil their potential. All teachers should expect to teach children with special educational needs and all schools should play their part in educating children from the local community whatever their background or ability (DfES 2004).

The ethos of the Green Paper (DfES 2003) supports strongly the idea of pupil performance and wellbeing. Schools are encouraged to extend their services, and build stronger relationships with parents and the wider community. Children with additional needs are to be identified earlier and supported effectively. Inclusive, innovative SEN classroom practice is expected in terms of enhancing pupils' wellbeing through government initiatives as promoted in DfES/OFSTED 2004 schools' self evaluation policy. At the time of data collection (1999 -2002) current ethos was upheld by new debate about approaches to inclusion:

Inclusion is '*the keystone*' of Government education policy (DfES, 1998).

In the Programme for Action (DfES, 1998), the government stated its intention to promote inclusion and defines inclusion as follows:

Inclusion is a process, not a fixed state. The term can be used to mean many things including the placement of pupils within S.E.N. in the mainstream school; the participation of all pupils in the curriculum and social life of mainstream schools; the participation of all pupils in learning which leads to the highest possible level of achievement; and the participation of young people in the full range of social experiences and opportunities once they have left school. For most children placement in a mainstream school leads naturally on to the other forms of inclusion. Thus for the great majority of children with S.E.N., there is never any need to consider provision outside the mainstream. (DfES, 1998)

Barton and Corbett (1993. p17) use the phrase '*dangerous complacency*' into which the '*new educational orthodoxy*' (Oliver, 1992 p.23) has lapsed. Other writers, (Uditsky, 1993; Barton, 1997), comprehensively analyse the shift from integration to inclusion, but Allan (1999) points out *it is important to 'highlight the different way of speaking about pupils with special needs which inclusion signals'* (Allan, 1999 p.140).

Indeed, some needs-based concepts of inclusion are opposed to other ideals of inclusion. Slee (1993) argues that schools have failed to alter their culture and practices towards increasing pupil participation and removing exclusionary pressures, suggesting that:

Inclusion, a euphemism for containment and assimilation, ignores the need for deconstruction and recognition across a range of boundaries.

(Slee, 1993. p.111)

As Allan (1999) comments, research on inclusion requires significant epistemological shifts to understand pupils' experiences as partial, or fragmented, and to challenge the foundational basis of special education.

A new social and political context of integration (Allan, 1999) emerged as the significant construct following the Warnock report (DES, 1978), as commented on by Gipps, Gross and Goldstein (1987), Wedell (1990), Visser (1993). Hinson considers the report brought *'beneficial consequences'*, claiming that the *'cause of special education advanced steadily in the 1980s'* (Hinson, 1991. p.12). Fish points to: *'profound changes in thinking and practice'* (Fish, 1990. p.219), and reflects on the importance of the Warnock report (DES 1978) in reversing a trend, in the sense that special education was considered optimal. Warnock, he argues, was salutary in forcing the trend 'inward' and encouraging ordinary schools to meet special needs, although he argues, that:

Limitations of all kinds placed on school, together with increased expectations, may be expected to reverse the trend again... to an outward movement of children from primary and secondary schools. (Fish, 1990. p.226-7)

The Warnock report (1978) was instrumental in reversing thinking from an exclusive strategy in which special education was seen as optimum to the desirability of ordinary schools meeting special needs. The 'inward' trend, which Warnock began, sets a context in which inclusive education could develop. The movement towards inclusive education provoked a debate as to whether this was achievable. Wedell argues that legislative and policy changes, such as the 1988 Education Act in England and Wales, interrupted progress in understanding 'needs' and making provision, casting *'a pall of doubt... as to whether the advances which have been achieved can be maintained, let alone furthered'* (Wedell, 1990. p.17).

Other writers, analysing the failure of schools to reach the Warnock ideals, focus on technical or administrative problems arising from a lack of resources (Fletcher-Campbell with Hall, 1993, Lunt and Evans, 1994); the singular or collective inadequacies of teachers (Hegarty, 1982; Galloway and Goodwin, 1987), a failure to adopt the 'whole-school approach' (Clark

et al. 1997. p.34), or a lack of commitment to integration (Booth, 1988). These criticisms remained and transferred to later initiatives in the development of inclusive education.

Integration which developed between 1978 and 1997 did so in a somewhat *ad hoc* manner (Dyson and Millward, 2000). Although the 1981 Education Act was an enabling piece of legislation, in terms of integration, the government essentially left the matter of placement to the Local Education Authorities (LEAs). Jones (1998) comments on how some LEAs enthusiastically embraced integration, whilst others retained segregated infrastructures. As Swann (1992) comments, the 1981 Act produced no great effect towards a fully integrated system. The 1997 Green Paper marked an important change in direction, not only with its explicit dissatisfaction with the *status quo*, but also with the view that inclusion should directly concern the central government (Dyson and Millward, 2000). The impact is noted of its explicit alignment with international policy trends in special education.

The Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) to which the Green Paper refers, was formulated three years earlier by delegates from 92 governments and 25 international organisations, and committed the international community to the development of inclusive schools (Dyson and Millward, 2000). This called on the special needs community in England to embrace inclusion as the 'norm', a term still largely unfamiliar to teachers and other members of the special needs community:

Regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building on an inclusive society and achieving education for all; moreover they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost effectiveness of the entire education system.

(CSIE, 1996. p.8)

Booth (1988, p98) makes it clear that inclusion involves two processes:

Firstly increasing pupils' participation within the cultures, and curricula, of mainstream schools, and secondly decreasing exclusionary pressures. Allan (1999) points out that this process requires schools to alter their ethos, and practices, to ensure all pupils are included as a right. It also implies there is no new binarism, 'the included child', as all are included. Recently, Spencer (2006) points out that the overall aims within inclusion should be for pupils to develop their own unique talents and to take charge of their learning:

It is rewarding to observe pupils develop increasing confidence and independence and direct their support network as they wish as they enter the next phase of their education (Spencer 2006).

Within the current context [data collection 1999-2003, but for update see 2.2] many parallel sub-themes emerge. Central to the context of inclusive education, the recognition of the individual's experience makes a powerful contribution to the social construct of inclusive communities and an inclusive society. Inclusive education is concerned with human rights in relation to access to, and participation in, appropriate mainstream community-based education, and an equal opportunity to engage in life-long learning and employment opportunities.

Other theorists comment that there are no fixed definitions, but the concept is confused with social integration, and special needs, models. Commentators, such as Powers (1996, p.68), point out that the term is best '*used to describe an attitude rather than an educational placement*'.

Dyson and Millward (2000) consider the adoption of an international declaration (UNESCO Salamanca Statement, 1994) into government policy (Green Paper, 1997) should make us cautious about understanding the term 'inclusion' in an England context. Superficially, the understanding of the term is fairly straightforward. But Booth points out that '*the apparently simple concept of inclusion is both slippery and highly context specific*' (Booth, 1996). Dyson and Millward point out that the Salamanca Statement reflects the fact that 92 of the participating governments came from relatively poor countries, concerned with providing basic education to a wide range of marginalised groups, such as street children, working

children, and children from ethnic minorities (Dyson and Millward, 2000). This contrasts with the picture in England of the transfer of children with special needs from special to mainstream schools in relatively-well resourced, and sophisticated, education systems.

Mittler describes *inclusion as a process*, which

... involves a ... reform and restructuring of the school as a whole, with the aim of ensuring that all pupils can have access to the whole range of educational and social opportunities offered by the school. This includes the curriculum, the assessment, recording and reporting of pupils' achievements, the decisions that are taken on the grouping of pupils within schools or classrooms, pedagogy and classroom practice, sport and leisure and recreational opportunities. (Mittler, 2000. p.2)

The aim of such reform is to ensure access to, and participation in, the full range of opportunities provided by a school to its pupils. Such a policy is designed to benefit all pupils, including those from ethnic or linguistic backgrounds, those with disabilities or learning difficulties, and children who are frequently absent or at risk from exclusion. The revised National Curriculum, Department of Education and Science (DES 1995), incorporates the concept of inclusion as a fundamental principle, intended to make its framework genuinely more accessible to a wider range of pupils (Mittler, 2000). The adult disability world, which has, traditionally, focussed on adults, has now turned its attention to children, with demands for inclusive schools in some countries. In the UK, the British Council of Organisations of Disabled People (BCODP) is working with other organisations to phase out special schools – a more radical model of inclusion than that favoured by the government (Campbell and Oliver, 1996).

Mittler (2000) describes how the disability movement has been transformed from *'the integration debate'* of special schools versus mainstream education. The trend has moved on and current research does not summarise the history of social models in debating the value of inclusion. They focus instead on summarising research on effective practice and raise questions

about how mainstream schools can meet the full range of needs. Since my original data collection (1999-2002) current thinking suggests that specialist teachers could contribute to the collaborative cultures between staff, governors, students and parents in schools (Lynas 2002). Recently, the government has made it clear that it will not update or legalise the SEN Code of Practice (2001) but under guidance from *Removing barriers to achievement* (DfES 2004), an ambitious programme is set out through action at local and national level 'to build the skills and capacity of schools to meet all but the most complex and severe of needs' (Soan, 2005, p.24).

Expectations have a marked influence. One factor emerging as having the greatest impact on effective inclusive education for all pupils with learning difficulties, or disabilities, is the expectation of staff, parents and pupils themselves. Lipsky and Gartner (1999) identify factors which show how staff in both mainstream and special schools can set an example through key aspects in their own behaviour, through their expectations, positive use of language (rather than disabling, patronising or infantilising), flexibility and adaptability in overcoming barriers as they arise.

The RNID comments:

Effective liaison presupposes a clear understanding of the role of the diverse professional agencies involved in the support of a deaf pupil in mainstream school. In particular the scope of intervention by specialist staff within mainstream classes needs to be clearly understood and agreed with mainstream colleagues.

(RNID, 2001b, p.7)

The implication here may be that deaf pupils are a unique group in terms of their needs. Whether the pupils themselves perceive themselves as unique as a group in their identity will be investigated as part of my research questions.

2.2.2 Pupils' views on deaf identity

From the perspective of those deaf pupils who feel they have a separate culture with its own sign language and (from their perspective) no communication deficit, the question needs to be addressed of whether

disability groups feel their identities have been eroded. Previously marginalised, now the Deaf rights movement argues strongly for minority interests to be represented. What are the views of deaf voices speaking for or against mainstreaming? As part of inclusion the cultural view of the Deaf community is important, and could make a valuable contribution to education offered to deaf pupils about their world. Deaf adults may feel their views need to be considered within the deaf pupil's educational setting, and some may feel deprived at being unable to be teachers of deaf pupils themselves. One needs to consider whether the pupils' environment is a good reflection of the Deaf community. Is the sign language used in the classroom a reflection of the Deaf community? This has clear implications for the methodology and the research questions.

The Deaf community will undoubtedly benefit from hearing pupils learning sign language at an early age - it will provide balance in an unbalanced society - but sign language has also much to offer hearing pupils in their perception of the world and their feelings of competence and contribution. And what better way to enhance a hearing pupil's understanding of language than by seeing it work (enacted before you) and by making it work (i.e. by physically participating). En route, their understanding of language as a means of communication is broadened, receptive and expressive are developed and concepts are clarified and their meaning transferred between languages (Robinson, 1997, p.43).

From a deaf cultural perspective, disability groups, such as the Deaf Ex-Mainstreamers' Group (DEX1997), have drawn attention to the fact that a consequence of inclusive education is that individual sub-cultural identities may be eroded. The formation of these identities has been crucial in the history of disability activism and, ironically, a driving force behind inclusive education. However, this is not necessarily the case for members of the Deaf community, who have reacted vociferously to changes in provision.

In 1995, 93.7% of deaf children were in mainstream schools compared to 64% in 1981 (DEX 1997). The 1981 Education Act made provision for the decline in deaf residential schools with the conditional integration of deaf children into mainstream schools (DEX, 1997). For many deaf children the bond of sharing a minority language within peer-group relationships, over years of residential school developed and contributed to the rich culture within the Deaf community. Consequently the Deaf community is defensive about the assimilation of deaf children into mainstream education.

Inclusion implies that all teachers are responsible for the education of all pupils. At an institutional level this impact may influence the ethos of the school into focussing on the individual with '*additional and different*' needs. Lipsky and Gartner identify factors which make some schools more inclusive than others, and present extensive lists of such factors:

- School-wide attitudes: 'The philosophy and practice of inclusive education is accepted by all stakeholders';
- '... inclusive schools have a belief that all children can learn and that all benefit when that learning is done together';
- a sense of community;
- services based on need rather than category;
- students with special needs attending their neighbourhood school and being distributed across regular classrooms;
- teacher collaboration;
- enhanced institutional strategies;
- standards and outcomes: 'The learning outcome for students with disabilities is drawn from that expected of students in general.'

(Lipsky and Gartner, 1999. p.17)

Although this list seems accessible, and largely without problems, in terms of a definition of inclusive schools, it largely ignores what is known about the complexity of school life, in particular what is known about the ambiguities of such adaptation, and its tendency toward exclusion (Hart,

1992). The difficulties, complexities and ambiguities of teacher collaboration, are also well known (Hargreaves, 1986). As Mortimore *et al.* (1988) point out, such characteristics are based on descriptions rather than on rigorous analysis. Dyson and Millward also consider:

It is never entirely clear whether such factors enable schools to become inclusive, cause schools to become inclusive, or are the result of the school's becoming inclusive, or are defining characteristics of inclusiveness (Dyson and Millward, 2000. p.18).

These comments serve to show how large parts of the 'inclusive schools' literature offers guidance as to how schools might become more inclusive, but is less strong in offering theoretical models which define inclusion. They do not help one understand how certain organisational structures, and processes, lead to greater inclusion, while other structures, and processes, lead to exclusion. Ballard (1997) considers such theoretical explanations irrelevant, as inclusion is essentially a matter of ideological commitment and political struggle. For the purposes of this research, it is only possible to describe *features* of inclusive schools, as *theoretical models* of inclusive schools are largely absent from the literature. Recent comments by Mumba (2002)

indicate such features as being: a collaborative classroom culture of learning in which rights, responsibilities and group learning are shared, evaluation of the learning process by both pupils and teachers, pupils being involved in decision making, and parents participation in their children's learning. Mumba describes this process as ownership of the school by its community: a strong emphasis on equality of participation (Mumba, 2002).

Recent developments in the self-advocacy field have had the results of self-determination movements amongst the deaf and hard of hearing groups themselves. This could be viewed as a natural autonomy to apply normal locus of control over their own lives and wrest management of the affairs of the deaf away from the hands of hearing people. This has resulted in the recognition in some classrooms by incorporating bicultural understandings and bicultural methodology into classrooms for deaf pupils (Giorcelli,

2002). However Giorcelli comments that this is mirrored by the difficulty mainstream establishments have in establishing sign language classes or teaching Deaf culture: a lack of deaf adults that many specialist establishments would make sensitive provision for (Giorcelli 2002).

Kyle (1993) and Corker (1996) give examples of how inclusive strategies have shaped deaf children's cultural identities:

- The experience of many deaf children in the mainstream environment resulted in their reporting a marginalised experience, by the effect of dissolving difference. (Kyle, 1993)
- Transforming their deafness into a disability and denying the existence of an *alien* Deaf culture (Corker, 1996. p.51, original emphasis).

Booth (1988) contends that the silencing of deaf culture in mainstream schools amounts to extreme prejudice, and the transgression practices of some deaf children could be interpreted '*as a survival tactic unknowingly cultivated by those caught between two worlds*' (Hartsock, 1996. p.49). The unique features of deaf culture, and identity, have led deaf people to demand '*recognition as a cultural and linguistic minority*' (Gregory and Bishop, 1991 p.5).

In an example given by Allan (1999), a child called Fiona repeatedly pretended to hear correctly in the mainstream class, to '*go along*' with assimilation into a hearing environment. This eroded her deaf identity and her culture. Fiona's learning support teacher sent a memo to the mainstream staff asking them to override her pretence that she could hear, by constantly checking that she understood their instructions:

Please ensure she understands by asking her to repeat (instructions). Remember if you ask 'Do you understand?' Fiona will say yes whether she does or not. Speaking slowly will increase understanding as Fiona can lip-read to a certain degree.

(Allan, 1999. p.94)

Allan comments that Fiona expressed an alternative view that her communication difficulties were caused by teachers, who '*speak too fast*'.

Inclusion for Fiona implied accommodation of her deaf identity. However, in practice Fiona's experience was that of assimilation – of integration rather than inclusion, forcing her to be less deaf and more disabled (Corker, 1993), rather than seeing her as having a language and culture of her own. The inclusion of deaf pupils in mainstream school has constructed deafness as a disability and exposed children to experience a '*totally exclusionary program called inclusion*' (Lane, 1995. p.182; in Allan, 1999).

Models in practice, as the previous example shows, can be understood from this pupil's experience as partial and fragmented (Allan, 1999). Allan (1999) considers a fundamental epistemological shift is required if pupils are to be given a voice to express their experiences and challenge our understanding of current inclusion practices. Recent shifts since the collection of data have been described by Giorcelli (2002, cf 2.3), RNID (2002), Lynas (2002), as the movement in schools towards inclusion seeks the pupil's voice in school's self-evaluation.

Gannon (in Schwartz, 2001) commenting regarding inclusion and deaf culture, described how recently deaf people have had to make a choice between shunning the Deaf culture in accepting mainstream education, or insisting on a separate identity and recognising a history of the accomplishments of deaf people. Note deaf with 'D' indicates those in the Deaf community see themselves as reflecting a special cultural identity, with shared beliefs, norms and values.

Gannon (in Schwartz, 2001) sees a sharp distinction between the deaf world and the hearing world, e.g, to belong to a hearing world is to accept deafness as a disability. Warnock (2001), commenting on Deaf culture and the National Curriculum, says that many social issues and problems faced by deaf youngsters can be explained within deaf adult BSL signed in-depth discussion in which signing children can fully absorb personal, social, and health education through their own language.

Whilst mainstreaming is underpinned by the ideal of equal rights and access, marginalised groups have not necessarily informed this change, or even been considered. This lack of voice extends to pupils in general within

the system. Writers, such as Allan (1999), comment that very little has been done to listen to the pupils' perspective. Research by Armstrong, Galloway and Tomlinson (1993), Collins (1996) and Collins *et al.* (2002), on the assessment experiences of pupils with emotional, or behavioural, difficulties, and their exclusion from the assessment process by professionals, are notable exceptions. It remains an important aim of this research to examine the perspective of deaf pupils in the context of power/knowledge relationships.

Allan (1999) comments that attempts by researchers to give pupils a chance to have their say, have so far been lacking in an authentic reading of special educational needs within a subjective approach. Cooper (1993) asked pupils about their experience of being labelled as disaffected. Others have measured the self-esteem of individuals with special needs (Gibbons, 1985; Resnick and Hutton, 1987) or investigated their ability to cope in a mainstream school (Lynas, 1986b; Sheldon, 1991). Research on mainstream pupils (Lynas, 1986a; Kyle and Davis, 1991) has produced superficial accounts of attitude towards, or acceptance of, pupils with special needs as some kind of generalised 'other' group, while ignoring what pupils say, and do to each other. Allan labels such research as 'essentialist' perspectives which *'construct pupils with special needs, as objects upon which integration or inclusion is to be exercised'* (Allan, 1999. p.13).

As Allan points out, inclusive education is now considered the way forward in terms of the 'norm', and that it is the right of each child to be able to access their learning in an ordinary context, through the flexibility, and adaptation, of teachers in enabling their pupils to overcome barriers as they arrive. Allan comments: *'Inclusive education has crept up and become the new orthodoxy'* (Allan, 1999. p.14). To conclude this section, two research questions arise:

Firstly, how do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom?

Secondly, are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of their needs?

2.3 Pedagogy

2.3.1. Pupils' views on teacher facilitation of pupils.

When considering pupils' perception of the way teachers' view deafness, it is necessary to also consider Pedagogy in its wider context, including the facilitation of academic inclusion, and the teacher's approach to communication, noise and interactive lessons.

The education of deaf children is a controversial topic – and one where feelings run high; ranging from the communication debate for and against the access of children to sign language on purely oral methods of education, to the limited contact, and access, some deaf children have with the Deaf community. In this section I explore how methods of education affect the learning potential of deaf pupils; in particular to examine why deaf pupils in mainstream placements have lower levels of achievement than other children with needs for linguistic support, and why, to get support they are deemed as having special needs, and fall within a model of 'social disability'.

Account must be taken of the learning style and aptitudes of deaf children. The level of cognitive demand, or challenge, in teaching should reflect the child's preferred language level regardless of the second language. BSL and English should be used as languages of instruction, and taught as subjects. The development of curriculum-based signs should be done by, and with, deaf people. The curriculum should reflect a range of languages and cultures, while a Deaf Studies curriculum should be available for teaching Deaf culture, history and sign language, with assessments taking into account the child's preferred language. As Giorcelli (2002) points out, these inclusive practices remain dependent on the adults' willingness to change educational practice and make accommodation for deaf pupils who may perceive the world differently.

In terms of whether deafness could be considered as a social disability, Ladd (1991) presents an image of the social encounters of a deaf person in mainstream education:

...He begins to build up an image of himself as a stumbling, blundering retard, breaking off his

sentences halfway through because he is sure no one wants to hear what he wants to say, lumbering around hopelessly on the fringe of things. After a while, the initial goodwill extended to him by his school mates dries up. The truce is over and battle begins: he becomes one of the butts of all the digs and jokes.

(Ladd, 1991. p.91-2)

Issues around deafness are frequently ambiguous as DEX (1997) notes:

It is easy to say deaf children need to be mainstreamed so they can take their place in the hearing society. What is forgotten is that deaf people do not have the capacity to belong fully to their hearing communities. Deafness is a social disability and, therefore, deaf people cannot fully take part in group activities. Even with the best hearing aids, cochlear and titanium implants, deaf people are still beset by technical problems as auditory equipment picks up background noise and does not relay acoustic sound to the brain as well as the human ear. The situation is intangible and ambiguous and again, professionals can take advantage of this. (DEX, 1997. p.9)

The situation of the deaf child is qualitatively different from those with other disabilities. Historically, politically, educationally, linguistically, socially and environmentally, they share a history which no other minority group has experienced in this way. In this situation, it is easy to see that educationalists who lack 'Deaf awareness' can ignore recognition across a range of boundaries. Corbett notes the replication of the binarities of inclusion/exclusion and asks: '*Can inclusion, in its most extreme form, become a form of politically correct bullying?*' (Corbett, 1997 p.57). More recently (since data collection 1999-2002), Giorcelli (2002) has identified four significant shifts in responses of the Deaf education field in relation to the need for self-autonomy expressed by self-advocacy movements of Deaf pressure groups. Firstly, recognition of the linguistic differences of deaf

children of deaf parents into incorporating bilingual and bicultural methodology into classrooms. Secondly, more successful implementation of inclusive practice in classrooms. Thirdly, a demonstrated need for accommodating educational needs of cochlear implant technology in young deaf pupils. Lastly, an emphasis on joint decision making regarding educational provision between deaf young people and their teachers. This has created a significant contextual change in the support deaf young people receive at school.

Accepting that deaf people are a linguistic minority, Allan (1999) argues that placing deaf children in a mainstream classroom automatically gives the child the mainstream curriculum, based on English language communication systems. Deaf people, she argues, should demand greater recognition as a separate cultural group (Allan, 1999). Sign language is portrayed, not as a minority language but as '*a system of communication*' (Hoffmeister, 1996. p.184).

Allan (1999) argues that the deaf child cannot fully participate, and, moreover, develops strategies which are counterproductive to the goals of education. So much energy, over the whole history of educating the deaf, has been put into the debate of educating deaf children orally or using sign language, that this often distracts from the issue of their achievements.

Vygotsky's (1978) claims about the social origins of individual functioning have relevance to this study because of the focus of cognitive development in relation to culture. A child with deafness will have many individual and cultural needs in areas of communication, personal and social independence, and learning.

Many writers have criticised the dominance of the medical model (Skrtic, 1995; Clark *et al.* 1998). In response to this criticism, the social model is hailed as '*the big idea*', Hasler (1993), behind the disability movement, and has been greeted as a mark of progress in theorising disability. Barton (1997. p.237) argues that the social model challenges the '*dominant orthodoxy*' of the medical model in which '*disability is viewed in terms of an individual's ability to function*'. Others argue that the social model has

not caught on, and, as Oliver (1992) says, it is 'intellectual masturbation' (1992 p.20) in which able-bodied academics debate the lives and experiences of disabled people. Oliver attributes part of the blame for this to the disability movement itself, which has much dissent over the nuances of the social model. Other writers join with Oliver in calling for solidarity, such as Finkelstein, 1996, Shakespeare and Watson, 1997, whilst others remain more sceptical about the desirability of achieving a unified social model (Morris, 1991, Casling, 1993, Hughes and Patterson, 1997).

This approach marks a fundamental paradigm shift from thinking in terms of children having special educational needs, and deficits in ability – a 'defect' model, to a 'social' model. Rather than making a 'diagnosis' of the pupils' needs, and forming an individual education programme, the social model sees the ethos of the school needing to change towards attitudes that create and maintain inclusion (Campbell and Oliver, 1996). The restructuring of schools along inclusive lines is a reflection of the social model in action (cf 2.1). More recently, Lynas (2002) reporting on good practice within the teaching of deaf children in mainstream schools, commented on how specialist teachers of the deaf enable mainstream teachers to feel more confident in their role by supporting, planning and team-teaching with mainstream colleagues. By working together to provide the best possible learning environment, the deaf pupil has many more opportunities for participation in conversation (Hopwood 2000), and this can be crucial to their language development.

With regard to methods of education, for a deaf pupil to attain levels of competence and proficiency in BSL and English, sufficient for their needs throughout their schooling, efficient overall organisation is necessary. This is achieved through the organisation of specialist and mainstream teachers in their planned use of BSL and English before, and throughout, lessons, as Pickersgill and Gregory comment: 'That within curriculum and assessment, decision making regarding support and placement should be based on the child's successes or strengths' (Pickersgill and Gregory, 1998. p.61).

How far are changes to structure, and organisation, planned and achieved to meet these ends? What is needed to bring this about? Account should be taken of the learning style and aptitudes of deaf children:

The level of cognitive demand or challenge in teaching should reflect the child's preferred language level and not that of the second language. BSL and English should be used as languages of instruction as well as taught as subjects. The development of curriculum based signs should be done by and with deaf people. The curriculum should reflect a range of languages and cultures. A Deaf Studies curriculum should be available for teaching about Deaf Culture, history and sign language and assessments should take into account the child's preferred language. (Pickersgill and Gregory, 1998. p.82)

Classroom talk is often characterised by an uneven distribution of conversational power. Collins (1996) describes how, since the 1970s, a number of researchers have found that although it was the pupils who were supposed to be doing the learning, they rarely spoke in school except in monosyllables, while it is the teacher who has control of the material to be learned. Cazden (1988) found a three-part sequence of initiation, pupil response, teacher evaluation (IRE) was the most common pattern of discourse at all levels of compulsory education. Initiation, pupil response, and teacher evaluation have become so much a part of school 'culture' that it is accepted by teachers and pupils alike.

It is interesting to be reminded of the largely universal 'rules' for such discussions:

- Teachers decide who will speak and for how long;
- Teachers plan and run the system for those who wish to speak.
This is usually the 'hands up' system;
- Teachers have the final say over the acceptability of particular contributions;
- Teachers can alter any of the rules at their discretion.

(Wray and Medwell, 1991. p.13-14)

Although pupils are encouraged to put their hands up, many ground rules

are not made explicit (Swann, 1992). For example, there are instances where teachers have told children to 'work in silence' but have meant with a 'minimum of noise'. This can lead to confusion and demonstrates another area in which pupils have to guess what 'the teacher is thinking'. Deaf children may lack either the skills, or the confidence, to participate in these kinds of guessing games. When speaking becomes competitive in whole-class discussions they are unlikely to compete for the teacher's attention.

There is evidence to suggest that pupils are denied the opportunity to ask questions and become inactive participants in their education from the moment they begin their formal education. Tizard and Hughes note few 'curiosity', or 'why', questions in their study of four-year old girls, but many more 'business' questions, of the 'Where is the glue?' type. '*Challenges*' were very rare at school, and '*passages of intellectual search were entirely absent*' (Tizard and Hughes, 1984. p.20).

Kyle points out deaf children may find great difficulty in initiating a range of question forms. In his research on sign questions in school:

Most commonly, questions are of the yes/no variety.
'Wh' type questions only gradually increased to minimal occurrence (compared to yes/no questions) at the age of 10/11 years. (Kyle, 1994, p.31)

Are these circumstances that deaf pupils at Greenview School would relate to? Collins (1996) cites a number of examples of how non-participatory behaviour is detrimental to learning, and how the teacher/pupil relationship can be re-examined to meet the needs of children unwilling to participate. She describes how teachers wishing to empower pupils must be willing to accept children's out-of-school experiences and engage them on their own terms. Recent research by Reason and Palmer (2002) suggests that teaching methods following the 'social model' of inclusion facilitates deaf children learning language if a series of steps are checked. For example, if teachers closely assess what the children know in order to plan what they need to know next. Secondly, if teachers retest following a period of teaching, and plan further teaching on the basis of retesting. Lastly if children's own strategies are observed teaching can be adjusted to take account of these differences, for example the needs some children have for a more repetitive

approach. Lynas (2002) comments on a recent challenge for the role teachers of the deaf being the focus switching from deaf pupil to that of the environment. The 'reconstruction' of an inclusive learning environment (with 'school improvement' as the primary goal) now places emphasis on reforming context. The RNID (Powers *et al* 1999) research on good practice in deaf education highlighted the school ethos as a critical feature in improving schools' inclusive practice. In a research project by the RNID (2002) deaf pupils were asked for their own views on inclusion with regard to self-advocacy and practical steps schools could take to improve their inclusive practice. They found that deaf pupils themselves were a key source of information regarding factors that support or hinder inclusion. This further extended Powers *et al* (1999) work on school ethos as a critical factor in facilitating inclusion.

2.4 How teachers' perception of deafness affects pedagogy

The history of deaf education can be described in different ways, and the challenge of presenting an unbiased history is difficult, depending on whether you support the Deaf community or an oralist approach. Prior to a watershed conference on deaf education in Milan in 1880, international congresses on the education of deaf children were small affairs. However in 1880, the Milan Conference passed several declarations including one on the '*incontestability of speech over signs*', which led to a total dedication towards oral methods, and that the use of signs is seen as '*injuring the development of speech, lip-reading, and the development of ideas*'. This declaration, made by only 164 delegates, most of whom were French or Italian, had a catastrophic effect on the Deaf community all over the world, and for teachers who were themselves deaf. Many sweeping changes followed, notably the rejection of signing, and all values and beliefs of an accompanying signing culture. Many deaf people, involved in the education of deaf children, were sacked, and their access to teaching was prohibited, a move which has yet to be reinstated. Oralist methods had been gaining popularity prior to 1880, and the debate about the advisability of signing versus oral teaching was as intense as it is now. Teachers of the deaf continue to be a powerful force in education today (Allan, 1999). Lynas (2002) comments regarding current context of inclusion, schools are being

charged with the task of catering for all-comers, therefore teachers of the deaf are in a privileged position. They have insights, developed over the years, about the barriers to learning caused by a variety of conditions and circumstances and their accumulated knowledge of techniques and strategies for overcoming barriers to learning are considerable. However, prejudice may remain in the eyes of inclusionists, as Ainscow (1997) comments, this may create a misapprehension of such specialists continuing to confer stigmatising labels on special needs children (Lynas 2002).

In the 1960s and 1970s, government reports, such as the Lewis report in 1968, and the Bullock report in 1975, investigated and supported the idea of minority languages being used in school, and many schools introduced Sign Supported English, Signed Exact English, Cued Speech or Total Communication systems, as a means of trying to establish effective communication and enhance the learning of deaf pupils. These days a bilingual option in units for the deaf has developed, in the context of recognising schools as multi-lingual communities (Kyle and Woll, 1985). However little has been done for the needs of deaf children whose home language is neither English nor BSL (Gregory, Silo and Callow, 1991). In considering the needs of deaf children from ethnic minorities, there is an absence of major research, although researchers have commented on the study of ethnicity alongside the child's special needs (Allan, 1999; Smith, 2000). Recently, Hope and Griffiths (2006), commenting on the rise in incidence of newly diagnosed deaf children in families who have children with English as an additional language, have commented on the additional support these children need, especially issues concerning identification of their first language. They stress the need for bilingual support workers to help meet the needs of bilingual interpretation.

As Gregory, Silo and Callow (1991) point out, the goals in the education of deaf children reflect a history of oralism. The reason a deaf child comes under the remit of the specialist educational services, i.e. diagnosis as having special educational needs, is made on audiological criteria; their degree of hearing loss, and not on cultural, or attitudinal, ones. For this reason I use the term 'deaf' throughout the dissertation. Those within the Deaf community however see themselves reflecting a special cultural

identity, with shared beliefs, norms and values.

Conrad (1979) looked at 468 deaf children's attainments at school-leaving age (between 15 and 16½ years) on reading ability, lip-reading and speech intelligibility. In the area of reading, it was shown that half the school-leavers were unable to read. In lip-reading, also tested with untrained hearing students, ten years of lip-reading training had no appreciable effect or improvement. For speech intelligibility, at least half had unintelligible speech. These rather depressing statistics created a major impact with educators unfamiliar with the problems of educating deaf children, and although an old study, no later studies have adequately demonstrated there is an improvement. Other significant studies, in reading by Wood *et al.* (1986), and in speech intelligibility by Markides (1970), show much the same results (Gregory, Silo and Callow, 1991). Although this research was with oralist schools, later studies by Wood *et al.* (1991), on attainments of deaf children where teachers were incorporating signs as they spoke, revealed no greater a difference.

Several research projects have shown that deaf children of deaf parents did better than deaf children of hearing parents on measures of general attainment, reading, lip-reading and on social development (Vernon and Koh, 1970, Corson, 1973). Corson attributes this to the fact that deaf parents were more likely than hearing parents, to have accepted their deafness. However, an alternative explanation, from knowledge about early cognitive development of young deaf children, (Harris *et al.* 1987, Woll 1998, Gregory and Bishop, 1991) deaf parents, regardless of the mode of communication, may be better able to establish interactive skills, essential for later development. Recent research however (post-data collection), suggests (Lynas 2002), that aspirations for the deaf child, given equal access to the curriculum, can achieve according to their intellectual ability. Deafness per se was not considered to be a justification for lower attainment. Within inclusive social models advocated post 2004, the goals should be those advocated for normal children. As yet statistics have yet to reflect deaf children's attainment post- *Removing barriers to achievement* (DfES 2004).

With regard to methods of communication, from the 1970s, in response to the failure of deaf education, apparent in research studies, such as Conrad (1979), there was a move to reinstate signing in the education of deaf children. 'Total communication' was presented in many schools as a philosophy encompassing the full range of communication gesture, sign, finger-spelling, writing and lip pattern. In practice it is usually interpreted as a method of communication in which signs are used in conjunction with English (Gregory, Silo and Callow, 1991). (Due the different grammatical structure, it is not possible for a person to speak in English and use BSL at the same time.)

Total communication has received criticism from the Deaf community as well as oralists. Oralists say it compromises the spoken language, as speed, and vocabulary, may be simplified in an attempt to use signs. Deaf people, and others in the Deaf community, [e.g. Wendy Daunt, 1992], criticise the fact that, as an approach, it is still English-based, is not BSL, and does not reflect the natural language of the Deaf community. In addition, it is used by hearing teachers who are not from the Deaf community themselves, very often with minimal training to a beginner's standard (CACDP, Level 1) on average. On the whole 'total communication' programmes have not produced the results expected of them (Gregory, Silo and Callow, 1991). In the USA where it has been used for longer than in the UK, it is said:

Since the 1970s, most deaf students have been educated in Total Communication programmes in which some form of signing and speech is used simultaneously for communication and instructional purposes. Most students are still functionally illiterate upon graduation from high school. (Paul, 1988, p.57)

Advocates of signing argue that deaf children of deaf parents do better than deaf children of hearing parents on measures of general attainment, reading, lip-reading and social development (Corson, 1973, Conrad, 1979). Lynas (2002) argues that access to the curriculum and an expectation of 'failure to achieve' led to many deaf children's failure to achieve. The goal of inclusion was to offer an equal curriculum with equal expectations (Lynas 2002).

What are the consequences of various teacher styles in the education of deaf children? In general, the work of the teacher is not to just impart information but to develop and maintain a context appropriate to education. Edwards and Mercer (1987) describe part of the teacher's agenda as defining, and ordering, classroom interaction between pupils to maintain learning for the group as a whole. The teacher has to take for granted that there is a mutual understanding of the language used. To pause and clarify the language may well be inconsistent with the development of ideas through conversation which is part of the classroom task with children at this age.

Gregory and Bishop (1991) in a study of 12 children aged 5½ to 6½ years, looked at the behaviour of teacher strategy when including deaf children in their mainstream classes. In this example, the teacher facilitates the child's responses by indicating, by facial expression, or tone of voice, which particular nod, or shake, of the head is required:

Teacher: What did you do? Did you stay in bed all day?

Deaf child: (nods yes)

Teacher: In bed all day

Deaf child: (nods yes)

Teacher: You didn't stay in bed all day, did you? (Shakes her head)

Deaf child: No

(Individual session 5½ years) (Gregory and Bishop, 1991, p.83)

Alternatively, the teacher could put words in the child's mouth, and use the child's elicited nods as confirmation, which would facilitate the conversation and could then proceed. Gregory and Bishop (1991) point out that teachers may not be overly concerned about these strategies, as with hearing children the topic may be clarified as the conversation proceeds with other children. However, Gregory and Bishop point out that these normal strategies are problematic with deaf children, who are unable to catch up later. In another example, this time on the classroom system as a whole, they point out how the teacher has to balance the needs of the deaf child with that of the class as a whole, and how contexts for the deaf child may be counter-productive in terms of the long-terms goals of education.

Every night to go home and think will (child's name) be able to

do this or have I got to think of some alternative? You have got to find time really, you have got to treat him as an individual. I mean, when you have chatted to the whole class about a robin or something, then you have to go over it all with... (child's name) (Gregory and Bishop, 1991, p.58).

This can present a dilemma for teachers, as their class sizes are not reduced to take account of a deaf child's presence, and as Bruner (1985) notes:

I increasingly recognise that learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture. (Bruner, 1985. p.127)

This research project concurs with Bruner's (1985) view that, within the classroom, learning may be viewed as a social activity, and within a hearing classroom, deafness may be construed as a social disability. Viewing deafness as a social form of disability has major implications for the pupil's own perception of their ability as learners. Just how much the culture of a hearing classroom is shared with a deaf pupil is a valuable focus for this study. A study by Wood and colleagues shows that attainments in mathematics do not lag behind to the same extent as attainments in reading. Table 2.1 indicates that children with a profound hearing loss may achieve well when subjects, such as maths, are taught through a visual or symbolic means, other than through English.

Table 2.1: Maths Age of Deaf Pupils Final School Year (16 years)

Type of School	Hearing Loss	Maths Age
Special school	92 db	12.1
Partial Hearing Unit	68 db	12.8
Mainstream Hearing children	48 db	14.0
		15.5

(Wood et al. 1986)

Wood *et al.* (1986) was able to show:

- That the type of provision makes no difference if hearing loss is taken into consideration;
- There is some relationship to degree of hearing loss, but this is not a direct relationship;
- Explanations involving language use only provide a partial

explanation of lag in attainment. Teachers over-estimate the contribution of language problems to mathematical problems;

- Deaf children make similar errors to hearing children, suggesting a *delay* in development rather than *different* development.

Wood *et al.* were able to conclude:

Our concern for the linguistic development of children leads us to underestimate and undervalue their potential and needs in other areas of the curriculum. Indeed it may be the case that linguistic development itself would be better served by using language to teach and instruct in such subjects as mathematics.

(Wood et al. 1986)

Recently, Powers (2001) demonstrated that attainment results for percentages of deaf pupils gaining 5 or more A-G grades at GCSE in mainstream settings (70%) achieved greater success than percentages of pupils gaining 5 or more A-G grades in special schools (29%). This does not demonstrate that one type of school is more effective than another type, merely that GCSE results are very much more successful in mainstream schools. He goes on to say that research to investigate the progress of deaf pupils in different settings is very important.

Whilst the education of deaf children remains dominated by hearing people, English is likely to remain the dominant language in most settings. Even if teachers learn to use sign, these studies indicate that a group of hearing people are unlikely to establish a BSL-using community in a school. However Wood *et al.*'s study poses the question of whether other systems of teaching are possible for deaf children, e.g. teaching through symbols, signs or through the use of ICT [Information and Communication Technology] for subjects which do not have to rely on traditional language systems for classroom communication.

Wood and his colleagues (1986) also looked at classroom interaction amongst deaf pupils in oral and signing settings. Their study found that the teaching style employed, i.e. levels of questioning teachers employed, had direct implications for levels of discursive response from pupils. The greater

the levels of control and questioning, the lower the levels of discursive material offered by pupils. They did not find teachers' signing particularly liberated language use by pupils neither did it inhibit the language use of the teachers.

However, no details were given about the competency of the teachers in sign language, or the degree to which deaf pupils were familiar with a signed context, or whether BSL, SSE or Signed English was used. This is a key piece of research on the implications of how to raise the attainments of deaf pupils within lessons, what kinds of language use deaf children most readily relate to. Its applicability to the mainstream situation is taken further in the Methodology in Chapter 3. Recent research undertaken by Evans (2002) shows that effective implementation of a bilingual/bicultural approach to teaching deaf pupils is the influence of a strong first language in a natural sign language. Without this, teachers and educators have to work very hard to make up for the early years of crucial child/parent language sharing. Secondly, deaf pupils learn more in a BSL/English classroom, when teachers do not follow rigid lesson plans, but allow the deaf pupils to experiment in their subject knowledge, with the allowance of dialogue to pursue their interest (Evans 2002).

With regard to language and learning, many deaf pupils over the age of five are still in the early stages of learning their first language, and teachers of the deaf see this language acquisition as one of their main areas of responsibility. Webster and Wood describe the strategies for facilitating children's development language in the classroom:

- create a context for conversation;
- share activities relevant and meaningful for children's lives;
- show an interest in what the child is doing or talking about;
- talk with and not at children;
- encourage the child to question and to initiate dialogue;
- expand and clarify the child's intended meaning;
- allow time for the child to reply;
- avoid overuse of two-choice questions [Is that big or small?].

(Adapted from Webster and Wood, 1989, p.52)

Some teachers think that inclusion within mainstream provision does not easily lend itself to the fostering of language development (Powers *et al* RNID, 1999. p.41). For deaf children in the early stages of learning their first language this is probably true, and many teachers of the deaf see a need for small-group, or collaborative, opportunities to specifically help develop language skill through conversation in that first language (Wood, 1988).

Deaf children have been caught within an acrimonious battle about how they should be taught [albeit without contributing their perspective]: on one side are proponents of oral methods, which equates with assimilation discourses; on the other side are those who see sign language as a means of preserving the culture and identity of deaf people (Allan, 1999). Sacks (1990) observes that this led to a century of failure in the recognition of deaf children's language needs, and it was only in the 1960s that serious questions were asked about the reliance on oralist methods. As we have seen from the earlier example of Fiona, the failure of Fiona's teachers to recognise, and value, her language and deafness could be seen as an act of oppression (Booth, 1988, in Allan, 1999). Fiona sought to transgress her way out of her deafness, because of its negative connotations in the mainstream school, and the way it was constructed as a disability, forcing her '*to cooperate in a view of herself as disabled*' (Lane, 1995, in Allan, 1999).

The discussion so far, has centred around the attainment of deaf pupils, construction of their identity within the special educational needs system, the social model of deafness as a disability and attempts to introduce signing in the mainstream classroom, but we also have to recognise the voice of the Deaf community, and their pride of language, culture and heritage (cf 2.1 Slee 1993, 2.2.2: Lane 1995).

In trying to recognise equal status for deaf pupils, common objectives, amongst professionals and pupils alike, as to positive provision in education for deaf children, as learners, recognise the necessity of equality of opportunity for deaf children and the chance for them to reach their maximum potential (Powers *et al*, RNID, 1999). Whilst recognising that deaf young people have different needs and requirements, they have the

same potential for language and learning as their hearing peers (BATOD, 1995), and *'should be expected to achieve the same levels of educational attainment, social responsibility, employment and citizenship'* (BDA, 1996).

Educational surroundings for deaf children are social and linguistic contexts characterised by issues of control and self-identity. Access to intelligible interaction is a key part of success in developing this identity. Wood (1988) notes how language and cognition are fused in verbal reasoning. Teachers have to be proficient at unpacking topics so that pupil can relate new concepts to their understanding. In decontextualising materials in this way, teachers perform a valuable role as 'a bridge' in which deaf pupils can access ideas and make use of new experiences. Within this socio-constructivist approach, skills in classroom communication and self-expression are acquired through interaction. How can children, with special educational needs, be helped to understand abstract constructs? How can we discover how the pupil overcomes problems of communication? This has implications for scaffolding the learning process, from within the context of the child's own experience, which is the aim of this dissertation.

The social dynamic operating for a group of deaf pupils who use BSL within mainstream classes is a key part of this study, as language input may have to be specially constructed to engage deaf pupils within mainstream teaching. Language input as part of style, speakers and topics, may have to be specially constructed to engage deaf children in conversation, with special types of questions addressed to them. Deaf pupils may not see themselves as information givers. What types of question need to be introduced for deaf children to answer? How are deaf children introduced to classroom talk? When communication breaks down it is easy to misread the nature and source of the problem. Is it the idea the deaf child does not understand, or the idea *'of filling in the gaps in the script'* (Swann, 1992). What part does BSL play in overcoming miscommunication? Recently, Warnock (2001) comments that many approaches of sign regulation are necessary to uphold clear communication in inclusive settings: meetings to set vocabulary signs for topics; clarifying context in which signs are found, checking that the right hand shape and movement have been chosen, setting up databases of definitions of vocabulary and accompanying signs,

regulating signs with other professionals, and the standardisation of signs for the National Curriculum. This would all contribute to clarifying a clearer signed language in the classroom.

Theoretical attention has been devoted to the conventions of classroom discourse (Mehan, 1979; Edwards and Mercer, 1987). Edwards and Mercer use the term 'educational ground rules' to describe the implicit assumptions teachers make about the way questions, tasks and other aspects of classroom discourse are intended for interpretation by pupils. How can teachers take into account problems with the ground rules of classroom talk when using BSL? Collins (1996), and Edwards and Mercer (1987) discuss strategies children use in the classroom to cooperate with the teacher in a classroom setting. What observations can be made?

Not all these areas can be dealt with within the context of this study, but are summed up by the investigation of pupils' perceptions of the way teachers' view deafness, including the facilitation of academic inclusion, teachers' approaches to communication, noise and interactive lessons, and more specifically by finding answers to the following questions: What educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work? How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy?

2.5 Communication

The discussion on communication considers the effect of using sign language on a pupil's social inclusion as a deaf pupil at school, and includes the aspects of friendships, deaf/hearing social activities and deaf awareness within the school community.

The question of using a sign language facilitator is first examined from the point of view of the debate on education for the deaf; between the legacy of those advocating oralist methods of education, and proponents of signed communication. As part of this history, I consider research literature on the recent advocacy of sign language in the classroom and the effect on deaf

pupils, and whether it makes a difference in the attainment of deaf children's learning. In considering this, it is useful to discuss the '*perceived failure of the education of the deaf in conventional academic terms*' (Sacks, 1990; Gregory, Silo and Callow, 1991) as contrasted to that of their hearing peers. To do this I assess the useful contribution of several studies looking at teacher strategy in mainstream classrooms with deaf children (Corson, 1973; Wood *et al.* 1986; Gregory and Bishop, 1991), and consider the children's attainments reviewed in these studies. Recent research by Evans (2002) has shed additional light on the importance of signing for deaf pupils in the mainstream classroom. Firstly, Evans comments, sign language makes the lessons more accessible to pupils. Secondly, using sign language motivates them to converse and become active participants in learning. Thirdly, the teachers' ability to communicate helped the teachers to take advantage of teachable moments to pick up on pupils' interests and incorporate their comments and questions. Lastly, using sign language enabled all pupils not just to develop grammar and vocabulary but to pick up on understanding the culture and community of the deaf world (Evans 2002).

With regard to sign language in the mainstream classroom, deaf children need the chance to make sense of the spoken word as it is translated into BSL, and think about the intended meaning before having to apply it directly to tasks. Seleskovitch, (1978) defines it in this way:

Translating language meanings and obtaining the desired effect, i.e., a wording immediately intelligible to listeners is impossible, not because there are doubts as to the intended meaning of words and phrases but because the resulting translation of such words and phrases would fail to carry sense adequately in the other language. This is why facilitators have to grasp sense and remember the ideas behind the words (Seleskovitch, 1978, p229).

Within this research project it will be interesting to observe how the deaf child manages to 'disembed' (Donaldson, 1978) the context of the mainstream lesson, and to apply it practically. Research on the development

of linguistic interaction in deaf children (Gregory, Knight, McCracken, Powers, and Watson 1998; Marschark, 2000) raises a number of clear points:

- The development of language can only occur where children are provided with input which they can perceive and where the adult and child are joint partners in creating communication;
- The development of gesture and the development of sign language are discontinuous, in the same way gesture and spoken language developments are;
- In learning a language, whether spoken or signed, children must be regarded as active participants in generating the rules of the language.

This can be seen in the types of errors they produce, and in the way their reasoning is understood, as

...we have to understand the structure of deaf children's knowledge so that we can mould our educational methods appropriately...Academic success is multifaceted and is not predictable from any single variable or combinations of variables. Daunting though it may be, it is time to develop a better model of the deaf learner (Marschark, 2000. p.87).

Considering the above, the point arises as to how well trained teachers of the deaf are in understanding the sign language explanations, and errors, of the pupils, and whether they can share BSL with sufficient fluency to fully express the meaning of the pupil to the rest of the class. Evans' (2002) research regarding bilingual deaf education programmes discovered that teachers consistently managed the signed instruction well, presenting meaningful language in a multimodal way through signs, spoken words, print and pictures. However it was noted that there was a tendency with less experienced teachers to use signing more explicitly, as a tool, rather than as a natural language. If these teachers tended to break the language down into smaller, less meaningful chunks this stilted the children's learning experience, and inhibited their active involvement in their own learning (Evans 2002).

Deaf people have great difficulty in understanding the spoken, and written, forms of sentences which require integration of syntactic constituents [e.g. 'The boy kissed the girl who ran away'] (Quigley and Paul, 1984). Yet it is possible that the instructions can be readily understood through BSL where they can be conveyed in terms of space, movement and facial expression. To teach deaf children the English language through sign language, Quigley and Paul (1984) point out that it would help for teachers to understand basic characteristics of deaf children's skills in contrast to hearing children. For example, in spatial memory tests, they perform as well, or better, than hearing children, excelling in visual skills, but in sequencing tests, dependent on auditory cognition, deaf children need a translation into motion and space via visual input or sign language. Recent research (2002) since data collection indicates that teachers within their pedagogical role need to learn the individual communication preferences of their deaf pupils, and adjust their pace and approach accordingly (Foster, Long, Ferrari, and Snell, 2002). Foster et al's research suggests that within the recent climate of inclusion, teachers related strategies in which they arranged to work with deaf children individually in order to work out communication strategies, and indeed pursued interactions in an effort to enhance or 'make inclusive education happen' (Foster et al, 2002).

Another example is when deaf children do their homework, or read letters from home, they, very often, go through the topic with manual signs. The method of conveying sequence with natural signs is common to hearing and deaf pupils, but deaf children will need this visual sequence throughout their education. As Kyle (1993) points out:

Sign language, when used in narrative, differs from speech, not in context or meaning, nor in capacity for recall, but in the way the events are reported. It tends to be more literal of the original happenings, more imaginal in presentation, and deviates much less from the original sequence of events. This leads to an events based description. As a result, there are increased uses of what deaf transcribers call mime, and there is a considerable occurrence of one sign sentences and propositions. At its simplest, one might say the sign task is imaginal, while

the speech task is referential; sign uses an event structure, while English creates a different propositional network.

(Kyle, 1993. p.68)

Gregory and Bishop (1991), after researching integration from the perspective of the deaf pupil in the mainstream setting, indicate that the discussions may not only be centred on whether the child has access to the curriculum, but also on how the children themselves construct their experiences. They note how children they studied developed coping skills that were counter-productive to the long-term goals of education, whether the goal was integration or cultural diversity.

Kyle (1993), in a review of deaf people as a minority group in the U.K. examines the status of sign language in school. He describes how, all too often, schools advocating a bilingual approach may

...use sign as an vehicle towards competence in the spoken and written language. In effect it is a transitional tool towards an assimilationist goal. It is easy to accept since it seems kind to the minority of deaf people. In practice, it may be a trap for direct integration. (Kyle, 1993. p.275)

Hoiting and Loncke (1990) place this in the classroom context from the pupils' view – as sign language is used alongside English, the child is reliant on an interpretation to manage instructions from the facilitator, discussing loose evaluations, trying to evaluate concrete everyday examples from the lesson situation where contextual clues may help the child to understand. However, the hearing majority is already cognitively and linguistically at another stage, frequently needing more demanding decontextualized tasks. The result is an agenda set at the hearing child's rate of interaction rather than at the deaf child's level.

The importance of BSL support within the classroom can be seen in the consequences of situations where such support has been lacking. This can lead to, and exacerbate, a developmental impoverishment of language (Brennan, 1999). The resulting disadvantages include poorly organised memories, a lack of shared understandings, a reduced level of abstract

understanding (Fraser, 1990, in Brennan, 1999). Given an adequate linguistic environment, the British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD) assert that deaf children have the same capacity for language as other children; hearing loss itself does not negate that capacity:

... deaf children and young people have the same potential for language and learning as their hearing peers. (BATOD National Policy, 1995)

Yet the typical experience for deaf children in this country is that their language is delayed, with the expectation of language delay found to be associated with deafness, rather than the lack of linguistic provision. This situation is exacerbated as many deaf children are expected to directly access the curriculum through English alone; simply because mainstream teachers are expected to be adequately trained and prepared, through provision of in-service training. Yet many mainstream teachers felt a lack of preparedness, because they could not sign (Language Support for Deaf Children in Mainstream Classroom O.U. E835, 1998). Background knowledge did not supplement their need for full-time mainstream assistance.

Even if circumstances are to their advantage, many hearing-impaired children may not achieve their potential because of the delaying effects of deafness on their understanding (RNID/BATOD, 1997 p.5).

With regard to the way the deaf pupils identify with their deafness, i.e. whether they regard it as special, I sought to discover how pupils' perceptions of learning were linked to their identity. One way to link pupils' perceptions to research projects is by observing, questioning them in interviews, and by group discussions. Within this research, it is the voice of deaf pupils and their experiences which will be sought to illustrate one particular inclusive setting – Greenview School. Their voices are not sought to explain an objective account, but simply to explain how they frame knowledge of their deafness within their own particular educational setting. Their portrayal is seen as a snapshot illustrating the progress of inclusion from the recipients' viewpoint, and how the attitude of professionals shapes

the children's world and their identity, as a frame of reference on themselves.

Culture, and goals, of minority communities also guide and shape the child's cognitive activity. What norms of behaviour predominate, and how are deaf children influenced by hearing children, or have they established alternative norms within their own signing culture? Does an exclusive culture exist amongst deaf pupils? Gauvain (1998) describes how cultural amplifiers shape thinking – for those working in sign bilingual programmes identity issues often concern the deaf child.

Powers (1999) describes how, in sign-bilingual settings, the deaf child is the recipient of a bilingual curriculum, which includes instruction in BSL, and education about the deaf world and its culture. The curriculum is usually taught by deaf instructors who act as role models for the pupils, with a deaf identity presented as one in which the child can feel there is a future valid role as a deaf adult.

Deaf groups, such as DEX, and the British Deaf Association (BDA), originate because they see themselves as a linguistic and cultural minority group. Such groups recognise that, within deaf education, focus on learning as a collaborative partnership between deaf children and deaf adults, who can amplify deaf language and cultural background, is essential. *'We now have deaf identity groups as a linguistic minority and a thriving community that has a rich culture'* (DEX, 1997 p.8). Recent research by Evans (2002) regarding the limitations of applying a bilingual/bicultural approach to a mainstream setting highlighted the inconsistencies of attempting to incorporate a Deaf culture within the classroom. The cultural element that were consistently represented were the more materialistic features, e.g. acoustic equipment, flashing light doorbells, vibrating alarms, etc. the hearing teachers found it far more difficult to model Deaf cultural values and beliefs. Evans (2002) suggested that it could be too difficult for hearing teachers to do this if the values and beliefs were not the teachers' own. However all specialist teachers were respectful of Deaf values and discussed cultural influences as they arose (Evans 2002). Such inclusion of pupils'

active involvement in their own learning could be included by visiting Deaf signers and storytellers.

The value of peer relationships in children's cognitive development can be examined from the Vygotskian perspective of gaining social and linguistic experience otherwise unavailable to children on their own (Cazden and Forman, 1985). This has considerable bearing on this study for the promotion of effective group work between deaf and deaf/hearing group members. The DfES (2003) and Powers (1999) note the necessity of assisting the deaf child's experience at involving themselves, enabling them to contribute towards social interaction in groups, and assisting the process of solitary reflection, to make learning within an integrated class, or withdrawn Unit setting, function usefully. This begs the question of how the deaf pupils themselves feel about these situations. Super and Harkness (1986) see the child's development as embedded within a particular cultural system, and use the concept of a '*developmental niche*' as a framework for organising cognitive developmental research in relation to culture and the sharing of cultural values.

As Webster and Wood (1989) comment, it is from socio-constructivist approaches (Bruner, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978) that Webster and Woods have taken the emphasis in this research on learning as a collaborative partnership between children and adults, through which children gradually acquire expertise and reconstruct cultural values and attitudes.

Wood *et al.*'s (1986) research demonstrates that the extent of controlling techniques used by teachers in managing interactions is predictive of the amount of participation by pupils. The more a teacher attempts to manage and control interaction, the less the response pupils are likely to make. They suggested that an overall emphasis on 'repair' – requiring pupils to make correct utterances – inhibits communication. The strength of a child's self-esteem in the classroom will depend to some extent on how confident he feels relative to his cohort. The question to be addressed is, How are pupils' needs for a more conversational style of discussion met? Children are embedded in a peer culture that includes specialised relationships with friends. They learn how to interact to achieve mutual understanding, and,

notably, in friendships they learn how to enact the principles of reciprocity and open communication. These insights allow the opportunity to explore how far deaf pupils can use the 'scaffolding' offered by a hearing pupil in peer-group relationships. In Foster, Long, Ferrari and Snell (2002) research within the current inclusion context, often teachers created links between deaf pupils and their hearing peers so that they have opportunities to get to know each other better. E.g. Asking the deaf pupils to perform the same presentations in front of the class (with the use of an interpreter), made for much better relationships and acceptance by the rest of the class outside the classroom (Foster et al, 2002).

The background review of literature leads to the following questions on communication:

Firstly how does the presence of a facilitator, and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation? Secondly, how does the presence of a sign language facilitator influence teacher pedagogy?

2.6 Summary

Inclusion policy and practice – update

The criteria below follow on from recent legislative change (2003-2004, cf 2.1). As part of governmental policy change the additional SEN provision made available in schools as part of OFSTED criteria for self evaluation of SEN and inclusion (DfES 2004) has been expected to have the following outcomes regarding inclusion. This new context is very much aligned to my original research questions and data collection 1999 – 2003, and has moved the discussion on towards new expectations:

- Pupils with disabilities are now admitted wherever possible after due assessment and schools make careful adaptation to include them in the life of the school. Preparation of placements, and provision of suitable teaching material is provided, with personal support to access their inclusion within the curriculum.
- Pupils' work is regularly discussed and the quality of teaching of pupils with SEN is regularly observed. Evaluation of the quality of provision is

linked to the information about the outcomes for pupils. Schools integrate their systems and procedures for all pupils with SEN (including arrangements for assessments, recording and reporting) into the overall arrangements for all pupils. (adapted from Cheminais, 2005)

Pupils' perspective

Learning and personal development is emphasised and all pupils learn about disability issues. Pupils with SEN and disability have a 'voice' in the school which is heard regularly: their point of view being sought and accepted (Cheminais, 2005).

Curriculum access

Curriculum access has evolved and plans to innovate are included in the school disability access plan:

- Pupils (with a special educational need) will have sensitive allocation to teaching groups and careful modification of the curriculum, timetables and social arrangements.
- The curriculum is reviewed annually in the light of a regular audit of pupils' needs and the school responds to the outcomes of the review by establishing additional or different programmes of study to meet their needs.
- Partnership between mainstream and special schools focuses on the development of the curriculum and teaching and enhances the opportunities available for pupils in both mainstream and special schools (adapted from Cheminais, 2005).

Pedagogy

Under recent legislation (see above) there is widespread awareness among staff of the particular needs of pupils and understanding of the practical ways to meet those needs in the classroom.

- Assessment is regular and thorough and is used to plan future work and help pupils understand how they can improve.
- Teachers have high expectations of what can be achieved and set challenging targets.
- Lessons use appropriate methods to ensure pupils learn and enjoy their work.
- Suitable resources are available to enable access to the curriculum. (adapted from Cheminais 2005)

Such influences on pupils' learning stem from a range of linguistic, social, cultural, environmental, historical and political contexts. Aspects of these form the children's identity within the inclusive context. Their personal identities are ascribed by teachers and by the pupils themselves, and greatly influence their learning (Lipsky and Gartner, 1999).

Much of the discussion within this research takes place around social issues: the social context of the classroom, socio-constructivist language models, and the possible neglect of minority cultural values, which could shed light on aspects of miscommunication between teacher and pupil. In 'labelling' a minority group as having special educational needs, what are the implications? Deaf children know they are different, by virtue of a whole range of language and sensory differences. How does this affect their identity as a minority group? Under present conditions at Greenview School, how can we seek '*an authentic reading*' (Allan, 1999) of what it is like to be deaf, and trying to learn in such an environment?

Research on the mainstreaming of children has, to date, tended to concentrate on the amount of integration taking place, seldom moving beyond crude notions of how much time a child spends in ordinary school or classroom (Allan, 1999. p.1), or '*inventories of human and physical resources*' (Slee, 1993. p.351). The technical and empiricist bases of knowledge production and the 'methodological individualism' of researchers (Oliver, 1992. p.107) has had the effect of seeing little account from the protagonists of deaf education – the pupils themselves.

Research by Wood *et al.* (1986) and Gregory, Knight, McCracken, Powers, and Watson (1998) examines the structure of conversations between teacher and deaf child, and observes that it is the quality of exchange that contributes to the child's learning, especially in their loquacity of response, rather than the mode of communication used. (For examples, see Appendix E: Completed observation record, (Island of Zodor, 23-3-02) and Appendix F: Completed observation record (The Wasteland, 19-6-01)). This has influenced understanding of my research questions towards the structure and content of lessons as suitable for deaf pupils, albeit as a translation in BSL, rather than the mode of communication used. This is discussed in the next chapter on Methodology.

Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter illustrates my pathway as a professional teacher and researcher, from 'prolonged engagement' (Lincoln and Guba 1990, p.50) with my pupils as a teacher, to the development of a case study research project at Greenview. This was about searching for data (within my three research themes and sub-themes) for tentative salient features of the case, in order to gain a clearer understanding of the pupils' perspective at Greenview School. Here I outline the background to this ethnographic case study approach, with my rationale for the choice of methods. I outline how I approached pupils, classes, teachers, and analysed policy documents, detailing who I met, what I did, and the timetable of collecting data. The chosen research procedure is detailed in terms of observation, interview methodology, analysis of policy documents, and triangulation (analysis) of data collected, according to particular themes, cf 1.3. These themes were chosen due to my background as a specialist teacher with the deaf, and lengthy experience at using sign language in the mainstream classroom (see personal background, chapter 1), coupled with inherent changes of meeting provision for deaf pupils outlined (in that current context) by DfES (1998), DfES Green Paper (2003), and DfES (2001) SEN Code of Practice. Since then more recent changes in legislation DfES 2004, DfES/OFSTED 2004, have illuminated the research themes and sub-themes even more clearly.

As detailed in the previous chapter, the philosophy influencing this study stems from a socio-constructivist perspective, and the three themes of Inclusion, Pedagogy and Communication are revisited using an adaptation of Stake's (1995) case study methodology in five steps, (outlined below) to address pupil issues. Wood et al's (1986) Move Matrix codes are used within the second theme, Pedagogy, to analyse pupil/teacher dialogue.

Step 1: Lengthy immersion in studying the case or 'Prolonged engagement' (Lincoln and Guba 1985 in Bassey 1999, p75) with the subjects (deaf

children; cf 3.4). Construction of pseudonyms are used to safeguard identities of LEA, school, pupils and teachers.

Step 2: Collection of data through thorough searching or 'persistent observation' (Lincoln and Guba 1985 in Bassey 1999, p.75), interviews, and analysis of policy documents. Consistent checking with subjects for accuracy and revisiting of sub-themes (see later for interview methodology). Details of schedules and raw data samples of observation, interview, and policy document analysis are given in Appendices B- N).

Step 3: Bringing together the data and reporting back to interviewees and supervisor that this is an accurate record, and seeking consent for data to be checked and amended if necessary before the next step.

Step 4: Searching for significant features, to pinpoint a place: an analytical tool known to researchers (and surveyors) as 'triangulation' (Bassey, 1999) was chosen to analyse and code raw data towards leading analytical statements. 'Strengthening confidence' in statements (Bassey, 1999) was deemed the correct approach, since triangulation could be used to apply to coded data from a variety of sources. This part of the investigation forms a process where specific aspects of research themes arise through exploration of sub-themes, are identified and if reoccurring from other sources of data, are then assigned codes. Coding the data helped to reveal the complexity of the case. In such a way, etic issues (the researcher's values) evolve into emic issues (the participant's values), (Stake, 1995). After triangulation, such specific aspects are used to illustrate the situation, which then involves relating findings to grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Step 5: Challenging the findings. Systematically testing the emerging 'storyline' against analytical statements or 'naturalistic generalisation' (Stake 1995). This involved the help of external supervisors or 'peer debriefing' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985 in Bassey 1999). Chapter 4, Analysis, discusses the implications of the findings within the over-arching themes and sub-themes, as part of building a worthwhile story. Chapter 5, Discussion leads to naturalistic generalisation (Stake 1995) or an overarching story of the experiences of deaf pupils at Greenview as 'justification for its end point' (Bassey 1999), and to convey convincing to an audience its key findings.

This case study methodology is intended to provide a clear 'audit trail' (Lincoln and Guba 1985, Stenhouse, 1988) to allow an auditor to check stage by stage on the research, in order to ascertain that its conclusions are justified. This 'case record' (Stenhouse 1988) consists of a substantial collection of relevant literature, policy documents, observer's notes, researcher's schedules, interview transcripts, statistics as evidence that the research was carried out systematically and could be repeated in the future.

In linking this chapter to Chapter 2, the Literature review, this chapter seeks to make explicit the link between eliciting the perspective of deaf pupils in the context of the three overarching themes, and how methods were employed to do this. Careful consideration is given here to the ethics of research taken from BERA 2004, as Bassey (1999) outlines: respect for democracy (and the freedom to express ideas), respect for truth in data collection, and respect for people, who are entitled to privacy.

Careful consideration was also given to the 'trustworthiness' (Lincoln and Guba 1990 p.50) of the case. Conscientious work to ensure rigour of method was developed in conjunction with my O.U. supervisor, to ensure reliability of the research, and replicability of research should this ever be needed. External validity was problematic, as this case study is intended to illuminate perspectives of pupils at Greenview in conjunction with specified themes and sub-themes. However it is not intended as a 'typical example' in the sense of typicality being empirically demonstrated, so issues of external validity are not meaningful. It is a 'study of singularity' (Bassey 1999, p.75).

3.2 Ethnographic Case Study: Rationale

This study followed an ethnographic case study methodology in line with using real-life examples to reflect the pupils' experience (cf 1.4). In line with Stakes (1995) case study methodology, I formulated a 'Five Step Framework' (cf 1.5).

The emergence of naturalistic case study methodology as an alternative paradigm to positivism or post-positivism (cf 1.1) has arisen because of a

need to understand context and situation. As a method, case study provides a metaphor, both as an individual specific subject term, and, within a wider meaning, as an applicable methodological approach. An inductive ethnographic approach is also appropriate as it incorporates the evolving empirical world in which pupils reflect on their view of teachers' perceptions of inclusion and deafness. Within the time of data collection 1999 -2002, the context of demographic, political and legislative change within the DfES Revised Code of Practice (2001), policies of inclusion, and revised practices of bilingual support make this study, as an inclusive setting, ideally suited to an inductive, ethnographic context. Since data collection, subsequent government policy has further developed strategies for inclusion in line with current OFSTED criteria for schools' self evaluation of SEN (DfES 2004) and inclusion (DfES/OFSTED 2004). Such current contextual change puts specific data of 2002 into a more sharply defined previous perspective. However despite these recent contextual changes, the research themes and sub-themes still hold as relevant:

They [the research questions] serve as metaphors useful to the reader to stretch and test his or her own knowledge; they provide the information and sophistication needed to challenge the reader's current construction and enable it's reconstruction; they serve as 'idea catalogs' from which the reader may pick and choose in ways relevant to his or her own situation; and most important, they provide the vicarious experience from which the reader may learn.
(Lincoln and Guba, 1990. p.54)

The use of research questions also uncovered the identification of issues, (or idea catalogues as termed by Lincoln and Guba, 1990 p.50) which, in turn, draws attention to problems and concerns. As Stake (1995) comments,

Issues are not simple and clean, but intricately wired to political, social, historical, and especially personal contexts. All these meanings are important in studying cases. Issues draw us towards observing, even teasing out, the problems of the case... the nature of people and

systems may become more transparent during their struggles. (Stake, 1995. p.17)

This allowed the discovery of detail about the instance (i.e. specific pupil experiences) rather than the class from which it was drawn – and allowed an in-depth reflection on the changing context – both at micro (pupil) and macro (research interpretation) levels. It was expected that my original interests, and questions I had, would become more realistic as my understanding of the nature of the people concerned, and problems involved, in the case study became more apparent (Stake, 1995). For example, on a macro level I observed mainstream teachers coping with the inclusive aims of Greenview's Communication policy, but at a micro level I explored the deaf pupils' view of the teacher's ability to express themselves to deaf pupils. With myself working as a researcher and facilitator of issues in the field to observe the workings of the case, I recorded observations according to the issues of the case, but simultaneously examined its meaning, and redirected observation to substantiate that meaning. Policy documents were also analysed in the same way (cf 2.1).

Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) argue that case studies are the preferred strategy when '*How*' and '*Why*' questions are being posed, as suited to an approach coming from a Socio-constructivist stance (cf 1.4, 2.5 Vygotsky, 1978, Bruner 1985). As with this study, when the research is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context, an ethnographic case study approach has much to offer. Its principal rationale is to reproduce social action in its natural setting and, as such, it can be used to test practice in an everyday environment, such as social interaction in a classroom context. It is crucial to remember that a case study is principally distinguished by the object to be explored, not the methodological orientation used in studying it (Stake, 1994. p.236). Hitchcock and Hughes (1995, p.317) discuss a number of characteristics of ethnographic case study, including the following that this research has employed:

- That ethnographic case study has as its characteristics:
- a clearly focussed bounded system;

- a concern with richness and vivid description of events within the case;
- a chronological narrative of events within the case;
- an internal debate between the description, and analysis, of events;
- a focus on a particular group of deaf pupils, and their perceptions;
- a focus on particular events within the case;
- a way of presenting the case to capture the richness of the situation.

(Adapted from Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995, p317)

Within the context of this study, there is an inherent assumption about the subjective nature of pupils, knowledge and research methods. The qualitative approach is based on the scientific activity of induction – a procedure for generating new theories in which theory emerges from the data.

The notion that theory is created from or emerges from data is consistent with the view that the pupil is subjective in nature and that his understanding, knowledge and meanings are subjective, and emerges in interaction with others in a given context. Hence, the qualitative framework entails a methodology in which theory is ‘grounded’ in data such as observations, interviews, conversation, written reports, texts and their interpretations. (Grieg and Taylor, 1999, p.55)

In examining Greenview context from a point of view of pupil experience, the pupil-teacher relationship was predominant in themes and sub-themes. At the onset of this research project I realised I would have to adopt a suitable method in which to examine pupil-teacher dialogue. I had to examine the context of power/knowledge relationships (cf 2.1 Foucault 1977) in which they were obtained. In this case active relationships are viewed from a context of social inclusion – how communicative ability affects the pupil’s perspective of their relationships. Further details of this approach are discussed within the literature review. A case study is an

obvious choice as an ideal approach to examine relationships in this context. Further research also led me to adopt Wood et al's (1986) Moves Matrix method as a way of specifically analysing the structure of pupil-teacher dialogue (cf. 2.4, 3.5.2).

3.2.1 Pupil's perspective

A pupil's perspective, as seen by Collins (1996), involves teachers stepping out of their own frame of reference, and using the pupil's account as an important frame of reference. As the work of Donaldson (1978), Gregory and Bishop (1991) and Armstrong (1995) illustrates (cf 2.5), the language and constructs of our analysis remain those of adults, and offers an interpretation that pupils themselves would not be in a position to articulate. In *'making connections'* Collins (1996) points out that our own interpretations are wrapped up in assumptions we may make about the causes of such behaviour. Viewed from a perspective of 'deaf awareness' a very different interpretation is possible (Ladd, 1991). As a researcher, and as a practitioner, I aim to get closer to the pupil's point of view by analysing my own assumptions, and beliefs, about the way pupils act and asking, instead, for their perspective from the start.

Louis Smith, (1994), one of the first educational ethnographers, helped define a case as a 'bounded system'; drawing attention to it as an object, rather than a process. It has a boundary and working parts. The case is likely to be purposive, even having a 'self'. Thus people, and programmes, are clearly prospective cases. Events and processes fit the definition less well. The case is an integrated system. The parts may not be working well, the purposes may be irrational, but it is a system (Stake, 1995). From this experience and from the *'spiral of understanding'* (Nias, 1995) gained from literature surveys, interviews and observations, different perspectives are gained to shed new understanding on the original investigative questions. e.g. a question that is phrased as, 'What do deaf pupils feel about their learning experience?' may be phrased, 'How do the deaf pupils feel about their learning experience when helped by a LSA (learning support assistant)?'

3.2.2 Etic and emic issues

The focus of this research is interpretive, focussing on participants (pupils) *emic issues*, and researcher's *etic issues*, (Stake 1995). For example, I focus on problem-relevant events such as the interference to learning of background noise in the classroom, or the issues a small group of deaf/hearing pupils face in working together. I have attuned the method to the research, based on researcher/subject interaction. E.g. using 'moves matrices' (Woods et al, 1986) to study deaf pupil/teacher dialogue. The research aims to be empathetic, and to account for intentionality. It seeks actor frames of reference, and although planned, its design is emergent responsive. The design is based on '*emic issues*' [the issues of the people who belong to the case – Stake, 1995], to understand the research questions from the participants' perspective. For example, a topical research question, such as, 'What do the deaf pupils feel about their current participation in the mainstream classroom?', is viewed on the basis that the majority of the deaf pupils in year 4 have difficulty participating in class dialogue between teacher/pupil in discussions. The issue pursued is for the researcher to observe and interpret length and nature of teacher dialogue to see what opportunities there are for pupils to participate. Resulting (emic) issue from pupils: researcher notes that pupils respond well (loquacity increases) under varied circumstances: lessening of questions by teacher, more personal contributions from teacher, more structured pauses to await pupils' participation.

Such evidence in turn lends support for the idea that the strategy of offering more pauses in the teacher's dialogue would assist deaf pupils with opportunities for participation. This observation would then be validated through triangulation/ corroboration of other evidence, such as teacher elicitation following a pause (requests for information from the deaf pupils), could also be a factor in their response. Other such evidence would be used towards a final stage of 'naturalistic generalisation' interpretation (Stake 1995), in which evidence contribute to a hypothesis leading to a theory which offers evidence for strategies which offer deaf pupils the best conditions for response in classroom conditions.

3.2.3 Ethics

See introduction to ethical concerns of 1.6. In this research, I relied heavily on the accounts, words stories and narratives of the pupils and staff. Especially when dealing with younger children, it is important to ensure that ethics are faultless, but researchers must ensure all other aspects are beyond reproach. To ensure my ethics were acceptable, I went to great lengths to cover all aspects:

I tried to ensure that all risk to the pupils and participants was negligible, and felt these standards helped establish my own code of ethics in this research project. In this respect, I had a great responsibility to safeguard the well-being of pupils, and staff, both as a researcher and as a professional. I developed complex skills of listening, and checked my assumptions through a detailed checking of my respondents' views. This enabled pupils to speak aided by *'listening skills and sensitivity'* (Owen, 1991. p.308). It also enabled valuable feed-back, information and insights into the teachers' world. The 'outside in' position has emerged from some groups of disabled people themselves as has recently been trenchantly restated by Finkelstein (1996):

The political and cultural vision inspired by the new focus on dismantling the real disabling barriers 'out there' has been progressively eroded and turned inward into contemplative and abstract concerns about the subjective experiences of the disabling world. (Finkelstein 1996, p.34)

In this context, Finkelstein is arguing that whilst the direct experience of disabling barriers (inside) is important, it has been wedded to a political analysis (outside) of why these barriers exist and how to eradicate them. These aspects of building a relationship of trust and understanding (and relating it to the outside world of inclusion) carried an ethical responsibility, and meant that questions I asked pupils should have negligible risk to their well-being (Dimond, 1996). I defined 'negligible' as ensuring the pupils fully understood why I was asking such questions.

As a researcher, I had the obligation to ensure everything done was in the interest of long term benefit to the pupils, rather than strictly for the

outcome of the project. I had to be clear when talking to pupils that I had their interests at heart, and that, at all times, I would consider their right to be listened to and their self-esteem as people (Pupils Act, Department of Health, 1989; House of Lords, Select Committee on Medical Ethics, 1994).

I had to ensure my research questions were of substance. To this end, I used a cross section of influences to make sure my research questions stood up to rigour, for example discussions with my tutor-supervisor to check assumptions of confidentiality, ethics, and analysis of data.

In terms of data collection, with my tutor-supervisor I discussed negotiating the professional boundaries between my role as teacher of the deaf and responsibilities as a researcher. Issues of how to keep information anonymous and confidential, how data could be ethically processed and confidentially cross-categorised, using codes was discussed. All data was confidentially stored at the researcher's home, and all such data used in the report had the participant's consent. In order to retain the essential content of their experience as well as safeguarding the rights of the subjects to remain anonymous I used pseudonyms in order to protect the anonymity of the setting, teachers and pupils involved. BERA (2004) principles were used in order to ensure ethical procedures were correct. This included:

- Formulating a viable research design with clear aims, objectives and methods;
- Explaining clearly to the participants the outline of this research design;
- Professional integrity: not using material that could lead to the subjects being recognised by others;
- Respect for the interests of the individual; demonstrating how confidentiality is built into the research and allowing subjects the right to refuse to take part in the research (although no subjects did refuse to take part);
- Knowledge of how the research could be used after completion;
- Democratic values: this is a vulnerable area since the subject matter of this research involves values, opinions, belief and attitudes;

- Also the school could have expected some ‘pay back’ in the form of value-free and quantifiable ‘facts’ or ‘remedies’ often to support their existing or future policies. In this sense I was aware of how the school might use my research in making its own evaluation.

(adapted from BERA principles, BERA 2004)

However in the quality of educational research, as (Denzin and Lincoln 1994 p.3) makes clear, the academic freedom is important to ‘pursue one’s activities as one sees fit’. As Hitchcock and Hughes (1995 p.54) comment, this is allied to rigorous scholarly method and an understanding for the researcher’s own values and judgements to be made clear at the end of the research. The research was also open to scrutiny by two other Open University researchers and three supervisors, all of whom added their comments as a check on reliability and validity.

3.3 Setting

Greenview School

Greenview Primary School, the site of my research project, is an ordinary mainstream primary school of 700 pupils in SW London. It is located in a fairly deprived socio-economic area with 30% of the school having free school meals. Most pupils come from some 20 different ethnic backgrounds, with the Southeast Asian community the largest. This study has as its focus 5 deaf pupils who are part of a Hearing Impaired Unit of 20 deaf pupils within Greenview primary school.

At Greenview School the inclusion of deaf pupils using sign is described as a ‘sign bilingual’ approach (cf 2.1). As Pickersgill explains:

The term ‘Sign-Bilingualism’ describes the use of two languages in different modalities, i.e., a signed and spoken language, as distinct from the use of two spoken languages. The term ‘Sign Multilingualism’ can also be used to describe the situation where the home language is neither English nor British Sign Language (Pickersgill 1998, in RNID 2001 p.14, cf 2.3.1 Pickersgill and Gregory, 1998 for discussion of bilingual aspects).

3.4 Participants

This study recognises the experience of the pupil as a powerful contribution to our understanding of inclusion in Greenview School. Powers (1996) argues that inclusion may be seen as attitudinal change to promote the rights of all pupils: *'the attitude we call inclusion should be one...that seeks to maximise opportunity, independence and participation for all pupils...'* (Powers, 1996 p.68).

Ainscow (1998 p67) proposes that rather than attempting to meet special educational needs through school improvement, schools should seek school improvement through special needs. He argues that those pupils whom we normally refer to as having special educational needs are *'hidden voices'* that can inform, and guide, developments in the school as a whole, by revealing how schools can become more effective for everyone. Ainscow suggests that by singling out pupils with special needs we *'further contribute to their marginalisation'*. Although in preliminary searches I found much research into the practice of inclusion (Allan, 1999; Dyson and Millward, 2000; cf 2.2.1 Mittler, 2000), little has been heard from the pupil's point of view. The research questions aimed to broaden my understanding of the context of the pupils' learning from their own perspective; to advance my skills as a practitioner, and make a contribution to an area of research, so far lacking in a crucial part of our understanding in the debate about inclusion.

3.4.1 Pupils

In cultural background, the deaf pupils are a mixture of Asian, West Indian, English and Deaf. [Deaf with a capital 'D' denoting affiliation to the 'Deaf' (BSL using) community.]

The pupils, two girls and three boys were all aged between 6 and 8 years of age at the start of the study. These ages were chosen with the expectation they would remain at the school for the next three years. Fortunately, none left within the period of this study. The pupils were closely observed between February 1999 and December 2003 as part of my research alongside my role as a teacher of the deaf. The five pupils have been given pseudonyms and feature in this research either relating their own experience, or as part of other pupils' recollections, or in their teachers' accounts.

The five deaf pupils selected, are:

Alexander and Farhan, (Year 1 at beginning of study Year 4 at end)

Marie and Shadeh, (Year 2 at beginning of study, Year 5 at end) and

Sarah (Year 3 at beginning of study, Year 6 at end).

Linguistically, one pupil (Sarah) comes from a family with parents who are profoundly, pre-lingually deaf, who use BSL as their first language. Other pupils in this study, such as Shadeh and Farhan, come from families in the Asian community, speaking languages other than English or BSL at home. Pupils such as Alexander and Marie come from English-speaking families who are attempting to learn, and use, BSL at home. The implications of these different linguistic backgrounds are discussed later, but the choice of these pupils is intended to represent a general picture of the variety of linguistic context in this West London area, and within these pupils' backgrounds (see table 3.1. Pupil Backgrounds)

For additional details on the pupils' backgrounds, please see Appendix A.

Table 3.1. Pupil Backgrounds

Pupils name	School year at start of data collection	School year at end of data collection	Languages spoken
Alexander	1	4	English/BSL
Farhan	1	4	Punjabi/English/BSL
Marie	2	5	English/BSL
Shadeh	2	5	Punjabi/English/BSL
Sarah	3	6	BSL/English

3.4.2 Staff

For staff details of teachers' background and experience of working with models of inclusion see Appendix B. The following table 3.2 shows the mainstream teachers, their position and year group, and the frequency with which they were interviewed. For details see Appendix B.

Table 3.2 Frequency of staff interviews

Staff (mainstream teachers)	Year Group	Experience at Greenview (years)	Frequency of interviews
Mrs Barbour	1	2	4 each term
Miss Coombes	2	3	4 each term
Mr Cox	3	7	4 each term
Miss Dawes	4	5	4 each term
Mrs Harpward	5	14	4 each term
Mrs Noon	6	2	4 each term
Mr Dee (Deputy) Miss Cook (Head)	N/A	8 years 7 years	2 each term
Teachers of the Deaf: Mrs Rork Mrs Baker	Unit (R - 6)	14 years	4 each term
LSAs: Miss Whycliffe, Mrs Benson	Unit (R - 6)	3 years 16 years	4 each term

An example of one year's research timetable 1999 -2000 can be seen in table 3.3 .(For others see Appendix C). (I/V = interview, Obs = observation): *All interviews/ observations 30-45 mins each.*

Table 3.3 Research schedule 1999/2000

Observation and interview schedule: Autumn: 6th September – 19th December,
Spring: 4th January – 11th April, Summer: 8th May – 19th July
Interview/ observation timetable 1999/2000

	9.30 – 10.35	10.55 -12.10	1.00-2.30	2.30 -3.15
MON		Obs. yr 1 Mrs Barbour, Farhan, Alexander		I/V yr 1 Mrs Barbour, Farhan, Alexander
TUES	Policy document analysis			
WED	Other interviews			
THUR		Obs. yr 3; Mr Cox, Sarah	I/V yr3: Mr Cox, Sarah	
FRI	Obs yr 2: Miss Coombes, Marie, Shadeh			I/V yr 2: Miss Coombes, Marie, Shadeh

3.5 Research Procedure

Five step methodology framework (adapted from Stake 1995): used with all research questions

3.5.1 Preparation and anticipation

The first phase of the research started with embedding the research process in the structure of the school, so that the research questions could be

investigated. The desirability of placing deaf pupils in mainstream schools makes it imperative to examine everyday practices, and language use in these settings, from the pupil's point of view. There is little information available on linguistic, and social, contexts, as seen by the deaf pupils themselves. Deaf pupils, like any other pupils, have developmental needs which are embedded in social contexts. They need opportunities to use language to engage with others, with other pupils and adults, who can share their language and make the world intelligible. These ideas were used as research tools in looking at the research questions from varying perspectives. Webster and Webster note that mainstream colleagues need support from specialist teachers to encourage:

...the same issues of control, use of questions, repair, personal contributions, and the deliberate teaching of language out of context, are just as important where signing is used (Webster and Webster, 1994) cf 2.3.1. difficulties of classroom talk.

The cause-and-effect relationships, which developed from my original questions into interview questions, emerged as a repeating pattern in a spiral of development (Nias, 1993 – a spiral of understanding). I therefore developed the following five step framework, as a focus for research altering the perspective of each as new facets emerge.

Research questions at the initial stage (Step 1) form into specific questions on which to base observations. From the observations, each collection of data contributes to category tallies, to expand or refine the design (Step 2: *Etic* issues¹). Specific aspects are identified (see table 4.8), to reveal the complexity of the case. Issues evolve into *emic*² issues (Step 3). Pedagogical questions are analysed using Wood's (1986) Moves Matrix, as chosen as suitable for the analysis of teacher/child dialogue. After triangulation (Step 4) such specific aspects are used to illustrate the situation. This evolves into an understandable pattern (naturalistic generalisation – Stake, 1995) or interpretation. As this is a case study, much attention is paid to the context, and a detailed picture evolves toward interpretation (Step 5). A summary of this appears in chapter 4, see table 4.8.

¹ *Etic* issues are the researcher's issues, sometimes the issues of the wider research community, colleagues and writers. (Stake, 1995)

² *Emic* issues - The issues of people who belong to the case. (Stake, 1995)

Over a period of 36 months, I observed the same five pupils, in years 3, 4, 5, and 6 classrooms. I focussed on pupils who are profoundly deaf, using BSL signers, as an additional language, and persons who could, potentially, be involved in the study for three years. I employed naturalistic sampling of cases to cover places, times and persons (Ball, 1993. p.38) in a systematic, and intentionally-guided, way throughout each class. When there were frequent disruptions to this schedule, because of school trips, changes to the timetable or teacher absences, I sought opportunistic sampling from other classes/teachers who would agree to impromptu observations. The information gained from observation resulted in thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973, in Stake, 1995) of the classes studied. Consistent sub-themes ran through the observations, which resulted in 'idea catalogs' (Lincoln and Guba, 1990 p.50), from which I collate key aspects to understanding my research questions. As I knew from my introductory enquiry that there would be many aspects to this research, I settled on the following approaches, within an ethnographic stance, to help me research the different aspects of the case see table 3.4.

- a) Ethnographic case study approach to investigate pupils' perspectives. Interviewing deaf pupils, classroom assistants and teachers on a 1:1 basis, group discussions and observations (later transcribed).
- b) Observations of lessons (transcribed).
- c) Analysis of policy document, such as school policies e.g. Greenview's Communications Policy (1995), and LEA SEN policy (Greenwood's SEN Policy, 1993) regarding inclusion.
- d) 'Move matrices' to analyse communication moves between pupils and teacher in class.

Table 3.4: Summary table of research techniques for each research focus:

	Inclusion	Pedagogy	Communication
a) Semi structured interview	Yes	Yes	Yes
b) Observation	Yes	Yes	Yes
c) Analysis of policy documents	Yes	Yes	Yes
d) Moves matrices	N/A	Yes	N/A

Documentary data, as public documents, provided a counter-balance to the reflective and private nature of the interview data. I drew some parameters around the documentary data I used, and selected what was most proximate to the research questions. I balanced this against the need to use as wide a range of documentary data as possible for triangulation purposes. The final selection of documentary data was as follows:

- Diary notes from observations
- Departmental documentation pertaining to teaching programmes
- Extracts from the unit's Communication policy
- Extracts from the borough's special needs policy
- Children's' records

The borough's Special Needs Advisor gave written permission to use such documents, and the school's departmental head gave permission to use local school records. In addition to semi-structured interview techniques and systematic observation procedures (cf 3.4) I was concerned as much with the frequency that reoccurring sub-themes from the research questions (cf 1.3) surfaced with policy documents (Greenwood SEN Policy 1993, Greenview Communication Policy, and SEN Policy, 1995). Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) refer to the location and source of potentially useful documents and in becoming familiar with special terminology and approaches used in documents in order to evaluate usefulness. Scott (1990) refers to a second phase, classification and evaluation, in which authenticity and representativeness develop. These ideas were noted when considering notion of meaning in terms of literal and interpretative understanding. At this stage documentary evidence was explored with a view to authenticity, credibility, and representation. In the final phase, interpretation and meaning, I was concerned primarily with use of definitions and concepts within the documents and the meaning attached to processes which change over time, e.g. the definition of the phrase 'enablement' within its context of inclusion.

In later stages of analysis, the following documents were analysed in a qualitative sense for striking words or phrases that were important for determining meaning in classroom practice. (The semi-structured interviews

and observations shared the same method of assigning codes to each communicated sub-theme. For description of technique see chapter 4 Analysis). Documents analysed included; The Code of Practice (DfES 2001), local authority special educational needs policy, and Greenview's special educational needs policy and communication policy. In undertaking this task I was seeking the selective viewpoint from which the text was constructed and in so doing, 'uncovering the standpoint from which the concepts acquire their relevance' (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995, p.227). Ethically all documents were scrutinised and names changed to pseudonyms to provide anonymity for the school, its staff and its pupils.

Such textual concepts were linked to the children's learning experience, for example in their access to signed interpretation of the lesson, or in the equal opportunities deaf pupils had to fully participate in the life of the school (cf 2.3.1 Tizard and Hughes 1984, Kyle 1994). Definitions of concepts, e.g. 'communication' or 'sign language' were particularly useful within documents, indicating as it did, the perspective of the writer and the school, in for example, in the kind of communication the school offered (e.g. sign bilingualism, BSL, SSE, S.E., finger spelling and spoken English) which gave the children access to the curriculum. For an explanation of these terms see glossary.

Deaf pupils often had an unqualified sign language facilitator, often a Learning Support Assistant (LSA) in the classroom. This was a significant part of the school life of deaf children and fundamental to their experience of learning (cf 2.4, Gregory and Bishop 1991, cf 5.2.1., 5.4.2.3. Mrs Benson). The experience pupils reported of, as part of the research questions was contrasted with the equality of opportunity mentioned in school policy documents.

3.5.2 Interview Methodology

As Millar (1983) points out, the case study requires the researcher to declare his/her presence. Both the benefits and drawbacks of researching one's own environment seem to lie in the fact that one is 'involved already'. On the positive side, I had ready access to documentary data and the trust of the

people within the case. The downside was that I perhaps knew too much or knew more experientially than was contained in the data. At time it was difficult to strike a balance between relying on the data and allowing my analysis and interpretation to be influenced by what I 'just knew' as a result of being there.

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with all participants. The style I adopted followed Berg (1995, p.61), involving the 'implementation of a number of pre-determined questions and/or special topics' asked of each interviewee, allowing space for digression and for probing beyond the boundaries of the prepared questions. I was aware that there was considerable power placed in my hands in the process of interviewing, and I tried to militate against this in the way I framed the interviews, and by outlining my questions by sharing them beforehand.

I conducted interviews for 3 years between 1999 and 2002 (See timetable schedule). Each interview or observation lasted approximately 30 - 45 minutes. I spent my period in the field planning, conducting and transcribing the interviews, as well as undertaking preliminary data analysis and making further contact each term with each interviewee in order to a) check the transcript and b) follow up some interesting and pertinent individual issues in a subsequent interview. In accordance with the social constructionist features of my philosophical framework, I emphasised that I was concerned with 'everyone's version of the particular social reality' and the meanings each 'person accorded to the practice'. I informed the interviewees that I saw the interviews as talk or dialogue. I gave them an idea of how long the interview would last and requested permission to tape record. I informed all the adults that neither the school or the individuals would be identifiable in the final thesis. My general aim was to provide a framework which encouraged the interviewees to speak as freely as possible and in their own terms about my research concerns.

Each series of interviews, carried out with each child and the class teacher each term, were designed as an opportunity to reflect on issues of the pupils' learning experience. At each stage of my enquiries, interviews were semi-structured, starting with the same base questions being asked (pertinent to

the issue I was observing), with remaining time checking the interviewee's personal experience, or clarifying issues from the prior data. For each terms involvement, they were asked to review anything they found significant about their learning, and how they saw the differences in relation to the learning of hearing pupils. They were asked to identify 'important moments in their learning' and to comment on their experience of inclusion, and communication in the classroom. Critical features regarding the current sub-themes of each research question were raised, as well as thoughts about other pupils' experiences. I saw talking about other pupils' (anonymous) experiences as a form of triangulation, for discussion at each stage. I reiterated my position and what I was interested in at each interview, refreshing the interviewee's memory with a broad question, followed up with illustrations of other activities, and asking for comments. I then moved through the more structured questions, using my prompts and checking meaning with interviewees as necessary. Where ever possible, I asked probing questions, and sought clarification by asking, 'Are you saying that...?' At times it felt appropriate to move through the questions in different order. I took sparse notes, in order to back the transcripts with pupils' emphasis or perhaps meanings behind multi-channel BSL signs, e.g. 'Doesn't bother me!' Each interview ended with the chance for interviewees to ask me questions. As Berg (1995, p.80), puts it, 'Throughout the interview process, the interviewer and the interviewee simultaneously send and receive messages on both nonverbal and verbal channels', including explanatory gestures, facial grimaces, expressions of discomfort, pauses, and so on. To include their non-verbal signals was a clear part of the transcript, but my interpretation was always later checked and clarified with the interviewee.

Scott and Usher (1999) point out, power relations form an essential backdrop to interview responses. As an interviewer, I was involved in constructing interview dialogues, even though I tried not to. Far from being objective, all manner of subjective interactions were going on. It was interesting to experience different inter-personal relationships in each interview. In order to meet my own plausibility criterion, I read each interviewee a copy of their transcript notes, and ask them to correct, add, and clarify. At the same time, I raised queries of my own and analytical

'hunches' that were beginning to emerge (generally in relation to individuals experiences). Each interview responded in some way, either positively, e.g. 'That was my exact feeling.' Or else by commenting, 'That there was nothing to add.' I invited the interviewees to share my analysis with them at a future time (to further meet the plausibility criterion). On reflection, this plausibility offers more a consensual validity which could be open to critique for wielding more power on account of the plausibility it constructs. I am aware that a positive agreement from an interviewee does not necessarily amount to plausibility. It could also be true that I offered an account which lay agreeably in line with their own image. But as Silverman (2000) comments '...interviews...as a major source of data for school research, need to be balanced by other sources, such as observations, or documentary evidence. Such methods must be justified with a balanced practical and analytical discussion depending upon reasons for choice.'

I spent a total of three days each week at the school as a teacher of the deaf and researcher. The mornings involved observation and taking detailed field notes of the teacher's interactions with, and provision for, deaf pupils, and the deaf pupils' interaction with the curriculum teachers, peer(s) and resources. The afternoons were similarly spent, following up with 1:1 interviews, to also try to understand the pupil's perspective (see research schedules in Appendix C).

These interviews helped me become progressively more aware of the experience of the pupil, and of the constraints, and beliefs, shaping the teachers' practices. The repetition of questions helped in understanding the responses from teachers, following similar situations in classes. While ensuring all my foundation questions were asked I was concerned the interview should be relaxed towards yielding maximum information (Nias, 1993), both about the micro situation of the pupil's perspective and the macro situation (researcher's reflection) of their educational context. The aim here was not to get succinct answers, but to provide a net for catching descriptions of episodes, a linkage or an explanation. Concentrating on one aspect of the deaf pupils' lives whilst in school, i.e. their social inclusion, is not a generality, and as such, the case of the deaf pupils at Greenview School is specific, it is a complex, functioning thing (Stake, 1995). It can be

viewed on its own as a separate entity, with a number of differently functioning features.

Following observations, interviews were arranged to address the pupils' views on their lessons, and the teachers' views on their inclusive class (Appendices I, and J). Interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed.

The semi-structured interviews used questions taken from:

- Baker's (1996. p.278-281) list for consideration of language acquisition amongst bilingual pupils, and
- Collins' (1996) interview schedule (c.f. 2.3.1)
- along with a consideration of some additional questions pertaining to Deaf issues (such as those that a researcher would not pick up by observation, e.g. 'What were the kinds of communication the hearing children offered that the deaf pupils rated most highly in terms of valued interaction?' or 'How had mainstream teachers' approaches varied over time?' See Appendices D and F for examples of initial, introductory interview questions, and Appendices E and G for examples of final interview questions which show how issues evolved from introductory questions to emic questions (Stake 1995) or pupil issues.

These semi structured interview schedules are not designed to be adhered to strictly, but were used as guidelines with which to draw pupils and teachers into issues, from which further questions would be asked specific to their own experience. As such they are seen as 'broad brush strokes' from which a base is established to lead to more personal details being checked. Formulating the questions, and anticipating probes that evoked good responses, was an art that slowly developed. The questions were tried out in pilot form, and a method of recording developed. This first happened in error as I tried to record everything in note form, but discovered there was not enough time for careful listening. To stay in control of the data gathering, I later felt most comfortable listening, carefully inserting interview probes, and cross-checking occasionally by asking what was meant. I ensured a 30 minute period free of interruptions for recording data after each meeting, and wrote notes, of key ideas, which were add to an 'ideas catalog' (Lincoln and Guba, 1990 p.50) immediately after an interview.

Getting the exact words was important and the interpretative commentary was crucial to the story. To note, for example, anecdotes, context and innuendo, could be very useful for links within the 'ideas catalog'. Observations and interviews to investigate aspects of research area of 'Inclusion' and 'Communication' (see Introduction) were analysed using Stakes (1995) 'Seven Step Methodology' (cf 3.1), as this model was deemed appropriate where an ethnographic type case study seeks the participants view. Observations and interviews on the research area of 'Pedagogy' (see Introduction), teachers' dialogue would be transcribed and analysed using a moves matrix, using Woods et al's (1986) codes (cf 2.4). This was used in order to analyse the view point of the teacher (within interviews) corresponded against the pupil's response to them in class. It was interesting to observe if the teachers' receiving feedback, about the ability of their class contributions to support, or inhibit, the pupils' feedback, would change their verbal styles of communication in the classroom. One teacher, Mrs. Baker, was inspired by the potential change she could facilitate, and later undertook her own small-scale reflexive project.

Data by observation, and from documents, were examined for reoccurring patterns or sub-themes, in the same way as for interviews. I planned well in advance and yet was open for unexpected clues. Research issues were developed in advance and a system of focus points set to keep matters on track. Although I never knew how useful a document would prove to be, or how much time to allow for analysis, as plans needed constant adjustment. As Stake (1995) comments, having a plan at least makes the researcher more alert to setbacks and revelations.

Having arrived at a set of foci for each research objective, the plan of observation was directed by each sub-issue. For example, in the first question on Inclusion: 'What are the experiences of deaf pupils in an inclusive classroom?' the sub-issues would centre on 'What is the physical proximity of the deaf pupils to the teacher?' 'What can be observed of their capacity to interrupt the lesson in order to catch up?' To increase my understanding of the case, observations were limited to two or three aspects of each question, at most, for each observation. Stake (1995) considers that qualitative data, or interpretive data, have meanings directly recognised by

the observer. As in the examples of Appendices H and I, I kept a record of events during observations, to provide a relatively incontestable description for further analysis. The shape of the story did not usually emerge until the write-ups of many observations were studied. The write-ups, as with Appendices I and J, were planned and written up according to schedule, soon after the observation. A similar process developed when establishing the methodology for the interviews. See Appendices G and H.

Policy documents were coded and filed for easy retrieval. These are cross-checked, after an initial set of observation and transcription of observation, for reoccurring sub-themes. For example bodies such as the RNID (Royal National Institute for the Deaf) or voluntary agencies such as the BDA (British Deaf Association) had much relevant information pertaining to acoustic levels of noise in mainstream classes, the use of facilitators and government policy towards inclusion (cf 2.2.2 Lynas 2002, RNID 2002). The National Deaf Children's Society, for example, proposes in their communication policy:

It is essential that, when considering the language to be used with the pupil, no method is seen as valid any more than any other. The most important thing is that the deaf pupil has a right to a fluent language and to consider whether the pupil is able to communicate effectively. (NDCS, 1994)

Such documents are be coded for sub-sections within each research objective and add towards a more specific focus, or *emic* issue (Stake, 1995) for the next series of observation points and interview foci. For example the above quote led to an *emic* issue: 'How much are deaf pupils an isolated social group, possibly by virtue of the fact that they can communicate easily with each other?' This led to other questions regarding the deaf pupils as a potentially separate social group, leading to the *emic* issue (Stake, 1995) of the presence of a separate deaf sub-culture at Greenview, by virtue of their language, and, in turn, further *emic* issues regarding the recognition of deafness as a separate culture. Very often documents served as records of activity the researcher could not directly observe. For example Greenview's Special Needs Policy document can be analysed for frequencies or

contingencies, such as how many support assistant hours were allocated to classrooms on a yearly basis, or to review lesson plans for group strategies. This, of course, gave accurate information to reveal a wider picture, than available through observations or interviews alone. These findings aided further development to the next step of methodology in refining my research focus towards a detailed understanding, and for developing the next level of issues to be researched.

To further illustrate methodology progression, the following analyses appendices are attached: Appendices K1 - 5: Analysis of coded observations, interviews and policy documents. The outcomes of this second step moves the researcher within the original questions to further perspectives from the point of view of pupils (*emic* or participant issues Stake, 1995). See following table 3.5 for sample of emic issues for each research focus. Subsequent progression is shown in these later appendices:
Appendices K 2 -5: Synthesis of coded issues into emic and etic issues
Appendix M: Examples of Naturalistic Generalisation.

Table 3.5 Sample of research findings or emic (participant's issues) for each research focus:

Research method:	Inclusion	Pedagogy	Communication
a) Semi structured interview	Pupils' assessment of learning objectives Pupils' understanding of lesson Pupils evaluation of teaching Classroom management Pupil satisfaction Pupil analysis of learning objective. Pupil reflection of learning targets.	Pupils evaluation of teachers' response to them, especially t's perceptions of deafness.	Participation using a sign language facilitator Communication problems Staff support Pupil support Support systems Communication policy - in practice Staff training
b) Observation	Pupil satisfaction Classroom management Deaf pupils participation Sub-themes of analysis from Stake (1995) e.g. decorum, elicitation, focussed, help needed. Pupil-pupil support Staff training Environmental problems Background noise Pupils' analysis of teacher support Pupil-pupil collaboration	E.g. level of teacher control: repetition, closed questions, open questions, phatics. Level of pupil response; e.g. clear understanding, misunderstanding, unintelligible, other. (Sub-themes of analysis: Moves Matrix Wood, 1986)	Classroom management Deaf pupils participation Sub-themes of analysis from Stake (1995) e.g. decorum, elicitation, focussed, help needed. Participation of deaf adults Quality of sign interpretation Use of sign with deaf adult/ BSL experiences Deaf Adults as role models
c) Analysis of policy documents	Class management Resources Collaboration with pupils Team teaching Acoustic Conditions	Communications policy/ comparison with M/S practice/observed sub-themes : teacher/pupil dialogue.	Communications policy/ comparison with M/S practice/observed sub-themes in teacher/LSA/sign language support Pupil-pupil support Staff training LSA roles/ responsibilities Pupils' observations
d) Moves matrices	N/A	Staff dialogue Team teaching; specialist/ mainstream Staff training in deaf awareness	N/A

3.5.3 From emic to etic issues:

Gather data, validate data

One early choice that had to be made on using interpretation as a methodological tool, was how much to rely on 'idea catalogs' (Lincoln and Guba, 1990 p.50) coded data [e.g. from moves matrices - response categories in pupil and teacher dialogue], or how much to rely on interpretation directly from observation. I tried for a balance of both coded

data and direct interpretation, but the conceptual load was finally borne by the direct interpretation of observations and appraisal of the pupils' responses. However in evaluating this methodological balance, would assessors of this research be more satisfied with an objective tally of incidents or with a description of events to bring out the essential character of the case study? I decided to make a major effort to develop understanding from direct interpretations which were more likely to succeed with early identification of situations in which the issues become apparent.

In this early exploration of *emic* issues, to find the quality of learning experienced by the pupils, this kind of contingency description is commonly required for issue questions of a qualitative case study. They describe how things were at a particular time and place. Von Wright (1971) also speaks of empathy, the knowledge of the plight of another by experiencing it yourself. Qualitative research tries to establish an empathetic understanding for the reader, through description, sometimes thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973, in Stake (1995), conveying to the reader what experience itself would convey.

Erickson (1986) drew attention to the ethnographers' traditional emphasis on *emic* issues, those concerns and values recognised in the behaviour and language of the people being studied. Geertz's (1973) term in Stake (1995), '*thick description*' does not refer to complexities objectively described; it is the particular perceptions of the actors, often with the aim, not so much as being a veridical representation, but as stimulation of further reflection, optimising readers' opportunity to learn. '*Experiential understanding*' and '*multiple realities*' cannot be caught by design (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994) but require continuous attention, resulting in what Stake and Trumbull (1982) termed '*naturalistic generalisation*' (or interpretation as applied to this study).

Qualitative advocates such as Guba and Lincoln (1989) and Eisner and Peshkin (1990) place high priority on the direct interpretation of events, lower priority on the interpretation of measurement data. My understanding, and adoption, of interpretation as a method, is because questions typically orient to cases of phenomena, or issues, seeking patterns of unanticipated, as well as expected, phenomena. For example, how do deaf pupils perceive

personal relationships of Unit and mainstream staff to be affected when exploring issues of communication breakdown between deaf pupils and themselves in the classroom? Or, how can deaf pupils best be supported when trying to ask questions in the classroom?

Following the guidance of Dilthey (1976), as a researcher I have tried to facilitate reader understanding that important human actions are seldom simply caused, but that many co-existing happenings may be recognised at the same time. The understanding of the success, or otherwise, of including deaf pupils in an ordinary classroom is a complex picture, which in the case study method is a matter of chronologies rather than of causes and effects.

3.6 Triangulation

The goal of analysis is to illustrate the contrasts in pupil experience particularly in their perception of which teacher strategies help them progress within an inclusive classroom. All analyses, including use of policy documents, are based on re-occurring coding categories, validation through triangulation and generalisation from reoccurring sub-themes evolved through the methodological approaches described in the last chapter.

Table 3.6 below serves as a reminder of the methodological instruments employed during the study and the way in which these map on to the research questions and their sub-themes, as discussed in Chapter 3 above.

Table 3.6: Summary of methodological instruments mapped on to research questions and sub-themes

Instrument of analysis	Research question 1: Inclusion	Research question 2: Pedagogy	Research question 3: Communication
METHODOLOGY			
a) Case-study interview	Pupils' views on inclusion Pupils' views on acoustic conditions Pupils' views on deaf identity Pupils' views on peer group interaction	Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses	Pupil perception of using staff roles as facilitators Deaf awareness of staff and pupils Deaf adults as role models
b) Observation	Pupils' views on acoustic conditions		Deaf awareness of staff and pupils Deaf adults as role models
c) Document analysis			Deaf awareness of staff and pupils Deaf adults as role models
d) Category analysis	Pupils' views on inclusion Pupils' views on acoustic conditions Pupils' views on deaf identity Pupils' views on peer group interaction	Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses	Pupil perception of using staff roles as facilitators Deaf awareness of staff and pupils Deaf adults as role models
e) Moves matrices		Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses	
f) Naturalistic generalisation	Pupils' views on inclusion Pupils' views on acoustic conditions Pupils' views on deaf identity Pupils' views on peer group interaction	Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses	Pupil perception of using staff roles as facilitators Deaf awareness of staff and pupils Deaf adults as role models

In this use of triangulation I am searching for the pupils' meaning in what the teachers do in particular contexts and in particular circumstances – i.e. the pupils' deafness: in the classroom, what they say in interviews, and the significance they give to their teachers' actions. I am looking for the cultural models of teachers, *in particular ways of working in particular contexts* (Gee, 1999), which serve to inform their beliefs and subsequent practices.

Connected to this is the influence of the teachers, who bring a whole range of beliefs, and values, to bear in their classrooms, developed over their careers, to categorise, characterise, explain and predict events (Wood *et al.* 1986, Ball, 1993, Nias, 1993). I am not so much simply interested in the content of what had been learned, but in the underlying features – the pupils' experience of their education. This could be how pupils reformulate

what has been learned within their own agenda, for example, how competent they feel as a learner in the mainstream classroom.

3.6.1 Triangulation and Assertion

Concern for validation is a theme throughout the case study, to ascertain whether an accurate interpretation had been provided. Not only is it necessary to ask, 'Are we generating a comprehensive and accurate description of the case?', but also 'Are we developing the interpretations we require?' The protocol of asking 'Is this accurate?' demands the use of triangulation to obtain the best view, despite the reality of multiple perspectives that need to be presented. As Stake (1995) comments, the demand for accuracy in qualitative research should be no less than that demanded for those who use test scores:

Although we deal with complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists, we have ethical obligations to minimise representation and misunderstanding.

(Stake, 1995. p.109)

Just as triangulation is used to gain a bearing from the stars, and plot an exact location for navigation, in this case study I wished to ascertain accurate interpretations of observations, and additional observations when needing further data to revise an interpretation. When one is in doubt about the 'contestability' of the description or the criticality of the assertions, further research and discussion is necessary.

Triangulation involves cross-checking of all the alternatives of case study method: observation, interview and document review. For example, if I observe a situation being interpreted in BSL, and I am not sure if I have the correct interpretation, I may ask the teacher. I may interview a deaf pupil and ask them, or I may ask a surrogate observer what they noticed. Their responses may confirm some of my description, and some of my interpretation. But often they illuminate aspects of the situation of which I was, hitherto, unaware, so enabling a reformulation of my original concept. In this way triangulation results in many subtle revisions. Table 3.7 gives examples of decisions taken where a need for triangulation is shown. As Flick comments:

The stronger one's belief in constructed reality, the more difficult it is to believe that any complex observation or interpretation can be triangulated. For Denzin et al. (1994) and many qualitative researchers, the protocols of triangulation have come to be the search for additional interpretations more than the confirmation of a single meaning. (Flick 1992)

Table 3.7: Summary: Need for Triangulation

Data Situation	Need for Triangulation
Incontestable description e.g. Level of noise in classroom	Needs little effort for triangulation
Dubious and contested description Farhan's reluctance to concentrate and difficulty giving explanation for his lack of work.	Needs confirmation (evidence from mainstream teacher, teacher of the deaf, and Farhan)
Data critical to an assertion. Deaf pupils' inability to follow instructions with regard to work.	Need extra effort for confirmation
Key interpretations: Information regarding task has not been understood.	Need repeated effort for confirmation
Researcher's persuasions, so identified By common reports. For example: of disturbance of background noise, disruptive for deaf pupils' learning. Those mainstream teachers who were interested in deaf awareness would modify approach to lesson in order that delivery of instructions would be clarified and strengthened.	Need little effort for confirmation

My observations and immediate interpretations are validated with rigour in this way; triangulation of the data is routine; there is a deliberate effort to query my interpretations by seeking alternative explanations. The research is intended to help readers make their own interpretations and to assist readers in the recognition of subjectivity. The observations were not part of my own role, resisting the exploitation of the specialist platform as a teacher of the deaf. The research had to be sensitive to the risks of research with deaf pupils. As a researcher I was competent in the methodology and its substantive discipline, but also versed in issues about special needs and the education of the deaf. As such I aim to honour multiple realities [relativism] as well as the single view. Naturalistic generalisations are formed from observing vicarious experiences, alongside the triangulation of data.

In recording patterns of classroom talk, reviewing policy documents and analysing 'correspondence', to ensure I was noting everything of interest, I went through the observation notes and transcripts, line by line, identifying topics with little regard to pre-defined issues, and raising other issues presented. These would be used for recognition of issues in future

observations. For examples of this, see the outcome of the issues further developed in Table 4.8 chapter 3, strands of analysis: emic/etic issues. Through issues flagged, I identified emerging patterns.

Such common sub-themes were identified as *etic* issues (adapted from Stake 1995) to describe further focussed areas of the research questions. For example research question 1: Inclusion; Pupils' experience: *etic* issue, background noise, *validated* against acoustic conditions in the classroom other pupils describe, *triangulated* by comparing which conditions of learning pupils describe as optimum for them, e.g seating positions, use of phonic ear, teaching strategy adopted by the teacher, classroom management. *Generalised* for chapter 5 into discussion notes, such as acoustic conditions, peer group interaction, teacher approach to facilitating deaf pupils, etc.

Appendices I and J illustrate mainstream classroom observations analysed in slightly different ways. Appendix I is coded for teacher moves/responses using for terms taken from Stake's (1995) methodology to record the deaf pupils' involvement in their lesson. Appendix J is recorded using observation comments as to the strategies the mainstream teacher is using with which to draw the deaf pupils into the lesson, and the effect this has on their involvement. Specialist terms were adopted from other case study researchers to describe what was happening in the classroom during my observations. This helped in describing teacher/ pupil facilitation when reviewing pupils experience in the classroom. For example, in Appendix I: Observation 1: Mainstream Literacy Lesson: 23-3-02 Island of Zodor, four *etic* issues are highlighted as worthy of attention. Terms regarding pupil participation are adapted from Stake, 1995, taken as appropriate for this type of case study observation.

Issue 1: Amount of time teacher spent in classroom control (**decorum**).

Issue 2: Pupil expression: the way the teacher encouraged and elicited information from deaf pupils through BSL facilitation (**elicitation**).

Issue 3: Pupils' readiness to work, and how much they focussed on the facilitator, or teacher (**focussed**).

Issue 4: How much pupils needed further support, and explanation in BSL, to understand the task, i.e. whether they could start the task unassisted, or with minimal help (**Further help needed: FHN**).

In analysing elicitation in Observation 1, the following correspondence Table 3.8 shows whether BSL was used to elicit further information from deaf pupils.

Table 3.8: Correspondence Table: Teacher Elicitation

	Further help in BSL		TOTALS
	Mentioned	Not mentioned	
Elicitation mentioned	7	33	40
Elicitation not mentioned	6	61	67
Totals	13	94	107

Note: When teacher elicits pupil feedback in BSL at start of lesson, further help needed by pupils when work starts drops by around 50%.

3.6.2 Findings: At the time BSL was needed to back up the teacher's elicitation, the teacher was not using visual clues. BSL support was always required if the teacher provided purely verbal information. BSL support is also crucial as soon as pupils are asked to start a focussed task.

To elaborate on these findings, and cast further light on the kinds of dialogue found most constructive when BSL interpretation is used, a second approach, Wood *et al.*'s (1986) framework was used. Wood *et al.* (1986) argue that ethnographic research offers teachers a practical approach most relevant to research within their own field. The search for meaning is a search for patterns, for consistency within certain conditions or for 'correspondence', that is, patterns which link in similarity.

Appendices K1-5 show analyses of raw data. These appendices show how I looked for threads in documents, observations and interviews, and coded the data, aggregated the frequencies and established patterns. Sometimes, I found significant meaning in a single instance, but usually the important meaning comes from re-appearance, over and over again. The method of analysis used was categorical aggregation, and direct interpretation. Sometimes the patterns would stand out in advance, drawn from the research objectives serving as a template for the analysis, as with the

expected quality of learning when withdrawing pupils to the Unit for work, after the initial introduction to the lesson in the mainstream. Sometimes the patterns unexpectedly emerge from the analysis, such as the marked negative effect background noise has on pupils' learning.

The raw data is recorded with key thoughts cross-linked to other interpretations. This is cross-linked with possible confused interpretations to regulate interpretations. Patterns of data were cross-linked between methods used, activities and data outcomes. As the data was reviewed new data was gathered, and querying of findings was deliberately sought between competing interpretations, as discussed with my supervisor.

As data became cross-linked, so I could triangulate findings and assert a sense of correspondence which led to an ability to interpret ideas between behavioural issues, and contexts of the particular case. For example, a child's disconnection from the lesson and background disruption from noise. Sometimes the simple question, 'What did that mean?' helped find the pattern of significance through direct interpretation. For the more important episodes, or passages, more time was spent reflecting, looking repeatedly, triangulating, being sceptical about first impressions and first meanings. For the evidence most critical to my assertions, I isolated the repetitions and the most pertinent correspondence, challenging the adequacy of the data for that assertion. For most observations time and interest call for formal analysis, and sections of data are isolated for further interpretation.

Both pre-established codes, taken from Stake, 1995, as appropriate for pupil observation on research areas Question 1, Inclusion and Question 3, Communication, and Woods et al 1986 (as useful for dialogue, adapted for research question 2, Pedagogy), and new codes collected from 'idea catalogs' (Lincoln and Guba, 1990 p.50) were used in analysis. It is useful to go through data separately looking for new codes, and reworking old data as new codes become significant. This pattern followed for example, in moving from aspects of general teacher strategy to aspects of focused facilitation. Full coverage was impossible for all data, so I spend the majority of analytic time on the clear foci for each observation, with clear aims and objectives, e.g. Acoustic equipment: Farhan's experience of using

his hearing aid, his experiencing of using hearing aids and phonic ears in the classroom; whether this equipment becomes a nuisance for a teacher when managing its use in a classroom; Farhan's attitude towards the teacher's use of equipment, etc.

In the search for meaning, the analysis was the primary aim; to roam out and return to these foci through a varied selection of the focused view from the pupils.

...the critical task in qualitative research is not to accumulate all the data you can, but to 'can' (i.e. get rid of) most of the data you accumulate. This requires constant winnowing. The trick is to discover essences and then to reveal those essences with sufficient context, yet not become mired trying to include everything that might possibly be described. (Wolcott 1990. p.35)

3.7 Summary of Methodology

This dissertation confirms the importance of the ethnographic case-study approach as an appropriate tool to observe language and behaviour in this type of research project.

The case study, like other research methods, is a way of investigating an empirical topic by following a set of pre-specified procedures, such as possible sources of evidence, a pilot case study, a literature search, establishing principles, methods of data collection, defining a suitable research design, and analytic and evaluative methods. All these procedures have their strengths and weaknesses, but I consider each as part of a repertoire which contributes to a whole picture. The method I had chosen offered a robust quality in that it allowed me to focus on different aspects, e.g. teacher approach or sign language. For example, when noted in the literature search (cf 2.4 Kyle, 1994, Wood *et al.* 1986; Powers, 1999, Reason and Palmer 2002) that strategy and teacher control were more influential than the use of BSL itself, the flexibility of the approach allowed for a change of focus.

This approach allowed me to contrast alternative perspectives, for example the strategies of data collection and recording talk that Mercer (1995) uses,

or the Case Studies that Allan (1999) describes. Lastly, for this case study to be complete (Yin, 1994), the boundaries of the case had to be characterised in three ways.

- Firstly the distinction between the phenomenon studied [the deaf pupils] and its context [inclusion] was given explicit attention. Through presentation of evidence in transcripts and tables, I show BSL had less impact on the deaf pupils' learning than the structure of the lessons they attended. Such testing of the case study boundaries persist throughout the research as boundaries have to remain tightly defined to retain focus.
- Secondly, I had to present evidence that critical pieces of research material had been given full attention in the analyses, so rival propositions could be discounted.
- Thirdly, I tried to present a complete piece of work within the time constraints allowed; to carry out the research competently, to ensure data was examined in a balanced way, and conclusions drawn only after competing perspectives had been discounted.

This methodology has allowed me to go beyond simply examining the 'method' of communication, and to focus on the style, and quality, of the linguistic environment, together with its implications for the educational process. One important aim of this research is to use a straightforward methodology which teachers can employ to analyse and evaluate their own use of language in guiding the 'construction of knowledge' (Mercer, 1995).

Chapter 4 Analysis

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter we focus on the triangulated data, focussing on the main themes, sub-themes and research questions in turn, and using features of that analysis to make analytical statements. The research then attempts to relate the outcome of analytical statements to an emerging story. The research themes are appraised from the outcome of chapter 3, conclusions being drawn from patterns reoccurring in coded data. The chapter ends with how each strand of 'emic' and 'etic' issues (Stake 1995) cf 3.5.3, relate to findings.

4.2 Inclusion

Triangulation of data and findings, research question 1:

How do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom? Sub-themes: pupils' views on inclusion, acoustic conditions.

Are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of needs? Sub-themes: pupils' views on deaf identity, peer group interaction.

4.2.1. Pupils' views on inclusion

Deaf pupils face enormous challenges in addition to the usual developmental needs faced by all pupils. Primarily they need opportunities to use language to engage with others (cf 2.1 Wood 1988). These opportunities must be embedded in comprehensible social contexts, where there are other adults who share the language and who can help make the world intelligible, as shown in this example:

I really like sitting in front of Mrs. Baker. When she writes on the board, I can guess quick! When she plays games I guess her words, she give me Buzzy Bee sticker. I think we like her games a lot. One time we played sentences rolling dice with words on. One time we played timetables with conkers. She likes to talk to us. Really she wants us to tell the lesson to her. She laughs at my stories.

(Sarah, yr 6, interview, 6th February, 2002)

Some of the lessons, like science, we do go over beforehand in the Unit. Mrs. Rork explains the lesson [instructions or preparation for work] so that we'll know what's happening when the lesson comes.

Mrs. Benson comes in for the lessons, often with Velcro bits [visual resources] she's made, and we all like playing with her things. [The hearing pupils also are very involved when Mrs. Benson made interactive resources for all the pupils to use.]

(Shadeh, yr 5, interview 10th October, 2002)

Michele Moore (2000, p.14) suggests that '*...the disabled are put into a restrictive and discriminatory reality*' since

...That disablement means impairment and impairment means social flaw..(David Hervey (1993) in Michele Moore 2000, p38)

This was experienced by Shadeh:

'When they say you're deaf and the supply teachers get told 'He's deaf'. You're stuck. That's it. They think they can put you in a place and everything you should be learning. We can't tell them what we think we need. We can't say no to their bossing.'

(Shadeh, yr 3, Interview, 12th January 2000)

Attitudes towards inclusion corroborated by a minority sample of pupils in RNID research (cf 2.2.2 RNID 2001):

We often have to go back to the Unit to catch up. This makes us very different to all the other children.

(Alexander, Yr 3, Interview 8th March 1999)

Children who feel categorised in this way experience profound difficulties in negotiating an alternative social identity (Michele Moore, 2000) (cf 2.1 regarding the dismantling of the pupils' identity (Foucault 1977)).

4.2.2 Pupils' views on acoustic conditions

Deaf pupils involved in individual work, or other deaf groups, withdrawn for lessons but without allocated Unit provision have to make do with limited space, and background disturbance, in the library, or corridors, which are not acoustically modified. These conditions are difficult – all classroom equipment has to be taken out and returned, and the conditions are noisy and there is competition with other groups also trying to work. This is off-putting for the staff as well as the pupils and very similar to having to tolerate the noise of the classroom:

The noise of chairs scraping and desks banging [signs feel ill] -is too much to cope with] it's better to say I have headache, then she lets me work outside. (Shadeh, yr 4, interview 13th September, 2001)

When we leave the classroom to work in the Unit ooooh, lovely soft quiet noise can think in quiet place. (Sarah, yr 5, 21st March, 2001)

Sometimes I switch my hearing aid off in class so that I can concentrate (Interview: Alexander, yr 4, 20th November, 2002,)

Hence deaf pupils would resort to their own coping strategies, by introducing artificial behaviour, termed by Allan (1999), 'transgressive practices', in order to manage their mainstream world (cf 2.2.2. Allan 1999).

When people speak in class, there are 32 children, there is a lot of noise and banging (desks, chairs, doors). They make such a lot of noise I can't hear. (Sarah, yr 5, interview, 21st March, 2001)

I don't understand the words and I hate my phonic ear, when I have to go to the front of the class to get the teacher's attention because she not put it on. I hate having to put my hand up. (Shadeh, yr 3, interview, 6th June 2000)

They were quite friendly at first but after a few weeks I was left to myself, and it was quite difficult to keep stopping people. (Sarah, Yr 6, 6th February, 2002)

She sits at the back and lets other people say something and had to be pushed to have her say. She says she doesn't know when to put her hand up. (Mrs Rork, interview 10th January, 2000)

I can't hear what they saying because there are 32 children in the class who makes such a noise I can't hear. (Alexander, Yr 5, interview after Design & Technology lesson, 25th September, 2003)

I can't sit right next to the window. The traffic noise is awful [signs nightmare]. I ask Miss Coombes sit me next to books

because they don't make noise! (Interview: Marie, yr 5, 5th November, 2002)

For a long time I sat at the back and looked out at playing field.[signs dream]. It is peaceful and did not know what is happening in the class. I would play football in my head. When Mrs. Harward saw my book [empty] she put me next to her desk, but I is right underneath the desk light and after a long time I felt nearly blinded! (Interview: Farhan, 4th December, 2000)

Within this situation, the children's own language needs do not seem to have been recognised, and they seem to have had difficulties successfully negotiating their way through a feasible working language (BSL or English) in the classroom, and have resorted to their own strategies of coping (cf 2.2.1 Wedell 1990, Wood 1988).

4.2.3 Pupils' views on Deaf identity

The following diary extract notes the way in which some deaf pupils try and meet their own learning objectives independently, in the mainstream class:

Farhan has taken responsibility for a number of deaf issues himself to enhance communication and he manages the use of his hearing aids well. The class teacher uses a radio aid and he prefers the class teacher rather than the LSA, to wear a transmitter, particularly if the teacher does a lot of demonstration in the lesson, as he needs to switch immediately to what she is doing. When attending to the LSA, unless Farhan switches off his aid, he may be receiving confusing messages. Since there is a time lag between the class teacher and the LSA's signing, he may also miss the beginning of the demonstration and it is important that the teacher waits on him to attend. If the class teacher is aware of these points, it is possible to allow for the extra demands made on deaf pupils. [Diary observation, yr 3, 17th January, 2002]

Greenview's SEN policy (1995) and LEA Inclusion Policy (1996) describe resources such as instructional methods and environmental arrangements that facilitate the child's access to the full curriculum. However none of the

documents describe the ways that pupils may intervene to slow down the pace of the class, and where the child is managing independently without the support of the LSA or the ToD in the classroom it may be difficult for the child to have a voice strong enough to intervene. This study also reflected the wish of the pupils to choose whether they wanted to use the LSA, for example when they were involved in group discussion. Farhan comments:

Sometimes I try to manage [be independent]. I am very proud to work on my own in D.T. [Design & Technology] or Art. At other times if Mrs. Benson is late, I just have to act big. [Pretend I can manage] (Interview: Farhan, [BSL signed] yr3, 17th January, 2002)

In these instances he was reliant on the pupils willing to use a few signs, and used the small amount of residual hearing he had, amplified by his hearing aids. Another set of factors came into play for him, such as the negative, and occasionally intolerable, effect of background noise, the need for clear instructions, and the need for lip-reading. Farhan disguised the fact that he had not heard properly, by pretending to understand, and using a neighbour to assist him with supporting information. But as this extract shows, as a deaf pupil, he would still need to disclose his difficulties to the teacher if he wished to learn (cf 2.1 Grieg and Taylor 1999):

Sometimes I say, 'Yes' even when I don't know, otherwise they might think deaf is stupid. (Interview: Farhan, yr 2, 2nd May, 2001)

Farhan's denial of his misunderstanding shows us how keen he is to move away from the label of 'deaf'. By simply nodding, it allows the lesson to continue with the chance of picking up later clues. As J. Allan (1999) comments, pupils may see a sign of failure to understand as yet another 'coercive marker of disability' and by avoiding this identity, Farhan seeks to assimilate further and 'fit in' with his peers) (cf 2.2.2. Corker 1996, Kyle 1993, Hartsock 1996). Another example of this is shown as follows.

The use of hearing aids and phonic ears may also be avoided by deaf pupils in their struggle to assimilate into an inclusive class. Mainstream teachers, in their lack of ease with unfamiliar equipment may be unaware that obtrusive use of such aids in front of a class further separates the deaf pupil as a coercive marker of disability.

'My mum wears a hearing aid, and so does my brother, but my hearing aid has been broken for ages and the phonic ear doesn't work.' (Sarah, yr 5, interview, 15th February 2001)

This suited Sarah, because she spoke of hating the phonic ear. Pupils comment that teachers are not aware of how to use the phonic ear, do not understand how hearing aids work, and need to check with the teacher of the deaf as to the accuracy of their skill to use equipment.

The deaf pupils usually fell into two categories: those who wished to communicate with their deaf friends, or those who would communicate with their wider hearing peer group. This greatly influenced how they saw themselves in terms of group membership and social identity.

Despite my hearing (loss) I had the good luck of being with my hearing friends in my class. (Interview Marie, yr 5, 24th October, 2002)

Lane (1995) describes '...deaf pupils in promoting a view of themselves as disabled', and as Farhan commented, he sought to avoid further stigmatising (interview 2nd May 2001).

However Sarah's view, 'we all sign – that's my language' (interview 9th July, 2002) conquers with Ladd, 1991 that sign language cannot be substituted by hearing aids or lip reading (cf Corker 1996). Corker (1996) comments on the importance of deaf people 'gaining recognition, acceptance and affirmation of deafness without assumptions about deaf identity as the driving force in their lives.' (Cf 2.2.1 Spencer 2006)

Alexander comments:

I did not know if I would understand much (an introduction to a new teacher) but he faced me, then he stopped after each sentence, and I was able to follow.

(Interview Alexander, yr 5, 16th September, 2000)

In cases where the children could not express themselves in sign or English, The deaf pupils were forced to communicate in a way which did not concur with Greenview's 1995 Communication Policy:

When there is a teacher we don't know I would sort of use arm or finger directions. (Sarah, yr 6, interview, 6th February, 2002)

I use sign to imagine things to myself, when I am bored or have stopped listening. (Farhan, Interview, yr 4, 5th November, 2002)

Signing keeps us together, separates us from other people. (Sarah, yr 6, Interview, 6th February, 2002)

My deaf friends are the most important part of school life. (Alexander, yr 4, interview, 11th September, 2001)

Little recognition was given to this core element of the deaf pupils school life. Much of their recognition of their deaf culture came from their school life, without much contact from the wider deaf community:

The lessons I have with the other deaf (children) help me learn more. (Alexander, yr 4 interview, 18th September 2001)

Deaf - different can work best in different way prefer work without aid. (Hearing aid). Don't like talk, I prefer signing. Like doing making things. Like experiments and games. (Sarah, yr 3, Interview, 6th July 2000)

In some ways this concurs with Corker's (1993) view that 'the deaf community...transgressed into their deaf identity and have demanded greater recognition as a 'separate linguistic cultural group' rather than as disabled people...' (cf 2.3.1 DEX 1997, Corbett 1997, Giorcelli 2002)

4.2.4 Pupils' views on peer group interaction

Some of the hearing pupils respond very well when a few tactful words in preparation are said to make them more sensitive to a deaf pupil's needs:

Mrs. Dawes told us that it would take a little bit longer for Alexander to understand, and that we are to give him a few chances when thinking about things. We like having him in the group because sometimes we go into the Unit for work.

(Interview: John, (hearing child) yr 5, 9th September 2000)

Some hearing pupils comment that the deaf pupils are often ignored, others comment that they receive too much help. Hearing pupils identify noise as interfering when trying to understand the deaf pupils' speech.

To start with they didn't understand us. But then they got used to our talk and the signing and we found they liked us.

(Alexander, yr 2, 8th March 2001)

If I try and make friends I can't lip read and they can't sign, but I can beat them at football. So I couldn't care less really. It's nice when they share stuff with me.

(Alexander, yr 5, 9th September 2000)

Sometimes I laugh, but I don't understand their jokes (signs nodding dog). When we had deaf part in school play we made up some jokes in sign about hearing people which we told everyone about. (Shadeh, yr 4, 5th April 2001)

The pupils pointed out that their contact with school was the main focus for their lives (cf 2.3.1.Hopwood 2000). Since most of the pupils came from hearing families, and had not been born into signing families (Sarah was the exception), they loved sharing and learning sign language, and gain great support from explaining things to each other and sharing information:

Every time we are lining up, washing our hands, going to the paint brushes, we can sign. No one minds what we say. We like being able to talk about the others. (Laughs)

(Farhan, yr 3, interview, 17th October, 2002)

We get marks for English (spoken, read, written). Everything we do is English. But we understand sign language. We can sort our problems out in sign language.

(Alexander, yr 4, interview 11th September 2001)

We could go to a hearing adult when we need help. But it is best when we help each other. We don't like going to people for help. (Marie, yr 5, interview, 17th December, 2002)

This concurs with the view that some pupils would prefer not to collude with a view that sees them as disabled. (Lane 1995, in Allan 1995).

Or, as Farhan comments...

I can't say I don't know, otherwise they will think deaf is stupid. (Farhan, yr 3, interview, 10th October, 2002)

Occasionally the pupils' desire to conceal their deafness emerged in anger and distress, and cooperated in promoting a view of seeing themselves as disabled (cf Giorcelli 2002). The collective strength they felt when they worked together helped to resolve this issue. This concurs with the positive transgression of a collective response by the deaf community remarked upon by Bienvenu, 1989, in Allan, 1995 'We are proud of our language, culture and heritage. Disabled we are not!' (Bienvenu, 1989 in Allan 1995, p.98 cf 2.2.2. Allan 1999).

The deaf pupils interviewed at Greenview School do not always assess how deaf they are according to their actual hearing loss, and, in some cases, their definition of their own deafness is based on friendship groups, and those that they best communicate with. Deaf pupils have a mixed attitude to disclosing their deafness, and asking for help. They describe this aspect of relationships as having advantages and disadvantages. For example, it can improve communication, and make hearing pupils much more interested in issues of deafness. On the negative side, hearing pupils can treat the deaf pupils differently because of their deafness, ask over-inquisitive questions, or take advantage of this personal disclosure to exclude the pupil because of their deafness:

We try and make her feel alright if she is not hearing right

(Interview with a hearing child Robert, 14th March 2001)

This good support system was encouraged by all teachers, who worked hard to support deaf/hearing integration. This was acknowledged by the deaf pupils:

It's really nice when hearing pupils come up and say will you choose me as your helper, but sometimes I don't want to be different. I like it when the teacher says please would you help her, [the hearing pupil] needs help collecting books. The second one, I'm normal. [The same as the other pupils] I like it best. Choosing helpers all the time make me feel special [signs freakish] and I want to be the same,

not different. [Researcher: what would help you be the same?] I like being with the others [deaf pupils] with the same friends. We have lots to sign [talk about]. The hearing pupils some are nice, but not the same. (Interview: Farhan, yr4, 16th October, 2002)

Mainstream peers of deaf pupils can play an important part as gate keepers of inclusion. Alexander said that 'Sometimes his friends understood what it was like to be deaf and they helped him'. However all pupils in this sample commented that they had problems when their friends spoke too fast or for too long. Sarah commented that her mainstream friends helped her manage work she found difficult by pointing out the answers, but at the same time as helping her in a hearing environment, they often forgot about her deafness in conversations with her, e.g. by forgetting to speak clearly:

They talk behind their hands or turn away, and then it's embarrassing because I don't know whether to ask or ignore it. (Sarah, interview, yr 5, 14th March, 2001)

However all of the deaf pupils at Greenview School commented that most informal conversation took place in groups where it was difficult to switch attention from one speaker to another fast enough. All deaf pupils perceived some difficulty because of this, but appreciated attempts from hearing peers to talk to them (cf 2.3.1 Ladd 1991, DEX 1997).

Unit staff work hard to support the whole group when there is a deaf pupil involved, and are especially supportive towards providing resources so a hearing pupil can work with a deaf pupil. In this way some hearing pupils became very skilled at knowing the deaf pupil's level of comprehension:

I get good at knowing where Alexander is, if he has not caught up. I can explain ideas as drawings. I can write down quickly what people have said. We do a juggling class together, and now we know a lot by looking at each other (Interview: John, yr 5, 18th September, 2000).

4.3 Pedagogy

Triangulation of data and findings, research question 2:

What educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work? Sub-themes: pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils.

How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy? Sub-themes: pupils' views of teacher moves and responses.

4.3.1 Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils

Playing a productive role with their peers at Greenview demands good skills as a listener, and contributor, whilst being a teacher, with the additional awareness that deaf pupils would find the flow of discussions difficult to follow (cf 2.3.1 Corbett 1997, Giorcelli 2002). The deaf pupils participated successfully as members in mainstream groups following specific activities, such as sport and P.E., games, in music groups, singing and story telling [with deaf partners], but engagement with peers in teacher-led group discussions is generally too difficult for them to follow, unless there is space, and opportunity, for the facilitator to pace the discussion. For example:

On an occasion when the yr 2 class teacher, Miss Coombes announced, 'O.K. tidy up time!' Mrs. Benson who is dealing with deaf pupils at the back of the room, did not hear. Farhan realised what all the frantic activity is about [a risk of losing points to gain an early play], and got up to flash the lights for the other deaf pupils to tidy up. The hearing pupils screeched and urged their deaf classmates to hurry, but the deaf pupils are with Mrs. Benson who did not register the fuss is important to the pupils. Miss Coombes adopted a hostile reaction to the fuss, and hissed at Farhan to stop signing. [This could not have been intercepted by Mrs. Benson to interpret.] Shortly afterwards, Mrs. Benson took her place at the front of the class, and is ready to interpret for the pupils. The deaf pupils looked at her and signed 'Good'. Miss Coombes, however had a serious face, and selected those pupils who did not have deaf pupils on their tables to go first.

(Obs/diary notes: yr 2 mainstream class, 27th April, 2001)

This observation indicates that when the need is pressing, mainstream teachers and hearing pupils could forget the children's deafness. Miss

Coombes seemed to penalise the deaf pupils for an instruction they had not seen, and did not give the facilitator an opportunity to help. In such a situation it is improbable there would be time to discuss the issue with a teacher, until the pupils grouped for registration in the Unit after lunchtime.

It can be hard for staff to remember the limiting factor is neither intelligence nor laziness, but language (cf 2.2 Campbell and Oliver 1996):

In groups, sometimes I don't open my mouth. I don't know what they've said, and I'll seem like an idiot. It helps if Mrs. Benson has given me a paper [summary of lesson] or if they've told me what new words to learn [i.e. new vocabulary has been explored]. If I work in a pair with John, he goes over the work in the book [course book] and helps me learn the ideas with the new words.

(Interview: Alexander, yr 5, 9th September 2000)

4.3.2 Pupils' views of teachers' moves and responses

Sometimes they can't finish one question before they start another... it's much too easy to make myself look stupid so I won't speak in class. But Mr. Cox knows this. He lets me work with John, shows me what to do. Then we get house points.

(Interview: Alexander, yr 5 18th September, 2000)

Amongst the deaf pupils, it was observed that, as they matured, had consolidated their ability to play, and were able to construct mutual understanding in communication, so they could begin to hold sustained interactions with each other (cf 2.4 Edwards and Mercer 1987, Gregory and Bishop 1991). It helped when teachers acknowledge that conversation during lessons was part of their language development: Sarah, Marie, Farhan and Alexander had grown up signing with each other, and in the Unit classroom so were very communicative with each other. For example, in a literacy activity they signed:

Alexander: Look! You've done wrong! That piece missing! [Points to book]

Farhan: I know it [I still have those ones to do]

Marie: Too hard. Can't cut with those. Not right. Better. [You should use these scissors]

Alexander: Mrs. Baker said tell her when finished. Tell her.

Farhan: Yours not right. Cut wrong. Rubbish.

Marie: Share with me. You can help. (Observation: PATHS Unit lesson, 13th February, 2002)

The pupils show great insight into the varying pedagogical approach of teachers. The deaf pupils are aware that it is not only the teacher who needs to be aware of the obstacles that deafness may present but the other pupils too had to be aware of difficulties with communication which may interfere with 'normal' social interaction (cf 2.4 Lynas 2002, Gregory and bishop 1991)

We can't answer if they talk so fast. But then we get blamed for not asking (when we don't know). We like the signing in the unit. It isn't all talking. (Alexander, yr 1, 4th June 2000)

See for example the following observation on 9th February, 2001, of Alexander's inability to stall the class to check with the teacher the point in the text they had reached:

Alexander raised his hand and kept it up for over four minutes. When he is fully recognised, his questions are, 'Where are we?' He had missed a large section of the worksheet they are going through because he had never figured out what Miss Coombes is talking about. (Diary observation, year 4, 14th March 2002)

Alexander is not given the means to stop the class so he could function adequately as a learner. He may have had no choice but to use the same strategy as those without disabilities, and therefore reduce his identity so as not to transgress the normal behaviour of mainstream pupils needing help. As Magill shows, ethical work for pupils with special needs privileges their desires over professionally-constructed needs, but 'this means not what we most powerfully desire, but which desires we most identify with, or most value' (Magill, 1997. p71, in Allan 1999).

Some teachers don't know we're deaf and ignore us. Some teachers really know we're deaf [Shadeh means they are Deaf aware] and they like us. They do great things to make us the same. Like at games, or plays or fun things we get picked to show hearing. Like at model making [design and technology] we get head teachers

stickers. Like at games we're really fast, we get picked because we are deaf and are as good as hearing, sometimes so fast, better than hearing! (Shadeh, yr 3, interview, 14th June, 2000)

Having a facilitator (such as the LSA or the teacher of the deaf, who commonly supported the deaf pupils) often complicated the illusion of support, as it gives the illusion of access, despite the mainstream experience often being unintelligible (cf 2.4 Bruner 1985) as in the following example:

Researcher: What helps you learn in the big classroom?

Shadeh: It's boring [I think Shadeh means generally negative: signs noise, plenty of disturbance, other pupils pushing others]. Other pupils are too busy, so much noise. The teacher is talking too fast, writing, writing talking, talking. There too much to look at. It fast e scapes me, I'm lost. (Shadeh, yr 4, interview, 22nd February, 2002)

The data that follows on as part of research question 2: Pedagogy, focuses on the Moves Matrix section of research which focussed on teacher moves (dialogue in class) and pupil responses, and, with the addition of my review of the field notes I began the process of cross linking data toward making patterns of correspondence from coded data (see appendices K1 – K5). It was from this material that grounded theory started to emerge. (Glaser and Strauss 1967, Burgess, 1982). From my field notes I annotated questions I had about my interpretation of events, and noted what I wished to further clarify to investigate perceptions, and highlight further areas with which to question the evidence. Through the presentation of evidence in the observation materials and matrix summary tables (adapted from Woods et al 1986), I show that BSL had less impact on the deaf pupils' learning than the structure of the lessons they participated in.

Table 4.1: Coding categories for teacher moves

Analysis 23-3-02 ~ Island of Zodor (Introduction)						
Teacher	Pupil Response					
Teacher Move	✓	✓ 4	✗	✗ 4	nr	Other
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	3	1	0	2	0
3	8	1	0	0	0	0
4	0	3	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.2	1	1	0	0	0	1
5.3	0	1	0	0	0	1
Ch	0	0	0	0	1	0

(adapted from Woods et al 1986) See Table 4.2 for coding categories

Table 4.1 shows the analysis of teacher/pupil interaction for each coded communication. Table 4.2 shows coding categories for types of teacher moves or responses. The ‘hybrid’ moves and ‘tag contributions’ are not shown, but are available in Table 4.3, which shows how much time was spent in the lesson for each coded category of communication. The concept for this structure of analysis comes from the model Wood *et al.* (1986) use in their study of conversations with deaf pupils.

Table 4.2: Coding Categories

Level of teacher control (T. move)	Examples:
1. Enforced repetition	Say, ‘Nobody gave me one’.
2. Closed questions	Was your dad happy or sad?
3. Open questions	What happened on Sunday?
4. Personal contributions	That’s my favourite as well. It’s called a gosling. It must have been really scary.
5. Phatics	Ooh! Lovely! Fantastic! Oh really. I see.
Pupil Response Categories:	
✓	Appropriate answer to question (even if wrong!)
✓ 4	Appropriate answer plus elaborating contribution
✗	Clear misunderstanding of what is required in question
✗ 4	Clear misunderstanding but pupil goes on to add contribution
nr	No response
?	Unintelligible
Ch	Chairing move, e.g. ‘OK Farhan, tell us about it’
Other	Any move not covered above, e.g. management in the form of: ‘Now let’s see who is sitting up nicely’, Teacher’s deliberate ignoring of wrong answer Facial response positive or negative/ body language

Acknowledgement to Wood *et al.* 1986

Table 4.3 is a sample of coding type per lesson (for full lesson transcript see appendix I) as a completed observation record coded for teacher moves according to table 4.2. It shows levels of teacher control, marked 1-5 and pupil response categories using Wood *et al.*’s (1986) codes. It shows the

more personal contributions (2, 4.), or tag contributions (5.2), the teacher makes, the better the pupil response.

Table 4.3: Sample of coding type per lesson

Analysis 24/3/02 Island of Zodor (Introduction)		
Length of extract: 345 seconds		
Category of move/control	Number/Incidence of each move	
	Number	%
Pupils participating	13	43% of class
Number of teacher utterances	35 295 secs.	64% of time
Number of pupil utterances	21 50 secs.	0.1% of time
Teacher's participation: % of T utterances		
1. Enforced repetition	0	0%
2. Closed questions	8	22%
3. Open questions	11	31%
4. Personal contributions	6	17%
5. Phatics	5	14%
5.1 Requests for repetition	0	0%
5.2 Tag phatics	4	11%
5.3 Tag contributions	1	2%
Pupil response:	Number/Incidence	% of Pupil utterances
	8	38%
4	8	38%
✕	1	4%
✕ 4	0	0%
nr	2	9%
?	0	0%
ch (response from teacher)	5	
Other	2	9%
Average length of utterances: teacher - 3.5 seconds. pupils - 1 second.		

Findings: Wood *et al.*'s (1986) concept of analysing teacher style, as a measure of 'teacher power', was simply the proportion of each teacher's conversational turns that end in a controlling move – questions and enforced, or requested, repetitions. A teacher who asks questions and, or, demands repetitions at the expense of lesser controlling options, such as contributions, or phatics, will gain a high power ratio, whereas one who asks relatively few gains a lesser ratio.

The 'Moves Matrix' used by Wood *et al.* (1986) provides an overall framework, useful for analysing teacher moves and pupil response as topics are introduced, both to the mainstream classroom and in the Unit, as in Table 4.1 for illustration, and Table 4.4 for a summary of results. The diagrammatic analysis allows the 'pattern' of response to be checked whilst a dialogue is in progress. [For verbatim recording the audio-tapes were transcribed.] As shown in Table 4.1, by reproducing a list of possible moves

the teacher will make on the left side of the matrix, and possible types of pupil responses at the top, the outcome of the teacher's move and the pupils' response can be identified. This system works well and the 'Moves Matrix' can be used to assess the locus of control in other aspects of interaction, for example, in conversation. The outcome of the pupils' response held the crucial key, as examples of teacher strategy that elicited the most response from learning. Through this method, teachers can analyse their own style of interaction objectively, as they hear their own recordings, and understand how the subsequent matrix reveals a profile of response over ten lessons, as in Table 4.4.

The results in Tables 4.1 and 4.4 can be measured in two ways. Firstly as a measure of how much 'initiative' the pupils show, and secondly, how talkative they are. The first finding, regarding initiative, takes into account several different features of pupils' responses. How does a pupil answer a question, and then go on to elaborate on the answer with an unsolicited additional contribution? How likely is the pupil to make another contribution after the teacher has made a contribution, or simply acknowledge what has already been said? How often does the pupil ask questions? These findings show that pupil responses, following the topic introduction, are negatively related to teacher power. In other words, pupils become increasingly passive as a teacher increases control via questioning.

Another kind of measure, which can be seen from Table 4.4, is the occurrence of how much the pupil says, i.e. how talkative they are, and from what kind of teacher move this originates. For example how much the deaf pupils would say depends on what the teacher has just said. Their usual length of response of words, or word-like sounds, was between two and three words. They offer short responses after two-choice questions, and only elaborate on these approximately 20% of the time, with relatively long responses after contributions, and, or, phatics, from the teacher. In other words, after contributions from the teacher ['Oh, yes, I've got one like that too!'] or phatics ['Gosh, lovely!'] pupil response will be longer and more receptive. In sessions where teacher control started high and stayed high, deaf [and hearing] pupils become progressively less likely to show any signs of verbal initiative, and their responses become briefer and briefer. Turns

become much shorter when teacher control is high. These important indications show that it is not enough to consider the relative merits of using BSL in the classroom, or whether a pupil is naturally talkative, or confident, we must go further and conclude that what they say, and how they say it, is strongly influenced by the facilitative style of the teacher.

From the 180 hours spent observing and transcribing, many such tables were collated. These tables do not indicate the ways pupils may talk, or not talk, to each other. However, the transcripts within this study continue to suggest that when teacher control is high, findings indicate that pupils do not easily talk, or listen, to each other, or address comments, or questions, to their peers. When control is low, pupils are not only more likely to contribute, but also to talk to each other. In this way the whole atmosphere of group discussion can be influenced by simple facilitative strategies on the part of the teacher.

Table 4.4 shows the analysis of teacher/pupil interaction for total averages of 10 lessons observed (%). In total, there were 180 hours observation and coding. Numbers in bold indicate the highest incidence of loquacious responses to teacher moves.

Table 4.4 Coding Interactions per 10 Lessons
(Averages of ten lesson introductions in percentages)

T. move	✓	✓ 4	2/3	4	5	✗	Other
1	100	0	0	0	0	2	1
2	57	23	0	3	0	6	16
3	72	5	3	3	0	15	12
4	0	4	6	71	23	0	3
5	0	0	4	78	20	0	4
5.2	58	37	0	1	0	0	3

For coding categories, see Table 4.2 for explanation.

As the following extract shows, equality of opportunity was unusual at Green view school. Even if the teacher's intention was to be non-controlling in conversation, uncertainty and insecurity about smoothness in following a line of thought could still result in a very tightly-structured chat, as this extract shows:

Teacher: Good Morning Alexander

Alexander: Good morning Miss Wilson

T: Good .What's this you've got?

A: Mummy medal

T: It's your mummy's medal. Can you say 'My mummy's medal'?

A: It mummy medal.

T: It's mummy's medal.

A: It mummy's medal.

T: Did she win it at the Marathon?

A: It win at Marathon.

T: She did win it at the Marathon.

A: It she win at Marathon.

(Alexander/Mrs. Barbour dialogue extract, yr 1, 14th September, 1999)

This research finds that the teacher's attempts to encourage pupils to entertain a line of thought, or to engender talk around a topic, by starting interaction through questions, are unsuccessful. Even when hearing pupils respond to such opening questions, their replies tend to fall wide of the target topic or are irrelevant. They seem to respond to 'please the teacher' and to assume that all the questions have a single 'right' answer.

Rarely do pupils think about the origins, or circumstances, surrounding an opening question. Indeed most adults seem to treat this strategy as rhetorical. But when such questions arise after a passage of discourse, or after an appropriate verbal 'map' has been established, pupils are much more likely to produce a considered, and appropriate, reply. Lessons where both the teacher and the pupils, have made a variety of contributions, rather than a series of questions from the teacher and a selection of answers from pupils, are more likely to provide a freer desire to communicate from deaf and hearing pupils alike. Some of the more innovative teachers see creative ways to forge relationships, by bestowing responsibilities on, and attributing skills to, members of the class who seem the most unlikely candidates for positive attention:

In the first year of Mrs. Dawes class we are doing 'dance' and supposedly listening to the whole lesson on the tape. Of course, there's no way I could listen to it, so Mrs. Baker got Matthew Denning, the worst one in the class, the one who is always being sent to Miss Cook to lip-speak what is being said on the tape so that I is able to follow, and he didn't get in trouble for the whole lesson. In

fact he is really good at helping me. Some of the teachers are really good at knowing who can help me, and the hearing ones [pupils] often ask if they can be my helper.

(Interview: Alexander, yr 2, 23rd March 2001)

As Greenwood LEA's SEN policy document (1993) describes, educational programmes should pay particular attention to the development of language and communication skills through conversational language work, expressive and receptive language development work (cf 2.4 Webster and Wood 1989). One such teacher, Mrs Baker, who was interested in this area reflected on preliminary observations in this study, and having heard recorded examples of her work, decided she asked too many questions and was doing a great deal of 'checking' on what the pupils were saying. As part of this study, she modified her style by introducing topics in a number of ways, maintaining each style for several weeks and recording, and analysing, interactions with the pupils en route, through a diary in which she made comments as observations progressed. As a researcher, I shared these notes, and added reflections from different points of view using Wood's (1988) analysis. Mrs. Baker noted that, as she questioned pupils less, and made more contributions of her own, pupils developed greater initiative at the start of introducing new material, said more and were much more interesting to listen to. Perhaps the pupils understood what she wanted to achieve, by her own commitment to the project, and her confidence that they could be given better access to discussions, instilled in them confidence to respond differently.

After three weeks of changed behaviour, Mrs Baker opted to revert back to traditional teacher-questioning high-level styles. However Mrs. Baker's changed strategy over the three weeks had the longer term effect of pupils becoming more independent, and confident, and rejecting the more traditional style of questioning, and repair. This next move was rejected by the pupils, who ignored her attempts to control the dialogue by overt use of a series of questions. The progress of this personal piece of action research is noted by Mrs. Baker in diary form, whilst observations, and interviews with Mrs. Baker, are carried out by myself. See the following example:

Mrs. Baker: Mrs. Dunoon [Lunchtime supervisor] has said you are all

getting far too cheeky at lunchtime. In order to support her, we will have a little listening game this afternoon. Pupils who do not win points will not be going out to play later. Is that clear? Right 3JB [class name], Today we are going to practice being less chatty.

Pupil 1: Where's Buzzy Bee?

Mrs. Baker: Buzzy Bee is having a rest! Please put up your hand to answer a question and no calling out!

Pupil 2: Did you bring the CD player?

Mrs. Baker: That's very cheeky. I want you to answer 'Good Afternoon' only. We shall practice strict rules; No calling out! Sit nicely! Mouths zipped! Whose turn is it to take the register? Where is the special pen? Who shall I choose?

Pupils: [Silence]. (Observation: mainstream class, 18th June, 2002).

This changed regime did not last long however, and soon the pupils' questioning stalled Mrs. Baker. They refused to relinquish their conversational power and kept interrupting. Pupils seemed to be reluctant to let her play a more controlling role. The pupils continued to expect a more equal, and active, role in their lessons, through their extended confidence and communicative ability. As Mrs. Baker comments:

I liked the way the pupils seemed more equal in discussion, and the way they are involved in supporting each other. Relationships in the class are much livelier and had in common, the sharing of the responsibility for developing the topic. It is an enriching time for me as well as the pupils. (Interview: Mrs. Baker, 12th July, 2002)

As one pupil responded, it is the idea of empathy they could relate to:

We like Mrs. Baker, we like Buzzy Bee. Mrs. Baker isn't like the other teachers. She lets us do nice things. She helps us understand. She likes us. (Interview: Marie, yr 5, 24th October, 2002)

The capacity of deaf pupils to behave creatively, and to use opportunities offered, is seemingly limitless if they perceive an opportunity to be meaningful.

This type of analysis reveals useful findings about how much of the mainstream classwork the deaf pupils were receptive to. Using the support

of a learning support assistant, or teacher of the deaf, to interpret BSL is important, but the most important part of the findings is the way to provide an opportunity to observe not only the pupil, but the way the mainstream teacher responds to their emergent abilities in communication. If the pupils' motivation to communicate, and understand, is fostered in the most effective way, an emerging structure of meanings and intentions can be expressed in BSL or English; it is the strategy that is important, not the mode of communication.

4.4 Communication

Triangulation of data and findings, research question 3:

How does the presence of a facilitator, and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation? Sub-themes: pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators, M/S, ToD, LSA roles; deaf awareness of staff and pupils; deaf adults as role models.

4.4.1 Pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators

All pupils commented on a wide range of communicative issues to do with their deafness. Their views varied widely within a range of positive and negative experiences. Some felt their communicative needs had been managed very well, other felt excluded and isolated. Those pupils whose experiences had been positive commented on the degree to which their M/S teacher, teacher of the deaf and LSA had facilitated their participation, or with careful monitoring, had left them to have some degree of independence.

4.4.1.1 Role of MS teacher

Pupils comment on the wide range of skills used by mainstream teachers to try to communicate in better ways. They also comment on how communication is made easier by the teacher of the deaf checking through problems in deaf awareness, use of audio equipment, practical issues of routine, timetables, and snags in work that has been set. The pupils' relationships with the teachers of the deaf are named as being very important. Most pupils noted how much easier communication is with the teachers of the deaf (cf 2.4 Webster and Wood 1989).

We sit at the front of the class we can sign to each other. Teacher, he knows, but doesn't see. We like the way he gives us different work to do. He lets us help each other. He wants to know if we like the lesson, and can see that we can't do the work of the others [hearing pupils] (Interview: Alexander, yr 4, 6th March, 2002)

The following extracts show a variety of interaction between the mainstream teacher and the teacher of the deaf/interpreter:

It's funny, Mrs. Rork and Mr. Dee, they do funny things all the time, like to pretend to be mad at each other, and they play jokes on each other, and they talk about each other to us. The lessons are such fun, a laugh, but we learn a lot too because Mr. Dee draws cartoons all the time and then he and Mrs. Rork get us to act out the cartoon. We don't have to watch [lip pattern] all the time. I like history lessons best of all. (Sarah, yr 4, interview, 28th February, 2000)

On one day we had new teacher [supply teacher of the deaf] Miss Bransome come in. She didn't know Mr. Cox, and when she stood at the front of the room to interpret, he pretended that she isn't there. She had to stop him to ask where the deaf pupils' books are to write the date, and he would not wait for her to go to the Unit to get the books. We all did it on a piece of paper. On another time, Mr. Cox did not let Mrs. Benson let us sit down. He said we should have our lesson in the Unit. (Sarah, yr 4, interview, 12th June, 2000)

There is no doubt that BSL offers deaf pupils the greatest chance of processing information in their own language, but I do worry when the sign language facilitator is an unqualified classroom assistant. I don't know how many of the Unit staff could converse with a deaf adult, not many I should think! I wonder if the quality of the BSL is beginner standard how that helps the pupils?

(Interview: Mrs. Dawes, 15th March, 2000)

Pupils are well aware of the teachers' efforts to help them learn effectively:

We like being in Mrs. Dawes class- she waits while we catch up. She asks if any of the deaf pupils have any ideas on the topic and she

write our ideas on the board. She knows the difficult words for the lesson and she has written them on the board before we go in. When people are talking, she stops them till we're ready and she makes sure we're looking, and then she makes sure if we want to ask something we can. She makes me feel wanted [belonging] in the room. (Sarah, yr 4, interview, 31st January, 2000)

Some mainstream teachers apparently feel inadequately prepared to have deaf pupils in their class:

We're not involved in the decisions to place the pupils in our class. We have no choice. We're given no training in sign language. We're given no extra time for all the writing of IEPs, class planning, resources which have to be made, or extra cash to buy materials to help the pupils learn. But despite this we're willing, and I feel committed to helping these pupils. (Interview, Mrs. Barbour, 17th April, 2001)

I like it when the teachers ask me to help [Alexander commented] for example Mrs Dawes (mainstream teacher) asked me, 'What's the difference between she and hers in sign language?' They are good when they try to finger spell and sign. (Alexander, yr 5 interview, 2nd October 2002)

Some of the pupils commented that the M/S teachers' ability to ask for help was rare, but those that did were seen as much better teachers:

We like it when they act out stuff and get signs to use and ask us to explain something, like acting out plants and animals (the Munch Bunch). We don't like lots of writing on the board and talking while she is walking around. (Alexander, yr 4, 17th April, 2001)

Some pupils commented:

When it's a confused mishmash of explanation with some signs and having to look at the board and the book and the teacher, we stop listening because it's all confused. (Farhan, yr 3, interview, 17th January, 2002)

The teachers' deaf awareness played an important role in managing a reasonable pace of lesson so that the deaf pupils could follow:

Some teachers, like Mrs Dawes, do things with pictures and models to show us and write words on the projector (OHP) to show us how it works (new vocabulary for literacy). I think its better to show it, rather than open books where you loose your place. (Alexander, yr 5, interview, 2nd October 2002)

When Miss. Coombes (mainstream teacher) is working with a mainstream teacher, and with deaf and hearing pupils in the same room, there are many times when communication 'just broke down' (cf 2.4 Lane 1995). She acknowledges several sources of the breakdown, an issue familiar to all teachers of the deaf at Greenview School. As Sarah put it,

Sometimes it's hopeless to follow. I can't keep asking what people have said. People cover their faces or speak behind me or I have to keep asking what people have said. I can't hear what people say behind my back. If sometimes I don't keep asking what people have said, it's embarrassing and then if I don't ask, I don't know what to do. (Sarah, yr 4, interview, 21st February, 2000)

The pupils commented on the M/S teachers with rudimentary sign language and some deaf awareness were in short supply:

During a play for assembly at Greenview:

The stalk (broom handle) was put in the ground. Mrs Dawes said, 'Put the stick in the grave.' I watered it, and it became a tree. Mrs Dawes said, 'Sign as the branch grows into a tree!' But I couldn't use my voice. Mrs Dawes said, 'Don't worry if you just sign BSL, don't talk, we will voice over.' I felt happy she said it was OK. I was too scared to talk.

(Sarah, yr 4, interview, 8th March,2000)

The deaf pupils described how they would like to be involved in their own management of support in the classroom. Shadeh commented:

Sometimes in class we can do the work. It's better to be on your own, I think we should say if we can do it (alone).

(Shadeh, yr 3, interview, 10th January, 2000)

Many pupils commented that teachers unhelpfully would turn away, or write on the board whilst talking to them, and that they didn't understand the instructions when tasks were set. Some teacher's expressions or mannerisms got in the way, and confused the deaf pupils: 'We don't like it when Mr. Harris shouts. We switch off very quickly' (Sarah, yr 4, 8th March 2000), or 'Mr Dee sits on different tables when he talks, and we can't lip read him'. (Shadeh, yr 3, 2nd February 2000). It is clear from this that deaf pupils should expect M/S teachers to modify their approach towards a standard delivery in order that deaf pupils can follow.

Pupils were aware that M/S teachers and teachers of the deaf could provide valuable collaborative support in relation to academic, personal and social needs. They frequently commented that they would like extra help with shared M/S teacher, and teacher of the deaf responsibility for shared lessons /planning monitoring the results, helping them manage poor class behaviour (so that they could listen more effectively), and help with explaining instructions for homework (cf 2.4 Wood 1988).

4.4.1.2 Role of teacher of the deaf

The pupils hold the role of a teacher of the deaf in high esteem:

Mrs. Baker, she really helps me here. She brings things in, like stickers and pencils for when we are good. We always know when we've got it right because she draws 'Buzzy Bee' round the right things. She always gets me to show the hearing pupils what to do when I've done good work, and she lets me take the visitors round.

(Interview: Farhan, yr 2, 9th May, 2001)

None of the pupils commented on the lack of advanced levels of sign language amongst the teachers of the deaf, [isolated as the pupils are from fluent adult signers in the Deaf community]. Instead, they praise the teachers for their creative approaches at getting lessons across:

Mrs. Benson understands what we do, that we can't concentrate for long. She helps us by drawing pictures [labels to diagrams] on the board to save us getting lost, but Mr. Cox says it disturbs his lesson, can she draw later? We like seeing her pictures. It shows the way through the lesson. Mr. Cox doesn't like stopping for her. [Marie mimes folding her arms

and looking annoyed] (Marie, yr 4, interview, 5th December 2000)

With a single hand shape, Mrs Rork showed the difference between 'she' and 'hers', and then showed the deaf pupils how to use each word in sentences. Mrs Dawes watched, showing the rest of the pupils on the board.

(Observation in mainstream class, 6th March, 2005)

The pupils remarked how able teachers of the deaf were able to adjust lessons to reflect BSL grammar and then adjust to English as the new vocabulary for the lesson was spelled, then illustrated or explained to clarify points (cf 2.4 Swann 1992, Edwards and Mercer 1987). As pupils noticed that delivery of mainstream lessons was sometimes over-complex, so they also noticed the teacher of the deaf re-scripting to clarify points, and slow down the pace to ask for pupils' reflection and check understanding.

I liked the way she showed the difference between subject and object as a change of direction in BSL, and then as a change of object pronouns in English. Both the hearing and the deaf children understood.

(Comment by Mrs Dawes, 10th May 1999)

Mrs Rork's ability to use BSL for teaching English grammar is unusual. She frequently does this for maths and science lessons. Some of the mainstream teachers admire this skill and would also like to learn BSL. Unfortunately the pressure of their work stopped many of them undertaking further evening training.

Teachers of the deaf used their collaborative skills to modify the teacher's delivery at times:

Mrs Rork said Mrs Dawes had her back turned, that's why we got naughty. She asked Mrs Dawes to explain again as we hadn't heard. This was very funny! (Sarah, yr 4, interview, 8th March 2000)

The teachers of the deaf see one aspect of their job as transmitting wider awareness of the deaf pupils' needs to the rest of Greenview, helping to create a better understanding between the deaf and the hearing of deaf awareness, and in lessons modifying their delivery to explain text and questions, and check with the

deaf pupils the accuracy of new signs. Deaf pupils say how valued they were for providing support in lessons, helping with homework, checking equipment and giving emotional support.

4.4.1.3 LSA role

The problems of background disturbance (cf 5.4.5) and demands on attention (see above) were recognised in KS 2 at Greenview by two of the support assistants, for two different year groups, who worked with two different year groups and integrated groups of deaf and hearing pupils. With slightly more time at their disposal, they had a copy of lesson planning, and summarised key vocabulary and concepts before the lesson.

We know it is difficult for the (deaf) pupils to walk into a lesson cold and understand where the teacher is coming from. Deaf pupils need so much more preparation than that, and it needs us to provide much smaller steps that they can associate ideas with. We really enjoy planning together and sparking ideas off each other as we think of resources to use that will fire the deaf pupils' imagination as well as inspire the other kids. (Interview: Mrs. Benson, March, 2001)

The role of the LSA is considered by the pupils to be crucial. Any attempt to include the pupils in new and different ways encouraged the pupils, who take great pleasure in the collaborative help from the LSAs.

Many of the pupils see the LSA's role partly as a 'mothering role', as they '*see to the work the teacher of the deaf can't do*'. The deaf pupils regard the LSA as helping their understanding in mainstream lessons, by drawing pictures to explain difficult words, and always being in the class to help when needed. Older pupils tend to regard this as too much support, and wish to continue lessons unsupported. Other pupils comment that there are over-complex explanations. Had deaf pupils been involved in planning their own support, some of this over-dependency could perhaps have been avoided (cf Warnock 2001).

It was facilitative skills that deaf pupils indicated as being most useful of all skills in the classroom. Mrs Benson was a BSL signer from birth, and was

one of the most successful at integrating deaf with hearing in the classroom. At most times she collaborates with M/S teachers and teachers of the deaf, but at all time the deaf pupils would include her in their conversations:

Mrs Benson joins in with us because she understands us. She makes us laugh and we know we can tell her things.

(Alexander, yr 5, interview, 25th September, 2002)

Mrs Benson was described as 'having a BSL outlook', and having been at deaf school herself, could relate to the children:

She always understands us first time, she doesn't use her voice and we understand what she means. She is good at our games. (Alexander, yr 5, interview, 25th September, 2002)

4.4.2 Deaf awareness of staff and pupils

Some of the teachers are kind, good heart. I like them, they talk [sign] to us. It's very funny. Some hearing teachers forget we're deaf and don't like being asked for help. Mrs. Benson takes us out to work better with her outside. She doesn't like some lessons. We know when, like Mrs. Benson, Unit teachers think lesson no good let's go. [Actually this is not the case. Unit teachers withdraw pupils to differentiate the lesson appropriately, but pupils misinterpret this as a negative indication by the class teacher] (Sarah, yr 5, interview, 9th July, 2002)

The deaf awareness levels, amongst mainstream teachers, vary a great deal. Where hearing pupils have benefited from deaf awareness training, deaf pupils generally always notice how this improves relationships and communication in class. It is refreshing to hear positive points of view as good examples of hearing pupils' attitude to deafness and inclusive practice. Mrs. Baker drew attention to the typical 'mainstream pupils' who in fact, she said, shared many of the aims and values of the head:

The average mainstream pupil is motivated towards inclusion and is co-operative. They operate from a fairly relaxed position and manage their own behaviour to the deaf pupils acceptably. I think it is a useful part of the personal development of mainstream pupils as well as an important part of managing the school, to help them understand the needs of less-resilient pupils.

I think all the pupils [deaf pupils] here get on well. The deaf pupils teach us a lot about valuing society, and their signing is very interesting, although I find they manage quite well without signing if there is no teacher of the deaf. (Interview, John, 5th December, 2000)

Many of the pupils commented how they appreciated the understanding that teachers who were deaf aware showed, in modifying their presentation, being aware of which strategies to use, monitoring best noise levels, being aware of optimum acoustic, visual and seating elements, and operating acoustic apparatus, especially the phonic ear. They worked well with the LSA or teacher of the deaf and often contributed to a 'double act' to engage the pupils (cf Edwards and Mercer, 1987).

DfES/OFSTED (2004) and Greenwood's SEN LEA policy documents (1993) relate to the recognition of the deaf child having rights to total access of all areas of the National Curriculum. At a local level, Greenview school's Communication and SEN policies (1995) recognise that deaf awareness is dependent on whole school commitment to inclusive values. These were frequently realised through practical issues being dealt with as instances of support arose:

We are trying to talk to Shadeh about coming tonight [to a school play]. He didn't know about it, so we showed him the programme. Later I thought, the lights will be off, how will he lip read? We had forgotten he would need a facilitator. (Interview: Richard, [hearing], yr 4, diary notes, 19th January, 2001)

The deaf pupils point out that deaf awareness training should not focus on particular deaf pupils in the school, but rather on general deaf awareness issues. Little comment was made by the pupils about their wish to have greater involvement in decision making about running sign language/deaf awareness classes, and decisions about the frequency of deaf awareness INSETs and when to run signing classes was left largely to the Unit coordinator.

The deputy head teacher at Greenview now regularly asks for the staff point of view on how the support of pupils with special educational needs can be better managed. This enables regular reviews of how best to use support staff, and most mornings there is a short planning meeting, where staff provide a list of key vocabulary for each lesson, and a concise summary of teaching points for the pupils to receive. Such clarity, and the willingness of senior managers to be receptive, has altered the way staff feel their views can be discussed, and welcomed, rather than criticised, and will surely help pupils feel more supported. As Miss Noon commented:

...If there is an occasion when a teacher needs support, the Deputy may go in to model a lesson to the teacher and the support staff. The Unit library is now building up a stock of resources to support key concepts, e.g. science topics, and the school is building up a bank of multi-sensory resources, that mainstream pupils as well as deaf pupils can use. We are also starting to enjoy the prospect of hearing pupils working in groups amongst deaf pupils in the Unit. (Interview: Miss Noon, 14th February, 2002)

Although the deaf pupils actively evaluate their learning experiences through the chance of support time in the Unit, there are few examples the pupils could give me of their views being directly sought by staff (cf 2.2.2 Allan 1999). A number of the more articulate deaf feel their views should be considered more, especially in terms of planning inclusive provision. Certainly within policy documents, awareness of children's needs was always stated as ensuing from a professional's assessment without recourse to requesting the children's view. Some teachers of the deaf encouraged the pupils to become more self-aware and develop their view within the school's Pupil Council, in order that mainstream staff would receive feedback on their participation within school life.

I wish the deaf young people are listened to! Asking and taking heed of the deaf pupils' views of their learning at Greenview is essential. This is also commented upon in the Revised Code of Practice (DfES 2001). Young people have a right to have their voice heard. We have to try and find a way to become skilled at accessing their voices and not gloss over the complexities involved when we don't like what we

hear. I think we are only just beginning to learn here [at Greenview] to access deaf pupils' views in authentic ways, like through the 'Buddy Support Groups' recent innovation at Greenview to review deaf/hearing interaction in the school.

(Interview: Mrs. Rork, 10th April, 2001)

On aspects influencing deaf awareness and a good teaching approach, pupils describe the following positive factors: clear communication; understanding and patience to listen, and work problems out; understanding the problems of background noise; being able to work the audio equipment; pupils able to be open about their problems; friends supporting each other, and an open, accepting, school environment all contributing to academic inclusion (cf 2.4 Webster and Wood 1989).

On the negative side, the pupils name several barriers to academic inclusion that teachers are not always aware of. One issue that frequently arises in comments is the lack of teachers' deaf awareness. Some teachers do not realise that written instruction, as well as verbal instruction, is helpful for deaf pupils to follow steps and organise themselves. Some teachers sit the pupils at the front, but in over-lit conditions near the window, where they are unable to lip-read. Teachers often seemed unaware of their own hindrances in habits of communication, such as speaking to the class whilst writing on the board, so nothing can be lip-read. Evaluating the pupils' views was not an aspect used within the yearly deaf awareness training.

4.4.2.1 BSL

Much emphasis was placed at Greenview in a 'whole school approach' to the use of signs. Hearing children were encouraged to participate in introductory signing classes, and the majority of staff attended one inset a term on basic BSL classroom vocabulary (cf 2.5 Seleskovitch 1978, see also Greenview Communication Policy 1995). Sparse vocabulary was used by many hearing pupils towards deaf pupils, mostly in the form of gesturing instructions, or in sharing instructions. On occasions during the lessons, there are times when the hearing pupils used their sparse sign vocabularies to give the deaf pupils hints about what to do, or, a bit more brusquely, to tell them what to do. At times the hearing pupils attempted to be helpful. On one occasion, Shadeh is sent by Mrs. Baker to Mrs. Noon to present her

with his finished piece of work, a 'thank you' letter. The teacher went to Shadeh, and said [by voice only], 'Draw a picture' and pointed to his paper. Shadeh stared at her, and as Mrs. Noon walked away, another pupil in his class (Janna) looked at him and signed CRAYON [a sign the pupils used to mean 'colour with crayons']. Shadeh stared at her and signed back, COLOUR, COLOUR, COLOUR? Janna stared at him and after a pause [perhaps trying to understand the signs] nodded her head. Shadeh picked up a crayon and started drawing.

Misplaced faith in the basic, that is limited, lexicon of isolated signs emerges here again. Although they reflect Greenview School's open-hearted acceptance of the deaf pupils, the hearing pupil 'signers' have very little knowledge of ways to engage in peer discourse with the deaf pupils. Although hearing pupils are certainly rude, or gruff, with each other, from time to time, they have a larger pragmatic repertoire from which to select when they want to interact with their hearing peers. When Janna wanted to interact with her deaf peers, she had relatively few choices, and like the other hearing pupil signers, virtually always resorted to the most directive, least 'polite', discourse forms.

Hearing pupils frequently use signs they know to evaluate, or comment, on the deaf pupils' work. Although these could be positive, or negative, comments there is a limited set of pragmatic choices available to the hearing pupils. For example, on one occasion two pupils are giggling and laughing at a model Shadeh is making. Janna, [a hearing pupil], sitting across from Shadeh, signed GOOD to him, without trying to get his attention or make eye contact first. (Diary notes, yr 4 observation, 22nd February, 2002)

Pupils' evaluations of each other are not particularly surprising instances of peer interaction. Firstly, it is certainly true that pupils express their ideas in varied ways that are not always friendly or well mannered from an adult point of view. Secondly, Dyson (1994) identifies a feature of classroom life that he calls the '*child collective*', a sense of being together at school that pupils express through collective action, group memory, group responses to school business [e.g. a supply teacher] and concern over common problems. It is possible that the helping, managing, and evaluating the hearing pupils

direct toward the deaf pupils grew out of the social, and moral, order that structures such pupils' collectives. The pupil collective that grew out of Mrs. Noon's classroom when the deaf pupils are there did not appear to result in the assimilation of deaf pupils amongst hearing pupils.

Amongst the deaf pupils, there is another class collective (cf 2.5 Evans 2002). Alexander, Farhan, and a new boy Lawrence, who is hard of hearing, and a new signer, have their own understandings. However the powerful social life that a class of pupils can build through talk and activity did not exist for the deaf pupils of year 5. Instead they fashioned a convenient, and instrumental, way of communicating to their hearing peers. Just as their hearing peers limited the way they signed to the deaf pupils, so the deaf pupils limited the communication they addressed to the hearing group. Almost exclusively, when the deaf pupils signed to hearing pupils, they enlisted heuristic functions. They sought information and asked questions, they looked for clarification of aspects of classroom business. For personal functions, that is, for making contact with others, or for expressing opinions, the deaf boys often looked all the way across the room and signed to their deaf classmates or walked across the room to hold 'conversations'.

The hearing pupils' signing in the mainstream classroom fell into two categories. It is either completely incomprehensible, or apparently confusing to the deaf pupils, or it seemed to be understandable to the deaf pupils but [to an outsider] impoverished. In the latter category, the signed utterances directed to the deaf pupils came from a very limited functional repertoire of directives and evaluations, which I term 'caretaker' talk.

Unintelligible conversation is often directed at the deaf pupils in the mainstream classroom. One day, during the discussion following a film about making wise purchases, the class discussed the ways people spend their money. Miss Coombes introduced the contrast between things people want and things people need. In the course of the discussion, they mentioned some household appliances, including washing machines. Peter, a hearing pupil, seated near Farhan, noticed the way Miss Coombes signed WASHING MACHINE. He slowly copied the sign, and then practised it and slowly signed to Farhan: WASHING MACHINE. Farhan stared blankly

back at Peter. By now this sign is far out of context since the class had moved on to another topic. (Observation, yr 2 mainstream class, 14th February, 2001)

Many of the deaf pupils comment on the innovative approach of some of the teachers' signing, which encourages them. However the mainstream teachers are not always aware of the pupils' reactions:

I really like some of the teachers, like Mr. Dee and Mrs. Dawes. They try and join in, and they keep trying even though they are deaf to us! They are funny the way they try and sign like my baby sister can do the same! They always try and tell us [explain to us] if another pupil in the class has a problem so that we know hearing pupils get it wrong too. I like it when they ask us to sign our work [interpreter gives a voice over] to the others, but I don't like the way the hearing pupils laugh [secretly]. If the hearing pupils had to sign their work, [signs revenge] (laughs).

(Interview: Marie, yr 4, 1st March, 2001)

Some of the teachers show themselves well aware of class management issues in involving BSL interpretation in Greenview's bilingual classrooms. From the point of view of the pupils, who are quick to observe details, it is clear, for example, which teachers are conscious of their learning pace, which teachers cue the facilitator to the start of explanations, which teachers highlight new vocabulary, which teachers highlight topic changes, or key concepts, by writing labels on the board, and which teachers provide visual materials to make abstract concepts more relevant (cf Marschark 2000, Evans 2002). The pupils remark that they followed the lesson more easily, or that they remembered stories from the visual ideas produced, or that, because the facilitator had previously been given the learning objective planning notes, they had discussed the new vocabulary and had already thought of a BSL equivalent explanation.

Mrs. Benson's perspective on this problem is particularly poignant since she had grown up as a struggling, hard-of-hearing, pupil, is 'enthusiastically' deaf, and is also acting as a facilitator [hence always present] in the mainstream classroom. She believes that mainstreaming teachers routinely

use the facilitator to *'remove themselves from direct communication'* with the deaf pupils. Teachers avoid engaging with deaf pupils in several ways. Firstly, they can simply ignore them, fail to respond to their bids for turns, and never offer them a chance to participate. It would be naive to say this never occurs in inclusive settings. Secondly, they could overtly, or covertly, relinquish their authority as a teacher, direct the facilitator to attend to, or help, the deaf pupil, and never interact with the pupil. Although this is far from the goal of Greenview's inclusive ethos, it is a frequent occurrence (cf 2.5 Hoiting and Loncke 1990, Brennan 1999)

Within Greenview's Communication policy, equal status is given to BSL and English, where it states:

Greenview's bilingual context creates an environment where a pupil may develop BSL as his first or preferred language, and English as his second. The duty of the Unit staff is to raise the profile of the use of BSL within the school so that it is present in all learning contexts where deaf pupils are participating.

(Greenview's Communication Policy March 1995)

4.4.3 Deaf adults as role models

Within the context of this study, sign language has been viewed as a language, and tool, for giving the deaf pupils access to the curriculum as well as to the deaf pupils' cultural world. Interestingly, it is only when Greenview's senior management team established regular support meetings for the pupils that both mainstream staff and mainstream pupils began to see the value of sign language as conveying not just a different language, but cultural differences - as Mrs. Benson comments.

Mrs. Benson (LSA) had been a deaf pupil herself at residential school, and had deaf pupils who are mainstreamed; her personal goals for mainstreaming strategies are especially touching. When discussing the idea of inclusion, she never mentioned equality as a motivator, although she held fierce opinions about civil rights and self-determination for deaf people. She saw part of her role as helping the pupils develop their BSL skills as well as being a role model for the pupils' development of a positive deaf identity. She summed up the role of interpreting in educational settings:

I have to go by my opinion, my philosophy, my personality, and what I hope is given to my pupils when they are mainstreamed.... Pupils deserve good communicative skills, a good sense of self about being deaf, and good friendships between deaf pupils, deaf adults, hearing pupils and adults.

(Interview: Mrs. Benson, 27th February, 2002)

Mrs Benson understood the need for suitably experienced, trained staff, but, it seemed to her, this is linked to a lack of funding for training opportunities, rather than a willingness of staff to enhance their skills (cf 2.5 Kyle 1993).

Unit staff have managed to gain finances to pay a deaf adult to come in weekly and sign stories to the pupils:

Mrs. Watkin comes in to tell us stories [signed stories in BSL] and tells stories about her family, how they came from Scotland, and how her son is living in Australia. She tells us about her family, like her baby shutting her out of the flat, and the dentist who pulled out the wrong tooth. All her family sign, but her pupils are hearing and she tells us what their pupils' hearing friends think of deaf [world]. She says you don't understand deaf world if you can't sign. Deaf need deaf she says. We like deaf stories to know deaf ways. Now I know deaf are good people. I didn't know deaf can marry have jobs, work. [Researcher: what do you want to do when you leave school?] I want to go to High School, train to be a chef now, like Watkin's boy. Before, my idea to work in my Dad's place [factory].

(Shadeh, yr 4, interview, 10th September 2001)

The pupils responded very favourably, and commented how much they enjoyed the weekly stories, and the trips to St Helens' deaf school, for regular open days, where lessons are shared with deaf pupils from other schools. At these sessions, the pupils meet school staff who are deaf, and who *'helped them see the world in a quite different way'* (cf 2.5 Powers 1999 Evans 2002):

At St Helen's school, Mr. H. would sign and ask me how I liked school, we would all sign at lunch, and it is wonderful to see the adults signing to each other. We [the Unit pupils] would watch them amazed. They are talking about work, about travelling to school, home life, money for furniture, CDs. I never saw adults

talking this way! I wanted to know everything! They said to come to SCOPE youth club to talk [sign] more. It is amazing thing to see adults signing that way. It made me feel different, strong.

(Interview: Alexander, yr 4, 27th February, 2002)

4.5 Summary of Analysis

See Table 4.5: How each strand of analysis (Emic and Etic issues) relates to findings (Naturalistic Generalisation) for a summary of results. This follows on from tables 3.4 and 4.4. Data was reviewed under various possible interpretations, from which point I searched for patterns of data, whether indicated by issues, or not. Next I sought linkages between observations, activities and outcomes. Subsequently, I then drew tentative conclusions, organised according to issues, so I could section the report into a progression of stages. Finally I reviewed data, looked other areas of data previous unexplored, and deliberately queried findings with colleagues in order to review understanding.

	Analysis: <i>Emic</i> Issues	Analysis: <i>Etic</i> Issues	Naturalistic Generalisation (N.G.)
Inclusion: What factors support learning in an inclusive context such as Greenview	Pupils express preference for experiential methods of learning.	What is the context of inclusion from the point of view of the pupils What is their point of view on 'teacher attitude'	N.G. Often pupils unaware of current issues, but thoroughly enjoy teachers who try to differentiate in creative/visual ways
	Pupils express preferences in terms of teaching style.	What differences can be observed in role between teacher of the deaf, teacher, and LSA	Differences in role not apparent to pupils when curriculum suitably differentiated. Pupils very able to observe differences when teachers unwilling to differentiate.
	Physical environment plays a major role in how much pupils able to learn. Pupils need careful prior preparation to learn new concepts. Deaf awareness issues a continual challenge, e.g. teachers' behaviour	Access to the curriculum defined (by pupils as physical environment – see acoustic conditions), differentiation of curriculum, and 'deaf awareness' in teacher attitude and behaviour. Learning objectives must be clearly defined and prepared for both new concepts and vocabulary.	Training for mainstream teachers!
Pedagogy: From the pupil's point of view what observations can be made about the teachers' different perceptions of deafness and the outcomes of those perceptions on pedagogy?	* Teachers deaf awareness * See Tables 3.8 to 4.3. Teachers moves, pupils' response: issues of control major factors of conditions influencing the pupils' learning	Teachers' attitudes toward deafness Teachers' strategy Acoustic conditions a major factor in disturbing learning. Seating, attention, eye contact, experiential learning, peer group learning, group work need careful management.	Deaf pupils need for structure, slower pace and 'hands on' experience Pupils gained much security from being adequately prepared for new concepts through pair work, group work or experiential learning
Mrs Baker's reflexive/action research	As above *; and deaf pupils need for discursive styles/cueing in	Mrs Bs reflexive research showed pupils positive response when offered opportunity to be discursive	N.G. Teacher strategy to approach teaching through other means rather than a questioning approach. (Woods '86)
Teacher moves/Pupil responses	Correspondence table of communication (see matrix tables in Discussion – Chapter 5)	See matrices (discussion). Pupil response inversely related to teacher questioning.	This research goes further to look at other implication of learning, e.g. teacher attitude,
Communication: The use of sign language in a mainstream class	Interpreter BSL standard weak, <i>Emic</i> : Mainstream T.s need training to use facilitators, lack of deaf role models	Teachers' attitudes towards signing Deaf (culture) aware? Development of identity deaf/deaf, or deaf/hearing?	Deaf awareness, access to the curriculum, and peer group scaffolding

Table 4.5: How each strand of analysis (*Emic* and *Etic* issues) relates to Findings (Naturalistic Generalisation)

The terms *Emic* and *Etic* issues and Naturalistic Generalisation relates to synthesis of issues in 2nd, 3rd and final stages of analysis. (adapted from Stake (1995))

Chapter 5 Discussion

5.1 Introduction

We will know that inclusive education has fully arrived when designations such as 'inclusive school', 'inclusive classroom', 'inclusive student' are no longer part of our educational vocabulary. Inclusion survives as an issue only so long as someone is excluded. (Giangreco, 1997. p.194)

In this chapter I draw together the findings from the outcome of chapter 4, indicating how patterns from research themes emerge towards a consistent story line or 'naturalistic generalisation' (Stake 1995). This looks at the consistency of pupil perspectives following research questions as pupils comment on their experience of inclusion, cf 2.2. It looks at the pupil's view of their own identity, and whether they relate being deaf to having separate needs. It looks at the conclusions of the findings as to whether deaf pupils find relationships with their hearing peer group rewarding, whether there are special aspects revealed by the data analysis, such as variance in teacher attitude. Some of the aspects considered are whether the acoustic environment and qualities of M/S teacher deaf awareness are more important to the deaf pupils than the ability to understand sign language (cf 2.5 Evans 2002). Which teachers, in the children's opinion, communicated in the most understandable way, and why? Was it useful having deaf adults to help in the classroom? Further discussion focuses on the pupils perception of favourable teacher strategy to help them, how is their knowledge facilitated in a way that helps them learn, and whether recent legislation has in fact 'improved their lot'.

This study has adopted a five step methodology adapted from Stake's (1995) Seven Step methodology (cf 3.1). In the final stage, 'naturalistic generalisation' (Stake 1995) is sought as a means to providing audience opportunity for understanding. People learn from generalisations from outside sources, and also learn from generalisations in their own experiences. Stake and Trumball (1982), and Stake (1995), call these naturalistic generalisations:

Naturalistic generalizations are conclusions arrived at through personal engagement in life's affairs or by

vicarious experience so well constructed that the person feels as if it happened to themselves. (Stake, 1995, p.85)

This case study seeks to convey the pupil's experience of inclusion at Greenview, as closely as possible, to the reader. As part of my aim to study naturalistic generalisations within this research, I sought to provide the opportunity for a vicarious experience. The accounts of the pupils' experiences are personal, describing matters of their direct learning. As such, they should appeal to the readers' own sense of learning. The narrative accounts, personal description, and emphasis on time and place, all provide rich ingredients for a vicarious experience. (cf 2.3 'Fiona's experience' Allan 1999). Stake (1995) describes an emphasis on time, place and person, as the first three major steps in offering the reader validation of naturalistic generalisations. The reader's ability to make naturalistic generalisation will be assisted by associating generalisations various pupils have reached in the variety of their experience.

Greenwood's SEN LEA policy and Greenview school's SEN Policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995) make it clear that deafness, in itself, is not a special educational need; but there are needs arising from deafness which require special educational provision. (Greenwood's SEN LEA policy 1993, line 22). That full and equal access to the curriculum is a right for the pupils is stressed in all three policy documents referred to in this research; however, in some circumstances access was not being met at Greenview due to instructional methods and environmental arrangements not being facilitated in a way that helped the children (cf 2.3 Corbett 1997). The pupils were very clear about the types of teaching strategy which helped them learn. These findings reveal that educational placement and learning context is not the same thing, even within a primary setting which has both an overall inclusive ethos and a bilingual communication language policy. This corresponds with findings (Wood *et al.* 1986; Powers *et al.* 1999) that a clear assessment of mainstream approaches to education of deaf pupils needs to be considered before the pupil is placed in a mainstream context where they can interact meaningfully. Whilst there may be some consensus on the aims of deaf education, there are differences in people's views on how best these aims are realised (Powers *et al.* 1999 p.197, cf 2.2, Mittler 2000). It was discussed in chapter 1 that events may be seen as

'multifaceted and everchanging' Merriam 1988, p.167), cf 1.1, but as may be seen from these findings, the individual's perspective suggests that they are subjects of the teacher's control and knowledge (cf 2.1) as Foucault (1982) suggests, and that teacher-pupil dialogue is based mainly on responses to the teacher's initiation (cf 2.1 Allan 1999, 2.4, Wood et al 1986).

The work described in the findings illustrates perspectives from the pupil's point of view of the challenges facing schools in their efforts to become more inclusive. The case study demonstrates that changes to the culture, structure, politics, systems and procedures of an organisation take time and cannot happen overnight. This study does show, however, that deaf pupils can themselves point the way to aspects of their learning which makes schools more inclusive. In this way, it is helpful to view inclusion as a journey or progressive stages (cf 2.2 Allan, 1999, Mittler 2000) and to celebrate, and welcome, the contribution of the pupils to our understanding.

This chapter discusses the implications of the findings under the three overarching themes, research questions and sub-themes presented earlier in the thesis. It draws together the emerging story from previous chapters, and discusses the findings, according to the original research themes and sub-themes stated in the introductory chapter (cf 1.8).

5.2 Inclusion

How do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom? Sub-themes: pupils' views on inclusion, acoustic conditions.

Are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of needs? Sub-themes: pupils' views on deaf identity, peer group interaction.

5.2.1 Pupils' views on inclusion.

There is no doubt about the challenge in learning faced by deaf pupils in this study, as Ladd (1991) illustrates:

Meanwhile he misses the crux of just about everything: jokes, quick remarks, frantically flipping his head from one side to another like a Wimbledon umpire, trying to catch the last bit of

whoever was talking and trying to piece together what so and so did, what so and so meant...' (Ladd 1991, p.91)

In considering the pupil's experience of inclusion at a mainstream school, these findings reflect aspects of their participation in lessons from a socio-constructivist point of view, i.e. that their learning is based on social context, or teacher-pupil dialogue (cf 2.4 Bruner 1985, 4.2.1 Wood 1988). Their experiences reflect the challenges they face as they interact, in the social context of the classroom, and utilise opportunities offered to make lessons intelligible. The pupils' ability to relate to the language of the lesson, and the context of the mainstream class, is closely connected to how comfortable they feel within the classroom, how able they are to listen to the lesson and understand the learning objective of the lesson, relate to the teachers' ability to communicate, work with the other children, and how comfortable they are with the way their deafness is treated. The deaf pupils did not appear to be in conflict with their peer group, nor were they the butt of the hearing children's jokes. Nevertheless '...access to the basic quick fire exchange' (Kyle, 1993) was often denied to them both inside and outside their learning environment. This culminated in a loss of self-esteem and often meant feigning understanding when they were lost, in order to 'keep up with the hearing world'. Such behaviour, and other bizarre practices, such as 'loosing' their phonic ear are due to the coercion within the mainstream environment and the pupils' inability to cope. Had their deafness been valued, such transgressive practices (Allan, 1999, p.92) might have been unnecessary (cf 2.2 Cooper 1993).

As commented on by RNID 2001, cf 2.2, schools need to considerably alter their culture and practices towards increasing pupil participation (cf 2.2 Slee, 1993, cf 4.2.1 RNID 2001) if pupil experiences are valued, and listening to unfamiliar voices (cf 2.2. Robinson 1997, Barton, 1997) become a keystone of 'celebrating difference'. Other commentators such as Powers (1996, p.68) point out that the term inclusion 'describes an attitude rather than an educational placement', which certainly resonates with the feelings of the deaf pupils and certain staff within this study, such as Mrs Benson LSA, who like Gregory and Bishop (1991) point out '...that once you have introduced a subject to the class, then you have to go over it all with...' (cf

2.4) Mrs Benson consequently used this issue as a means to explore more varied teaching approaches, at benefit to all the pupils, deaf or hearing.

Among the factors the deaf pupils' have commented on in their ability to self-manage are the acoustic conditions in the classroom (amount of noise, divergence of learning sources, e.g. lots of people talking all at the same time, how clear the structure to the lesson is (how able they are to understand the learning objective and key vocabulary, ability to cope with mainstream group discussions), the accessibility of enlisting support from a deaf peer group during lessons, the adequacy of support from teacher of the deaf or LSA, and the way his deafness is perceived or treated by others (cf 4.2.2 Shadeh 2001, cf 2.4 Wood 1988) notes how a key part of language and learning is dependent upon issues of control and social identity. In this study we note how a key part of the children's self esteem was based on whether they felt able to engage or access what was going on in trying to make sense of the world in the classroom, and it was for that reason that the children responded so well to Mrs Baker's reflexive response (cf 2.4 Gregory and Bishop 1991).

5.2.2 Pupils' views on acoustic conditions

Foucault portrayed the challenge of keeping up with conversation in the mainstream class and the transgressive elements of behaviour (cf 2.2.1, 4.2.2 Wedell 1999, cf 4.2.3 Diary/obs Jan 2002, cf 5.1.1) such as feigning understanding when the pupils lost track as 'a form of combat with pleasures to be mastered' (Simons, 1995, p73). In actual fact the multiplicity of acoustic interference (background noise) was a major obstacle to the pupils' learning. Although Wynter (1987) argues that this aspect of living with two partial identities in the mainstream class allows individuals to make 'potentially innovative contributions', in this case the pupils simply felt disabled and discouraged. It was usually other occasions (cf 2.1 Foucault 1977) where they were able to show their creative abilities.

The deaf children frequently mentioned the problem of classroom noise interfering with listening, (cf 4.2.2) and background noise inhibiting their ability to hear properly, and take part in class discussions. None of the deaf

pupils liked wearing hearing aids or radio aids. This is seen as embarrassing and further evidence of a 'difference' they perceived as a stigmatism.

As a colleague, I understood how difficult it was to work with small groups in communal facilities, where there is no environmental adaptation for special needs, and yet, as a participant observer, I needed to keep the research questions uncluttered by my insider's perspective. The practical environment left a lot to be desired. The deaf pupils' schooling unfolds in two different locations: their regular mainstream classroom [according to year group], and the self-contained Unit classroom for deaf and hard of hearing pupils. This is shared by three different year groups of deaf pupils, and can accommodate one group at a time. The Communications Policy (1995) and the SEN Policy at Greenview (1995) refer to unit teachers managing day to day issues arising from teaching groups, but whether the following constitutes 'an educational environment which is wholly aware of, and committed to meeting the needs of deaf children in an educational setting' (SEN Policy 1995) could be questioned (cf 2.5 Evans 2002, cf 4.2.3 Diary/obs Jan 2002).

Much fuss is made over logistical arrangements of settings where deaf and hearing pupils are integrated. Observations of daily life, and conversations with teachers at the school, clarify the difficulty of putting ideals into practice. For most of the general education staff, decisions about deaf pupils are based on the equality of provision. As Mr. Dee comments:

'We make a lot of fuss over the practical arrangements of the best place in which the pupils will learn' (Interview: Mr. Dee, 21st March, 2001)

But, in practice, it is observed that taking advantage of the best places to participate in the lessons is left to the pupils (c.f 2.4 Wood 1988).

5.2.3. Pupils' view on Deaf identity

The deaf pupils were not unlike any other pupil in their wish to be independent learners. In common with Pickersgill and Gregory (1998), regarding cognitive demand reflecting the child's preferred language level, cf 2.3, they commented on their learning preferences, but their opinions did not reflect the fact that their teaching experiences had been matched to the

deaf child's preferred language level (cf 2.5 Swann 1992). Unlike Pickersgill & Gregory's comment the children's frequent complaint was that language speeds in teaching did not give them a chance to catch up (cf 4.2.1 Alexander 1999). They commented from several different viewpoints in the debate about how important a deaf identity was, according whether they viewed their deafness as a primary identity or not. The first view point as commented by Michele Moore (2000) may be called the 'inside out' perspective in which deaf people see themselves as having a special experience, shared language and culture, which isolates them as a group from other groups in society. This was the view shared by Sarah, whose first language was BSL. The second point of view, 'outside in' position, involves the disabling experience that people who are deaf may experience and share 'disabling experiences of the outside world' Finkelstein (1996, cf 2.5 Sacks 1990, Gregory, Silo and Callow 1991). This was the view shared by Shadeh, and Alexander, who had begun to sign only on starting school. The insider and outsider positions shared by the children set the scene as to how the pupils chose to describe themselves, e.g. deaf, a bit deaf, partially hearing. This factor was largely dependent on whether communication was an issue, i.e. how able they were to understand hearing children. This, in turn influenced whether a key aspect of school life, namely, their friendships. Some of the deaf pupils preferred simply to communicate with other deaf friends. Other deaf pupils valued hearing and deaf friends for various reasons, e.g. football, shared class work, lunch time activities.

How sickening, I thought. I had always been taught that lip-reading and hearing aids were adequate, yet only now, I realise that they were at best crutches. They were not legs. It became clear that my legs were in fact sign language. It seemed as if I spent all my time on crutches, when I could have had legs. (Ladd, 1991, p96)

Ladd argues that denial of access to sign language prevent the real world of language being available to deaf people. But this belief is based on the premise that deaf people should all desire to become part of a signing world (cf 2.3 Ladd 1991).

The deaf pupils experience in the mainstream was often characterised by 'tension and a fear of discovery' (Allan 1999 p.92 cf 2.3 DEX 1997, cf 4.2.3 Diary/obs Jan 2002). Their behaviour of feigning understanding when they lost track (cf 5.1.1) could have been unnecessary if their deaf identity had been valued. In fact Hartsock suggests that many such pupils experiencing the realities of living with two separate identities are 'forced to exist in the interface' (Hartsock, 1996, p49)

In order to gain more awareness of the identity stated by the deaf children through their social interaction and culture, Greenview could have looked at the role of deaf adults could play in the education of their deaf pupils. This would have provided access to the wider values of sign language as a living transmitter of culture, rather than as a tool for the classroom (cf 2.5 Powers 1999, Marschark 2000). Many of the deaf pupils were happy without full sign language support. They did not see the need for full sign language facilitation as an essential part of learning, or understand the link between sign language and the deaf community (cf 4.2.3 Farhan May 2001). Had the school invested more in offering opportunities for deaf pupils to have contact with the wider deaf community, the school could have broadened its access to deaf culture enhancing the recognition so badly needed in that 'inclusive' mainstream setting.

Of the pupils who took part in the research the issue of gaining independence in the mainstream is very different for two of the pupils, Alexander and Sarah, who share the same educational background but have very different needs in terms of educational and personal support. In earlier examples, [see chapter 4 Analysis, Alexander (9th September, 2000) and Sarah (8th March, 2000, 12th June 2000)] they have problems of isolation because of their deafness but for different reasons. The circumstances surrounding resettling into school with cochlear implants, as in Alexander's case, and Sarah's cultural affinity to other BSL users, promotes reflection and discussion, around the question of involving pupils in the social support of their peers who may be isolated for a variety of reasons, but in terms of education, language and identity, see themselves as a unique group (cf 2.5 DEX 1997, cf 4.2.3, 2.2.2 Corker 1996).

The deaf pupils liked having other deaf pupils with them at school. Their aspect of friendship was seen as the most important aspect of their school life. Their ability to relate to each other affects their self-esteem in a positive way, enhancing their ability to manage mainstream life. Social aspects such as someone to eat lunch with, consult with on gaps in understanding, [e.g. about tasks set for homework], or organising day-to-day arrangements so they master rearrangements in timetabling, and self-responsibility, such as remembering what to bring to each lesson. Communication with someone else who understands their problems in school life is a very important aspect of their well-being (cf 4.2.3 Sarah July 2002, Lane 1995). Policy documents at a national and local level make frequent referral to equal opportunities as part of a mainstream class (see Greenview's Communications Policy (1995), SEN Policy (1995), Greenwood LEA SEN Policy (1993), without expressing the importance of the bond deaf pupils feel with each other. This was a crucial aspect of their identity as pupils (cf 2.3.1 Hoffmeister 1996).

Greenview's SEN policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995) set high regard in facilitating communication between deaf and hearing pupils (SEN policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995)). The clarity of the pupils own perceptions is offered by examples which reflect the values in their own identities as pupils at Greenview School. Some of the deaf pupils convey this in clear statements – for example on the priority of their relationships with other deaf pupils, as the comment below shows:

At lunchtime all of us [Unit pupils] sit together, hearing aids off, sign, eat. Then play football with deaf [Unit pupils]. My best part of day! (Interview, Shadeh, [BSL signed] yr 3, 14th March, 2000)

Policy documents refer many times, at a national policy level (DfES Code of Practice (2001), Department of Health (1989, The Children Act), and local level (Greenwood SEN LEA Policy 1993) to school aims meeting access to a mainstream curriculum for pupils with SEN, depending on the acknowledgement of the individual needs of all children (see Greenwood LEA SEN policy, 1993, Greenview's Communication Policy and SEN Policy 1995). Greenview's Communication Policy encouraged the acknowledgement of each pupils' individual needs via good communication, encouraging BSL, SSE, SE, and finger spelling as well as

oral communication to facilitate expression and understand the child (cf 4.2.3 Sarah's comments July 2002, Alexander Sept 2000).

Children's heritage languages will be valued and used to support the development of communication (Communication Policy 1996)

The pupils much appreciated the teachers' attempts to communicate with them, but on a wider scale, a acknowledgement of deaf culture through 'the parental involvement workshops, communication classes, informal meetings and close home school links' (Communications Policy 1995) mentioned in the policy were not in evidence at the time of research, possibly due to the practical limitations of the teachers' time. There is some evidence here that mainstream teachers on the whole treated the deaf pupils as a unique group even when the pupils themselves preferred not to draw a distinction in terms of their needs. This would at least provide scope however, for recognising and celebrating the positive features of deafness and as Pickersgill and Gregory (1998) comment (cf 2.3) a deaf studies curriculum would reflect the need to explore Deaf culture, history and sign language, and hence value the deaf children's backgrounds, and a future community they may wish to be a part of (cf 2.3.1 Hoffmeister 1996, Allan 1999).

5.2.4. Pupils' views on peer group interaction.

The mainstream peers of pupils with deafness played a major part as gatekeepers of inclusion. They could respond with kindness, with pastoral care, regimentality, pedagogic attitude, or punitive treatment, depending how they so felt at that moment (cf 4.2.3 Marie 2002). Their attitude towards deafness itself could be highly influential, since it could collude with helping the deaf pupils deny the aspect of deafness (which to the deaf pupils could be highly desirable, for example, if choosing team members), or the hearing pupils could be 'coercive markers' of disability (Allan 1999, p.89) by inadvertently making communication difficult.

Sometimes in class I can't hear what people say when they speak too fast or I can't keep stopping them to repeat the last bit. But if I don't ask then I'm lost. (Interview, Farhan, yr 3 10th October 2002).

None of the hearing children in our research ever seemed to make life deliberately difficult for the deaf children, but frequently they forgot their deafness, and mumbled or 'forgot' to speak clearly. Within chapter 2, (cf 2.4) I commented how negative connotations in the mainstream school, regarding deafness, and the way it was constructed as a disability, could force deaf pupils '*to cooperate in a view of themselves as disabled*' (Lane, 1995, in Allan, 1999, cf 2.4). Knowledge of how we limit pupils with special needs from being fully included, by being a disabling society, (cf 4.2.3 Sarah Feb 2002, Corker 1993) can help us understand how to tackle constraints, as in Alexander's case. Although as Allan comments:

There is a danger that helping pupils with special needs develop transgressive practices which relate specifically to them, merely recreates the binarism of the included pupil who is always identifiable.

(Allan, 1999)

This 'binarism' is shown in the undramatic but not minor disadvantage of deafness, felt less positively by the deaf pupils than by their hearing friends: having to dispense with the easy interchange of trivialities that is oil to the wheel of conversation and to the business of living. The use of language as gesture, as reassuring noise rather than an instrument of specific communication, is largely denied the deaf (Wright 1993, p.6-7 cf 2.5 Marschark, 2000).

That fact that sensory equality mattered between the deaf pupils was reflected in their wholehearted support for having other deaf pupils with them at school. (cf 5.2.3). In 2000 as part of a poetry day, the deaf pupils contributed a rap song, written by Shadeh and Sarah: '*Deaf can do it/ have no fear/ Deaf can do it/ Except hear!*' (Observation 6th July, 2000) went the chorus with the phrasing flowing beautifully in sign. The performance delighted teachers and pupils alike, so illustrating beautifully the strengths of personal expression within BSL. In such a way, the deaf pupils demonstrated bonds of a minority deaf community confident in its own identity.

5.2.5 Summary

All pupils and staff interviewed are clear about Greenview's ethos of valuing diversity as an important part of what 'makes the school good'. All pupils understood this term as having a practical outcome in their relationships, for example, Alexander commented (18th December 1999) 'friendly girl who happy with a deaf person' (cf 4.2.4 John, Sept 2000). Little however, was made of the wider implications of recognising separate cultures, hearing pupils were not aware of cultural difference and frequently simply commented that they enjoyed working with deaf pupils. Especially interested were those who had been involved in previous 'deaf awareness' lessons. Hearing pupils said it was good to have deaf pupils at school because 'there's nothing wrong with them apart from their deafness' (Interview: John, (hearing child) yr 5, 9th September 2000, cf 4.2.4 Sarah March 2001). The hearing children's view was assimilationist (Allan, 1999, p.90, cf 2.3.1 Corbett 1997, Giorcelli 2002 cf 4.2.3 Sarah, Feb 2002), erasing their deafness from their identity. If they helped the deaf pupils to become more like a hearing person, so the difference or deafness would be removed (cf 4.2.4 John, September 2002). The hearing children knew little of the deaf person's culture, or language, although they enjoyed using a few phrases of sign language. On occasions where their behaviour, like the occasional behaviour of mainstream teachers, excluded the deaf children and disabled them from learning the rules of a successful mainstream performance, transgressive behaviour, such as absence through bad behaviour or the invention of 'feeling sick' or 'having a headache' could result (cf 4.2. Farhan October 2002, Shadeh 13th September, 2001). This implies that an 'assimilationist policy' seem to result unofficially, despite Greenview's official inclusion ethos (see Greenview SEN policy (1995)).

5.3 Pedagogy

What educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work?

Sub-themes: Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils.

How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy? Sub-

themes: Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses.

5.3.1 Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils

Deaf pupils have greater difficulty in perceiving the range of sounds that people with 'normal' hearing use to develop their language and conceptual skills (See Greenwood SEN LEA Policy, 1993), so rather than learning language naturally as they grow up, they have additional needs to develop languages via direct instruction. A further difficulty is that deaf pupils are expected to acquire expressive skills through English, without pre-existing conceptual understanding related to English, by virtue of the fact that they are separated from a community speaking English. As Brannigan (1996) states, ethical research narrating that identity reflects the teachers' perception of the pupils' disabilities (cf 4.2.4 Sarah March 2001). The M/S staff at Greenview would often reflect this point of view:

She needs to sit at the front if we are talking. In group discussion work I'm not sure that she is always fully involved. She will sit at the back and let everyone else put their bit in and has to be encouraged to have her say. Possibly she is not hearing as well as she could be doing. (Allan 1999, p.93)

The implications of this reflect an attitude of social disability towards individual deaf pupils at Greenview rather than a facilitation of learning on the part of the teacher. This aspect of the research looks at sub-themes of inclusion within a socio-constructivist context, examining the ways teachers approach the education of deaf children in their classrooms, and the ways pupils' reactions to those approaches are accepted. Here I explore how analyses of different styles of teaching have different effects on pupils' ability to participate in active learning, particularly influencing their expressive and receptive skills. These findings help identify strategies for achieving sustained, and productive, communication with pupils to assist their language skills (cf 2.3.1 Pickersgill and Gregory 1998). The essence of this research links with Vygotsky's findings (1978 p.90), that internal processes only operate when the pupils are interacting with people in their environment, and in cooperation with their peers (cf 2.4 Bruner 1985). Throughout chapter 2, (cf 2.3) the debate continued regarding the uneven distribution of conversational power between teachers and pupils (Wray and Medwell 1991). This research confirmed Cazden's (1988) three part sequence (cf 2.3, cf 4.3.1.Observation April 2001) of common patterns of

classroom discourse, but revealed other styles used by teachers which were commented on as very positive by pupils, e.g. Mrs Baker's reflexive response, Mrs Benson's empathy, Mr. Dee's group work approaches. This confirmed that pupils are very aware of the power balance in teacher/pupil dialogue (cf 2.3 Kyle 1994, cf 2.4 Gregory and Bishop 1991).

Policy documents at a local and national level encourage the development of equal opportunities through differentiated work and communication, through whatever teaching approach is relevant to the child's needs (see Greenview's SEN policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995)). This varies according to the skills and philosophy of individual teachers. Communication policy advice was restricted to advocating a wide range of oral and signing approaches without being prescriptive (see Greenview's SEN policy, 1995 and Communication Policy, 1995). However pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils varied widely (cf 4.3.2). This is addressed in this research within Moves and Responses (cf 5.4.2) because of the analysis related to research question 2 (cf 1.3) on communication strategy teachers employed.

To see which teacher strategy is valued most by pupils, is reflected within this study by recording types of the most positive pupil responses, such as spontaneity and loquacity (cf 2.5 Corson 1973, Wood et al 1986). The findings of classroom observation were analysed in terms of teacher strategy factors and resulting pupil initiative. A lack of communication between pupils and teachers, and lack of mutual coherence in sign language, meant that some encounters were rather literal and asocial in nature. This is understandable. It would be unrealistic to expect deaf pupils to maintain extended and productive play themes with each other, when they are unable to participate knowingly in interactions with communicatively skilled adults. Pupils are clear in their views of how the teachers' perceptions of deafness influenced a good understanding and teaching approach (cf 4.3.2 Shadeh June 2000). This part of the study links with the way, as a researcher, I found to describe how active, or loquacious, the pupils are in response to opportunities offered by the teacher. Working over a three-year period, I was surprised by differences in classrooms over the period. In some classrooms, the hearing pupils appeared responsive and talked a great

deal during lessons. In others, the pupils appeared reticent and unforthcoming. Although the deaf pupils had known their hearing classmates throughout their school career, they are on the whole as one would expect, far less verbal. The aim in this area of the research is to capture the kinds of response from pupils, following the teacher's verbal moves. I was struck by the predictability of the kinds of responses the pupils would make. Although I was unable to anticipate the kinds of things the teacher would say in response to a pupil, the kind of action the teacher would make was usually possible. The framework developed for analysing moves is based on the fact that the teacher exerts control over the pupils' part in response to the new topic or material. Table 5.1 is a summary of the full Table 4.3, and is a shortened version of categories, or codes, for common control categories, used by teachers, and responses used by pupils.

Table 5.1: Coding Categories: Levels of Control

Level of Control (Teacher's moves)	Examples
1. Enforced repetition	Say, 'Nobody gave me one.'
2. Closed questions	Is your dad happy or sad?
3. Open questions	What happened on Sunday?
4. Personal contributions	That's my favourite as well. It's called a gosling. It must have been really scary.
5. Phatics	Ooh! Lovely! Fantastic! Oh really. I see.

A series of moves is fairly predictable in line with a scenario following a general sequence of events:

- i) The pupils listening are being cooperative and compliant, attempting to meet the expectation laid down by their teacher.
- ii) After the initial move from the teacher, within the limits of their expressive and receptive skills, the response of our 'well-behaved' pupil is fixed.
- iii) In the teacher's next move, a two-choice question specifies at least one word the listener should respond with. The pupils usually reply to this move with the single word (e.g. yes/no, mummy/daddy, hot/cold, etc)
- iv) In the next category, 'wh- type questions' also dictate the nature of the ensuing response. If the pupils understand the semantics of the question (e.g. where - location, when - a time, who - a person) the

response is predetermined. The teacher will still control the direction and content of the conversation.

- v) The category 'phatics' includes any move that fills a turn without offering any substance, or direction, to the content or discourse. This allows the teacher to signify reception and comprehension of what has been said, but leaves the next person to speak with control.
- vi) If pupils respond with phatics to the teacher's phatics, the teacher may retake control and switch the focus to another topic, or another pupil.

In most classes observed, the opening sequence from the teacher is received with compliant listening from the pupil. The subsequent different types of teacher moves are responded to with the predicted pattern of response. This means active participants can readily be identified, by their contrasting contributions. An active participant will sometimes take control of the interaction by asking questions. They contribute readily, and frequently, after a contribution, or phatic comment, as seen in Example 1. in Appendix N, taken from observation of mainstream literacy lesson 23rd March 2002. (See Appendix I). In Example 2, the teacher gives an appropriate answer plus an elaborating contribution.

In the example in Appendix J, taken from an observation of a mainstream literacy lesson, 19th June, 2001, the teacher extends the theme being discussed, and occasionally introduces new topics of thought, and when answering questions the teacher goes on to add more information by answering and contributing to the topic. In this example, the teacher knows Shadeh and Alexander have difficulty in replying in class, and accepts 'I don't know' as a fair start, compared to their usual silent response. In these circumstances, replies such as 'I'm not sure', are accepted as valid answers, a positive step instead of a passive, or no reply, answer. One sees here the teacher working hard to include pupils who do not usually participate, without being confrontational. Strategies which offer thinking time, or collaborative pair-working time usually greatly aid the deaf pupils.

How active and forthcoming the pupils are depends on the shared personal boundaries of the pupil's relationship with the teacher (cf 4.3.2 Diary/observation March 2002), and how the teacher manages the

interaction. At first I was unsure how much the deaf pupils are aware of this sequence of moves, or whether they could be influenced by different structures of classroom management in the same way hearing could be influenced. In fact they are able to follow the less-controlling moves from the teacher [contributions or phatics], by saying something themselves. Where they did not take the initiative, it is possible to prompt the deaf pupil to add something, or ask a question after a contribution or phatic.

A critical finding here concerns the contributions deaf pupils make to each other. When teacher control is high, pupils seldom address comments or questions to their peers. However when control is low, pupils are more likely not only to contribute comments and questions to the teacher but also to converse with each other. Thus, very specific, and very simple, features of teaching style directly influence the whole 'tenor' of a group conversation. Examples are given in Appendix N, from observation on a mainstream lesson, 23rd March 2002 (cf 4.2.4 Sarah March 2001).

Relating to policy documents (see Greenview's SEN policy 1995, and Communication Policy 1995), to enable all children to reach their full potential in terms of communication, and attend to children's conversational language needs (see Greenwood's LEA SEN Policy 1993), (cf 5.6), if teachers want to challenge, and stimulate, pupils to contribute, they have to be prepared, not only to question, but also to inform, react, listen and acknowledge. Rather than directing the conversation by questions or trying to use it to 'improve language', they need to form their moves from the standpoint of the pupil and accept their point of view. The trend in the Unit towards an equal basis of sharing learning through one's own narrative, results in longer, more animated and interesting contributions from all pupils. These opportunities are rare in the mainstream. Such occasions in the mainstream are still characterised by a teacher-led control of question and answer exchanges, effectively limiting the exploration, and sequencing, of accounts. Viewed from the perspective of the pupil it seems that less-aware mainstream teachers do not see themselves as partners with the pupils in creating teaching points for the pupils to relate to (cf 2.5 Evans 2002, Gregory et al 1998, Marschark 2000).

Pupils commented that frequently they are ignored by the mainstream teacher throughout the lesson, and are unable to change the pace of instruction, or explanation, in order to catch up (cf 4.3.2 Shadeh February 2002). The lack of awareness of the mainstream teacher in altering her pace during the lesson, for example, to leave gaps so that other sources of information can be gathered, e.g., information from the board, or checking back through textual information is a major factor in the pupils' ability to absorb new concepts. Deaf pupils feel that in these situations they have no choice but to 'hang on' as best they can, and catch up from other pupils' work later. Coping with this led to pupils reporting general loss of motivation or transgressive behaviour (cf 2.2.2 Corker 1996, 4.3.2 Shadeh February 2002).

Observation and interview material show that in speech interpretation, it is the meaning that has to come across – not the words or the syntax, but the actual meaning behind the words (cf 2.5 Kyle 1993) points out the difficulty deaf pupils may have in asking questions. Teachers of the deaf (or LSAs) need the chance to develop the skills necessary to differentiate, between language meaning and message meaning, in advance of the lesson if deaf pupils are ever to really understand the sense of the interpretation. Such forward planning [between teacher of the deaf and mainstream teacher] is essential to creatively describe, and 'disembed' (cf 2.5 Donaldson, 1978), new concepts, new vocabulary and technical language in ways which relate to areas of the pupils' personal experience (cf 2.5 Marschark 2000).

5.3.2 How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy?

Pupils views of teachers' moves and responses

I had not expected to understand much but the reality was a chilling experience. I understood very little of what was said and, to add to my discomfort, I had no idea where to look. By the time I swivelled round to locate a speaker he would be half way through his question; a brief one would be finished before I could start to make any sense of it. (Allan, 1999 p.215)

Sometimes they can't finish one question before they start another... it's much too easy to make myself look stupid so I

won't speak in class. But Mr. Cox knows this. He lets me work with John, shows me what to do. Then we get house points.

(Interview: Alexander, yr 5 18th September, 2000)

The pace of the lesson the pupils' experienced was crucial to whether they could understand it or not (cf 2.5 Kyle 1993, Gregory and Bishop 1991, cf 4.3.2 Alexander March 2001). The pupils commented on a preference for learning activities where they sit and work together, and help each other. Pupils comment that sitting near their friends, in a group-work context is important as communication can be difficult. They comment that teachers often move them so they are not with friends, but frequently this frustrates their chances of checking their understanding. Other, more positive, pupils' views of the teachers' strategies towards deaf awareness included 1:1 practical help such as homework always being explained clearly, extra help and support with exams, and support to use the full range of school facilities (cf Marie October 2002).

It is clear to the pupils why they like, or dislike particular topics, or subject areas. They know the kinds of lesson approach they prefer and the amount of explanation, length of instruction and how much noise is allowed from specific teachers (cf 4.3.2 Mrs Baker July 2002). The pupils disliked long explanations and topics where there was a lot of class discussion or a significant amount of noise.

Wood *et al.*'s study (1986) and, later, Knight and Swanwick (1998) focus on the different levels of control in conversations between deaf pupils and teachers. It is found that lower levels of control allow the pupil to be an active participant in the conversation, that is, to be able to take control of part of the conversation, and contribute readily, or introduce new topics. The more control the teacher has over conversation, the more passive and uninvolved the pupil becomes. When teacher control is lessened, the pupils also tend to address comments, or questions, to each other.

What is needed is greater and more detailed attention to the content and structure of discourse as a basis for linguistic development.

(Wood *et al.* 1986. p.168)

As shown in Greenview's SEN policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995) points out, deafness in itself is not a special educational need, but

there are needs arising from deafness, which require special educational provision to be made. As Greenwood's SEN LEA Policy, (1993) points out, the deaf child must have equality of opportunity so that they can think for themselves.

If a teacher 'sets the scene' to establish background, then the pupil can relate to the story, by interpreting their own event (cf 2.5 Evans 2002, Quigley and Paul 1984). There are many different ways this might be done. The teacher might fantasise about the future, or recall a past shared experience. Or in another twist, the pupils might be encouraged to tell their own story about news, events or themes. Such strategies determine who will talk, but not necessarily what is said. Two examples to consider are given in Appendices I and J. These findings reflect that the deaf pupils very much noticed and enjoyed the teachers' attempts to adapt their delivery to accommodate their language needs, (cf 2.3.) They were aware that the less experienced teachers had greater restraints on classroom dialogue, and made fewer attempts to relinquish conversational control in favour of pupils' interests.

5.3.3 Summary

Some of the pupils experienced teachers' facilitation of learning as a restricted view which could be read as an act of oppression (cf 4.3.2 Alexander September 1999, Booth 1988). Some of the pupils sought to deny their deafness because of what they see as negative connotations within the mainstream, and the way they feel their deafness is constructed by teachers. Some of the pupils felt forced to 'co-operate in promoting a view... of themselves as disabled' (Lane, 1995, in Allan, 1999). Other pupils adopted transgressive acts due to their negative self-esteem such as 'loosing' their hearing aids or 'denying' their misunderstandings. Others, such as Sarah, rallied towards the deaf community, and held within their pride at being deaf.

The deaf pupils all remark on how effective they find an experiential approach to learning, for example they enjoy looking at visual forms of learning, e.g., diagrams, cartoons, pictures, role play, acting out sequences, inventing games [for example, learning times tables on numbered carpet

tiles with conkers] (cf 4.3.2 Marie October 2002, Shadeh June 2000). They love the pedagogic approach of teachers who are prepared to act out abstract concepts, for example, Mrs. Dawes and the 'Munch Bunch' vitamins (Interview, Alexander, 17th April, 2001), and feel this relates closely to their own learning needs of play-acting, through physical expression such as gesture and mime, although the hearing majority may already be at another stage (cf 2.5 Hoiting and Loncke 1990).

This approach contrasted strongly with some of the pupils' views that the teachers see their deafness as a social disability e.g. *'they can't see our deafness'* [the pupils' deafness is invisible to some teachers] *'they are deaf themselves'* [our image of them is the stupid one they give us]. This social view of deafness is regularly shattered when imaginative teachers choose role play and the use of props to explain concepts, thereby involving all pupils, and effectively crossing the language barrier. So many of the pupils, both deaf and hearing, find this kind of learning effective that in a way it could threaten the more traditional teachers, and perhaps make their views more entrenched (cf 2.3.1. Powers, 1999).

One of the most positive areas for me, as part of this research, is to see the pleasure on the deaf pupils' faces as they participate freely in play acting their lessons alongside hearing pupils. Their participation shows that inclusion can be more than equal, provided deaf pupils' achievements are valued on their own terms. Hands on, experiential learning, is commented on by the pupils as being their favourite approach, e.g. within subject areas such as art, and design and technology.

5.4 Communication

How does the presence of a facilitator and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation? Sub-themes: Pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators, M/S, ToD, LSA roles; deaf awareness of staff and pupils; deaf adults as role models.

5.4.1 Pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators

She will say that 'we have to do this' or 'I don't understand'.

She didn't always do that but she is getting a lot better [at

admitting she doesn't know], so we are trying to put the responsibility back to her and again I go back to our original thinking that making her a good citizen, we want to get into her that if she doesn't understand something she must say so and if you can do that in the world of work then you stand a better chance of being a good worker and keeping your job than if you just sit quietly and do nothing...(Allan, 1999, p.93)

Many of the more deaf aware teachers reflected their experience in the way they facilitated the learning of deaf pupils (cf 2.4 Allan 1999, 4.4.1.1 Alexander March 2002, Sarah January 2000, Ainscow 1997, Lynas 2002). Language is seen as the key element in the process of integrating the children into their mainstream class (Greenwood Communications Policy 1995), cf 2.3, Collins (1996). As with Collins' 1996 study, the children remarked that non-participatory behaviour was detrimental to their learning and that failing to grasp their instructions or information in lessons on a frequent basis was most demoralising for them. Additional facilitators were provided for activities such as small group work, reverse integration groups (deaf/hearing groups taught in the unit), and sign language support in class and assemblies. There were opportunities for staff and adults to learn sign and in addition, deaf awareness classes for mainstream staff to learn of the effect on learning of optimum seating position, background noise, lighting, teaching style, use of LSAs as facilitators to support children and use of radio-aids/equipment (cf 2.4 Evans 2002, cf 4.4.1.2 Marie December 2000).

LEA policy support materials list LSAs and teachers of the deaf when acting as facilitators to be responsible for differentiating work, including the provision of additional resources. In addition, facilitators ensure that the child can take part in accessing the curriculum and fully participate in the classroom and the life of the school. (See Appendix L: Communication Policy (1995).

It matters to the pupils that the teachers, who are aware of deaf issues, and the ways in which Greenview's 'model' of inclusion might be influenced, frequently check with the facilitator on the pace of the lesson, that the content is acceptable, or whether the class needs to pause and recap. This made lessons more manageable for all the pupils, who benefit from regular

summaries, whether in BSL or as a voice-over (cf 4.4.1.1 Alexander October 2002). Many teachers are also aware of the social isolation of deaf pupils in the class, and regularly ask deaf pupils to take part in assisting other pupils, for example in collecting or distributing materials, or using the pupil's personal experience, asking them to explain a skill in BSL, for example, making a pizza, or keeping a pet rabbit, which is then interpreted. The pupils note that these teachers frequently try to elevate their status in front of hearing pupils, for example, by bringing in a BSL narrator [interpreter, or voice-over from off stage], or asking them to bring in objects from home to talk about [for example, the marathon medal of Alexander's mum]. These teachers note the value of such experience for the deaf pupils, and the deaf pupils respond with pride at having their own experience valued (4.4.1.1 Farhan May 2001). This area of the research relates to chapter 2, (cf 2.4) in which Bruner's (1985) view of learning as a social activity is discussed, with a useful opportunity to express shared beliefs, norms and values.

The pupils speak of their relationships being dependent upon communication; therefore the quality of that communication is very important. During deaf awareness sessions, new teachers are taught basic signs. Rarely does this ability progress beyond a basic introductory level. In addition the deaf children do not have any teachers of the deaf who are deaf. The mature BSL communicative skills imparted by deaf adults are from occasional visitors. This leaves the question open as to how these pupils manage with the bare essentials of BSL being used to teach them through a teacher of the deaf or LSA who has beginner level BSL. In this section I illustrate how the deaf pupils have benefited in the limited ways that BSL is used alongside spoken and written English (cf 2.3.1 Powers et al 1999, Lynas 2002).

5.4.2.1 Role of M/S teacher

Campbell and Oliver, 1996, (cf 2.3) discuss how mainstream teachers can share the experiences of disabled people, by exchanging views on seeing deafness not as a deficit model, but as a social model, demanding that the school change towards that of an inclusive ethos.

Sometimes I would speak to her but the difficulty of that is, typically, you are used to talking over everybody's shoulder and so if she is not looking at me then I would develop, not sign language, [but] it would be to point to the screen and signal and she would understand to do what I was pointing to and I would use sort of nod and point. (Allan, 1999, p.93)

Mainstream staff through INSETs, are taught the skills to expect a facilitator to provide in their classroom (cf 2.3 Hopwood 2000, Lynas 2002). Often it is in the children's interest for them to share these skills in collaborative presentations with the facilitator during the presentation of learning concepts. LEA and Greenview's special needs policy documents do not describe the advantages of such collaborative work, but the children could all name examples of key learning experiences they had enjoyed. The pupils value and like the fact that there is a wide range of staff responsible for their learning. They have no difficulty separating each staff member, and their identity, from their role, although these roles are occasionally somewhat different from their official designation (cf 4.4.1.1. Sarah March 2000). They perceive mainstream teachers as having useful identities in terms of explaining, sorting out problems, looking after problems with homework, paying attention to the progress of class work and monitoring of behaviour.

This research started from the premise, via Greenview's Communication Policy (1995), that the deaf pupil should be considered communicatively competent in sign language. Part of this is the assumption that, given access to appropriate models, all language goals can be reached through this language, and the pupil becomes a second language learner in relation to English. In other words, the learning of English is seen as part of the general educational achievements required in a shared environment. However, it is noted in this research that adults using sign language may not have a shared language, or culture, with the deaf world, and that their experience at sharing the world through the medium of BSL is limited at best to intermediate levels. (cf 2.5 Kyle 1993). There is little hope of extending the development of language in a situation where adult and pupil are joint partners in creating communication if the teachers fail to adequately interpret what the pupil has to say (cf 4.4.1.2 Farhan May 2001). In turn it

follows that they need far more training in understanding language levels that deaf children could relate to (cf 2.3.1 DEX 1997, 2.5 Kyle, 1993).

It is clear that the needs of deaf pupils require mainstream teachers to be highly skilled in their deaf awareness, communication skills and versatility of teaching approach. The needs of these pupils require a high level of teacher monitoring, and involvement, and great adaptation of language, and environment, necessary to make classroom talk intelligible. The deaf pupils give generally positive comments about their lessons and recognise the wide range of skills mainstream teachers offer. At Greenview, it seems, outside of a familiar context, it is frequently hard for unfamiliar mainstream teachers to hold productive conversations with deaf pupils. Some of these difficulties are directly related to the deafness. For example, the fact that some deaf pupils' speech is often very difficult to understand, arise directly out of the deafness (cf 2.3.1 DEX 1997, cf 2.2.2 Kyle and Davis, 1991, 4.4.2.1 Mrs Dawes May 1999).

In real life, there are no 're-runs' and the teacher must respond in 'real time' to what the pupil says, with only mental re-runs of the interaction for referral. Though their knowledge of the pupil should provide them with a better basis for understanding, teachers will find it difficult to understand what some deaf pupils say. However, as Mercer notes, context-related situations may frequently reoccur and provide new opportunities for revisiting past breakdowns of communication.

There are many ways that teachers try to create continuities in the experience of learners – sequencing activities in certain ways, by dealing with topic in order of difficulty, and so on...Through language there is the possibility of repeatedly revisiting and reinterpreting that experience, and of using it as the basis for future talk, activity and learning. (Mercer, 1995. p.33)

The deaf pupils have variable attention spans and simply do not watch the facilitator at all times (c.f 2.4 Wood et al 1986). Although the hearing pupils also have lapses of attention, those by the deaf are more obvious; by the way they lose their place on the page, sometimes because they simply 'tune out', and sometimes because mainstream teachers move around the room a lot,

and the deaf pupils prefer to watch them rather than watch the facilitator. An interpreted education is unlike directly interacting with the teacher, but often good collaboration can be achieved between the facilitator and the mainstream teacher, as the extracts (cf 4.4.2.1. Mrs Dawes May 1999, 4.4.1.3. Mrs Benson March 2001).

5.4.2.2 Role of teacher of the deaf

I think you have to be able to admit that you can't do something in order to ask for help so if we can that in a way that she find comfortable then hopefully we will be able to transfer to a situation where she is not so comfortable and that is what we are trying to do. (Allan, 1999, p.93)

The teachers of the deaf are a key aspect of the bridge of learning described above (Allan 1999) between M/S goals and the deaf children's learning, both in promoting and educating the whole school ethos in adopting an inclusive policy, but in educating the school in deaf awareness, use of sign language and finger spelling throughout the school, and in training staff in use of audiological equipment. The LEA special needs policy and Greenview's Communications Policy makes this full range of support very clear. The deaf pupils recognised that the teachers of the deaf were very different in their attitude and understanding (cf 2.4 Evans 2002, 4.4.2 Sarah July 2002):

At Greenview School sometimes it feels big and scary [signs very noisy] but the Unit teachers show us what to do. They are always there if you need help. (Shadeh, yr 4, interview, 5th April, 2001)

The teachers of the deaf have a very different orientation to teaching – to assist the pupils in their care, in a way specifically geared to the individual's best method of learning, and this is reflected within the Unit, in the adaptation of the curriculum's language and environmental modifications (cf 2.4 Sacks 1990, Powers et al 1999). Some of these characteristics of creative practice are shared by the more able mainstream teachers. Where teachers recognise and value the cultural distinctiveness of deafness, pupils respond very well. They recognise the steps the teachers take to involve them in a creative way, for example, through a different presentation of new vocabulary, or the using the teacher of the deaf to help them teach in an

innovative way. All the deaf pupils comment on the immense disturbance of background noise in the mainstream classrooms, which are not acoustically treated. All the deaf pupils mention the problem of amplified noise through their hearing aids in the mainstream classroom, and the fact that external influences of noise, traffic or the teacher shouting, for example, can be very disturbing. The deaf pupils prefer the Unit for their lessons as the acoustic modifications means it has a *'beautiful hush'* with no extra sound to disturb concentration, and also because in the Unit, the teachers of the deaf used BSL to teach, rather than sign a lesson. These teachers are experts at adapting class materials to take account of a deaf perspective and the pupils often remarked how enjoyable the lessons are.

In the mainstream class, the deaf pupils mainly have to take responsibility for their own seating position, and when choosing unsuitable places to sit, such as right under a desk lamp, at a table with a view of the playing fields, or next to a noisy pupils, the deaf pupils frequently remark that their discomfort and inability to concentrate goes unnoticed (cf 4.4.2 Richard, January 2001). The pupils say that frequently they cannot attract the teachers' attention when they need to, for example, to regain their place in the text book. It is the teachers of the deaf who reward them in the mainstream class, for example in gaining eye-contact, concentrating when having to lip-read for long periods, and managing to learn new vocabulary. Indeed, the pupils seem to delight in the progress they make with teachers who are prepared to be more receptive and less dictatorial, and are quick to notice the differences in the pedagogical approach of teachers who are inspired (cf 2.3.1 social model of disability: Campbell and Oliver 1996, Gregory and Bishop 1991, cf 2.4 Bruner 1985).

The deaf pupils are highly observant at noticing adaptation of the curriculum designed to offer them a more meaningful experience in the classroom, and the pupils express a high regard for both the learning experience and their relationships with the teachers. The more articulate deaf pupils express a need for their views to be taken into consideration when planning, an important consideration towards their equal rights and the validity of having a school ethos which values diversity.

The teachers of the deaf are principally seen as undertaking arrangements for in-class support, organising the work of the LSAs, and helping to sort out problems with class work and homework. The Unit teachers also give emotional support to the deaf pupil, and closely liaise with parents and carers on progress at school, as deaf pupils frequently comment on information shared via news in the home-school diary.

The role of teacher of the deaf, or LSA, in a support role as a facilitator is a difficult one (cf 4.4.2 Edwards and Mercer 1987). This role includes attending to subconscious features of classroom discourse; the structure, organisation and management of 'teacher talk'. A facilitator can ask speakers to slow down; who often do so when reminded. However, few speakers can sustain careful and reflective attention to pace of speech. Teacher/pupil conversation is very difficult to interpret at the right pace to naturally maintain the flow (cf 4.4.1 Alexander September 2002).

Both Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Rork (teachers of the deaf) recall their first year of working in the mainstream. It took Mrs. Rork a year to get accustomed to working with a mainstream teacher. The mainstream teacher has to adjust the pace of lessons to accomplish communication, and interpreting in both directions, between spoken English and signing is then possible. In Mrs. Baker's experience not all teachers welcome the additional presence of a facilitator.

Appendix N shows the experience needed to establish key preparation for the pupil's learning. In this instance the teacher of the deaf knows the pupils understand how to talk in groups as they have already worked within the personalities of this particular peer group. They already have an in-depth understanding of using the pupil's perspective, and past experience, in extending their knowledge. Because of the already close relationship with the pupils, they work hard to seek an area they can relate to, to 'deconstruct' the new concept (cf 2.3.1.Lynas 2002, Wood, 1988). The extracts in chapter 4 also give a clear indication of how creative the teaching objective can be when shared between mainstream teacher's role and the ToD or LSA.

The interdependence of BSL and English is vital in all lessons, and transference of communication between the teachers of the deaf, or LSAs, and the class teacher is encouraged. To this end, thorough planning by Unit teachers, LSAs and class teachers, regarding curricula, vocabulary, BSL signs, and multi-sensory materials to convey the most appropriate information, is considered vital to ensure access for deaf pupils (cf 2.3.1. Pickersgill and Gregory 1998, Hopwood 2000). Teaching strategies utilise BSL for the development of English skills (cf 4.4.2.1 Mrs Dawes May 1999). It is recognised it is necessary to approach the curriculum in a different way for deaf pupils, to suit their different learning styles and aptitudes (adapted from Greenview Communication Policy, March, 1995: See Appendix L). From comments, adaptation of the curriculum is the most important aspect noted by the pupils.

5.4.2.3 LSA role

Through the support from [the learning support teacher] and the teacher of the deaf we try to make her responsible for saying what she doesn't understand. (Allan 1999, p.93)

In terms of this study, it was the LSAs who showed most sensitivity in terms of consulting with deaf pupils about what support they needed. Mrs. Benson had been a deaf child herself at residential school, and had deaf children who were mainstreamed; her personal goals for mainstreaming strategies were especially touching. When discussing the idea of inclusion, she never mentioned equality as a motivator, although she held fierce opinions about civil rights and self-determination for deaf people (assessment based on knowledge of the child: (cf 2.3.1. Pickersgill and Gregory 1998, cf 4.4.3.1 Mrs Baker, March 2001). Instead, she summed up the role of interpreting in educational settings:

I have to go by my opinion, my philosophy, my personality, and what I hope to God was given to my children when they were mainstreamed.... and if somebody doesn't educate them, if somebody doesn't give them all the advantages and help and everything... well, who will? (Mrs Benson 25th September 2002)

This committed perspective, at least indicates Mrs Benson's real sensitivity for the perspective of all pupils. In agreement with Fielding (1999 p.286) the issue points to:

...a real concern with learner involvement which involves "the complex reality of a lived partnership" whereas in a common rhetorical concern "their voice is little more than an assenting punctuation mark in an institutionally constructed sentence."

(Fielding 1999 p.286 in Collins et al, 2002, p.73)

As such these findings reflect in agreement with this research that:

An interactive teaching approach should seek to validate the marginalized voice. (Collins et al, 2002, p.77)

In Greenview, in an attempt to include those who could be marginalised, teaching strategies utilise BSL for the development of English skills, but learning is influenced in the mainstream environment by external disruption (cf 2.4 deaf children's attainment, cf 4.4.2 Mrs Noon, February 2002, DfES 2004, Gregory and Bishop 1991, Bruner 1985). Problems include class size, discussion time available per pupil, physical space in mainstream classrooms, noise and a lack of resources. A deaf pupil also has a problem in not knowing where to look - the mainstream teacher, the facilitator, visual prompts on the board or the other pupils responding to questions. Some of the LSAs had experience themselves of coping at school with a hearing impairment and were able to anticipate and plan around the problems the deaf pupils' could encounter in specific lessons, e.g. by making additional resources. This insight greatly enriched the quality of the pupils' learning.

5.4.3 Deaf awareness of staff and pupils

Goffman (1963) in Allan (1999), describes the struggle in which 'individuals struggle to gain acceptance in both worlds...individuals with a stigma...may have to learn about the structure of interaction in order to learn about the lines along which they may reconstitute their conduct if they are to minimise the obtrusiveness of their stigma' (Goffman 1963, p.127, cf 4.4.2 Mrs Rork, April 2001). As Miss Coombes observation shows:

I don't think she always follows what is going on. She says nothing unless she is encouraged to have her say. Sometimes her hearing aids are not switched on.

(Interview with Miss Coombes 27/2/2000)

For further examples of misunderstanding cf 2.4 (Gregory and Bishop 1991).

Collins et al maintain:

that finding out how learners see things, i.e. how they see themselves, the teacher and the learning situation, is fundamental to engaging them as learners. Our concern with teaching as an interactive and emotional process inevitably leads to us to a concern with learners themselves, as people with whom we have some kind of relationship.

Collins et al (2002, p.72)

In addressing this, Collins et al (2002) assert that perspectives must be drawn from learners and teachers. Corker stresses the importance of deaf people 'gaining recognition, acceptance and affirmation of deafness, without assumptions about *deaf identity* being the driving force in their lives' (Corker 1996, p.61, original emphasis). This means it is important to accept, simultaneously foregrounding and backgrounding the individuals' deafness to recognise the individual features of how a person sees their own deafness. This identity is described by Wright, (1993) in Allan (1999) for example in a deaf person 'dispensing with the easy exchange of trivialities' that is social oil in conversation (cf 2.4 Webster and Wood 1989, Wright 1993, p.6 in Allan, 1999).

Communications and LEA policy both explicitly emphasise shared opportunity and explicit valuing of diversity. (See Communication Policy 1995) Deaf pupils were aware of how the school's policy valued their interests; although they were not aware of the school's Equal Opportunity Policy, they took part in the pupils' School's Council meetings, and raised important questions about access to participation in the life of the school, for example to have facilitators present at after school clubs.

5.4.4 BSL

The idea of mainstream staff constantly checking that deaf pupils have understood their instructions was a common theme spoken about by deaf pupils and mainstream teachers (cf 4.4.2.1). Hasler (1983) and Allan (1993) (cf 2.3) both introduced in chapter 2 the idea of a fundamental epistemological shift, if deaf pupils were to be given a voice to express their experiences. This was a common issue of being unable to vocalise their experiences commented on by pupils due the reluctance of mainstream teachers to shift their teaching approach to allow more listening time: (cf 2.4) relinquishing the teachers agenda. (Edwards and Mercer 1987).

The sensory world is a very different world without audition and sign language is possibly the only way of fully expressing the meaning that this world has, for it is a 'gestural-visual spatial language. (Corker, 1993, p.150)

Awareness of visual support for the lessons at Greenview, was in practice, left to the responsibility of the sign language facilitator. The philosophy underpinning Greenview's Communication Policy is based on a *...linguistic and cultural minority model of deafness and a social model of disability* (Pickersgill and Gregory, 1998. p.3). Within the Unit lessons, the social form of signing takes a very different shape to that in the mainstream classes. The year 5 deaf pupils, Alexander, Farhan and Lawrence, demonstrate a preference for each other as conversational partners. Indeed, they take intentional steps to seek out people with whom they can easily communicate, in a language they have in common, and about topics they share an interest in (sharing of culture cf 2.2.2 Corker 1996, cf 2.5 DEX 1997, Powers 1999, cf 4.4.2.1. Communications Policy 1995, cf 4.4.3 Shadeh September 2001). They avoid non-signers. Preferring not to interact at school with people who cannot sign, they routinely decline to engage, or even sit, with non-signing substitute teachers, instructional aides, and other staff who attempt to enter the social life of the deaf classroom.

When Lawrence had to work with a non-signing person in class, he balked at the idea of hearing modes of communication, and became uncooperative. It can be argued that sign language is an intrinsic part of a deaf pupil's

language, and its absence is a denial of this deaf identity (cf 4.4.2.1 peer group collective of deaf identity, Corker, 1993).

For Farhan at Greenview, this perhaps was a clue to his occasional transgressive behaviour: ... *as a survival tactic unknowingly cultivated by those caught between two worlds* (Hartsock, 1996. p.49). Ladd (1991) argues that the denial of access to sign language can be interpreted as oppression against deaf people (cf 2.2.2. Giorcelli 2002, Kyle, 1993, Hartsock, 1996). At Greenview, pupils are very aware of the teachers lacking in knowledge on Deaf awareness:

Some of the teachers expect us to learn through the bit that we haven't got – our hearing! We know how to sign, how to communicate, tell stories, tell the teacher our problems if they can understand us. But the teachers can't communicate. We can't talk to a wall! (Interview: Alexander, yr 4, 27th February, 2002, cf 4.4.3 Mrs Benson February 2002, 4.4.3 Shadeh September 2001).

5.4.5 Deaf adults as role models

It is suggested here that some of Greenview's deaf pupils adopted transgressive practices (cf 5.1.2) as a failure of some teachers to recognise and value deafness as a culture and language. The deaf community, in contrast have demanded greater recognition as a 'separate linguistic and cultural group' (cf 2.2.2. Corker 1996, cf 5.2.2) rather than as disabled people. Both these contrasts, in the behaviour of deaf children negotiating management of their learning in the classroom, to the position of the deaf community who wish to have their rights recognised, seek acknowledgement from deaf people who feel marginalised (cf 2.3, Lane 1995).

As Greenwood's LEA policy documents (1993) describe, deaf pupils need opportunities to meet with a variety of deaf adults, and learn from their experiences, to help with the development of self-awareness and self-esteem. (see Greenview's SEN policy (1995) and Communication Policy (1995)). Deaf adults are seen as important for natural conversation with BSL features, in order to develop deaf children's conversation. This was in particular, one area at Greenview that was emerging as a key factor lacking

in the education of the deaf pupils at Greenview. The pupils had visited a deaf school in North London, as part of an 'open day' between schools. Most interesting is the surprising reaction of the pupils who, on meeting some of the deaf staff, remarked how wonderful it is to see adults signing together as a means of communication. They had never realised that BSL is a living language, rather than a support prop for explaining things in the classroom (cf 4.4.3 Alexander February 2002).

This obviously is an interesting reflection on their need and appreciation of deaf culture, and on the needs for the children to develop healthy social skills as future deaf adults. (cf 2.3 Vygotsky's (1978) claims about the social origins of individual functioning) and provides an indication of the badly-needed assistance of deaf adults as role models in the pupils' school experience. They often comment on the interest, and vitality, engaging in sign language gives towards their access to a deaf world otherwise cut off to them. When meeting deaf adults it is a revelation to them that sign language is not simply a tool to give them access to the curriculum, but a living, breathing, language which gives them access to an adult culture, and an example of future opportunities as deaf adults. It seems vital to consider the role of deaf adults in the classroom so the deaf pupils' culture is recognised as a valid part of an adult deaf community outside the school.

The use of sign language is of great interest to mainstream staff, hearing pupils and deaf pupils alike. Mainstream pupils should be encouraged to use sign language, but deaf pupils often find their use of elementary signs frustrating. It would be helpful for hearing pupils to be involved in intensive training rather than ad hoc voluntary sessions. Without deaf adults, fully trained teachers of the deaf and support staff BSL is unlikely to develop as a living, developing language, or a *sharing of culture* (cf 2.5 Bruner 1985, cf 2.2.2 Gregory and Bishop 1991) at Greenview. Mainstream teachers are often confused, and poorly trained, in working with facilitators of the lesson. In terms of aspiring towards a bilingual approach at Greenview, this does not mean that BSL does not have influence on helping the pupils learn. The bilingual nature of Greenview's school policy would probably have a much greater impact if more than the deaf pupils and their facilitator use BSL in the mainstream classroom. The fact that both pupils and teachers of

the deaf use pure BSL in the Unit has a very positive influence on the deaf pupils' identity, and their security, in absorbing new knowledge (RNID 2002). But it is of importance here to stress that the process of communication and the strategies of education found in the mainstream are having a much greater effect on the deaf pupils' learning. This study links with Wood *et al.* (1986), who comment (cf 2.4) that linguistic delay leads us to underestimate and undervalue potential and needs in other areas of the curriculum.

For competent development of mature BSL by pupils, it would seem possible for teachers of the deaf, and facilitators, to be trained to at least BSL level 3, and that deaf adults be employed as support staff to develop the pupils' BSL in its own right. At present the school is, at best, exercising SSE as a tool to support lessons, but this cannot be said to represent a bilingual environment (cf 2.3.1. Pickersgill and Gregory 1998).

The deaf pupils particularly mention that hearing pupils make a great effort to help them and try to understand. In two instances of teasing mentioned [teasing of deaf pupils by hearing pupils], staff worked hard to resolve the matter appropriately. Socially, the pupils mix well, both at play and in after school clubs. In such a way, the deaf pupils' experience did not transform their deafness into a marginalising experience as Corker (1996) described (cf 2.3, cf 4.4.2 Communication Policy (1995), cf 2.5 Powers 1999, Evans 2002). From a more positive perspective, efforts made by Greenview to improve their inclusive strategy proved to be very popular with the deaf pupils. For example, the opportunity to mix with all the deaf pupils in the Unit at support groups is seen as helpful in building a bilingual context and cementing friendships between deaf and hearing pupils. Other activities commented on as offering deaf pupils useful occasions for working with hearing pupils, to build self-esteem and confidence together, included the bilingual design and technology clubs, art clubs and book clubs, where deaf/hearing pupils share and translate books into BSL as part of the Literacy Hour. Within these less-structured contexts, there is less pressure for the deaf pupils to have to relate quickly to a large amount of information within a short time slot, and then produce work on the basis of that understanding. Within the creative atmosphere of the clubs, they can relax

and flourish, showing equal potential to hearing pupils, as the context allows for spontaneity and creativity, without the linguistic constraints of the pupils' usual lessons (cf 2.3.1 Reason and Palmer 2002, Powers et al 1999, RNID 2002). Their framework for social adjustment and building relationships, within the 'normal' classroom environment may be interpreted quite differently because of lack of quality in intelligible conversation (Ladd, 1991; Corker, 1996). Each deaf pupil has individual needs, but all deaf pupils have as much need for social integration as for academic subjects within a classroom environment.

The legacy and present continuation of Oralist policies affects attitudes toward deaf education to this day. Since the revised Special Education Needs Code (2001) the provision for deaf pupils stands under more threat than ever, as the Department of Education now includes deaf pupils in a category with other pupils who have special educational needs, so encouraging a lack of specialised deaf educational placement and inferring that deaf pupils can be educated alongside other pupils with special educational needs. It also infers that proper inclusion programmes with qualified facilitators need not be set up, and that deaf people can be made to be more like hearing people, for example, by having cochlear implants, playing musical instruments, as though deafness is something which can be 'overcome'. Mainstream teachers at Greenview share this attitude when they occasionally refuse to acknowledge the importance of the facilitator in mainstream lessons, or else treat the deaf pupils as 'normal', because of the physical presence of an 'interpreter', as though the provision for special needs had been satisfied simply through a facilitator being present. These findings strongly imply that adequate sign language training is necessary for teaching appropriate levels of language development (cf 2.4 Sacks 1990, Lynas 2002, Allan 1999). Because deaf pupils are mainstreamed from the Unit right from the start of their school career, at the age of 4 years, beginning in reception class, some of the hearing pupils had been with them for about three years when this study took place. About once a year someone from the Unit taught a short sign language class for the hearing pupils. Some year 5's could fingerspell and had command of a small lexicon of signs; and they use both skills when initiating communication with the deaf pupils. However the hearing pupils do not have any systematic

command of any kind of signing. Knowing finger spelling and a few signs to add to their non-signing methods of making contact with the deaf pupils still does not provide enough linguistic raw material to accomplish much interaction (cf 2.5 Corson 1973, Evans 2002, Seleskovitch 1978).

Some of the adults seem at first to be highly superficial about pupils and language. Several teachers told me that once the pupils had command of a few basic signs [an unspecified level of competence] they would be able to communicate with the deaf pupils. (See 'tidy up' extract, or 'washing machine' extract, earlier). Unfortunately none of the hearing pupils could sign fluently, and attempts at communication through language among the peers is often mangled and abrupt. The deaf and hearing pupils have virtually no linguistic resources for playing or joking together, for conversing about mathematics, science or social topics, or for building friendships and relationships. Some teachers are aware of these issues, and act constructively in breaking a task down so that both deaf and hearing pupils can achieve their learning together (cf 2.5 Foster et al 2002, Wood et al 1986, Bruner 1972, Vygotsky 1978).

In analysing this crucial role that Communication Policies play in the recognition of culture and formation of self-identity, Swanwick and Knight (2002) describe how a sign bilingual policy places the role of sign language users at the heart of the education of deaf pupils, and they comment on the importance of organisational strategies that allow for the planned and structured use of both sign language and English. The role of sign language and native sign users, Knight and Swanwick (2002) observe, is at the heart of the education of deaf pupils. This is one of the apparent inconsistencies noted between the status ascribed to BSL within Greenview's policy, and its apparent lack of trained or native signers. In this respect practice still lagged behind policy, comparable with Tizard's (1984) comment:

Teacher variables are rarely considered. Programme variables where referred to at all are stated in gross terms. It is assumed that the fact that the teachers and pupils are together implies the presence of an educational programme relevant to the development of pupils. Also that the presence of a teacher provides effective educational

programmes... in practice these may not have been met. (Tizard, 1984)

This interpretive case study approach supports the research of Powers *et al.* (1999, p.142) which indicates that to learn, pupils need repeated and intelligible interaction with people who are fluent users of a shared language with a history (cf Super and Harkness 1986, Webster and Wood 1989). This interaction creates avenues for mediating activities and enables the pupils to mature as part of their language acquisition. Through sign language in the Unit, the deaf pupils gain cultural tools; their knowledge of the world is made explicit, accumulated and interpreted. If their mainstream classroom surroundings are organised for development and learning in a way that allows the deaf and hearing pupils to incorporate sign language, they would become members not only of a social deaf group, but active members of a BSL using mainstream group as well (cf Foster et al 2002).

5.4.6 Summary

Deaf pupils within this context have been part of an interesting debate as to how they should be taught, with facilitation and oral methods on one hand, and on the other with deaf adults who see sign language as a means of preserving their deaf identity. It is clear within these findings that the mainstream teachers occasionally fail to appreciate and value the children's deafness beyond that as a disability. Within the classroom, these findings reflect that the deaf pupil shares the same context as hearing pupils, but is unable to participate on an equal level, if the language of the classroom is not structured to allow the deaf pupil access. These findings show a difference between the inclusive approach reflected in Greenview's bilingual communication policy, and the actual experience of the deaf pupils in sharing a monolingual culture and it is essential that all staff, and hearing pupils, should be trained in deaf awareness. The deaf pupils are unaware of equal opportunity issues in Greenview's Communications Policy (1995), and this is a need reflected in these findings. Much more detail needs to be paid to the language of the classroom in constructing an environment suitable for deaf pupils, if they are to feel sufficiently supported to learn comfortably. Mainstream staff need be more open to using a discursive style of teaching in a way that will benefit all pupils.

Chapter 6 Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

This research has sought to provide a link between theory and practice in the realm of inclusion through seeking the viewpoint of its participants, the children. It has attempted to find links between the identity of pupils as expressed by themselves, and the way school, LEA and national policy influence their participation in a M/S system. Whilst the language used by teachers is important, i.e. quality of BSL or English, what has been shown to be more significant is the approach M/S teachers use towards having deaf pupils in their classrooms. In this way, changes in pedagogical approach may be more effective when accompanied by restructuring what the children do – especially in developing the way they work together. As such, these findings support the social constructivist theory of language development through social activity (cf 2.2). In this summary, I examine how through the findings we can find ways of using these children's experiences to include them across all sites of activity. I review recent changes in terms of the learning experience offered to the deaf children in the mainstream class, identity of the deaf pupils as learners, and their views on the most favourable teaching strategies.

As part of looking at the 'Inclusive' theme, I review current attempts to hear the voice of pupils within pupil advocacy groups e.g. school council. Within the research theme 'Pedagogy', I review the findings in terms of whether the findings reflect legislative change e.g. whether pupils have noticed collaboration planning and teaching approaches, e.g. the involvement of specialist colleagues in planning or co-teaching lessons. Within the research theme 'Communication', I review findings regarding pupils' self-identity and whether sign language helps to integrate them or simply creates divisions in learning as a group. The outcome of the findings in terms of pupils' views of M/S, ToD and LSA roles is discussed, with a view to pupils' views of the way they are taught. I discuss the quality of deaf awareness that M/S teachers show, and how this affects deaf pupils' self-esteem. The aspect of use of BSL is reviewed according to findings, as to

whether the level of skill used by teachers is helpful as a language model. Lastly, I consider the role deaf adults may have in the classroom in providing suitable role models for supporting deaf children's learning.

Recent legislative change (cf chapter 2, 2.1) as part of governmental policy has altered current additional SEN provision made available in schools as part of OFSTED criteria for self evaluation (DfES/OFSTED 2004). Within the borough of Greenwood, in which Greenview school is situated, this has had the following recent (2005) outcomes:

As part of the LEA's strategy to remove all barriers to learning and combat any form of discrimination, the authority has improved access for deaf pupils by reviewing all policies on access and inclusion for all learners, and has adopted its key role as being the removal of all barriers to children's learning, to combat any form of discrimination.

In its policy and practice, the LEA has reviewed access for disabled pupils in schools through:

- adapting the physical environment
- increasing access to the curriculum
- providing information to parents

In terms of access to the curriculum, Greenview school now plans, targets, and reviews its accessibility plan, and allows time to ensure resources are appropriately targeted towards the needs of pupils. Pupils are expected by the LEA to contribute to reviews and participate in decision making. The authority has made a comprehensive access audit of the facilities at Greenview School, which has resulted in a acoustic adaptation of rooms to enable better auditory access to the curriculum.

As part of taking on recommendations to guidelines for self-evaluation (DfES/ OFSTED 2004), pupils' voices have become a key part of the self-audit. This has resulted in greater satisfaction of deaf pupils and their parents with the provision made for them, evidence of greater involvement of deaf pupils in the life of the school, for example participation in after school clubs, leisure, sporting and cultural activities and school visits, and

observable changes in staff confidence in teaching and supporting disabled pupils with a range of needs.

During the time of data collection, staff at Greenview were working towards change to closely match the school's 'inclusive communications' policy, and these moves were welcomed by both pupils and staff. However, it is advisable to consider the gaps identified by the deaf pupils in this study, which is not simply about inclusion, but also about pedagogy and communication. This research links with Vygotsky's findings (1978) that internal processes only operate when pupils interact with people in their environment and in cooperation with their peers (p.90). Deaf pupils of hearing parents are expected to develop language virtually alone via direct instruction, rather than learning language naturally as they grow up. A further difficulty is that deaf pupils are expected to acquire a spoken language first, despite the fact they are separated from the English-speaking community by virtue of their deafness. Deaf pupils' first attempts at language acquisition, and literacy development, often lack the intelligible interaction that would unlock meaning and admit them to a social world.

6.2 Inclusion:

How do deaf pupils describe/feel about their learning experience in an inclusive classroom? Sub-themes: pupils' views on inclusion, acoustic conditions.

Are deaf pupils a unique group in terms of their needs? Sub-themes: pupils views on deaf identity, peer group interaction.

6.2.1 Pupils' views on inclusion

Deaf pupils have positive and negative experiences of being in mainstream classes, and sharing lessons with hearing pupils, depending on the skills and 'deaf awareness' shown by the mainstream teacher's approach to pupils. The senior management team at Greenview has instituted many changes and INSETS to review their policy of inclusion, including pupil-led discussions to review the practices of inclusion. This has many positive results, such as the institution of 'buddy support networks'. Pupils comment about friendships more than on any other area. How happy they are in their friendships is a key aspect of school life. Learning to relate to one another is

a central part of each pupil's development, and, as such, learning to be socially included has to take place before any other aspect of academic inclusion can happen. A key part of deaf awareness training for pupils is the resolution of barriers to successful inclusion, such as name-calling, teasing, and bullying. Most pupils at Greenview, however, comment that problems like this have been dealt with successfully.

The Unit has been acoustically improved, and with class sizes reduced from 32 to 5 pupils, all the deaf pupils in this research remark on the ease of learning away from the amplification of background noise. Greenview has arranged for a member of the Unit staff to facilitate in each lesson, provides the physical arrangement, the participants and the discourse patterns of the school. Greenview School is however, on the whole organised for hearing pupils not for deaf pupils. The classroom facilitators sometimes have to ask mainstream teachers to speak more slowly, to allow only one speaker at a time, and to avoid speaking with their backs to the class. These are difficult adjustments to maintain, although most mainstream teachers comply with them when reminded. More seriously, a few mainstream teachers make little, or no, effort to reorganise their presentations of materials in mainstream lessons. 'The chalk and talk' discourse pattern, where the teacher speaks while writing examples on the board, or points to texts, is the most common instruction method. However, over-reliance on divided visual resources is commonplace and results in confusion. Pupils do not know where to look during the lessons: at the mainstream teacher? Or the facilitator? At the board? Or at other pupils answering questions? This process is greatly assisted when teachers of the deaf, in conjunction with the mainstream teachers, produce, before the lesson, a clear synopsis of the lesson printed in advance, with key concepts, and vocabulary, carefully described.

6.2.2 Pupils' views on acoustic conditions

All deaf, and hearing, pupils mention the problem of background noise during class discussions, paired and group work. This is a major hindrance for the deaf pupil when trying to listen. The recommendation here is that mainstream classrooms should be appropriately acoustically-treated with acoustic tiles, and sound field systems, to deaden background noise as far as

possible. In terms of noise management, teachers' frequently need support to reduce levels of classroom noise to an optimum level to improve listening conditions. Mainstream teachers need to consider the effect of noise on hearing aid users, and lesson management should be monitored to assess background noise levels for suitability of deaf pupils' listening. At present they find the environment inhospitable, because of a lack of physical space, awkward seating positions, and the continual interference from background noise.

There are many difficulties with mainstream teachers 'getting to grips' with the use of audio equipment. Infrequent in-service training, poor supervision and the embarrassment of deaf pupils having to remind teachers to use the radio aid, contribute to many pupils commenting on the inefficiency of some teachers in using the equipment. Some pupils prefer to sit through the lesson not hearing, rather than give the radio aid to the teacher and draw attention to them. This situation can be remedied if teachers are trained in the use of, and regularly use, audio equipment, and can identify ways of managing the equipment unobtrusively.

6.2.3 Pupils' views on Deaf identity

The goal of Greenview's communication policy aims to offer deaf pupils a bilingual educational context, with the opportunity to mix with signing deaf adults, and learn, from the deaf awareness of deaf adults, how to function positively, and confidently, in a hearing world. Although this opportunity is presently limited, an awareness of the pupils' needs is growing, and recognised, and this will be developed in future. The hearing adults who 'sign' at Greenview School do not sign well enough to impart a mature level of BSL capability, but the policy, and organisational strategies, allow for planned, and structured, use of both sign language and English throughout lessons.

6.2.4 Pupils' views on peer group interaction

All pupils, whether deaf or hearing, comment on the importance of learning from each other and the value they have gained from deaf, and hearing, relationships. It is noticeable how much more successful collaboration in

work, between deaf and hearing pupils was, after communication issues had been explored in deaf awareness training. It is useful for the deaf, and hearing, pupils to be involved in training which gives them strategies for inclusion, for example, in group, or paired, work. The deaf pupils at Greenview all comment on how valuable it is to have the experience of deaf adults signing around them, either through an occasional visit to a deaf school, or through visiting deaf adults for story telling. The frequency of these visits is insufficient, and these findings indicate that deaf people should be given access to teacher training to enable them to work in the classroom.

Other activities commented on, and offering deaf pupils useful occasions for working with hearing pupils, to build their self-esteem and confidence together, included the working of bilingual design and technology clubs, art clubs and book clubs, where deaf/hearing pupils shared, and translated, books into BSL as part of the Literacy Hour. Within these less-structured contexts, there is less pressure for the deaf pupils to have to quickly relate to a large volume of information in a short time slot, and then produce work on the basis of that understanding. Within the creative atmosphere of the clubs, they could relax and flourish, showing equal potential to that of the hearing pupils, as the context allows for spontaneity and creativity, without the linguistic constraints of the pupils' usual lessons. Few deaf pupils are aware of the School's Equal Opportunity policy, although they take part in the School Council pupils' committee.

All pupils interviewed named aspects of school life they are positive about, and are clear about why these aspects are successful, for example what makes a good teaching approach, or why 'valuing diversity' is important. An aspect of Greenview's bilingual policy that is working well is the Friends group instigated by the Unit teachers. All the deaf and hearing pupils comment that it enables them to understand each other's needs in a clearer way, and the deaf pupils are delighted that deaf issues are top of the agenda at last. In addition, the recognition of the Friends group gives the deaf pupils a chance to sign across all year groups within the Unit, an opportunity to learn from the older deaf pupils and boost morale across the

board. Deaf pupils are not happy to have the needs of specific deaf pupils discussed in these groups.

There is a clear indication that inclusive practice at Greenview trails somewhat behind the inception of the inclusive policies. From a more positive perspective, efforts made by Greenview to come more into line with their inclusive strategy proved to be very popular with the deaf pupils. For example, the opportunity to mix with all the deaf pupils in the Unit at support groups is seen as very helpful in building a bilingual context, and cementing friendships between deaf and hearing pupils.

6.3 Pedagogy

What educational strategies are in place to make inclusion of deaf pupils work? Sub-themes: Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils.
How do teachers' perceptions of deafness affect their pedagogy? Sub-themes: Pupils' views of teacher moves and responses.

6.3.1 Pupils' views of teacher facilitation of pupils

Since the time of data collection, Greenview has embarked upon a review of its teaching and learning methods. In line with other schools in the borough, curriculum access for deaf pupils has been reviewed in schools through all teaching and support staff being involved in the development of an accessibility plan, and increased staff training towards awareness of the teaching staff's statutory responsibility to consider the needs of prospective disabled pupils.

Critical language-use opportunities are notably absent in the mainstream classroom. In the Unit classroom, however, many such opportunities exist, and both pupils and adults participate, and learn, from each other. Each pupil has their own way of approaching tasks, and utilising the resources in the classroom, but all five pupils studied employ strategies for engaging others during writing when they need assistance, or companionship. Importantly, each also acted, precisely as Vygotsky's (1978) theory predicts, and developed good language skills through a rich socialising environment. There is a distinct difference in richness of environmental language between

the Unit classrooms and the mainstream facilities. Within the Unit, indirect tools, both material and symbolic, help the pupils engage with language, and their learning context. Examples of material aids for the pupils to use in the Unit, include crayons, scissors, pencils, marking pens, whiteboards and lined paper to help with literacy skills. Examples of symbolic tools include displays of alphabetic 'word banks', calendars, classmates' finger spelling and written texts entries in their own journals, used as glossaries, and finger spelling and BSL signed, as memos to themselves. It is observed that the pupil's acquisition of language uses support from various sources. This strategy exploits the pupil's mediating skills to make use of indirect tools that support language. Such interactive resources are not in evidence in the mainstream rooms, but would, undoubtedly have added to the whole mainstream class's learning.

6.3.2 Pupils' views of teachers' moves and responses

The pupils all mention how much they enjoy interactive lessons, and how much they learn when working in partnership with other deaf and hearing pupils. Hearing pupils frequently mention how successful they feel the ethos of 'valuing diversity' is, for example, how much they learn from deaf friends. This implies that deaf and hearing pupils should not be split from their friends during interactive group, or paired, work, and that they gain great value in learning from each other. Pupils thoroughly enjoy lessons making use of deaf awareness strategies to communicate, for example, the correct acoustic conditions, restriction of background noise, optimum seating position, use of audio aids, clear, well paced explanations, written lesson outlines and new vocabulary and instructions on the board.

This study illustrates the deaf pupil's problems can be exacerbated by style of teacher control in classrooms. If the 'balance of control' in interactions can be adjusted, so that low, rather than high, control becomes typical of the pupil's experience in listening to new knowledge, then their power as discourse partners, and eventually as narrators, will improve. A crucial factor here is the contingent control of interactions and the strategic use of dialogue repair and feedback. Often, however, what is shown to be good practice with deaf pupils is also good practice for all other pupils.

The implications leading from this in terms of professional skills are that teaching deaf pupils in a mainstream class requires a high level of knowledge, understanding and skills on the part of the teacher. Deaf awareness training and subsequent support, and monitoring, of the skilled delivery of lessons is essential. Odd sessions of INSET provision after school are inadequate to promote an inclusive ethos.

Deaf pupils are very fond of their teachers of the deaf; close relationships are formed, and pupils readily felt they could approach these teachers, to sort out difficulties, both practical and personal. Sometimes these relationships are seen as over-protective, for example when pupils want more independence away from the Unit, or when they want to take responsibility into their own hands, for example, by not wearing a hearing aid, or wearing it but failing to switch it on. In some cases pupils are critical of the support they receive, for example, they find some extended explanations of concepts in lessons by LSAs unnecessary. Pupils did not mention the aspect of being involved in discussing what helped, or hindered, their support in lessons, but the implications for teachers of the deaf indicate that deaf pupils themselves, where possible, should be involved in discussing their needs for academic, personal and social support, and these findings should be implemented in planning provision.

The pedagogy of the mainstream teachers is challenged by the research of Wood *et al.* (1986) and Knight and Swanwick (2002), which shows how active, or loquacious, responses by pupils are in response to teacher strategy.

The findings of this study are reflected by Mrs. Baker, who changed her teaching strategy to try to reflect different responses from the pupils. When she tried to return to her old approach, the pupils were reluctant to retract their newfound confidence, and held firmly to the new pattern of self-disclosure they had been able to make in Mrs. Baker's new discursive system. The pupils all described how much better this felt for them as pupils. This is a most insightful part of this study, and my thanks go to Mrs. Baker for her ability to take risks, and continually try new approaches to her teaching.

6.4 Communication

How does the presence of a facilitator, and their participation in the classroom, influence the situation? Sub-themes: Pupils perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators, M/S, ToD, LSA roles; deaf awareness of staff and pupils; deaf adults as role models.

6.4.1 Pupil perceptions of using staff roles as facilitators

In analysing the crucial role of access BSL enables the pupils to have to the curriculum, these findings show that progressive bilingual practices lie at the heart of giving the deaf pupils access to the curriculum. At Greenview, much more is needed in terms of training teachers of the deaf, and mainstream staff, to an adequate level of BSL competence, and then more opportunity is needed in the mainstream class to recognise the place of BSL in organisational strategies. This will enable deaf pupils to better cope in the mainstream class, and feel their needs are recognised.

6.4.2 Role of M/S teacher

Pupils appreciated there was a wide range of staff responsible for their education. They had no trouble differentiating staff in terms of their own perceptions of their identities and corresponding roles. Pupils were clear about the role of the mainstream teachers in their work, and generally felt positively towards them. They felt negatively about too much homework, and about strict supervisory behaviour.

The needs of deaf pupils are more complex than for other pupils, because of the great adaptation of language, and environment, necessary to make classroom talk intelligible. At Greenview, outside of a familiar context, it is difficult for mainstream teachers to hold productive conversations with deaf pupils. Some of these difficulties are directly related to the deafness. For example, the fact that deaf pupils' speech is often difficult to understand, arises directly out of their deafness.

Class teachers need a great deal of support to envisage signing pupils in their class as a means to access better quality of learning for all pupils. There has been much evidence from this study that some teachers would prefer to distance themselves from the involvement of giving pupils with

special needs access to the curriculum. Rather than seeing this as an extra layer of work, class teachers could apply the same knowledge to all pupils, and see the results as a better quality of provision across the class. If the communication strategies pointed out in this research, i.e. questioning and control levels, are addressed by all teachers, it is possible to see the need for enhanced communication across the class, rather than isolating pupils who have a special educational need, or seeing deafness as a disability.

This lack of awareness is partly due to the absence of a vision, on the part of mainstream staff, of what an 'inclusive school' looks like. Many of the staff seem to accept the idea that providing support/interpreting staff in the classroom is supposed to 'normalise' the deaf pupils, and supposedly relieve them of additional responsibility.

Since the collection of data for this study, the Sensory and Language Impairment team at the LEA has conducted an audit of communication methods at Greenview school to ensure all teaching staff undertake level 2 training in BSL, and the borough has provided support in obtaining resources e.g. sound field systems, to enable better communication within the class. This has met with excellent support from pupils, who enjoy the teachers' signing skills being developed.

6.4.3 Role of teacher of the deaf

The pupils see the role of the Unit teachers very positively, in terms of sorting out problems, checking work, clearing up misunderstandings and keeping in contact with parents and carers. The majority of the Unit teachers' work however, is assessing and providing support in lessons, co-ordinating support staff, checking audio equipment, and helping provide deaf awareness training to the rest of the school.

6.4.4 LSA role

This is challenged by two of the classroom assistants who, with the availability of release time, devised many additional resources to inspire and motivate both the deaf pupils and others, in the mainstream, who need support. This offers all the pupils many new insights into lessons which formerly used traditional 'chalk and talk' approaches, and shows

mainstream teachers how multi-sensory teaching can extend all pupils' learning, with the deaf pupils taking an equal role. On the role of a Learning Support Assistant (LSA) the pupils accept, and appreciate, the wide range of tasks the LSAs do to help them with their learning. However they often feel overprotected, and wish for the chance to be more independent in lessons. In particular, an opportunity to be involved in planning their own support can help resolve this difficulty.

6.4.5 Deaf awareness of staff and pupils

The major factor influencing the pupils' learning in these findings is not the mode of communication experienced by pupils. Rather, the deaf pupils, like their hearing peers, are influenced by the type of teaching strategy they encounter as new topics are introduced. This does not mean BSL does not have influence in helping the pupils learn. The bilingual nature of Greenview's school policy would probably have a much greater impact if more than just the deaf pupils, and their facilitator, use BSL in the mainstream classroom. The fact that a true bilingual environment exists in the Unit has a very positive influence on the deaf pupils' identity, and on their security in absorbing new knowledge. But it is of importance here to stress the process of communication, and the strategies of education found in the mainstream, are having a much greater effect on the pupils' learning

In analysing the pupils' views of teacher's strategies in the mainstream, compared to that of the Unit, teaching styles are very different. Within the Unit the trend is towards an equal basis of sharing learning through one's own narrative, and this results in interesting contributions from all pupils. In the mainstream the deaf pupils do not respond in a loquacious way, and their contributions are characterised by a teacher-led control of question and answer exchange. This is in line with the findings of Wood *et al.* (1986) and Knight and Swanwick's research (2002). However, these findings go further to suggest it is the relationships the pupils share with the teacher, and the familiarity the deaf pupils feel with the adult, which relates to their own background, which fosters the self-esteem and social competence the pupils need to make headway in an educational context.

6.4.6 BSL

The use of BSL provides a range of learning alternatives for the deaf pupil; but this is not matched in positive language attitudes by mainstream staff; hence Kyle's (1990) comment that actual practice lags a long way behind policy in schools. All the deaf pupils comment on how much they gain from signing, and learning, from each other. They see interaction with their deaf peers as an advantage to their social and academic confidence, and also as a bridge between the deaf and hearing world, which supports their step towards independent work in the mainstream classroom. This has implications for the integration of deaf pupils with hearing pupils, in both primary and secondary education, and underlines the role of deaf peers when planning the education of deaf pupils.

Unfortunately, although translated into BSL, the curriculum is still based on the hearing pupils' strengths, without recognisable opportunities for response being created for the deaf pupil. Consideration of the kinds of response expected from a deaf pupil should be discussed in a preparation meeting between Unit and mainstream teachers, so the lesson can be suitably organised. In these findings, deaf pupils rarely understood when it is time to interject with an answer, and frequently failed to recognise the kind of response they are required to give, such as an answer with the teacher's key words inserted in a pre-ordained sentence.

6.4.7 Deaf adults as role models

Most surprising of all is the reflection of the pupils who, on visiting a deaf school, remarked how wonderful it is to see adults signing together as a means of communication. They had never realised that BSL is a living language rather than a support prop for explaining things in the classroom. Obviously this is a reflection on their poor understanding and experience of deaf culture, and provides an indication of the badly-needed assistance of deaf adults as role models in the pupils' school experience.

Within the context of this study, sign language is viewed as a language, and tool, for giving the deaf pupils access to the curriculum as well as to the deaf pupils' cultural world. Interestingly, it was only when Greenview's senior management team established regular support meetings for the pupils

that both mainstream staff and mainstream pupils began to see the value of sign language as not just conveying a different language, but also cultural differences. This could be seen to be in opposition to a school with an inclusion philosophy, but Greenview is not promoting an assimilation ideal, it is rather preparing pupils for eventual participation in a multi-cultural society.

Deaf pupils need far more understanding in awareness of how using a different modality and language will affect their outlook as a minority culture.

These findings reflect the views of mainstream staff that piece-meal provision may satisfy the mainstream teachers' assumptions of inclusive provision being made. This is shown, for example, by their lack of orientation to the presence of a deaf pupil in the classroom when accompanied by an 'interpreter'. Mainstream staff expect this effect to 'normalise' the pupils, so lessening the adjustment they feel they have to make to be inclusive. Such inclusive approaches that are appropriate, are encouraged by teachers of the deaf, and are structured to adapt their language, and teaching materials, to an enriched, more discursive form of teaching.

6.5 Recommendations

Inclusion

- Deaf pupils need help in the support they can expect to receive, if they are to be open about asking for help. Deaf pupils mention that, although the quality of their learning improved when they had lessons in the Unit, this actually isolated them from the hearing world of Greenview. The deaf pupils consider the Unit acts as a bridge between the deaf and the hearing world, but feel the more lessons spent in mainstream the better able they are to cope with ordinary life, in a mixed world with hearing people. As such, they support the view that Greenview's ethos of valuing diversity reflects the values they would hope to see in the community at large.

- Teachers need regular deaf-awareness training to know how to communicate effectively with deaf pupils, to manage the audio equipment, and check the efficiency of radio and hearing aids at the start of lessons. Those who had been trained knew how to keep background noise to a manageable level, how to enable deaf pupils to make use of their hearing aids, and how to maximise their pupils' residual hearing.
- It is noticeable that when hearing pupils take part in Greenview's deaf awareness training, relationships in the classroom improve, with clearer, and more confident, attempts by the hearing pupils to communicate.
- When using visual material, there needs to be a spacing of time between presenting the materials, to allow deaf pupils a pause before specifically addressing matters arising. This allows deaf pupils enough time to absorb both what they see, and what is being interpreted visually. Deaf pupils need extra time to check information.
- It helps if time is spent in the Unit to explain usage of new vocabulary, or technical terms, before the start of a mainstream lesson. This involves regular planning between mainstream teachers and Unit teachers. The Unit staff need time to investigate how such vocabulary should be interpreted, so the pupils will understand the concepts;
- Pupils comment on how they value the close relationships they have with the LSAs, but pupils also comment that they, occasionally, find the support unwelcome, and wished they could occasionally be independent of help. The proposal to involve the pupil in discussions on the level of support required would help here. However these implications go further and suggest that support staff need to be clear on their specific targets in supporting pupils, and to assist the mainstream teacher with support for the lesson, for example, in reducing noise and disturbance levels. Support staff require high quality training, to understand specific learning needs, and to monitor support work, and need sufficient timetabled preparation time for support planning.

Pedagogy

- Pupils were clear about the most effective teaching approaches. Popular teachers were those who showed a range of skills in communicating, and who were keen to acknowledge difficulties, by asking pupils how best they could be supported. Effective teachers helped deaf and hearing pupils support each other by providing interactive lessons; often facilitating practical tasks which enabled deaf and hearing pupils, or deaf partners, to work together.
- The pupils liked clear facilitators, those aware of the deaf pupils' needs, who did not talk for too long, or involve the class in lengthy discussions.
- The over-zealous correction of ungrammatical sentences, at the expense of natural interaction, has been illustrated as detrimental to dialogue, also the poor receptive, and expressive, interpreting skills of some of the staff in BSL undermined the quality of the children's natural dialogue;
- This study concludes that the deaf pupil's problems are often exacerbated by the style of teacher control. If the 'balance of controls' in interactions can be adjusted, so that low, rather than high control becomes typical of the pupil's experience in listening to new knowledge, then their powers as discourse partners and eventually as narrators will improve. A crucial factor here is the contingent control of interactions and the strategic use of dialogue repair, and feedback. It is apparent that what is good practice with deaf pupils is also good practice for all other pupils.
- In terms of Unit provision, most deaf pupils saw the Unit as a transition between Unit and mainstream, and towards independence. Many deaf pupils commented on how they would like to be more involved in planning their timetable, and curriculum, with lesser support in some instances.

Communication

- If BSL is seen as an equal language within Greenview school, support is needed from adults who can sign fluently. Conversational interaction using BSL is not found to be present within mainstream lessons, but within Unit lessons, teachers of the deaf deal

competently with the specific needs of each pupil, and conversational language communication is commented on as a key aspect of the pupils' satisfaction in their appraisal of learning within the Unit.

- Extra time needs to be allowed when introducing a lesson because of the time delay between the spoken presentation and the relay of signed interpretation. This is especially important when introducing new concepts and vocabulary;
- A role for deaf adults within the classroom should be considered, to recognise the contribution other communities, and cultures, make to our education, and to future identities as deaf, and hearing adults.
- The pupils in this study relate to sign language as their first language, despite having other languages at home. The essence of this relationship is strongly linked to their identity as a deaf pupil and the bond they feel in signing with each other. The deaf pupils emphasise how much easier communicating with each other is. Their explanations of events tended to be more literal and yet be more imaginative in presentation. But there is much about the context of classroom explanations they fail to grasp, and the frequent necessary explanations for what mainstream teachers do is left to the teachers of the deaf to explain. It is because these teachers understand the deaf pupils' perceptions of life so well, that they know the areas where frequent misunderstandings are likely to occur. Otherwise differences in behaviour, between deaf and hearing pupils, could be more pronounced.

In this study I can only comment on the thoughts of the pupils themselves on their school lives. It is notable how much the pupils have themselves said about their ideas of inclusion, the staff who teach them and the other pupils they work with. The range of their comments is impressive, and this chapter seeks to underline key themes, and their implications on professional practice. By increasing the number of deaf pupils in mainstream, the issue of deafness as a whole-school issue becomes increasingly a 'whole-school problem' with class and subject teachers being responsible for identification, assessment and provision – this will lead to greater

consistency for deaf pupils, consequent on appropriate training for all teachers, with bridges built via whole-school staff development.

As stated by Jensema and Trybus (1978. p.19):

Large amounts of effort in our field have been devoted to the consideration of the educational effects of using one group of muscles rather than another to convey messages to hearing-impaired pupils. Our work has convinced us, however, that relatively fixed and unchangeable factors presently have the greatest influence on the educational achievement of hearing-impaired pupils. If this report encourages any of its readers to shift their attention and efforts to materials, teaching methods, attitudinal and cognitive factors, and the like in an attempt to undo the influence of the fixed factors, we shall consider our work here a success.

As the school celebrates diversity, so Greenview's inclusive ethos will widen. The profile of deafness should be celebrated within the school, the curriculum and the teaching approaches, as part of valuing of differences. As this study shows, deaf pupils themselves are a key part of valuing this difference, and can point to directions towards an inclusive ethos. This study provides an insight into the difference between government policies and a typical example of ordinary practice. The work described in these findings illustrates the challenges facing schools in their efforts to become more inclusive. The case studies demonstrate that changes to the culture, structure and politics, systems and procedures of an organisation take time and cannot happen overnight. One should view inclusion as a journey and celebrate the small steps on the way.

6.6 Influence on my professional development

In the culmination of this research this chapter addresses reflexivity on my work as an insider researcher and I provide suggestions for future research, building on this current work. Perhaps at the cost of individuality and conflict theory, socio-cultural research offers the best opportunity to study my chosen area, particularly because it is reflexive, and accounts for the

research process itself. It recognises the researcher as another language user, and involves, and engages, them in talk with the people they are observing. This does not mean the loss of objectivity, but, as Mercer (1995) explains: *... rather the beginning of transforming research into a process, in which traditional distinctions between 'practitioners' and 'researchers' no longer apply.*

During this research, I discovered that working towards the development of an inclusive environment is a highly complex task. Despite warnings in the literature (Corbett 2002), I realised that the process is far more complex than at first envisaged. Hopkins, West and Ainscow (1996) compare it to a journey. At Greenview, it could accurately be compared to a trek. The journey entailed learning to respect differences in others, to understand the constraints upon them and to work in harmony, despite the differences. As Braidotti (1997, p.68 in Allan, 1999) observes, 'the only way to undertake this process is to actually be attracted to change, to want it'. Apart from believing in the overall aim which is to develop an understanding of how deaf pupils experience their placements in M/S schools, I believe it is crucial to enjoy this small scale project and see it as a stepping stone towards the overall aim. The research is therefore in the present as well as being part of a journey.

To that end, I see this project as providing a valuable additional experience in my training as an advisory teacher to meet the current demands of personalised educational provision. The deaf children within this study have offered me painstaking insight into the features which they see as making up an inclusive environment. I learnt a great deal from the pupils and these ideas will contribute to the aims of innovative, inclusive classroom practice. This will inform my practice both in my own teaching and in policy making as I meet entire ranges of staff across schools to discuss how best to offer each child enhanced learning and wellbeing.

References

- Ainscow, M. (1995a) Special Needs through School Improvement: School Improvement through Special Needs in Clark, C., Dyson, A. Millward, A., (Eds.) *Towards Inclusive Schools?* London, Fulton
- Ainscow, M. (1995b) Education for all: making it happen. *Support for learning*. 10, 4, 147-155
- Ainscow, M. (1997) Towards inclusive schooling. *British Journal of Special Education*, 24, 1, 3-6.
- Ainscow, M. (1998) "Would it work in theory? Arguments for practitioner research and theorising in the special needs field", in Clark, C, Dyson, A, and Millward, A (eds) *Theorising Special Education*, London, Routledge.
- Ainscow, M. (1999) Understanding the development of inclusive schools. London: Falmer Press
- Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Booth, T., Shaw, L., and Vaughan, M., (2000) *Index for Inclusion* CSIE (Centre for Studies on Inclusive education)
- Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" London: Falmer Press
- Armstrong, D. (1995) *Power and partnership in Education*, London: Routledge.
- Armstrong, D., Galloway, D. and Tomlinson, S. (1993) "Assessing special needs: The child's contribution", *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(2), pp.121 -31
- Baker, C. (1996) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2nd Edition, Clevedon, "Multilingual Matters" Journal
- Ball, S. J. (1993) "Self-doubt and soft data: social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork" in Hammersley, M. (ed): *Educational Research, Current Issues, Vol.1*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Ballard, K. (1997) "Researching disability and inclusive education: Participation, construction and interpretation", *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 1(3), pp. 243-56
- Barton, L. (1997) "Inclusive Education: Romantic: subversive or realistic?" *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(3), pp.231-42
- Barton, L. and Corbett, J. (1993) "Special needs in further education: The challenge of inclusive provision", *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 8 (1), pp.14-23

- Bassey, M. (1999) *Case study research in educational settings*.
Buckingham, Open University Press.
- BATOD. (1995). "Towards a national policy in the education of deaf children and young people." British Association of Teachers of the Deaf.
- BDA (1996) *The right to be equal* London: British Deaf Association Policy statement
- BERA (2004) "British Educational Research Association revised Ethical Guidelines", www.BERA.org.uk
- Berg, B. (1995) *Qualitative Research methods for the Social Sciences*
Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bienvenue, M. (1989) "Disability", The Bicultural Center News, 13, April, p.1, in Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" London: Falmer Press
- Bolger, A.W. (1975) *Child Study and Guidance in Schools* in Davie, R., and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to Children in Education* London: David Fulton Publishers
- Booth, T., (1988) "Challenging conceptions of deafness", in Barton, L., (ed) *The Politics of Special educational Needs*, London: Falmer Press
- Booth, T. (1996) A perspective on inclusion from England. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26, 1, 87 -101
- Booth, T. (1999) "Inclusion and exclusion policy in England who controls the agenda?" in Booth, T. and Ainscow, M., (1998) (eds) *From Them to us; an International Study of Inclusion in Education*, London: Routledge
- Braidotti, R. (1977), Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" London: Falmer Press
- Brennan, M. (1999) "*Challenging Linguistic Exclusion in Deaf Education*" in *Deaf Worlds, Deaf People, Community and society*, Vol. 15, Issue 1
- Bruner, J. S., (1985) "Vygotsky: a historical and conceptual perspective" in Wertsch, J. V. (ed) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Burgess, R. G. (1982) "Styles of Data Analysis: Approaches and Implications" in Burgess, R. G. (ed) *Field Research: a Sourcebook and Field Manual*, London, George Allen and Unwin
- Campbell, J. and Oliver, M. (1996) *Disability politics: Understanding our Past, Changing Our Future*, London: Routledge

- Casling, D. (1993) "Cobblers and song-birds: The language and imagery of disability", *Disability and Society*, 12(3), pp. 325 -40
- Cazden, C. (1988), "*Classroom Discourse: the language of Teaching and Learning.*" Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Heinemann
- Cazden, C., and Forman, E.,(1985) "Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education; the cognitive value of peer interaction" in Faulkner, D., Littleton, K., and Woodhead, M., "*Learning relationships in the classroom*" London: Routledge/O.U.
- Centre for the Study of Inclusive Education (England) (CSIE) (1996) *Developing an Inclusive Policy for Your School: a CSIE guide* (Bristol, CSIE)
- Charlton, T., "The voice of the child in school" in Davie, R., and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to Children in Education* London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Cheminais, R. (2005) *Every Child Matters: A new role for SENCOs* London: David Fulton publishers
- Clark, C., Dyson, A., Millward, A., (eds) (1998) *Theorising Special Education*, London: Routledge.
- Clark, C., Dyson, A., Millward, A., and Skidmore, D., (1997) *New Directions in Special Needs: Innovations in Mainstream Schools*, London: Cassell.
- Collins, J. (1996) "The Quiet Child" London: Cassell
- Collins, J., Harkin, J., and Nind, M., (2002) *Manifesto for Learning*, Continuum Studies in Lifelong Learning. London: Cassell
- Conrad, R. (1979) "*The deaf schoolchild*" London: Harper Row.
- Cooper, P. (1993) *Effective Schools for Disaffected Students: Integration and Segregation*, London, Routledge
- Corbett, J. (1997) "Include/exclude: Redefining the boundaries", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(1), pp. 55-64
- Corbett, J. (2002) *Inclusion Special children* Issue 146.
- Corker, M. (1993) "*Integration and deaf people: The policy and power of enabling environments*", in Swain, J., Finkelstein, V., French, S., and, Oliver M., (eds) (1993) *Disabling Barriers –Enabling Environments*, London: Sage Publications/Open University Press.
- Corker, M. (1996) "A hearing difficulty as impairment", in Hales, G. (ed.) *Beyond Disability: Towards an Enabling Society*, London: Sage/Open University Press

- Corson, H. M., (1973) *Comparing Deaf Children of Oral parents and Deaf Parents using Manual Communication with Deaf Children of Hearing Parents in Academic, Social and Communication Functioning*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio, University of Cincinnati in Gregory, S., Silo, J., and Callow, L., Open University D251, Block 2, Unit 5 course materials, Buckingham: Open University Press
- Daunt, W. (1991) "Point of view: Do we have a dream?" *British Deaf News* November 1992
- Davie, R. (1993) "Listen to the child: a time for change" *The Psychologist*, 6 (June) 252-7 in Davie, R., and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to Children in Education* London: David Fulton Publishers
- Davie, R. and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to children in education*. London: David Fulton pubs
- Dearing, Sir Ron (1994). "*The National Curriculum and its Assessment: Final Report*" London, SCAA
- Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (Eds). (1994) *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- DES (1978) *Report of the Commission on Special Education (Warnock Report)*, London HMSO
- DES (1995) *The National Curriculum* London: HMSO
- DEX (1997) "*Mainstreaming issues for Professionals working with deaf children*" Deaf Ex-Mainstreamers group, Yorkshire
- DEX (1999) "*Responses to the government Green Paper*" Deaf Ex-Mainstreamers group, Yorkshire
- DfES (1998) *Meeting Special Educational Needs: A Programme of Action*, London, DfES
- DfES (2001) *S.E.N. Code of Practice*. www.dfes.gov.uk/sen
- DfES (2003) *Every Child Matters* London: Department for Education and Skills
- DfES Green Paper (2003) *Excellence for all children: meeting special educational needs*. London: The Stationary Office
- DfES (2004) *Removing Barriers to Achievement. The Government's Strategy for SEN*. London: Department for Education and Skills
- DfES/OFSTED (2004) *A new relationship with Schools: Improving Performance through School Self Evaluation*. London: Department for Education and Skills/Office for standards in Education

Department of Health (1989) *The Children Act*. London HMSO

Dilthey, W. (1976) The construction of the historical world of the human studies [Der Aufbau der Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften] *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1-7. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner in Stake, R. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Dimond, B., (1996) *The Legal Aspects of Health Care*, in Grieg, A., and Taylor, J., (1999) *Doing Research with Children* London: Sage Publications

Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds*, London: Fontana

Dyson, A. (1994) Towards a collaborative learning model for responding to student diversity. *Support for Learning*. 9, 2, 53-60

Dyson, A., and Millward, A. (2000) *School and Special Needs*. London: Paul Chapman publishing

Eatough, M., (2000) Deaf pupils and teachers of the deaf, *BATOD magazine*, May 2000

Edwards, A. D., Mercer, N. (1987) *E242 Unit 6/7 The Language of the Classroom* Buckingham: Open University Press

Eisner, E., and Peshkin, A. (Eds.). (1990) *Qualitative inquiry in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, F. (1986) *Qualitative methods in research on teaching*. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp.119 –161). New York: Macmillan.

Evans, C. (2002) in Power, D., and Leigh, G., eds (2002) *Educating Deaf Students: A Global Perspective*: Gallaudet University Press.

Farrell, M (2004) *Inclusion at the crossroads*. London: Fulton Pubs

Finkelstein, V. (1980) *Attitudes and Disabled People*, New York: World Rehabilitation Fund, in Clough, p., and Corbett, J. (2000) *Theories of inclusive education: A students' guide* Paul Chapman Publishing Limited

Finkelstein, V. (1996) Outside "inside out", *Coalition*, April 30-6

Fish, J. (1990) "Sensitivity to special needs: Trends and prospects", in Evans, P. and Varma, V. (eds) *Special education: Past, Present, and Future*, Basingstoke: Falmer Press

Fletcher-Campbell, F. with Hall, C. (1993) *LEA Support for Special needs*, London: NFER Nelson

Flick, U. (1992) Triangulation revisited: Strategy of validation or alternative? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 22(2), 175-

- Foster, S., Long, G., Snell, K. (2002) Providing access for deaf students, in Power, D., and Leigh, G., eds (2002) *Educating Deaf Students: A Global Perspective*: Galluadet University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*, London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1982) "The subject and power", in Dreyfus, H., and Rabinow, P. (eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Brighton: Harvester.
- Fraser, B., (1996) "The needs of Hearing Impaired children and Integration" in Evans, P, and Varma V, *Eds Special Education Past and Present* London Falmer.
- Galloway, D., and Goodwin, C. (1987) "The Education of Disturbing Children: Pupils with Learning and Adjustment Difficulties" New York: Longman.
- Gannon (2001) in Schwartz (eds) *Choices in deafness: A parents' guide to communication options*. Woodbine pubs USA
- Gauvain, M, (1993) "The development of spatial activity in everyday thinking" *Developmental Review* 13, 92 - 121
- Gee, J.P. (1999), *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*, London Routledge
- Geertz, C. (1973) Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures* (pp.3 -30) New York: Basic Books
- Giangreco, M. (1997) "Key lessons learned about inclusive education", *International Journal of Disability Development and Education*, 44(3), 193 -206
- Gibbons, F. (1985) "A social-psychological perspective on developmental disabilities", *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 3(4), pp.391-404
- Giorcelli, L. (2002) in Power, D., and Leigh, G., eds (2002) *Educating Deaf Students: A Global Perspective*: Galluadet University Press.
- Gipps, C., Gross, H. and Goldstein, H. (1987) *Warnock's Eighteen Per Cent: Children*
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative research*, Chicago, IL: Aldine
- Goffman, E. (1963) Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity, In Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" Falmer Press
- Greenview Communication Policy (1995), Greenview School, L.B Greenwood (unpublished).

- Greenview Special Educational Needs Policy (1995), L.B. Greenview, (unpublished).
- Gregory, S. and Bishop, J. (1991) The mainstreaming of primary age deaf children. In S. Gregory and G. Hartley (Eds), *Constructing deafness*. London: Pinter Press
- Gregory, S., Knight, P., McCracken, W., Powers, S., and Watson, L., (Eds) (1998) *Issues in Deaf Education*. London: David Fulton Press.
- Gregory, S. Silo, J. and Callow, L. (1991) *Deaf people in Hearing Worlds D251 Issues in Deafness Block 2*, Course materials, The Open University
- Gregory, S., Smith, S. and Wells, A., (1997) "Language and Identity in Sign bilingual deaf children" in *Deafness and Education* 21 (3) pp. 31-38
- Grieg, A., and Taylor, J., (1999) *Doing Research with Children* Sage Publications
- Guba, E., and Lincoln, Y. (1989) *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Sage Publications
- Hargreaves, D. (1986) "Whatever Happened to Symbolic Interactionism?" in Hammersley, M. (Ed): *Controversies in Classroom Research*, 2nd Edition, Buckingham, Open University Press
- Harris, M., Clibbens, J., Chasin, J., and Tibbitts, R. (1987) *The social context of early sign language development*, Paper presented at the *Child Language Seminar*, York.
- Hart, S. (1992) Differentiation- way forward or retreat? *British Journal of Special Education*, 19(1), 10-12
- Hartsock, N. (1996) "Postmodernism and political change: Issues for feminist theory", in Harvey, D., and Greenway, A., "The self-concept of physically handicapped children and their non-handicapped siblings: An empirical investigation", *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 25(2), pp.273-84
- Hasler, F. (1993) "Developments in the disabled people's movement", in Swain, J., Finkelstein, V., French, S., and Oliver, M. (Eds) (1993) *Disabling Barriers – Enabling Environments*, London Sage/Open University
- Hegarty, S., (1982) "Meeting Special Needs in the Ordinary Schools, *Educational Research* 24(3), pp.124-81
- Hegarty, S. (1993) *Meeting Special Educational Needs in Ordinary Schools*, London: Cassell.

- Henwood, K., and Pigeon, N. (1995) "Grounded theory and psychological research", *The Psychologist*, March, 115-18
- Hinson, M. (1991) "Aspects of coping with change", in Hinson, M. (Ed) *Teachers and Special Needs: Coping with Change*, Harlow: Longman.
- Hitchcock, G., and Hughes, D. (2nd edn.) (1995) "Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research" London, Routledge.
- Hoffmeister, R. (1996) "Cross-cultural misinformation: What does special education say about deaf people?" *Disability and Society*, 11 (2), pp.171-90
- Hoiting, N., and Loncke, F. (1990) Models of Acquisition and Processing of Multilingual and Multimodal Information in Kyle, J., (1994) *Sign Questions in School: Project Report to ESRC*, University of Bristol pub.
- Hope, R., and Griffiths, R (2006) Including deaf children with BSL: *BATOD Magazine May 2006*
- Hopkins, D., West, M., Ainscow, M. (1996) *Improving the quality of education for all*. London, David Fulton publishers.
- Hopwood, N, (2000) in Giorcelli (2002) in Power, D., and Leigh, G., eds (2002) *Educating Deaf Students: A Global Perspective*: Galluadet University Press.
- Hughes, B. and Paterson, K. (1997) "The social model of disability and the disappearing body: Towards a sociology of impairment", *Disability and Society*, 12(3), pp. 325-40
- Jensema, C. J., and Trybus, R.J., (1978) *Communication Patterns and Educational Achievement of Hearing-Impaired Students*, Gallaudet College, Washington
- Jones, A. (1998), "Pedagogical desires at the border: Absolution and difference in the university classroom", Paper presented to the Winds of change: Women and the culture of the universities international conference, Sydney, Australia, July, in Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" Falmer Press
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M.L. (1986) *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*, Qualitative Research methods Series No.1 Newbury Park, CA: Sage, in Hitchcock, G., and Hughes, D. (2nd edn.) (1995) *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research* London, Routledge.

- Knight, P. and Swanwick, R., (2002) *Working with Deaf Pupils: Sign Bilingual Policy into Practice* David Fulton publishers
- Kyle, J. G. (1990) BSL development: final report. Centre for Deaf Studies, University of Bristol; UK
- Kyle, J. (1993) "Integration of deaf students" *European Journal of Special needs Education*, 8(3), pp201-20
- Kyle, J.G., (1994) *Sign Questions in School: Project report to the ESRC* 1994 University of Bristol pub.
- Kyle, J, and Allsop, (1982) *BSL development*. Final Report Bristol, Centre for Deaf Studies
- Kyle, C., and Davis, K. (1991) "Attitudes of mainstream pupils towards mental retardation: Pilot study at a Leeds secondary school", *British Journal of Special Education* 18(3), pp.103-6
- Kyle, J.G. and Woll, B. (1985) *Sign Language* Cambridge University Press
- Kyriacou C. and McKelvey, J. (1985), An exploration of individual difference in effective teaching. *Educational Review*, 37, 13 -17
- Ladd, P. (1991) "*Making plans for Nigel: The erosion of identity by mainstreaming*", in Taylor, G. and Bishop, J. (eds) *Being Deaf: The experience of Deafness*, London: Printer Publishers
- Lane, H., (1995) "Constructions of deafness", *Disability and Society*, 10(2), pp.171-89, in Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" Falmer Press
- LEA Greenwood (1993) Special Educational Needs Policy (Borough policy)
L.B. Greenwood (unpublished)
- Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E.G., (1985) *Naturalistic enquiry*. Newbury Park, CA Sage
- Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E.G., (1990) "*Judging the quality of case study reports*" *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1990, Vol. 3 No. 1.53 -59
- Lipsky, D.K., and Gartner, A. (1999) Inclusive education: a requirement of a democratic society , in H. Daniels and P. Garner (eds) *World Yearbook of Education 1999: Inclusive Education* (London, Kogan Page)
- Lunt, I., and Evans, J. (1994) "Dilemmas in special needs: Some effects of local management of schools", in Riddell, S., and Brown, S. (eds) *Special Needs Policy in the 1990s: Warnock in the Market Place*, London: Routledge.

- Lutz, F. (1981) "The holistic approach to understanding schooling", in Green, J.L. and Wallat, C. (eds) *Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Lynas, W. (1986a) "Pupils' attitudes to integration", *British Journal of Special Education* 13(1), pp.31-3.
- Lynas, W., (1986b) *Integrating the handicapped into ordinary schools: a study of hearing impaired pupils*. London: Croon Helm.
- Lynas, W. (2002) in Farrell, P. and Ainscow, M.C. eds *Making Special Education Inclusive*, David Fulton (pub)
- Markides, A. (1970) The speech of deaf and partially hearing children, with special reference to factors affecting intelligibility. *British Journal of Disorders of Communication*, 5: 126-40
- Marschark, M. (2000) Education and development of deaf children in P.E. Spencer, C.J. Erting, and M. Marschark (eds) *The deaf child in the family and at school*, London, Erlbaum.
- Mehan, H. (1979) E242. O.U. Course Materials: *The Language of the Classroom* Open University Press
- Mehrabian, A. (1972) *Silent Messages* in Davie, R., and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to Children in Education* David Fulton Publishers
- Mercer, N. (1995) "The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk amongst Teachers and learners". Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Merriam, S. B. (1988) *Case Study Research in Education*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, in Hitchcock, G., and Hughes, D. (2nd edn.) (1995) "Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research" London, Routledge
- Mittler, P. (1985) "Integration: The shadow and the substance", *Educational and Child Psychology*, 2(3), pp.8-22
- Mittler, P. (2000) *Working Towards Inclusive Education Social Contexts* London: David Fulton Publishers
- Moore, M. (2000) *Insider perspectives in Inclusion*, Philip Armstrong Publications
- Morris, J. (1991) *Pride against Prejudice: Transforming Attitudes to Disability*, London: The Women's Press
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, P., and Ecob, R. (1988) *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Wells, Open Books)
- Mumba, I (2002), in Farrell, P. and Ainscow, M.C. eds (2002) *Making Special Education Inclusive*, David Fulton (pub)

- National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS 1990) "*Deaf Young people's Views on Integration: A Survey Report*" National Deaf Children's Society, London
- National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS 1994) "*NDCS Policy on Communication*" National Deaf Children's Society, London
- Nias, J. (1993) "Primary Teachers Talking: a Reflexive Account of Longitudinal Research" in Hammersley, M. (ed): *Educational Research, Current Issues, Vol.1*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing
- OFSTED (1994) "*Primary Matters: A Discussion on teaching and learning in primary schools*"
- Oliver, M., (1992) "Changing the social relations of research production?" *Disability, Handicap and Society*, 7 (2), pp.101-14
- Owen, I. R. (1991) "Using the sixth sense: the place and relevance of language in counselling" in Davie, R., and Galloway, D., (1996) *Listening to Children in Education* David Fulton Publishers
- Paul, P. V. (1988) "American Sign language and English: A Bilingual Minority Language Immersion, Programme CAID – News n' notes" Washington, DC, Conference of American Institutions of the Deaf, in Gregory, S., Silo, J., and Callow, L., *Deaf people in Hearing Worlds*, D251 Block 2 Unit 5, course materials(1991), Open University Press
- Payne, T. (1991) "It's cold in the other room", *Support for Learning*, 6(2), pp.61-5.
- Pickersgill, M. and Gregory, S (1998) "*Sign bilingualism: A Model*" Middlesex: LASER
- Powers, S. (1996) Inclusion is an attitude not a place; Part 1. *Journal of British Association of Teachers of the Deaf*, 20, 2, 35 –41
- Powers, S (1999) The educational attainments of deaf pupils in *American Annals of the deaf*, Vol 144, 261 -270
- Powers, S., Gregory, S., Lynas, W., McCracken, W., Watson, L., Boulton, A., and Harris, D., (1999) *A Review of Good Practice in Deaf Education* RNID
- Powers, S., Gregory, S., Thoutenhoofd, E.D. (1998) *The Educational Achievement of Deaf Children: Research Report RR65*. London: DfEE *Psychiatric Annals*, 9 (4), pp.1-7
- QCA (2000) *The National Curriculum Handbook Excellence in Schools*. QCA
- Quigley, S., and Paul, P., (1984) "Cognition and language" in Gregory, S. and Hartley, G.M. (eds) (1990) *Constructing deafness*, London,

Pinter Publishers. (D251 Reader two, Article 3.1) Open University Press

Reason, R., and Palmer, S., (2002) in Power, D., and Leigh, G., eds (2002) *Educating Deaf Students: A Global Perspective*: Gallaudet University Press.

Resnick, M. and Hutton, L. (1987) "Resiliency among physically disabled adolescents", *Disability, Handicap and Society*, 8(2), pp. 199-206

RNID/BATOD (1997) "*The hearing-impaired child in your class; A guide for teachers in ordinary schools*" London RNID/BATOD

RNID Education guidelines project: (2001a) "Effective inclusion of deaf pupils into mainstream schools" Royal National Institute for Deaf People

RNID Education guidelines project: (2001b) "Guidelines for mainstream teachers with deaf pupils in their class" Royal National Institute for Deaf People

RNID/University of Hertfordshire: (2002) "Inclusion: what deaf pupils think" Royal National Institute for Deaf People

Robinson, K. (1997) "Sign in Education: The Teaching of Hearing Children British Sign Language in School" Teeside TEC

Sacks, O. (1990) *Seeing Voices*, London, Picador, in Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" Falmer Press

Schofield, J. W. (1993) "Increasing the generalisability of qualitative research" in Hammersley, M. .(ed): *Educational Research, Current Issues, Vol.1*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing

Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Seleskovitch, D. (1978) *Interpreting for international conferences*. Washington D.C.: Pen and Booth, in Kyle, J.G. and Woll, B. (1985) *Sign Language* Cambridge University Press

Shakespeare, T. and Watson, N. (1997) "Defending the social model" *Disability and Society*, 12(2), pp. 293-300

Sheldon, D., (1991) "How was it for you? Pupils', parents' and teachers' perspectives on integration", *British Journal of Special Education*, 18(3), pp.107-110

Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage Publications

Simons, H. (1980) "*Case study in the context of Educational Research and Evaluation*", in Simons, H (ed) 1980. "Towards a Science of the Singular." Centre for Applied Research in Education Occasional publications: University of East Anglia.

- Simons, J., (1995) *Foucault and the Political*, London Routledge
- Skrtic, T. (1995) (ed.) *Disability and Democracy: Reconstructing Special education for Postmodernity*, New York: Teachers College Press
- Slee, R., (1993) "The politics of integration – new sites for old practices?" *Disability, Handicap and Society*, 8(4), pp.351 -60
- Smith, Louis, (1994) Biographical method. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (1994)* (pp. 286-305). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Smith, R. (2000) *Gender and Special Education: what makes boys so "special"?* PhD thesis, London: University of London Goldsmiths College in Clough, P., and Corbett, J. (2000) *Theories of inclusive education: A Students' Guide* Paul Chapman Pub. Limited
- Soan, S. (2005) *Reflective Reader Primary Special Educational Needs*: pub Learning Matters
- Spencer, R., (2006) in Copeland, M., *Inclusion in Leicestershire BATOD magazine January 2006*
- Stake, R. (1994) "Case Studies" in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, California, Sage
- Stake, R. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*, Sage Publications
- Stake R., and Trumbull, D. (1982) Naturalistic generalizations. *Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science*, 7(1), 1-12.
- Stenhouse, L (1988) Case study methods. In J.P. Keeves (eds) *Education Research, Methodology and Measurement: an International Handbook*, 1st Edn. Oxford, Pergamon
- Super, C., and Harkness, S. (1986) The developmental niche conceptualisation at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioural development*.9 p545
- Swann, W. (1992) *Learning for all: Unit 6/7 Classroom diversity*" E242 Course Materials, Open University
- Taylor, G., and Bishop, J., (1991) *Being Deaf: the experience of deafness*, London: Pintor
- Tizard, B., and Hughes, M. (1984) *"Young Children learning"*. London, Fontana
- Uditsky, V. (1993) "From Integration to Inclusion: The Canadian Experience", in Slee, R., *Is There a Desk with My Name on It?* London, Falmer
- UNESCO (1994) *UNESCO Statistical year book*, Paris: UNESCO

- Vernon, M., and Koh, S. (1970) "Effects of early manual communication on the achievement of deaf children", *American Annals of the Deaf* 115: 527-36
- Visser, J. (1993) "A broad, balanced, relevant and differentiated curriculum?" in Visser, J. and Upton, G. (eds) *Special Education in Britain after Warnock*, London: David Fulton.
- von Wright, G. (1971) *Explanation and understanding*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in Society: the development of higher psychological processes*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1981) The genesis of higher mental functions. In J.V. Wertsch (ed.) *The concept of activity in Soviet society* (pp144 -188) Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Walker, R. (1986) "The conduct of educational case studies," in M. Hammersley (ed.) 1986 *Controversies in Classroom Research*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press
- Warnock, N (2001) BSL and the National Curriculum in *BATOD magazine*, Sept/Oct 2001
- Webster, A. and Webster, V. (1994) Supporting pupils in the primary school. Meeting individual needs under the New Code of Practice. Avec publications.
- Webster, A. and Wood, D. (1989) *Special needs in Ordinary Schools: Children with Hearing Difficulties*. London: Cassell.
- Wedell, K., (1990) "Children with special needs: Past, present and future", in Evans, P. and Varma, V., (eds) *Special Education: Past, Present and Future*, Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- Woll, B. (1998) in Gregory, S and Powers, S.: *Issues in Deaf Education*, David Fulton
- Wood, D. (1988) *How Children Think and Learn* Blackwell
- Wood, D., Wood H., Griffiths, A., and Howarth, I., (1986) *Teaching and Talking with Deaf Children* Wiley
- Wood, D., Wood, H., and Kingsmall, M., (1991) *Signed English in the Classroom*, unpublished monograph.
- Woods, P. (1986) *Inside Schools: Ethnography in Educational Research*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

- Woolcott, H. (1990) *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wragg, E., and Brown, G. (1993) *Explaining Leverhulme Primary Project Classroom Skills Series*: Routledge
- Wray, D. and Medwell, J. (1991) "*Literacy and Language in the Primary Years*" London: Routledge
- Wright, D. (1983) *Deafness: An Autobiography*, in Allan, J., (1999) "*Actively Seeking Inclusion*" Falmer Press
- Wynter, S. (1987) "On disenchanting discourse: 'minority' literary criticism and beyond", *Cultural Critique*, 7, pp. 235-7.
- Yin, R., (1994) *Case Study Research Design and Methods* London: Sage Publications

GLOSSARY

BATOD	British Association of Teachers of the Deaf
BSL	British Sign Language
CA	Classroom assistant
DEX	Deaf ex-Mainstreamers Group
DES	Department of Education and Science
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DoH	Department of Health
EAL	English as an additional language
IEP	Individual Education Programme (DfEE Code of Practice 2001)
LEA	Local Education Authority
LSA	Learning Support Assistant
M/S t	Mainstream teacher
Oralism	Education of the deaf through methods of development of speech rather than sign.
SB	Sign bilingual
SE	Signed English
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SL	Sign language
SSE	Sign supported English
TC	Total communication
ToD	Teacher of the deaf

Appendix A: Background of Pupils

The following pupils were these ages/ year group at the start of data collection in 1999: Alexander age 5, year 1; Farhan age 6, year 1; Marie age 7, year 2; Sarah age 7, year 3; Shadeh age 6, year 2.

Consideration must be given to the complexity and diversity of their bilingualism as two of the pupils lip read other languages at home and use English/BSL/SSE in school. Punjabi, Arabic and Hindi are the three most common home languages after English. All five deaf pupils have been learning BSL in the Unit, and English/BSL in mainstream lessons since their arrival at the school. In addition to their home languages they have at home. Alexander speaks some English and uses some BSL at home. His parents learned BSL at evening classes. Farhan lip reads Punjabi/Urdu at home. Marie lip reads English at home. Sarah is Afro-Caribbean and lip reads English at home. Shadeh lip reads Punjabi/Urdu at home, but no English is spoken at home.

Alexander

Background: Alexander is age 5 and the third son of four children, all born from a middle class background. He is profoundly deaf in both ears, and is dependent on sign language to communicate in the Unit, using residual hearing through the cochlear implant when he is not with signers. He is the only deaf child in the family, born to parents whose background consists of post-graduate qualifications and professional careers. His siblings are in academic secondary schools, and Alexander often has enormous frustration coming to terms with his own slower academic progress.

Repertoire: The family speak English as the main language at home [parents have learned BSL at evening classes]. Alexander had a cochlear implant fitted three years ago at the age of seven. Alexander's adjustment to receiving sound through the implant has been closely monitored. It has meant that his language has greatly improved in his expressive and receptive skills, but his ability to cope with frustration is still an ongoing behavioural problem.

School/Use of Language: Alexander is of above average intelligence and is very able in most areas of the curriculum, held back only by the considerable delay in his language skills. Given enough intensive support in areas that will explore his needs to understand different contexts of the curriculum, he would be able to successfully manage mainstream teaching. At present he becomes frustrated when his ability to do well is held up by less able pupils in the Unit, or by lack of language preparation for him in the mainstream.

Farhan

Background: Farhan is 6 and has a profound bilateral sensory-neural loss. He was diagnosed in Pakistan at the age of 3, and came to Britain shortly afterwards where a teacher of the deaf placed him in a nursery and he began to learn English and Makaton (sign language for pupils with special needs/learning difficulty). At the age of four he started Greenview School and began to learn BSL in the Hearing Impaired Unit.

Appendix A: Background of Pupils cont.

Repertoire: Although the family speak Urdu/English at home, and read Arabic, Farhan is supported in his school work by the English his family speaks around him. His family are very willing, and able, to support him in his school work and older brothers (aged 14 and 16) and sisters (aged 11 and 23) help him with language and spelling work.

School: He is very able and has the support of a LSA through all his mainstream lessons at Greenview School. He sees the Teacher of the deaf for 1:1 support work twice weekly. He has been fitted with two post-aural hearing aids, and is on the waiting list for a cochlear implant. During his lessons the LSA repeats what the mainstream teacher has said using lip patterns without using her voice. She accompanies this message with the support of signs. If Farhan has not made eye contact with the LSA at the start, to save time, she will give him a short update so that the pace of the lesson is not interrupted. Farhan has asked that when class work in smaller groups takes place, the LSA leaves him to manage, as he would prefer this. Farhan continues to wear his hearing aid, although at times he switches it off.

Use of Language: Farhan's skills enable him to be in the top Maths set, although terms are often introduced for which there is no specific sign, or his LSA is unfamiliar with the sign which should be used. In such instances she has to fingerspell the sign which takes more time. Occasionally Farhan has problems in a lesson when a term is introduced that he does not understand. If a term such as 'calculate the difference' is used in a mathematics lesson, and Farhan is unfamiliar with it, having missed out on an earlier piece of learning, he could find the whole lesson very difficult to follow. The continued support of the LSA is vital because misunderstandings such as these frequently arise.

Marie

Background: Marie is now 7 years old and profoundly deaf. She is the eldest of two children, the only deaf child in the family. She was born deaf and early diagnosis meant she was diagnosed before the age of 10 months and immediately fitted with post-aural hearing aids. Marie is a imaginative child, who seems easily able to relate stories to actual life, and will confuse things she has heard with her own actual experience. Marie describes herself as quite tall with curly hair and good at drawing. She has learnt signing through contact at school and FYD (Friends of the Young Deaf Club). Marie is a lively child, always moving about and inquisitive about the world around her. She has an younger brother.

Repertoire: One year after having been diagnosed as profoundly deaf her spoken language development was still very slow and both Marie and her family became very frustrated. When their visiting teacher of the deaf suggested a signing approach could help language development to become easier for Marie, her family were delighted and felt this could make life easier for them all. Both parents started a course in sign language, but because of other demands, Marie's father had to give it up, and her mother was the only one who finished the course. Marie went to a playgroup where

some of the children use sign language and some had deaf parents who signed. For some time, Marie's parents have attended a deaf club, thus

Appendix A: Background of Pupils cont.

helping the family's contact with the Deaf community. Marie's brother has absorbed some of the signs she uses at home, and seems able to communicate bilingually at deaf club.

School: When Marie's parents were considering what kind of provision would be right for her, they felt strongly that she should have the opportunities provided by a mainstream school, but it also seemed clear that signing was her preferred mode of communication. A signing unit in a mainstream school seemed ideal, although she would lose the local community contact with neighbouring children. She was able to go to Greenview School using a bilingual approach of English, SSE and BSL where speaking and signing are used together. She travels to school everyday by taxi and has settled there happily.

Use of language: Marie does frequently express difficulties to her LSA – she cannot answer questions because she does not know where to look: at the teacher talking, the board, the LSA interpreting, or other pupils talking. As with other deaf pupils, she finds routine classroom background noise intolerable. For example, the scraping of chairs, banging of doors, movement in the classroom, and background chatter, are all amplified through her hearing aid. As with the other deaf pupils, her arrival back at the Unit [when there is the availability of a room] is greeted with the signed welcome, “Ah – delicious! No noise!” – Which shows the ordeal mainstream noise is, in the normal course of events.

Sarah

Background: Sarah, aged 7, is Afro-Caribbean and the youngest of three children, all born in London, with parents from the Caribbean. She is severely deaf and has deaf parents who sign. She is a fluent user of BSL. She has a profoundly deaf sister, and an older sister, Hayley, who can partially hear, and the family communicates through sign language.

Repertoire/School: Sarah is socially very confident and has many friends at school. They communicate through a mixture of signs and speech. At Greenview School, she is accompanied by a LSA who interprets the class activity into sign language for her. Sarah has made good progress in her literacy skills. Her LSA gives her a great deal of support in this and sometimes Sarah objects, as she wants to do things for herself. Sometimes Sarah's LSA finds it difficult to interpret what Sarah is signing to the class and so some of her contributions to the lessons are missed. Frequently when she is explaining something to her LSA, she has to repeat it four or five times until the LSA has properly understood the circumstances. This can be very frustrating both for Sarah and the LSA, and demands a good relationship so that the strength of communication is positive despite the difficulty.

Use of language: Sarah's parents are enthusiastic about her attendance at a mainstream school, as they feel it provides her with educational equality. They would like to encourage her with reading and writing, but have poor literacy skills, so spend time taking her to the library, and encouraging her to look at books. They have also broadened their knowledge of new technology, with investments in a home computer and textphone, so that Sarah can access the internet and phone her friends. Despite her parents' enthusiasm, there are many times the school staff feel Sarah's parents miss the ethos of partnership in following her education. For example, the parents have a struggle to see that Sarah's behaviour at home has a knock-on effect at school, e.g. running about in the playground without shoes and socks, or the fact that Sarah is allowed to stay up until 11pm on weekday nights.

Sarah's parents are part of a separate linguistic and cultural minority – the Deaf community. They are proud of their language and their separate identity. They want Sarah to cope in a hearing world, but very much see her as part of a Deaf community. As such, Sarah does not relate to the term 'disabled', but sees her deafness as 'normal'. The value and identity from the deaf community is an important part of her background which is at threat if Sarah's cultural needs are not considered as part of her mainstream provision.

Shadeh

Background: Shadeh is age 6. He has a younger brother and sister, and there is one child younger than himself. He was born in Lahore, Pakistan, and diagnosed as being profoundly deaf at the age of 5. Last year, his parents moved to England and he lives in a large house with his paternal grandparents. His home languages are Urdu and English. He has been at Greenview School for two years.

Repertoire: Shadeh has wide linguistic experience. His mother speaks Urdu, and his father Urdu and English. Shadeh had little idea of spoken language when he first came to Greenview School, although he knew the names of his family. He lip reads basic commands in Urdu, but does not follow conversations at home, nor does he initiate conversation, but he can request simple things through gesture and mime. His brother and sister are very caring towards him. His elder sister assists with his homework, and she interprets with his teachers when there are issues to discuss.

School: Shadeh is popular at school amongst his peers, both for initiating and playing games with the deaf pupils from the unit, and for 'clowning around' and making his hearing cohort laugh. He has close relationships with the other deaf girl in his year and uses BSL to communicate. He has been involved in several serious incidents of bullying other pupils, and occasionally copies other pupils' misbehaviour, e.g. in deliberately breaking windows. Unfortunately, Shadeh has little insight into the social consequence of being labelled a 'trouble maker or a clown', and his lack of insight into a perspective of boundaries regarding social behaviour has resulted in cautions from the head teacher and a threat of suspension.

Use of Language: Shadeh talks fluently in BSL with the 19 other deaf pupils in the unit, who have a strong collective identity. He gets on well with the

unit staff with whom there is a close relationship and BSL is used as a means of communication. With his other teachers, and the head teacher, Shadeh says he understands 'nothing' and if the Unit teacher is not present, the other hearing pupils will help out with explanations in simple English and some signs. This is very helpful, and indicates the other pupils' willingness to care for the deaf pupils.

Appendix B: Staff interviewed: background experience of inclusion/deaf awareness/signing.

Staff interviewed	Frequency interviewed: (times per term)	Teaching qualification: (<i>italics</i> denotes special needs)	Experience: special needs. BSL INSETS attended	Years at Greenview
Mrs Barbour	4	Teacher, BA	**	2
Miss Coombes	4	Teacher, BA	*	3
Mr Cox	4	Teacher, BA	*	7
Miss Dawes	4	Teacher, BA	*	5
Mrs Harpward	4	Teacher, BA	*	2
Mrs Noon	4	Teacher, BA	*	8
Mr Dee	2	Deputy, BA	**	5
Mrs Rork	4	<i>BA ToD</i>	**	14
Mrs Baker	4	<i>BA ToD</i>	**	13
Miss Whycliffe	4	LSA	**	3
Mrs Benson	4	LSA	**	16
Miss Cook	2	Head BA	*	7

Number of * denotes number of BSL INSETS attended by the member of staff concerned during the data collection (3-year period):

- * one BSL INSET attended over 3-year period
- ** two BSL INSETs attended over 3-year period
- *** three BSL INSETs attended over 3-year period

Appendix C: The research timetables 1999 -2002

(I/V = interview, Obs = observation): All interviews/ observations 30-45mins each.

Research schedule 1999/2000

Observation and interview schedule: Autumn: 6th September – 19th December; Spring: 4th January – 11th April; Summer: 8th May – 19th July

Interview/ observation timetable 1999/2000

	9.30 – 10.35	10.55 -12.10	1.00-2.30	2.30 -3.15
MON	I/V Miss Cook	Obs. yr 1 Mrs Barbour, Farhan, Alexander		I/V yr 1 Mrs Barbour, Farhan, Alexander
TUES	Policy document analysis	I/V Mrs Benson	I/V Mr Dee	I/V Miss Whycliffe
WED	Write ups			
THUR		Obs. yr 3; Mr Cox, Sarah	I/V yr3: Mr Cox, Sarah	
FRI	Obs yr 2: Miss Coombes, Marie, Shadch	I/V Mrs Baker	I/V Mrs Rork	I/V yr 2: Miss Coombes, Marie, Shadch

Research schedule: 2000/2001

2000/2001 Observation and interview schedule:

Autumn: 5th September – 18th December; Spring: 7th January – 27th March; Summer: 18th April – 24th July

Interview/ observation timetable 2000/2001

	9.30 -10.35	10.55 -12.10	1.10	2.30 -3.15
MON	Other I/V			
TUES	Policy document analysis	I/V Mrs Benson	I/V Mrs Rork	I/V Miss Whycliffe
WED	Obs yr 4: Mrs Dawes, Sarah	I/V Mrs Baker		I/V yr 4: Mrs Dawes, Sarah
THUR		Obs yr 3; Mr Cox: Marie, Shadch	I/V yr3: MrCox: Marie, Shadch	
FRI	Obs yr 2: Miss Coombes, Alexander Farhan	I/V Miss Cook	I/V Mr Dee	I/V yr2: Miss Coombes, Alexander Farhan

Appendix C cont: Research schedule: 2001/2002**2001/2002 Observation and interview schedule:**

Autumn: 5th September – 18th December; Spring: 7th January – 27th

March; Summer: 18th April – 24th July.

Interview/ observation timetable 2001/2002

	9.30 – 10.35	10.55 -12.10	1.10	2.30 -3.15
MON	I/V Miss Cook	Obs yr 5: Mrs Harpward, Sarah	I/V Mr Dee	I/V yr 5: Mrs Harpward, Sarah
TUES	Policy document analysis			
WED	Obs yr 4: Mrs Dawes Marie Shadeh	I/V Mrs Baker		I/V yr 4: Mrs Dawes Marie Shadeh
THUR	Obs yr3: Mr Cox Alexander Farhan	I/V Mrs Rork	I/V yr3: Mr Cox Alexander Farhan	
FRI	I/V Miss Whycliffe	I/V Mrs Benson		

Research schedule 2002/2003**2002/2003 Observation and interview schedule:**

Autumn: 9th September – 16th December; Spring: 8th January – 10th April;

Summer: 24th April – 23rd July.

Interview/ observation timetable 2002/2003

	9.30 – 10.35	10.55 -12.10	1.10	2.00	2.30 -3.15
MON	Obs yr 5: Mrs Harpward, Marie, Shadeh	I/V Miss Cook	I/V Mr Dee		I/V yr 5; Mrs Harpward, Marie, Shadch
TUES		Obs yr 6: Mrs Noon, Sarah			I/V yr 6: Mrs Noon, Sarah
WED	Obs yr 4 Mrs Dawes Alexander Farhan	I/V Mrs Benson	I/V Mrs Baker		Obs yr 4 Mrs Dawes Alexander Farhan
THUR	Policy document analysis	I/V Miss Whycliffe			
FRI	I/V:	Mrs Rorke			

Appendix D: Interview schedule: introductory questions for Pupils

Inclusion

What do you like/dislike about this school?

What do you like/dislike about the teachers?

You were at X nursery/school before. Can you think of anything better/worse that you felt when you came here? What was it like?

Have you anything you would say to anyone deaf that was coming here about what it is like?

What is your favourite activity? Worst?

What would you do to change the school if you were head teacher?

What changes would you make to the way adults help you in the classroom?

What have you found helps when you have a quarrel/fight?

Have you ever been bullied?

Pedagogy

Which teachers are your favourites? Why?

Which teachers are your least favourites? Why?

If you were in charge of the Unit, can you think of anything you would change to make life at Greenview better for deaf children?

Which subjects do find easiest to understand?

Least easy to understand?

How do you get on in tests in the classroom?

Communication

What happens when you're with a deaf pupil on your own?

What happens when you're in a group with deaf/hearing pupils in class?

What happens when you're in a group with deaf/hearing pupils during playtime?

How would you describe yourself?

How do you prefer to communicate: Sign? English? Another language?

**Appendix E: Example of final pupil interview questions (extract)
Researcher/Shadeh: following 'Island of Zodor' - lesson 23-3-02)**

R: You remember how I've been coming into lessons and afterwards talking to you about your work?

Shadeh signs: MRS B LOOK AT FOR A LONG TIME ASK GOOD BAD WHAT YOU LIKE.

R: What did you like today's lesson

MAN GET OFF BOAT BROKEN HAVE TO SWIM A LONG WAY SAW ISLAND SWIM VERY FAR VERY TIRED GET TO ISLAND SAW MONSTERS RUN FROM MONSTERS (laughs)

R notes: sees story in own words. Didn't describe outcome of learning.

R: What do you think the teacher was trying to teach you?

SCARY ISLAND, HAVE MONSTERS STAY AWAY FROM SCARY ISLAND.

R: How did you learn it?

SCARED ME SCARED ME NO. PRETENDING YES!

R: Did you know anything about this before the lesson, from school, or from something outside school?

SCARY ISLANDS REAL NO MAGIC LIKE FILM

R. What helped you learn?

HAVE BOOKS HOME LIKE FAIRIES AND GIANTS NOT REAL NO I KNOW LIKE FILM LIKE MONSTERS (inc) SCARED NO LAUGH ME.

R: What do you like about school

PLAYGROUND BEST. PLAY FOOTBALL WITH FARHAN AND ALEXANDER

R: What about in the classroom what helps you learn?

BORING (signs noise, plenty of disturbance, other pupils pushing others). OTHER CHILDREN TOO BUSY NOISE NOISE TEACHER TALK TOO FAST WRITING WRITING TALKING TALKING BORING TOO MUCH FAST TOOMUCH FAST.

R: Can you ask the teacher to go slow?

CAN'T GO SLOW ENOUGH FAST ASK MRS BAKER SHE SAY LOOK AND DRAW PICTURE. I DRAW PICTURE. DRAW VERY NICE MRS BAKER SAY. SHE PUTS WORDS ON IT.

R: Can you understand the other (hearing pupils)?

IT'S THE OTHER CHILDREN THEY BOTHER ME NOISE PLAYING CANT FOLLOW TALK TOO FAST TOO MANY DIFFERENT CHILDREN TALK FOLLOW NO TOO FAST. WAIT LATER MRS BAKER TELL ME WHAT TO DO. FRIENDS HEARING NO FRIENDS DEAF BETTER.

R: How did other pupils help you, or stop you from learning?

SOMETIMES HEARING CHILDREN TALK SOMETIMES HEARING TEACHER (mainstream) TALK. DEAF EARS DON'T KNOW HER MEANING. HEARING CHILDREN SAY TO ME DO IT DON'T UNDERSTAND HEARING CHILDREN. NOISE TOO MUCH. IN UNIT (signs beautiful hush) PEACEFUL LOVELY CALM NO SHOUTING BIG CLASSROOM TOO BUSY.

R: How do you learn best?

UNIT, MRS BAKER SIGN/SAY SLOWLY NAMES, REPEAT, ASK US SAY FOR HER NAMES. TELL STORY, SAY NAMES SHOW US PICTURE TO LEARN NEW WORDS TELL US STORY MAKE US SAVE KNOWLEDGE UNDERSTAND UNTIL NEXT DAY. IN UNIT (signs beautiful hush) SAY STOP REPEAT. BIG CLASSROOM NO REPEAT TOO FAST HEARING WORDS NOT DEAF WAY HORRIBLE NOISE MESS. PEOPLE ALL SAY YES IDONT KNOW. BORING. HORRIBLE.

R: Can you stop teacher to say "Again?" Do you use Mrs Baker to slow down the lesson?

MRS BAKER TAKE US OUT SOON.THEN WE TRY AGAIN. CAN TRY AGAIN IN UNIT

Was there anything you wanted to ask, but couldn't?

(would like to) STAY IN UNIT ALL THE TIME. STAY WITH FRINDS CAN DO BETTER WORK FEEL HAPPY LIKE MRS BAKER. UNIT GOOD FOR DEAF. BIG CLASSROOM BORING.BAD NOISE.

Well done Shadeh, thank you for your help. End of transcript.

Appendix F: Example of Interview schedule:**Introductory questions addressed to mainstream teachers at the start of data collection**

1) Communication at School	
What is the overall goal?	
	To be able to use spoken and written English?
	To be able to use British Sign Language(BSL)?
	To be able to use spoken and written English and BSL?
	To be able to use spoken and written English and signed support e.g. S.S.E.?
	Other
What forms of language are used when teaching this child?	
	Spoken English?
	Written English?
	Sign-Supported English?
	British Sign Language?
	Other
What form of communication does he use in the classroom and in the playground?	
	Spoken English?
	Spoken language other than English?
	British Sign Language?
	Sign-Supported English?
	Gesture or mime?
	Other

2) Spoken Language	
Does this child use spoken language?	
How easy is it for hearing people to understand him when he speaks?	
	Every one can understand him?
	People who know him a little can understand him?
	Only people who know him really well can understand him?
	No one can understand him?
	Other
How much spoken language does he understand when he sees the face of the talker?	
	He can understand a few simple words. (e.g. "Mummy" "Drink")
	He can understand some common phrases. (For example "What's your name?" "Where's Mummy?" "Time to go home")
	He can understand a spoken conversation with someone he knows well?
	He can understand a spoken conversation with someone he has never met before?

3) British Sign Language	
How easy is it for people familiar with BSL to understand when he uses BSL?	
	Everyone can understand him?
	People who know him a little can understand him?
	Only people who know him really well can understand him?
	No one can understand him?
	Other
How much BSL does he understand?	
	He can understand a few simple signs (e.g. "Mummy" "Drink")
	He can understand some common sign combinations. (For example "What's your name?" "Where's Mummy?" "Time to go home")
	He can understand a signed conversation with someone he knows well?
	Understands a signed conversation with someone he has never met before?.
	Other

4) Signed Supported English or S.S.E.	
How easy is it for people familiar with S.S.E. to understand when he uses S.S.E.?	
	Every one can understand him?
	People who know him a little can understand him?
	Only people who know him really well can understand him?
	No one can understand him?
	Other
How much S.S.E. does he understand?	
	He can understand a few simple signs (e.g. "Mummy" "Drink")
	He can understand some common sign combinations. (For example "What's your name?" "Where's Mummy?" "Time to go home")
	He can understand a signed conversation with someone he knows well?
	He can understand a signed conversation with someone he has never met before?
	Other

5) Socialisation and engagement in school activities (May vary according to the setting, the teacher and /or the subject being taught)	
How much of the time does he pay attention when being taught in a large class (e.g. 30 pupils)?	
	He is almost completely disengaged?
	He pays attention less than 25% of the time?
	He pays attention about 50% of the time?
	He pays attention more than 75% of the time?
	He pays attention nearly 100% of the time?

In the Unit (1 – 5 pupils)

	He is almost completely disengaged
	He pays attention less than 25% of the time?
	He pays attention about 50% of the time?
	He pays attention more than 75% of the time?
	He pays attention nearly 100% of the time?
How much of the instruction does he understand?	
	He appears to understand very little?
	He appears only to understand information that is familiar or highly structured?
	He appears to understand some information that is new or less structured?
	He appears to understand everything?
What is his typical behaviour when he does not understand?	
	He appears to understand even though he doesn't?
	He drops out and distracts other pupils?
	He drops out and engages in an irrelevant activity?
	He drops out and becomes quiet and withdrawn?
	His facial expression indicates a lack of understanding?
	He seeks assistance from another pupil?
	He seeks assistance from a teacher?
How engaged is he during group discussions?	
	He is completely engaged?
	He is attentive initially, but then gives up?
	He is attentive throughout, but does not comment.?
	He is attentive throughout, but comments inappropriately?
	He is attentive throughout and attempts to control the discussion?
	He is attentive through out and comments appropriately?

6) Hearing Speech

Can this child hear most of what is said in a group conversation with at least fifteen other people in a normal classroom?	
	He can hear what is said with an aid to hearing (e.g. hearing aid, cochlear implant, phonic ear), and a BSL facilitator?
	He can't hear what is said even with the above?
	He can't hear what is said but does not use an aid to hearing; only BSL?
Can this child hear most of what is said in a group conversation with at least three other people in a unit room?	
	He can hear what is said with an aid to hearing (e.g. hearing aid, cochlear implant, phonic ear), and a BSL facilitator?
	He can't hear what is said even with the above?
	He can't hear what is said but does not use an aid to hearing; only BSL?

7) The child's educational support?

From whom does he receive support, how much support does he receive?	
Teacher of the deaf	

	Appendix F cont: Example of Interview schedule introductory questions teachers.
	2 Hours of individual support per week?
	7.5 Hours of support in a unit/resource base shared with 3 pupils per week?
	12 Hours of support in a mainstream class per week ?
Learning Support Assistant (because of hearing difficulties)	
	Hours of individual support per week?
	Hours of support in a unit/resource base shared with 3 pupils per week?
	Hours of support in a mainstream class per week?
Learning Support Assistant (because of other difficulties)	
	Hours of support in a unit/resource base shared with 3 pupils per week?
	Hours of support in a mainstream class per week?

Appendix G: Example of Interview Schedule

Focussed questions addressed to mainstream teachers in the final year of data collection

Inclusion

- What is the experience of the pupil in an inclusive classroom?
- What factors are highlighted by teachers and pupils as being important aspects of the pupils' success in learning?
- Logistics of communication for the deaf pupil. What factors do the pupils and teachers comment on as raising difficulties in their ability to listen [e.g. disturbance of others, background noise.]
- What special problems do pupils who are deaf have at Greenview School that other pupils with special needs don't have?
- What are their perceptions [of the pupils' view] of problems caused by pupil's deafness?
- How much difficulty do pupils have in concentrating or gaining the teacher's attention when needing help?

Pedagogy

- How able does the mainstream teacher feel in involving deaf pupils in the lesson?
- What did the teacher think was the essence of good practice where deaf children were involved?
- Did she try in her practice to put across any particular principles?
- How much work had the pupils done on this topic in previous sessions?
- Had the teacher assumed the pupils had some previous experience of the topic outside the observed session?
- What kinds of questions/content related to their earlier experience?
- What were the objectives behind the lesson (What did they want the pupils to learn?)
- How well do you think the pupils grasped the key points?
- How well do you think the special needs pupils grasped the main points?
- What do you think were the main things they had learnt?
- How receptive were their comments to your ideas?
- Which teaching approach do you think suits the pupils in your class best for their learning?
- What prevents them from learning?
- Had they found anything in the lesson confusing?
- What kinds of feedback influence the planning of the next lesson?
- What special conditions are provided to give pupils access to the curriculum?
- What observable indications are there of pupils' readiness, of their active involvement in the lesson?

Communication

- What is the experience of the deaf pupil of a sign language facilitator in the classroom?
- How involved are they with the sign language facilitator, e.g. how well understood do the pupils feel?
- How involved are the pupils in asking questions for further clarification?
- How able does the teacher feel to manage the situation of teaching with a sign language facilitator present?

**Appendix H: Example of completed mainstream teacher interview
(extract)**

Interview with Mrs. Dawes Transcript 15-3-2000

R: How long have you been at Greenview School?

T: This is my first year within teaching. I'm just finishing my first year, after a four year B Ed course.

R: Is this your first experience of working with deaf pupils?

T: I haven't worked with deaf children before. I've worked with children with learning disabilities who have used Makaton sign language, so I was aware of how sign language may actually work in the classroom and how it actually works in society. I did a research dissertation on how Makaton sign language allows social integration at school for the pupils, and in the wider community.

R: What is your experience of the way the inclusive classroom works in practice? What factors do you think contribute as being important aspects of the pupils's success in learning?

T: I am not sure why it exists at Greenview School, but there seems to be a wide spread desire in the staff team for the (mainstream) staff to expect the deaf pupils to behave more like the hearing pupils in order to be accepted by the hearing community. These young people shouldn't have to behave like hearing pupils to "fit in" - to sit integrated with hearing pupils at lunch and so on. I don't think that because they are in a normally hearing school, some "normality" should be expected to rub off on them. It's the other way round. If we accepted they have a different culture, a different way of learning, I think we would see much more achievement in their learning. I am not sure how secure their learning relationships are in the mainstream at present, although they love their unit teachers, that's for sure.

R: The language and communication policy at Greenview. school states: "The language environment should be bilingual giving equal status to both British sign language and English. The environment should be bi-cultural giving equal status to both Deaf and Hearing cultures. The classroom languages will be British Sign Language and English. This will give access to both Deaf and Hearing Cultures and the curriculum. There will be an ongoing programme of training and development for all staff to establish clear understanding and good practice of the Bilingual Policy" What do you think happens in practice?

T: I don't think there is a mutual understanding of the language that is used. Teachers pretend and collude with the child to maintain a sense of good communication in the classroom in order that the work of the classroom can proceed. So mainstream teachers assume the deaf child can understand alongside. But in fact the simplest sequence may be a mystery. Long after all the other pupils understand that a caterpillar changes into a chrysalis and then into a butterfly, the deaf child will still need a separate lesson to explain. You see hearing pupils nod, and you can assume they have understood. I always need to check each tiny stage with a deaf child, if I have time, but the teacher of the deaf can do that much better outside in the unit. I worry about the separate way I can explain the lesson to a deaf child

Appendix H cont: Example of completed mainstream teacher interview

R: What factors would you comment on as helping, or raising difficulties, in the pupils' ability to join in?

T: It's the amount of time they need to catch up. If I can explain it face to face that's good, as long as the other (hearing) pupils are on task. But although I can try basic signs, I don't often know what the pupils say back to me, and using the sign language facilitator just means the pupils relate better to her, which is what I don't want. I want to communicate with them, but the language difficulty is a great problem, and I see very little communication between the hearing and the deaf pupils except for the pupils gesturing and shouting at the deaf pupils to speed things along.

R: Logistics of communication for the deaf child. What factors do the pupils and teachers comment on as raising difficulties in their ability to listen (e.g. disturbance of others, background noise.)

T: Well sometimes it seems as if there is just so much which is a struggle for them. They cannot readily communicate with the hearing pupils, and the general melee, noise and confusion in the class is a nightmare for them. However it is a real achievement when the hearing pupils do their best to communicate even if this is not always accepted by the deaf child. I do leave the prompts for readiness and listening to the sign language, as usually I am trying to settle the rest of the class at the same time.

R: What special conditions are provided to give pupils access to the curriculum? What observable indications are there of their readiness, of their active involvement in the lesson?

T: It certainly helps when the teacher of the deaf has been through the curriculum areas in advance. The (deaf) pupils lack so much background knowledge that they seem to keep playing guessing games all the time, and they come out with the most bizarre guesses as answers. Some of the pupils watch and try to copy, but the teacher of the deaf has to work very hard in making sure they understand and can de-contextualise key vocabulary. I'm not sure that the "access to the curriculum" isn't better done in the unit where there is a chance for them to catch up. To be fair in subjects, like drama, science and history it is better to relax my expectation of their achievement and concentrate more on achievement in literacy and numeracy. Farhan and Sarah both did very well with their speaking parts for the school assembly - it was a huge lift so see them do so well in front of everyone. I think helping them to do visual things, where they are not so involved in social skills may be one way forward. I know how they appreciate not being in the firing line, and I can see that they hate being asked questions in front of the others. So generally I try and talk to them about their work and draw out the strands of success, using visual clues. In my experience, that very much does help, in that it does bring it on, and it is something very visual, that helps explain things. Conceptually, I think pupils work with visual before they are able to understand vocabulary and other things around it. I do believe that if signing is used then words should be used alongside, so the pupils get used to either reading the lips, or hearing the language.

Appendix H cont: Example of completed mainstream teacher interview

R: So would you say that you had experience about visual methods of reinforcing language before you'd ever met deaf pupils.

T: Probably, yes, particularly having worked with learning difficulties, pupils with language difficulties who were handicapped, visual always worked very well, as a young trainee teacher, that was something I resorted to in the classroom, use something visual such as Food Webs, and so on. [A lesson involving labelling of pupils, as components of a food web, and linking them via a continuous web of wool.] Although, as a teacher, it can be very stressful sometimes, I find the time to find the resources, making or researching visual aids. It is only when, often with hindsight, you are teaching a lesson, you realise you should have had the resources there to back you up. A Teacher of the deaf alongside to assist in this respect also helps a lot.

R: So with hindsight there are issues of vocabulary or concepts that you can see actually were grasped, were missed completely, that ordinary pupils would have grasped with no problem, and accepted it.

T: Yes.

R: When you think back to the time you came to Greenview School had you any expectation or awareness of what to do if you had a Hearing Impaired child in your class?

T: I had the obvious awareness of where to seat them, where the facilitator should stand, and something I found very difficult, was not turning your back to them whilst writing on the board, carrying on speaking, so I was aware that you had to be very careful about seating, of the lighting as well, that lights can often cause problems. But I wasn't all that aware of conceptually how they understood things, and the whole concept to me that they might have missed out a word, and not have understood it for the whole of their lives, or never even heard the word before, or heard the word and never have had it explained. That came as a shock to me sometimes.

R: Yes, it comes as a shock to me as well sometimes. For example Farhan and Marie (9 year olds) had heard the word "gravity" in science, and never understood what it meant. What special problems do the pupils who are deaf have at Greenview School that other pupils with special needs don't have? What are their perceptions of the problems caused by the child's deafness? (As seen from the child's point of view). How much difficulty do they have in concentrating or gaining the teacher's attention when needing help? How able does the mainstream teacher feel to involve them in the lesson?

T: I think some teachers feel that sign language is just a route towards speaking English properly. That is, when they have learned enough of English through sign language then sign language will become unnecessary. They think that sign should be a vehicle for pupils to transfer skills to learn English for interaction. They don't realise how difficult it is to teach deaf pupils ordinary concrete things, or explain everyday things even if there are contextual clues to help you wade through the concepts, e.g. just explaining the concept of "pollution" this morning was a nightmare. The deaf pupils were no wiser at the end of the lesson. The hearing pupils understood the

concept from the beginning... Whereas I think that to have a deaf child in the class, for example (to teach) a different concept, perhaps something like gravity, it forces you to confront an issue thoroughly, and that may help other pupils. For example, gravity, is a very difficult concept for me to visualise. You can't see it, can't touch it, smell it, so it is very difficult to bring a concept like that in the classroom. Having a deaf child in the classroom you may try and use diagrams, something you can rely on, may assist other pupils in the class as well as the deaf child. So I think that deaf pupils at this stage still do not have any chance of succeeding as well as majority pupils in cognitively and linguistically more difficult tasks. And when you add to this the problem of large numbers of pupils in the class (this class had 35) and the background noise of the class, their radio mikes amplify a huge amount of rubbish. It must be deafening for them! (Laughs)

R: So for the deaf pupils, you feel you have to address the task differently? It makes you break down areas, and think about very specific goals?

T: I just think about a whole different strategy for them the whole time. Is there anything about deaf child that strikes you as typical?

R: I think that their obvious reliance on having another member of staff with them, and always worrying about whether they've understood and whether they've got it right, rather than going for it, taking the risk really, maybe not always understanding where they are. But on the whole they seem to develop their own way of dealing with things. They can show for example that they've understood, because that's the way they think they should act. So they anticipate how they should act, rather than being what they're feeling or how they're feeling.

T: Particularly with Sarah, she'll pretend she's understood, and won't, and then will sit there and worry. I have only worked with Sarah and Farhan, but yes, they do rely on support really in class, although I think they're getting on without that sometimes now.

R: We do these things. We provide them with extra staff, and we provide them with people with a lot of skills who can do things with them or who can go over areas in retrospect or plan ahead, but then you can sometimes create a danger of dependency when perhaps some pupils could behave more independently.

R: What quality do you think is the experience of the deaf child of having a sign language facilitator in the classroom? How involved are they with the sign language facilitator e.g. how well understood do the pupils feel? How involved are the pupils in asking questions for further clarification? How able does the teacher feel to manage the situation of teaching with a sign language facilitator present?

T: Well, most teachers in the school would tell you this, it's not easy! It is a distraction for the hearing pupils (although it is supposed to provide an enriched learning environment) and also sometimes it's tricky to work with a facilitator unless you have had time to do a lot of planning of the lesson in advance. There is no doubt that BSL offers deaf pupils the greatest chance of processing information in their own language, but I do worry when the

sign language facilitator is an unqualified classroom assistant. I don't know how many of the unit staff could converse with a deaf adult - not many I should think! I wonder if the quality of the BSL is beginner standard how that helps the pupils. The deaf pupils are given extra time for explanations after the other pupils have started their work, but they rarely interrupt the class during explanations. Even with a BSL interpretation I expect they miss most of the dialogue, because they never know in which direction to turn their heads. I try and voice over - but the delay is significant in them losing track very easily. I think we should plan key concepts in advance and go through the vocabulary in advance that would help matters.

R: How easy do the deaf pupils you teach relate to the hearing pupils?

T: There is a danger, this is sometimes I had to check, I wasn't doing the deaf pupils an injustice by putting them with the SEN group. If you are doing a withdrawal group, teacher is supporting Sarah and Farhan in class, you don't place those pupils who have other S.E.N.s with Sarah and Farhan in a group, whereas I put Simon and Jodie, those pupils who are very able, those pupils who have a good broad use of language, and you place them with Sarah and Farhan, so that they are bringing them on, rather than bring them down to the level of those pupils who find work very difficult.

R: That's one of the arguments against integration, I think, that deaf pupils in an ordinary school may get placed in the bottom stream.

T: I don't think that's happened in this class. There is that danger to begin with, but if the T. is aware of it - it's the danger of the unknown really. Within teaching, you place pupils in pigeon-holes in order to work out what levels of work they can meet and what they can do.

R: Is there any thing that's been a surprise to you, what they can do, or can't do?

T: The thing that's been the biggest surprise to me, when we were doing autumn, they didn't have the concept of autumn. We were doing a poem back at the beginning of the first terms, I was new to them, they were new to me. The pupils were talking about crackling wood and rustling leaves, and that was a thing they hadn't ever been able to pick up on, and they were confused about that, in that you do rely, particularly in creative writing and poetry reading, on sounds a lot. It's a hearing world, and a lot of concepts, and a lot of poetry of course is based around sounds.

R: Very high frequencies they hear, and perhaps low frequencies (e.g., aircraft), but the frequencies which are about sound and words and intonation, they don't pick up. I was surprised with Sarah and Farhan that they don't use sign as a language only as a prop.

T: I think they use it between them, to chat between the two of them, but they integrate, the two of them with the other Hearing Impaired pupils, they don't choose to go off with their other class peers in the playground, which I find quite interesting, even though Sarah and Farhan are quite popular in the class. they don't have any problems with friendships in the class, but they obviously feel they need to associate with pupils that also have those same problems, those that are Hearing Impaired it is a secure

thing. You find other similarities - those that are sweet little girls share together, the boisterous lads enjoy football stick together. We all associate with somebody that we can recognise in order to feel secure, and feel we can develop really.

R: There is an interesting point. The deaf pupils here don't really have much to do with deaf culture here, they don't mix with a deaf community outside. They don't all watch the deaf programmes on T.V., they don't all know deaf adults, or attend deaf clubs, or have friends with deaf parents, so often they have any contact with the deaf community outside the school. but inside the school, they all seem to have a solid group identity.

T: I think the problem with the fact that with having a unit, is that they all travel from such wide distances, in that a lot of the pupils here, make their friendships from pupils in the street where they live, playing football in the street, skipping in the street, riding their bikes, so the pupils that are Hearing Impaired. are slightly lacking in that those friendships with normal pupils have been made before the pupils ever come to school. It's not an area within which the pupils move in and out, so it is quite static as an area.

R: So for the deaf pupils, it narrows it down to what they really have in common is coping with their Hearing Impairment.

T: So if Sarah and Farhan were both hearing pupils, you wonder whether they would ever actually associate with one another. I wouldn't have thought so. But H.I. pupils such as Sarah lack a general knowledge, so Sarah and Farhan have no real idea about the Spice Girls. It is such a huge culture within school, but I've never her seen singing their songs. She can obviously hear them. But I do wonder whether there is an over-protection from the parent's side - they don't let them. I think H.I. pupils can miss things through not hearing, but there is a tendency for the parents to be selective about what the deaf pupils do hear. So the Spice Girls, they may think that's a bad image to put the child to learn about, so deaf pupils then are deprived of normal experiences, and this puts up a barrier between them and other pupils .I don't think Sarah can even name the Spice Girls. She couldn't tell me any of the names of the songs, and this immediately separates her from the girls and boys of her own age.

R: Another child, H., in the school, her Mum and Dad like her to do everything for the good of her education. Just playing at home seems not to be "good enough". At home, what she plays with her younger brothers, is teacher and pupils. Looking at H. now, she often acts like a miniature adult.

T: I think this a problem, that parents are very keen to bring the pupils on, and don't allow them to be pupils really. They are lacking the experiences, really, in that they don't go out and play in the street.

R: So common social norms get missed?

T: It is very difficult to change Sarah and Farhan where they are. You can't change their friendship groups, or say go off and play with such and such because it won't work.

R: So it is not just their curriculum in school, it is there in the outside world too?

T: It is social within school.

R: Has there been anything you've done deliberately to modify the curriculum?

T: About the class I'm working with - I feel that I went through a stage of thinking, I don't necessarily need to differentiate for Sarah and Farhan, but I need to differentiate for the whole class, so I ended up thinking this make my teaching better, having the posters books, displays. When we're doing book study, we put on a video afterwards to reinforce the story, and those strategies to do with the deaf pupils very much improve your own style of teaching within the whole class. Otherwise there is the tendency just to sit down and talk at the pupils. And some of there backgrounds, they come from very deprived circumstances.

R: Has your B Ed taught you about working with deaf pupils.

T: No. My experiences of working before I went into teaching, with working for pupils and adults with special needs helped a lot. I worked for Mencap. There were things about communication that I picked up there. Doing Makaton projects at college also helped. Today, I spent the whole morning just talking about nature to lead onto the concept of conservation, just so that the pupils had sufficient background to grasp the concepts.

R: So you knew from your background of working with pupils and adults that it wasn't just talking....

T: It sounds obvious, but we mustn't accept what the pupils already know. Concepts can be very difficult, and particularly with these pupils. The thought of someone building on their land, it's never happened to them, and until it does it's never going to bother them really. But the actual fact, that they can have a point of view, and do something about it, take actions, and even motivate other people to act, I doubt most of the pupils have still to grasp that. The philosophy of teaching is really empowering the pupils to have choices. If they want to complain, then they can complain. I had this conversation with Sarah's mother, and it turned out Sarah doesn't watch pupils's programmes, for example, Blue Peter. Parents need to go out of their way to make sure they are pupils, because play is such an important part. Pupils, through play, hopefully find their role within society, that's hopefully the idea, that they can manage, and work out their differences and similarities. In order for pupils to understand their roles in society, they need to play them out, in which situations they feel secure, in which they don't feel OK. They're rehearsing life. In playing "Mummies and Daddies", they are working out their role in their family. In playing "Cops and Robbers" they can work out more of a world outside the family, "Doctors and Nurses" jobs in the world, etc

R: In some lessons deaf pupils learn an awful lot, and in other lessons they learn very little. What do you think influences them to learn?

T: The weather! Again, you have to make sure that introductions aren't too long, Sarah and Farhan are straining to hear. So breaking it up, speech

with pictures, to give a visual break, so they don't have to tune in all the time, which must be incredibly difficult. F, towards the end of the day, will just loose concentration. Class noise is a big factor, and a worrying one, because sometimes, realistically, you can't get it any quieter, so there are funny ways of dealing with that, and the pupils also need to deal with that. Sarah and Farhan have to deal with noisy lessons, for example Drama, where the pupils can't be quiet. Sometimes the deaf pupils want the classroom to revolve around them, and obviously it can't. They don't seem to understand that there are different times and various levels of acceptable noise, depending on the time of day. So lots of talking during registration is not acceptable, but at other times, it might be. Having Sarah and Farhan highlights the kind of strategies that they need to take on board.

R: It is a valuable lesson for Sarah and Farhan to know they are not in a special class. They are in an ordinary class. And that in society, likewise not all people will sign to them.

T: In an ideal world, we would all know how to sign. Sarah and Farhan have found that I don't know how to sign, so they do have to communicate with me verbally. But in any case they function well using sign as props. Sometimes, I have to tell Sarah and Farhan off as they are signing, and this is communicating just the same as when I have asked the hearing pupils to stop talking. In class, they will go and stand above somebody, and expect them to move. They don't verbalise, they just expect the pupils to get up. It can be very difficult. You can think, am I working for the benefit of the two pupils in the class who are deaf, or am I going to work for the majority this lesson. For example, I have to say to them in Drama, if it is too loud, switch off your hearing aids, and do the best that you can really.

R: Yes, teachers of the deaf have to aware of that too.

T: Those needs often fall to deaf teachers job. My job is 30 pupils. Your job is 2. I have to make sure that my job is to access the N.C. to 30 pupils Sometimes your job of getting Sarah and Farhan to access the N.C. and my job with getting the N.C. to 30 pupils clash. Both of us have to be understanding that our interests may clash.

R: What kinds of help have you received in the classroom?

T: What I anticipate was support within the class, but being left very much on my own, so I got more support in class than I actually expected. I was slightly expecting more withdrawal, but ended up with Sarah and Farhan in the classroom for most of the time, which is something to be honest than I'd fought for, because I felt that they were capable of meeting up with mainstream for most of the time. it was in their interests to be in the mainstream class. They're placed within a mainstream school. There's times when they need to be taken aside, when you need to follow up.

R: It depends on the child, and from term to term.

T: Had I had Stacey, it would have been followed up in a very different kind of way, but Sarah and Farhan are very able pupils. There's the danger of putting all pupils in one box, and they all need to be treated individually. When I first came to the school, I did expect to receive some support from

Appendix H cont: Example of completed mainstream teacher interview

somewhere about learning how to sign. I would be interested in doing this. There used to be a parent's signing club, but that has now finished.

R: Within the school where there is a unit, that form of support would be very useful.

T: I do come into contact on playground duty, with pupils that use only sign, and it would be useful to ask simple questions rather than ask for a Teacher of the deaf. Pupils get frustrated, and it would be useful to be able to help them. Maybe courses being made available.

R: What about things like radio-aids and hearing aids. Were you given any help?

T: I had a little introduction when I first came here, and to be honest, that was enough. You soon get the hang of it, and learn to deal with it in your own way. The biggest thing at the end of the day is to teach the pupils to use them and communicate with them, and then they can tell me if it is on or off it is been fine.

R: Would it help you know more about their hearing loss and how to manage it?

T: Yes, it would, although of course I couldn't understand technical details. It has been very interesting getting to know how deaf Sarah is without her hearing aids.

R: Have you noticed their level of independence is different with their hearing aids on?

T: I notice how much more they can understand when the mike is switched on. and I do turn my back on the class, they can still understand what is said.

R: Is there anything that you would say to a new teacher coming in?

T: More to take each child as an individual, and assess them more as individual rather than a Hearing Impaired child, and try to push them to see how far they can cope, before setting your limitations and expectations. Farhan has moved on leaps and bounds since last term. The point at which I thought he had reached a plateau and stuck has long since passed. Telling him his work wasn't good enough and that I had higher expectations of him has worked, and he is now achieving much more. It is remaining open minded and having normal expectations. Also bringing in resources, not just for the deaf pupils, but for the benefit of all pupils.

R: Thank you for your help.

(End of transcript)

**Appendix I: Completed observation to show record of chosen foci
Mainstream literacy lesson: Island of Zodor 23-3-02**

Coded for teacher moves/pupil response. (c.f. Chapter 4, 4.1)
See Table 4.3 for coding categories. Codes adapted from Stake (1995)

D = Decorum

E = Elicitation

F = Focussed

FHN = Further help needed

x = occurrence of issue

o = open question

c = control move

p = phatics

Transcript of Observation of Chosen Foci	Decorum	Elicitation	Focussed	Further help needed
Teacher. You can all see in front of you the island of Zodor. Can you see anything on the map which you'd like to visit, Josh?	x	x o x	x x	x x
Pupil 3: Mrs. Dawes, can I give the books out?				
Teacher. Let's see what Josh has to say, first, shall we?				
Pupil 1: Zodor's cave		o		
Teacher. Why would you like to go there?				
Pupil 3: To see if he drinks blood!		x p		
Teacher: Yes, It's exciting. Have you found anywhere you'd like to go, Marie?				
Pupil 2: No				
Pupil 3: I think..				
Teacher. No, It's Marie's turn. I'd like to hear what she has to say. (Prompt from learning support assistant in BSL)				
LSA: Can you see something you'd like to visit, Marie?		c		
Pupil 3: Miss Dawes, yesterday, he was sick!		x		
Pupil 2: (Points to monster says nothing)	x			
Teacher: There's something there that Marie's found. What has he found coming up from the sea?		o		x
Pupil 4: A monster!				x
Teacher: Yes, lovely. Now what can you see coming out of his hand?			x	
Pupil 3: A fork				
Teacher: Let me ask someone who's not shouting out and has their hand up. I can only hear people with their hands up. What is it?		c		
Pupil 5: A sword			x	
Teacher: It's not a sword, think of another word.				
Pupil 6: A fork				x
Teacher: No we've had that. Look at the weapon. It has a special shape...A word beginning with t.... Emma?				
Pupil 7: Thumb?	c	x		
Teacher: Shadeh?				

Transcript/observation of chosen foci cont.	Decorum	Elicitation	Focussed	Further help needed
Pupil 8: Looks blank	x			x
Teacher : A word meaning three..T...Fiona?	x c			
Pupil 9: tree?				
Teacher: No, it's a trident. Now what I'd like you all to do for two minutes, with your friend sat next to you is to decide which part of the island you'd like to visit first, and use some words to describe why you'd like to go there. For example, Peter, you could say, I want to go to Zodor's cave, to see if he is at home. It looks really scary. Talk quietly to your neighbour now, about which spot you'd like to visit and try to describe it.	x	x o x	x	
(For some minutes the children chat noisily amongst themselves. Shadeh, Marie and Michael are having the island and the task explained by Mrs. Benson. As she finishes, the teacher beings the next part of the lesson.)	x c x c	x	positive answer	x
Teacher: O.K. everyone, did you find and describe the places you would like to visit? (Some of the children put up their hands.)	x	to deaf pupil x x o x	x	x
Teacher: Now I want you to imagine that you are part of the Armada fleet on a long journey towards Spain. There has been a terrible storm and you are shipwrecked. Imagine a part of the island that you come to be washed up on, and write for me the beginning of your story to help me understand how you have reached the island and the sights you are about to see.	x c x x	x o x x o x	x	x
Explicit instructions follow from the teacher as to how they should present their work, and then the teacher gives monitor responsibilities to Alexander and two other pupils to issue writing books, pencils, etc.	noise x x x	x o x	x x x	BSL LSA help
(Although Mrs. Dawes thought this was helpful to Marie's status, in fact she missed the explanation that Mrs. Benson was giving to the other deaf children.)				
Length of extract: 7 minutes 35 seconds				

**Appendix J: Completed observation record to show teacher facilitation
Mainstream literacy lesson: The Wasteland 19-6-01**

Aim to record teacher talk in terms of the approach teacher has in attempts to draw deaf child in to lesson.

Mainstream - Year 3:19-6-01. 30 pupils, including two from the unit (Alexander and Farhan).

Mainstream teacher: Mr Cox,

Learning Support Assistant/Class facilitator: Mrs. Benson.

Lesson Objective: Taking another's point of view (The attacker or victim).

Observation	Observation Notes
<p>Teacher: This is a rather scary, shocking story about the problems of lawlessness which faced non-whites living in South Africa. They have left their old African communities in search of work. This story is about the problems of violence and lawlessness they face when facing despair and poverty away from their own homes.</p> <p>It is rather frightening to imagine you have to travel many miles in search of work, and that you may be robbed or mugged if you do manage to earn some money. Can you all imagine all the difficulties of trying to find work in a very hostile area? Just imagine who the people are that you read about just now. Can you look over the story and tell me who (and how many) the characters are?</p>	<p>Many of the pupils in this group are quiet, some through shyness, some through difficulties with reading and analysing text.</p> <p>The teacher used this kind of discussion to draw out their communicative competence. At the moment this sequence begins, the more able pupils perhaps are just wondering who has died in the story. The less able will need support to begin to piece the meaning of the story together.</p> <p>The pupils are all a little shocked having been asked to examine and explain the end of the story. Many seem to be confused as they try and guess whose body the man has discovered. It is clearly difficult for them to envisage what has happened, and they are not looking up from their stories to listen to the teacher.</p>
<p>Teacher: Which one is the father in the story do you think?</p> <p>P1: That one.</p> <p>P2: The one under the lorry</p> <p>Teacher: How do you know?</p> <p>P3: I think he ran away with the others.</p> <p>P4: It is all a muddle, like the darkness in the story.</p> <p>Teacher: Lovely observation, Josh...Sam disagrees. Why do you think that isn't him, Sam?</p> <p>P2: Because he says, "Freddy, your father's got away."</p> <p>Teacher: Well spotted. What do other people think? Jill you look doubtful?</p>	<p>Both pupils have spoken at once: no evidence of class rule "Hands Up, no calling out!"</p> <p>Teacher support the different observations and enables an ethos of flexibility rather than "right or wrong" answer. He manages to maintain a natural, enquiring, interpretative approach that values different views.</p>

Observation	Observation Notes
<p>Appendix J cont: Completed observation record Mainstream literacy lesson: The Wasteland 19-6-01 P5: (Jill) Says nothing, looks confused. Teacher: Not sure? That's right, it is very tricky, the names aren't used to carry on the impression of chaos. P6: It can't be the one under the lorry because then the father would've killed the son. Teacher: Why didn't they know who had been killed (Some of the children begin talking all at once) Teacher: I can't hear you all talking at once! One at a time! Carl! P7: (Carl). They didn't know it was one of the gang who had been killed. They thought it was the dad. Teacher: Can you all think what it's like. The son (as part of a gang) is pursuing the father who is trying to escape being mugged for his wages. He doesn't know his son is one of the attackers. Farhan, can you guess what happens? Alexander, can you work together? Have a little talk together, can you guess. Anyone else – have a talk with your friend and see if you can guess how the mix up happened. (Teacher allows two minutes thinking time as the class talk in pairs. Some of the boys excitedly act out the fight). Farhan's group what did you think of? P8: (Farhan) I don't know. It doesn't say. Teacher: (enthusiastically) well done – it doesn't say. (Alexander and Farhan nod). It's all dark and a big mess and there is lots of confusion with secrets- misunderstandings which come clear through our conclusion at the end. Well done Alexander and Farhan – a good answer. P9 and P10: We think that the man did not know the attacker was his son P9 and P10: (shouting out). He was beating them up, yeh, and then killed him, yeh,</p>	<p>Carl often talks as spokesman for the group. As he is confident, the teacher often allows him the first shot in posing theories. Frequently his ideas are inaccurate, but the teacher finds that his lively personality helps other people feel it is safe to contribute.</p> <p>The teacher tries to include those who can't answer directly by inviting them to form collaborations in order to share ideas.</p> <p>The teacher knows Farhan and Alexander have great difficulty in replying in class, and accepts "I don't know" as a fair answer. In these circumstances, replies such as "I'm not sure", are accepted as valid answers, a positive step instead of a passive no reply answer.</p> <p>We see/hear the teacher working hard to include pupils who do not usually participate, without being confrontational. Strategies which offer thinking time, or collaborative pair working time usually helped the deaf pupils greatly.</p> <p>The teacher has succeeded in eliciting response from the pupils through providing evaluative comment (a good answer); Repetition: P: "It doesn't say." – T:</p>

Observation	Observation Notes
<p>Appendix J cont: Completed observation record Mainstream literacy lesson: The Wasteland 19-6-01</p> <p>P11: ...He didn't know because he was acting in self-defence, but killing his son at the same time. Teacher: that's right he was attacking someone to save his life – in self-defence as you say, but he didn't realise his son was an attacker because it was dark.</p> <p>P6 and P8: I was going to say that! Teacher: Good, you've understood the deeper meaning, or inferred what was really happening. Several pupils respond yeah). Now have a go at sharing with your partner, in pairs, for two minutes on how you think the one hiding under the lorry, Freddy's father, is feeling right now. He had thought he was the victim. Is he still the victim? Who is the real victim?</p>	<p>“Well done, - it doesn't say” And through making a reformulation and a recap of the discussion (but he didn't realise his son was an attacker because it was dark.). This final statement represents the teacher gathering all the information in a summary teaching point.</p>
<p>In discussion with the teacher after this observation, he explained how the control of the discourse had to include pupils with many varied needs to develop receptive and expressive skills. These included: Helping pupils with the meaning of new words, e.g. terms such as victim, self-defence. Those who found the language/meaning of the text difficult, and needed more thinking time. Those who were hearing impaired, and needed lots of repetition of basic text, with confirmation of question and answer in discussion. Enough space for everyone to examine the issues on the common topic of violence/mugging: the perspective from the points of view of attacker and victim, and share their point of view within pairs if not able to share with the class.</p> <p>In this way the teacher felt he had achieved his objective of managing a cohesive, supportive discussion, whilst (in a limited way) supporting the needs of individual learners.</p>	

Appendix Analysis K1:

Raw data collected under themes from interviews, observations & policy documents.

METHODOLOGY INSTRUMENTS	1) Semi-structured Interviews	2) Observations	3) Analysis of policy documents
<p>DATA THEMES:</p> <p>Inclusion:</p> <p>Class size</p> <p>Background noise</p> <p>Acoustic support</p> <p>Peer group support</p> <p>Deaf identity</p> <p>Expectation of pupil achievement</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>Assessment</p> <p>Monitoring outcomes</p> <p>Target setting</p>	<p>Mrs Baker on inclusion 12.7.2002, & 21.3.2001</p> <p>Mrs Barbour: no choice about accepting deaf 17.4.2001</p> <p>Settling in: Shadeh 11.1.2000 & 22 2.2002 & 10.4.2001 & 14.6.2000</p> <p>Children's' deaf awareness (unity): Shadeh 5.4.2001</p> <p>Deaf children's' unity Shadeh, 14.3.2000</p> <p>Being unable to sort out misunderstandings: Sarah 15.2.2001</p> <p>Lack of integration: Sarah 6.2.2002 & Shadeh 11.1.2000</p> <p>Acoustic peace in unit: Sarah 21.3.2001</p> <p>Difficulty following interrupting lesson: Sarah 21.2.2000</p> <p>Colleagues interacting, Sarah 12.6.2000</p> <p>Lack of awareness talking behind hand: Sarah 14.3.2001</p> <p>Acoustic interference: Shadeh 13.9.2001 & Sarah 21st March 2001</p> <p>Acoustic interference; Marie 5.11.2002 (limiting discomfort): Alex 13.2.2002</p> <p>Background noise – Alexander 8.3.1999</p> <p>Background noise- Alexander 25.9.2003</p> <p>Shared identity (peer group support) Alex: 13.2.2002</p> <p>Shared discussion of problems (peer group support) Alex 23.5.2001</p> <p>Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002</p> <p>Deaf collaboration: Marie 17.12.2002</p> <p>Deaf collaboration (M/S lessons): Alex, 6.3.2002</p> <p>Hearing helpers: Alex</p>	<p>Class size Year 4, 15.2.2001</p> <p>Background noise</p> <p>Acoustic interference: background noise: year 4, 13.9.2001; year 4, 22.2.2002; year 4, 8.3.2000; year 5, 21.3.2001 year 5, 15.2.2001 year 6, 14.2.2003 year 4, 21.2.2000 year 5, 11.2002; year 5, 6.11.2002; year 5, 19.11.2002; year 1, 4.6.2000; year 4, 20.11.2002; year 5, 25.9.2003;</p> <p>Peer group support, sharing difficulties, year 5, 17.12.2002, year 2, 2.5.2001; year 3, 23.5.2001; year 5, 16.9.2000; year 2 19.2.2001;</p> <p>Shared signing: 27.2.2002.</p> <p>Deaf identity: through peer group language, Year 4, 5.4.2000 Year 3, 14.3.2000 Year 4, 10.9.2001; year 3, 11.1.2000; year 1, 8.3.1999, year 4, 18.9.2001; year 4, 13.2.2002</p> <p>Expectation of pupil achievement – assumptions of teachers: Mrs Barbour: 17.4.2001; Mrs Benson: 27.2.2002; & 13.3 2001; Mr. Cox, 22.2.2001; Mrs Dawes, 15.3.2000; & 10.5.1999; Mr Dee 21.3.2001; Miss Noon, 14.2.2002; Mrs Rork: 10.4.2001 & 10.1.2000 Year 3, 12.1.2000; Mrs. B. 21.3.2001; Year 3, 10.1.2000 Year 3, 14.6.2000 year 4, 27.2.2002</p> <p>Lack of confidence in class: year 5, 9.9.2002, year 2, 19.2.2001; year 3,</p>	<p>Communications policy</p> <p>Planning documents</p> <p>Special needs policy</p> <p>Special needs policy; Known of by staff (contents unknown of by children)</p> <p>L.B. Ealing Hearing Impaired Unit policy: (known of by staff) contents unknown of by children.</p> <p>Pupils did not know of the existence of such policy, although could define "inclusion" in their own terms.</p>

METHODOLOGY INSTRUMENTS	1) Semi-structured Interviews	2) Observations	3) Analysis of policy documents
<p>Appendix Analysis K1 cont: Raw data collected under themes from interviews, observations & policy documents.</p>	<p>23.3.05 Hearing helpers: Marie 24.10.2002 Deaf identity/ self consciousness Alexander 9.9.2002 Deaf identity: switching off hearing aid- Sarah 14.2.2003 Switching off hearing aid – Alexander 19.11.2002, Ditto, Alexander 20.11.2002 Multiplicity of demands on deaf pupil: board, teacher, book. – Farhan 17.1.2002 Survival strategy, Farhan 10.10.2002 Survival strategy; Farhan 10.10.2002 Farhan’s Self Management 17.1.2002 Missing flow of instruction – Alexander 14.3.2001 Missed communication – hearing support: Alexander 9.9.2000 Hearing support: Alexander 25.9.2002 Alexander 9.9.2000 Hearing support: Farhan, 2.5.01</p>	<p>17.1.2002 Pupil ability to stop class: year 6, 6.2.2002; year 2 14.3.2001, year 5, 9.9.2000; year 1, 28.2.2000; year 3, 17.1.2002; Planning Assessment Monitoring outcomes Target setting Inclusion policy, assistance of hearing pupils: year 2, 9.2.2000; year 2 8.3.2001, Pace too fast: year 5, 9.9.2002,</p>	
<p>RQ Pedagogy Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes Pupil/teacher communication features Collaboration consistency of approach Discussion of teacher moves and responses Multi-agency planning</p>	<p>RQ Pedagogy Mrs. Benson understanding inclusion. 27. 2.2002 & 13th March 2001 Lack of deaf awareness –t.’s shouting Sarah 8.3.2000 Mis understandings – t.’s approach: Sarah 8.3.2000 Mrs Baker’s reflexive approach: Sarah 6.2.2002, & Sarah 6.2.2002 Marie 9.05.2001, 24 10, 2002 Mrs Benson deaf awareness – Alexander 25.9.2002 Interactive lessons Farhan 1.3.2001 Interactive lessons Sarah 6.7.2000 Mrs Benson’s help</p>	<p>RQ Pedagogy Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes: Year 3, 2.2.2000 year 4, 13.2.2002 Pupil/teacher communication features: year 2, 19.2.2001; year 4 11.12.2002; Constricted dialogue, t. questioning: Alexander/Mrs Barbour 14.9.1999 T. control: Year 3, 10.1.2000; year 5 9.9.2002, Alexander, 8.09.2002 Collaboration consistency of approach: receptive teaching styles: Mrs Baker: Mrs B:12.7.2002</p>	

METHODOLOGY INSTRUMENTS	1) Semi-structured Interviews	2) Observations	3) Analysis of policy documents
<p>Appendix Analysis K1 cont: Raw data collected under themes from interviews, observations & policy documents</p>	<p>Communication: problem solving – Farhan 28.2.2000 Signing in deaf company; Farhan 17.10.2002 Sign language: self stimulation—Farhan 5.11.2002 Sign language – problem solving Alexander 11.9.2001 Lessons deaf together- Alexander 18.9.2001 Lack of deaf awareness : Shadeh 2.2.2000 Independence in learning: Farhan 17.1.2002, & Shadeh 10.1.2000 Deaf friends – Alexander 8.3.1999 Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999 Finger spelling Alexander 2.10.2002 Deaf awareness, signing Alexander 25.9.2002 Signing preference: Alexander 8.3.2001 Sign/Hearing support Alexander 9.9.2000 Sign language as identity: Alex, 27.2.2002. Signing – preferred to talking- Alexander 4.6.2000 Close understanding of deaf: Alex 13.2.2002 Understanding signing in classroom, Alexander 8.03.2001. Unit lessons Alexander 25.9.2003 “Signing at the paintbrushes” Farhan 17.10.2002 Awareness of deaf adults Shadeh 10.9.2001</p>	<p>year 4, 16.10.2002. Assistance of sign Support roles: awareness of signing vocabulary ambiguities: year 4, 8.3.2000; year 5, 2.10.2002; year 4, 11.9.2001 Team teaching Communication systems INSETs Monitoring role and responsibilities Staff collaboration in planning Staff support Deaf adults: year 4, 10.9.2001; year 4, 15.2.2001; Pupil/teacher communication issues. Independence: Year 3, 10.1.2000 Communication policy INSET programme Monitoring teachers/ LSAs Training in BSL/ INSETs</p>	

Appendix Analysis K 2: Analysis of Interviews

Interview Foci: Emic Issues as Outcome of Step 2

	<p>What is the experience of the pupil in an inclusive classroom? Is it a satisfactory learning experience? How much time is spent in classroom control? (Issue: decorum) R [Researcher] Notes: Pupil - Problems: Background noise of class. Teacher control not a problem but switching attention from one source of information to another intensive and exhausting. Noise from other pupils exhausting (problem of amplification of noise through hearing aid) Teacher M.D: Mainstream staff expect deaf pupils to 'fit in', act like hearing pupils. Expectation of deaf pupil's inability to cope. Settling pupil left to teacher of the deaf. Difficult to 'include' pupil who is continually striving to catch up, or has missed understanding foundation ideas. Tasks 'cognitively and linguistically often above their heads' Amplification of background noise disturbs their learning. Tries where at all possible to use much more visual diagram when teaching.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Inclusion</p>	<p>Logistics of communication for the deaf pupil. What difficulty do pupils have in concentrating, or gaining the teacher's attention when needing help? How much does the mainstream teacher involve them in the lesson? (Issues: elicitation, focussed) R Notes: Pupil - Teacher activity too intensive (verbal/writing) to follow. Demands for pupil's attention too much. Pupil can't follow talk of hearing pupils unless slowed down. Mainstream teacher's focus on S. short and pressurised. Quality of explanation too short to resolve difficulty. Pupil S has strategies to mask misunderstanding (e.g. says yes, (I don't know). Note: can resolve difficulties in unit lessons. Teacher M.D: Teacher aware of difficulties needed constant help from teacher of the deaf as interface to help overcome attention/communication deficit. Help with hearing aids/phonic ear etc, sort out misunderstandings</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Pedagogy</p>	<p>What special problems do the pupils who are deaf have at Greenview School that other pupils with special needs don't have? (From the pupil's point of view) (Issues: elicitation, focussed, further help needed (FHN)) R Notes: Pupil - Mixing with hearing pupils difficult/not seen as friends. Not aware of hearing pupils's interests. Do not share interests of deaf community as all come from different localities. Unit pupils of all ages have strong collective identity (as seen by themselves and hearing cohort), but do not mix with deaf community (only 1 pupil had deaf parents). Teacher M.D - Abstract concepts often unknown to deaf pupils, background knowledge/life experiences limited isolated by language. Linguistically and cognitively a long way behind hearing pupils. Faced with background noise and distractions of not knowing where to look, T's expectation of what they learn poor.</p>

	<p>Appendix Analysis K 2 cont: Analysis of Interviews</p> <p>What special conditions are provided to give pupils access to the curriculum?</p> <p>What observable indications are there of their readiness, of their active involvement in the lesson?</p> <p>(Issue: further help needed (FHN))</p> <p>R Notes:</p> <p>Pupil - problems of background noise, communication, learning quality, miscommunication. Wanted calm, quiet atmosphere (resolved in unit by unit teacher). Problems not resolved within large class. Was aware of the benefit of learning like the other pupils but copes with great difficulty with noise, class size, multiplicity of demands of where to look etc.</p> <p>Teacher M.D - left a lot of the responsibility for the outcome of the deaf pupil's learning to the teacher of the deaf. Understood how difficult the deaf pupil found it to relate to new concepts. Tried to help the deaf pupils by contributing visual resources to the lessons. Enjoyed seeing the deaf pupils make great contributions to the class, e.g. in assemblies and drama productions.</p>
Communication	<p>What is the experience of the deaf pupil of having a sign language facilitator in the classroom?</p> <p>How involved are they with the sign language facilitator?</p> <p>How involved are they in asking questions for further clarification?</p> <p>(Issue - further help needed (FHN))</p> <p>R Notes:</p> <p>Pupil - has problems sorting out issues without a facilitator. Feels close to facilitator rather than teacher.</p> <p>Teacher M.D - The teacher of the deaf has to resolve communication difficulties/misunderstandings. Large numbers of pupils mean her time is limited to give deaf pupil attention. Finds working with a facilitator tricky. Needs a lot of prior preparation, and hearing pupils find it distracting, a further adult making demands on T's time. Finds unqualified facilitators dubious resource. Feels deaf pupils are continually torn which way to look - board, facilitator or teacher, or other pupils?</p>

Appendix Analysis K 3: Coded observation: pupil themes
Inclusion, pedagogy, and communication: Codes derived from emic issues of pupils.

Coded pupil themes

RQ: Inclusion

Code: Pupil's experience

Com: Lack of integration: Sarah 6.2.2002 & Shadeh 11.1.2000

Code: Class size

Com: Difficulty following interrupting lesson: Sarah 21.2.2000, Com: Multiplicity of demands on deaf pupil: board, teacher,

book. – Farhan 17.1.2002, Com: Survival strategy; Farhan 10.10.2002, Com: Farhan's Self Management 17.1.2002.

Com: Teachers interacting, Sarah 12.6.2000, Com: Lack of awareness talking behind hand: Sarah 14.3.2001,

Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah 6.2.2002

Code: Hearing peers support

Com: Settling in: Shadeh 11.1.2000 & 22 2.2002 & 10.4.2001 & 14.6.2000

Code: Background noise

Com: Missing flow of instruction – Alexander 14.3.2001, Com: Acoustic interference: Shadeh 13.9.2001 &

Sarah 21stMarch 2001

Code: Acoustic support

Com: Acoustic interference; Marie 5.11.2002 (limiting discomfort): Alex 13.2.2002,

Com: Switching off hearing aid

– Alexander 19.11.2002, Alexander 20.11.2002

Com: Background noise – Alexander 8.3.1999

Com: Background noise- Alexander 25.9.2003

Code: Peer group support

Com: Missed communication – hearing support: Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Hearing support: Alexander 25.9.2002

Com: Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Hearing support: Farhan, 2.5.01, Com: Survival strategy, Farhan 10.10.2002, Com: Hearing helpers: Alex 23.3.05

Com: Hearing helpers: Marie 24.10 2002

Com: Acoustic peace in unit: Sarah 21.3.2001

Com: Shared identity (peer group support), Alex: 13.2.2002

Com: Shared discussion of problems (peer group support), Alex 23.5.2001

Com: Being unable to sort out misunderstandings: Sarah 15.2.2001, Com: Deaf collaboration: Marie 17.12.2002

Com: Deaf collaboration (M/S lessons): Alex, 6.3.2002. Com: Deaf identity/ self consciousness Alexander 9.9.2002

Code: Deaf identity

Com: Deaf identity: switching off hearing aid- Sarah 14.2.2003

Com: Children's' deaf awareness (unity): Shadeh 5.4.2001

Com: Deaf children's' unity Shadeh, 14.3.2000

Code: Expectation of pupil achievement:

Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Sarah 6.2.2002

Code: Planning

Com: Mrs Benson's help 5.12.2000 Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Alexander 6.2.2002, & Sarah 6.2.2002

Marie 9.05.2001, 24 10, 2002

Appendix Analysis K 3 cont: Coded observation: pupil themes

Code: Assessment

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000, Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Code: Monitoring outcomes, Code: Target setting

Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah 6.2.2002

RQ Pedagogy

Code: Teachers' beliefs and attitudes

Com: Mrs Baker on inclusion 12.7.2002, & 21.3.2000, Com: Mrs Barbour: no choice about accepting deaf 17.4.2001,

Com: Colleagues interacting, Sarah 12.6.2000

Com: Lack of awareness talking behind hand: Sarah 14.3.2001

Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah

6.2.2002, Com: Lack of deaf awareness

t.'s shouting Sarah 8.3.2000, Com: Misunderstandings – t.'s approach: Sarah 8.3.2000,

Com: Mrs Baker's reflexive approach:

Sarah 6.2.2002 Marie 9.05.2001, 24 10, 2002

Com: Mrs Benson deaf awareness – Alexander 25.9.2002

Code: Pupil/teacher communication features

Com: Management of aids (M/S ts): Alex 13.2.2002, Com: T. control; red and yellow

cards. Alexander, Com: Mrs. Benson

understanding inclusion. 27. 2.2002 & 13th March 2001

Code: Collaboration

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Code: Multi-agency planning

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Code: Consistency of approach

Com: Interactive lessons – Alexander 14.9.2000, Ditto Alexander 2.10.2002

Code: Discussion of teacher moves and response

Com: Interactive lessons Farhan 1.3.2001, Com: Interactive lessons Sarah 6.7.2000

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Com: Interactive lessons: Shadch 10.10.2002 & Farhan: 4.4.2001

Com: Interactive lessons – Alexander 14.9.2000, Alexander 2.10.2002

RQ Communication

Code: BSL quality

Com: T. strategy – deaf awareness Alexander 6.11.2002, Com: Deaf awareness

Alexander 16.9.2000,

Com: Hearing teachers join in signing, Marie 1.3.2001 Com: Communication: problem solving – Farhan 28.2.2000,

Com: Signing in deaf company; Farhan 17.10.2002, Com: Sign language: when bored— Farhan 5.11.2002

Code: Monitoring teachers role and responsibilities, LSAs, M/S t, ToD, LSA sign/support

Com: Negative interaction with t.s control, Shadch, 12.1.2000, Com: Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000,

Com: Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000, Com: Lack of deaf awareness: Sarah 6.7.2000 & 6.2.2002,

Com: Hearing teachers lost in communication Marie 1.3.2001,

Com: Disunity between M/S staff and teachers of the deaf: Marie 4.12.2000,

Appendix Analysis K 3 cont: Coded observation: pupil themes

Com: Understanding flow of speech in classroom dialogue Alexander, 9.09.2002, Com: Managing equipment: year 3, 12.1.2000, Year 3, 6.6.2000

Code: Assistance of sign

Com: Finger spelling Alexander 2.10.2002, Sign language: when bored—Farhan 5.11.2002,

Com: Understanding signing in classroom, Alexander 8.03.2001

Com: Signing preference: Alexander 8.3.2001, Com: Sign/Hearing support Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Understanding signing in classroom, Alexander 8.03.2001

Com: Unit lessons Alexander 25.9.2003

Com: “Signing at the paintbrushes” Farhan 17.10.2002

Com: Awareness of deaf adults Shadch 10.9.2001

Code: Support role

Com: Mrs Benson’s help Farhan, 5.12.2000 Com: Mrs Baker’s help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Code: Team teaching:

Com: H. t. being aware of necessary support Sarah 9.7.2002, Sarah 8.3.2000, Com: Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000,

Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Miss Noon

14.2.2002, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000

Code: Communication systems: Difficulty of t.s. using acoustic equipment:

Com: Shadch 6.6.2000, Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000 Deaf awareness insets: Mr Cox 22.2.2001,

Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Miss Noon 14.2.2002, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000,

Code: Sign language as identity

Com: Alex, 27.2.2002, Com: Signing – preferred to talking- Alexander 4.6.2000, Com: Close understanding of deaf: Alex

13.7.02, Com: Lessons deaf together- Alexander 18.9.2001, Com: Deaf friends – Alexander 8.3.1999,

Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999, Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999

Com: Mrs Benson Shadch 15.2.2001

Code: INSETs: Deaf awareness insets

Com: Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Miss Noon 14.2.2002, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001

Code: Staff collaboration in planning:

Com: Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000, Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Miss Noon 14.2.2002, Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001

Code: Staff support:

Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999, Com: Mrs Benson’s facilitation, Shadch 15.2.2001

Code: Deaf adults

Com: Signing in deaf company; Farhan 17.10.2002

Code: Pupil/teacher communication issues:

Com: Deaf awareness, signing Alexander 25.9.2002,

Code: Training in BSL/ INSETs

Com: Sign language – problem solving Alexander 11.9.2001 Com: Lack of deaf awareness : Shadch 2.2.2000 Independence in learning: Farhan 17.1.2002, & Shadch 10.1.2000, Com: BSL quality: year 4, 27.2.2002, solidarity of understanding, com: signing as cultural signifiers: obs: year 3 14.3.2000;

Appendix Analysis K 4: Policy document analysis: coding themes: interview, observation & policy documents

CODING SCHEMA (EXTRACT)

Repetition of categorical data in analysis of interview (com), observation (com) & policy documents (Doc. number and line)

RQ Inclusion Codes:

Code: Pupil's experience:

Code: Class size:

Code: Background noise:

Code: Hearing peers support:

Code: Acoustic support

Code: Peer group support:

Code: Deaf identity:

Code: Expectation of pupil achievement:

Code: Planning:

Code: Assessment:

Code: Monitoring outcomes:

Code: Target setting:

Com: Lack of integration: Sarah 6.2.2002 & Shadeh 11.1.2000

Com: Difficulty following interrupting lesson: Sarah 21.2.2000, Com: Multiplicity of demands on deaf pupil: board,

teacher, book. – Farhan 17.1.2002, Com: Survival strategy; Farhan 10.10.2002, Com: Farhan's Self Management

17.1.2002. Com: Teachers interacting, Sarah 12.6.2000, Com: Lack of awareness talking behind hand: Sarah 14.3.2001, Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah 6.2.2002

Pol. Doc 1:14: Every child's right to communicate Pol. Doc. 1:20 Every child's right to achieve full potential

Pol Doc 3:10 code of Practice Pol doc. 3: 95 Whole school approach

Com: Settling in: Shadeh 11.1.2000 & 22 2.2002 & 10.4.2001 & 14.6.2000

Pol. Doc 1:14: Every child's right to communicate

Com: Missing flow of instruction – Alexander 14.3.2001, Com: Acoustic interference: Shadeh 13.9.2001 &

Sarah 21st March 2001

Pol. Doc. 1:102 Class management

Com: Acoustic interference; Marie 5.11.2002 (limiting discomfort): Com: Switching off hearing aid –

Alexander 19.11.2002, Alexander 20.11.2002

Pol. Doc. 3:70 Instrumental & environmental access to N.C.

Com: Background noise – Alexander 8.3.1999

Com: Background noise- Alexander 25.9.2003

Com: Missed communication – hearing support: Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Hearing support: Alexander 25.9.2002

Com: Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Hearing support: Farhan, 2.5.01, Com: Survival strategy, Farhan 10.10.2002,

Com: Hearing helpers: Alex 23.3.05

Pol.Doc.1:13, 3:80, Deaf Peer group: identity

Com: Hearing helpers: Marie 24.10 2002

Pol. Doc. 1:136 Hearing helpers/ equal opportunities

Com: Acoustic peace in unit: Sarah 21.3.2001

Com: Shared identity (peer group support), Alex: 13.2.2002

Com: Shared discussion of problems (peer group support), Alex 23.5.2001

Pol.Doc.1:13, 3:80, Deaf Peer group: identity

Com: Being unable to sort out misunderstandings: Sarah 15.2.2001, Com: Deaf collaboration: Marie 17.12.2002

Pol.Doc.1:13, 3:80, Deaf Peer group: identity Pol. Doc.1:136 Hearing helpers/ equal opportunities

Com: Deaf collaboration (M/S lessons): Alex, 6.3.2002. Com: Deaf identity/ self consciousness Alexander 9.9.2002

Com: Deaf identity: switching off hearing aid- Sarah 14.2.2003
 Com: Childrens' deaf awareness (unity): Shadch 5.4.2001
 Com: Deaf childrens' unity Shadch, 14.3.2000
 Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Sarah 6.2.2002 Pol. Doc. 1:136
 Equal opportunities 2:85
 SEN Policy, 1:125 Termly IEPs 1: 106 staff support role.
 Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000
 Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002
 Pol. Doc.: 3:105 Whole school policy, 3:95 Whole school approach. 1:18 Planning for
 progression and continuity.
 2:85 SEN policy.
 Alexander 6.2.2002, & Sarah 6.2.2002 Marie 9.05.2001, 24 10, 2002 Pol. Doc.1: 25 termly
 IEP.
 Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000, Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002.
 Pol. Doc.: 3:105 Whole school policy, 3:95 Whole school approach. 1:18 Planning for
 progression and continuity.
 2:85 SEN policy.
 Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah 6.2.2002
 Pol. Doc.: 3:105 Whole school policy, 3:95 Whole school approach. 1:18 Planning for
 progression and continuity. 2:85 SEN policy.

RQ Pedagogy

Code: Teachers' beliefs and attitudes:

Code: Teachers' beliefs and attitudes:

Code: Pupil/teacher communication features:

Code: Collaboration:

Code: Multi-agency planning:

Code: Consistency of approach:

Code: Discussion of teacher moves and response:

Com: Mrs Baker on inclusion 12.7.2002, & 21.3.2000, Com: Mrs Barbour: no choice about
 accepting deaf 17.4.2001, Com: Colleagues interacting, Sarah 12.6.2000

Com: Lack of awareness talking behind hand: Sarah 14.3.2001

Com: Over expectation of M/S t's (deaf communication) Alex 27.2.2002, Sarah 6.2.2002,

Com: Lack of deaf awareness –T.'s shouting Sarah 8.3.2000, Com: Misunderstandings –
 t.'s approach: Sarah 8.3.2000, Com: Mrs Baker's reflexive approach: Sarah 6.2.2002 Marie
 9.05.2001, 24 10, 2002

Com: Mrs Benson deaf awareness – Alexander 25.9.2002.

Pol. Doc.2:164 Staff resources 2: 165 Staff support

Pol. Doc.2:166 Staff communication 1:17 All communicative intentions accepted

Com: Management of aids (M/S Ts): Alex 13.2.2002, Com: T. control; red and yellow
 cards. Alexander,

Com: Mrs. Benson understanding inclusion. 27. 2.2002 & 13th March 2001 Pol. Doc.3:95
 Whole school policy, 3:126 Whole school approach

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002,

Pol. Doc. 3:85, 2:98

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Pol. Doc 2:98

Com: Interactive lessons – Alexander 14.9.2000, Ditto Alexander 2.10.2002

Pol. Doc. 2:100

Com: Interactive lessons Farhan 1.3.2001, Com: Interactive lessons Sarah 6.7.2000 Com:
 Mrs Benson's help

Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002

Com: Interactive lessons: Shadch 10.10.2002 & Farhan: 4.4.2001

Com: Interactive lessons – Alexander 14.9.2000, Alexander 2.10.2002

Pol. Doc.:2:100, 2:98, 2:85, 1:118, 1:123

Appendix Analysis K 4 cont: Policy document analysis: Coding categories/cont.

RQ Communication

Code: BSL quality

Code: Monitoring teachers role and responsibilities/ LSAs, M/S t, ToD, LSA sign/support:

Code: Assistance of sign:

Code: Support role:

Code: Team teaching:

Code: Communication systems:

Code: Sign language as identity:

Code: INSETs: Deaf awareness insets:

Code: Staff collaboration in planning:

Code: Staff support:

Code: Deaf adults:

Code: Pupil/teacher communication issues

Code: Training in BSL/ INSETs:

Com: T. strategy – deaf awareness Alexander 6.11.2002, Com: Deaf awareness Alexander 16.9.2000,

Com: Hearing teachers join in signing, Marie 1.3.2001 Com: Communication: problem solving – Farhan 28.2.2000,

Com: Signing in deaf company; Farhan 17.10.2002, Com: Sign language: when bored— Farhan 5.11.2002

Pol. Doc. 1: 31 self-esteem- self confidence to communicate, 3: 50, 2; 175, 2:180

Com: Negative interaction with T.s control, Shadeh, 12.1.2000, Com: Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000,

Com: Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000, Com: Lack of deaf awareness: Sarah 6.7.2000 & 6.2.2002,

Com: Hearing teachers lost in communication Marie 1.3.2001, Com: Disunity between M/S staff and

teachers of the deaf: Marie 4.12.2000, Com: Understanding flow of speech in classroom dialogue

Alexander, 9.09.2002, Com: Managing equipment: year 3, 12.1.2000, Year 3, 6.6.2000

Pol. Doc. 3:85, 1:106, 1:111, 3:120

Com: Finger spelling Alexander 2.10.2002, Sign language: when bored—Farhan 5.11.2002,

Com: Understanding signing in classroom, Alexander 8.03.2001

Com: Signing preference: Alexander 8.3.2001, Com: Sign/Hearing support Alexander 9.9.2000

Com: Understanding signing in classroom, Alexander 8.03.2001

Com: Unit lessons Alexander 25.9.2003

Com: "Signing at the paintbrushes" Farhan 17.10.2002

Com: Awareness of deaf adults Shadeh 10.9.2001

Pol. Doc. 1:40, 1:43, 1:49, 1:100, 1:105

Com: Mrs Benson's help Farhan, 5.12.2000

Com: Mrs Baker's help: Farhan, 24.10.2002 Pol. Doc. 1:21, 1:106 1: 85, 2:98, 1:118, 1:125, 1:23, 1:126

Com: H. T. being aware of necessary support Sarah 9.7.2002 & Sarah 8.3.2000, Com: Deaf awareness of teachers:

Sarah 31.1.2000, Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001,

Miss Noon 14.2.2002,

Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000

Difficulty of t.s. using acoustic equipment: Shadeh 6.6.2000, Deaf awareness of teachers: Sarah 31.1.2000

Deaf awareness insets: Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Miss Noon 14.2.2002, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000, Pol. Doc. 2:175, 2:180

Com: Alex, 27.2.2002, Com: Signing – preferred to talking- Alexander 4.6.2000, Com: Close understanding

of deaf: Alex 13.2.2002, Com: Lessons deaf together- Alexander 18.9.2001, Com: Deaf friends – Alexander 8.3.1999, Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999, Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999

Mrs Benson Shadeh 15.2.2001. Pol. Doc. 1:21, 1:23, 1:31, 1:40, 1:43, 1:47, 1:49, 3:80

Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000 & Mr Dee 21st March 2001, Miss Noon

14.2.2002, Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000

Pol. Doc. 1:21, 1:23

Com: Mrs Dawes 15.3.2000, Mr Cox 22.2.2001, Miss Noon 14.2.2002, Mr Dee 21st March 2001,

Mrs Rork, 10.4.2001, 10.1.2000 Pol. Doc. 2:85, 2:98, 2:100

Com: Unit lessons Alexander 8.3.1999, Com: Mrs Benson's facilitation, Shadch 15.2.2001
Pol. Doc. 2:85, 2:100 Com: Signing in deaf company; Farhan 17.10.2002, Pol. Doc. 3:90,
1:21, 1:23 Com: Deaf awareness, signing
Alexander 25.9.2002, Pol. Doc. 1:21 Com: Sign language – problem solving Alexander
11.9.2001
Com: Lack of deaf awareness : Shadeh 2.2.2000 Independence in learning: Farhan
17.1.2002, & Shadeh 10.1.2000
understanding, com: signing as cultural signifiers: obs: year 3 .

Appendix Analysis K5: Policy document analysis

Reference to policy document and line of reference: see Appendix L for Communication Policy.

DATA THEMES:	Communication Policy (1)	Special needs policy (3)	LEA policy documents (3)
Inclusion			
Class size			
Background noise	1: 50		3:10
Acoustic support	1: 56	2: 165	
Peer group support	1: 59,65		3:76
Deaf identity	1: 51	2: 130	
Expectation of pupil achievement	1: 76,77 1: 71,72	2: 130	3:70 3:80
Planning			3:120
Assessment	1: 69	2: 85	3:126
Monitoring outcomes	1: 71,72 1: 69,71		3:105
Target setting	1; 76,77		3: 95
Pedagogy			
Teachers' beliefs and attitudes	1: 62 -64	2: 100	3: 85
Pupil/teacher communication features	1: 54 -57 1: 54 -57	2: 100 2: 85	3: 105
Collaboration consistency of approach	1: 84,85		3: 126
Discussion of teacher moves and responses	1: 84	2: 98	
Multi-agency planning	1: 69,70		
Communication			
BSL quality	1: 80	2: 100	
M/S t, ToD, LSA sign/support	1: 53 1:53	2: 85	3: 85
Assistance of sign		2: 98	3: 85
Support roles	1:69, 70		
Team teaching			
Communication systems	1: 53, 70	2: 175, 180	3: 70
Monitoring role and responsibilities	1: 84		
Staff collaboration in planning	1:54 -60, 64		
Staff support	1: 84		
Deaf adults			3: 90
Pupil/teacher com	1: 84,85		
Training in BSL/ INSETs	1: 84,85 1: 84,85	2: 170, 185	

**Appendix L: Greenview Unit for the Hearing Impaired:
Communication policy: October 1985**

Philosophy

We aim to enable all children to develop effective communication skills both in understanding and expression.	1
	2
We have commitment to and a high level of awareness about meeting the needs of deaf people throughout Greenview School.	3
	4
By the term "communication" we mean the exchange and understanding of information, ideas, feelings, values and beliefs.	5
	6
We believe that every individual has the right to take part in this exchange and therefore, all communicative intentions, signed or oral are accepted and valued.	7
	8

Aims

To enable all children to realize their full potential in terms of communication.	10
To provide equal opportunities for pupils to access the National Curriculum and to take part in the life of the school.	11
	12
To develop skills and awareness of the need for sensitive communication throughout Greenview School	13
	14
To develop the self esteem and the confidence of each individual to communicate.	15
	16

Policy Guidelines

Equal status is given to both oral languages and sign	17
At Greenview we provide a variety of sign language forms which we consider appropriate to the range of communication situations:	18
	19
Sign with BSL features for story telling, clarification of informal context and natural conversation.	20
	21
SSE for accessing the curriculum, and in some situations where interpretation is required, e.g. assemblies.	22
	23
Finger spelling is used with all sign language	24
Spoken natural English word order is always used with SSE and SE in order to give maximum opportunity to develop auditory/ oral skills and sign language vocabulary.	25
	26
	27

Speaking and listening

We provide children with rich diverse language experiences as soon as they enter the school in order to develop each child's expressive and receptive skills to the full, through:	29
	30
Natural conversation and interaction	31
	32
Auditory training	33
Structured language lessons	34
Regular speech therapy	36
Use of the "speech viewer" computer.	37

Reading

Reading is particularly highly valued as it is the only full pattern of English to which the hearing impaired child has access. Teachers of the deaf are therefore responsible for the monitoring delivery of the individual reading programmes.	39
	40
	41

Writing

The deaf child's written language structures may resemble BSL more than standard English structures. We accept and value this.	43
	44
Standard English structures are taught in parallel. Teacher of the deaf are responsible for differentiating writing tasks to provide optimum learning.	45
	46

Appendix L cont: Communication policy: October 1985

Integration

Deaf children are full members of their mainstream class.	48
Staff work together to provide the best communication opportunities through:	49
Small group work	50
Reverse integration groups	51
Sign language support in class and assemblies	52
Opportunities for staff and pupils to learn sign.	53
Staff training to raise awareness of the effect of :	54
Seating position	55
Background noise	56
Lighting	57
Teaching style	58
Use of radio aid equipment	59
Resources	60
The deaf child at Greenview school requires and is provided with:	61
Teachers of the deaf	62
Support staff	63
Supportive mainstream staff	64
Acoustically treated rooms	65
Mainstream rooms with carpets and other soft furnishings	66
Properly functioning and appropriate hearing aid equipment	67
Planning, Record Keeping and Assessment	
We plan for progression and continuity. Communication skills are developed through topics in all subjects across the curriculum.	69
Evidence is gathered with reference to termly IEP targets, annual reviews, GAEL language assessments and liason with speech therapist and parents.	70
	71
	72
Equal opportunities	
We recognise and endorse the Greenview statement on Equal opportunities.	73
Developing communication skills must ensure equal access for all children and will take into account differences in gender, ability, disability race, faith and cultural heritage. Children's heritage languages will be valued and used to support the development of communication.	74
	75
	76
	77
Parent involvement	
Parents communication with children is vital and we support it through:	79
Communication Classes	80
Informal meetings	81
Close home/school links.	82
Staff development	
We aim to provide communication classes for all staff according to needs.	84
Regular staff induction includes communication training.	85

Appendix M: Example of Naturalistic Generalisation

Starting emic issue: What is the experience of the pupil in an inclusive classroom? Is it a satisfactory learning experience?

Etic issue: (research question brought in from the outside by the researcher) How do experiences of the pupil learning in the Unit compare with the classroom? What factors are highlighted for the pupil and the teacher?

Possible problem: Many of the mainstream staff express concerns that they think the deaf pupils are better off learning the curriculum in the Unit. They feel supportive towards the idea of social integration, but feel inclusion is impractical. The head teacher and special needs co-ordinator adopt the prevailing attitude of 'inclusion is here to stay' and are interested in promoting new attitudes as a staff team. The pupils, both deaf and hearing, on face value, do not seem concerned about whether they are taught in the mainstream classroom or in the Unit; except they frequently remark how 'lovely and silent' the Unit classroom is.

Evolved issue: What is the extent of noise in the mainstream classroom that aggravates deaf pupils' learning? What attitude, or 'deaf awareness', do mainstream teachers have towards the deaf pupils' ability to tolerate noise recruitment problems, when using hearing aids in the mainstream classroom?

Assertion (petite generalisation): Background classroom noise interferes with deaf pupils' learning. The mainstream teachers may, or may not, be aware of this.

Appendix N: Question and Answer: classroom observation examples

Example 1:

Teacher: You can all see in front of you the island of Zodor. Can you see anything on the map which you'd like to visit, Josh?

Pupil 1: Zodor's cave

Teacher: Why would you like to go there?

Pupil 1: To see if he drinks blood!

Teacher: Yes, It's exciting. Have you found anywhere you'd like to go, Alexander?

Pupil 2: No

Pupil 3: I think ...

Teacher: No, It's Alexander's turn. I want to hear what Alexander has to say (Prompt from learning support assistant in BSL.)

LSA: Can you see something you'd like to visit, Alexander?

Pupil 2: (Points to monster says nothing)

Example 2

Teacher: Well done Farhan, well actually they are fauns, mythical creatures. Creatures that are part of a fairy tale. Made up, imaginary creatures. Have a think now. If you are telling someone about the island, what would be a good word to describe it? For example, you could describe it this way... In the warm blue waters of the southern seas, a time long ago, there existed a magical island full of fairy tale creatures. It is an enchanted place, full of mystery... Or another one could be... It is a dark, forsaken place full of enchanted monsters... What way would you talk about it? Farhan?

Pupil 8: [Farhan looks baffled, then says] Not nice, ghosts!

Teacher: Very good, well done, there could be ghosts! Or, maybe lost aliens from another planet!

(Farhan looks at Mrs. Benson for explanation).

Pupil 10: Cool

Teacher: Some more descriptive words?

Pupil 3: scary

Pupil 6: weird

(Both extracts from Appendix I, Classroom Observation: Year 4. Literacy Lesson: Island of Zodor 27th February, 2003)

In Example (1), we see use of questioning as a strategy of control by the teacher. She observes pupils who she would like to draw into the classroom dialogue, but personal contributions and supplementary information from her are few, and responses back from the pupils tend to be short with little spontaneous dialogue. In Example (2), we see that, later in the class discussion, personal involvement and contribution from the teacher result in many different points of reference the pupils can relate to, less use of questioning as a control, and more use of phatics has resulted in spontaneity and a lively discussion by the pupils.