The Primary Review

... children, their world, their education

LEARNING NEEDS AND DIFFICULTIES AMONG CHILDREN OF PRIMARY SCHOOL AGE: DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, PROVISION AND ISSUES

Harry Daniels and Jill Porter
University of Bath

Esmée Fairbairn FOUNDATION

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Faculty of Education

LEARNING NEEDS & DIFFICULTIES AMONG CHILDREN OF PRIMARY SCHOOL AGE: DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, PROVISION AND ISSUES

Primary Review Research Survey 5/2

Harry Daniels and Jill Porter

This is one of a series of 32 interim reports from the Primary Review, an independent enquiry into the condition and future of primary education in England. The Review was launched in October 2006 and will publish its final report in late 2008.

The Primary Review, supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, is based at the University of Cambridge Faculty of Education and directed by Robin Alexander.

A briefing which summarises key issues from this report has also been published. The report and briefing are available electronically at the Primary Review website: www.primaryreview.org.uk. The website also contains Information about other reports in this series and about the Primary Review as a whole. (Note that minor amendments may be made to the electronic version of reports after the hard copies have been printed).

We want this report to contribute to the debate about English primary education, so we would welcome readers' comments on anything it contains. Please write to: evidence@primaryreview.org.uk.

The report forms part of the Review's research survey strand, which consists of thirty specially-commissioned surveys of published research and other evidence relating to the Review's ten themes. The themes and reports are listed in Appendices 1 and 3.

This survey relates to Primary Review theme 5, **Diversity and Inclusion**.

Harry Daniels is Professor of Education at the University of Bath. Jill Porter is Director of the MRes Programme at the University of Bath.

LEARNING NEEDS AND DIFFICULTIES AMONG CHILDREN OF PRIMARY SCHOOL AGE: DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, PROVISION AND ISSUES

INTRODUCTION

This research review is concerned with learning needs and difficulties among children of primary school age. This is an aspect of provision and policy which is both extensive and methodologically diverse. In a recent review, Dockrell, Peacey and Lunt (2002) outline the difficulties that are revealed in a close examination of the literature concerning attempts to meet the needs of children with special educational needs (henceforth SEN). They argue that intervention studies are limited in that they usually only consider one model of treatment often without appropriate controls. They also suggest that: there is 'little focus on the reliability and validity of assessment measures used both in qualitative and quantitative research' (p2); that there has been very little research which has looked for features of schools which are both 'effective' and 'inclusive' (p38); that studies often involve small samples and there are few population-based perspectives on diversity and needs (p1) and that there are very few longitudinal studies that consider change over time (p1). Similar reservations were noted by the Evidence for Policy and Planning Information (EPPI) systematic review group which maintained a particular focus on pedagogical approaches and found only 68 out of 2095 reports which met its criteria (Nind *et al*, SEN Review Group 2004) This finding acts as a note of caution with regard to the limitations of reviews such as the one we present here. Importantly, Davis and Florian (2004a) also note that reviews inevitably carry with them a cultural and historical specificity which renders them an important but incomplete part of any evidence base. They refer to the EPPI review conducted by Dyson, Howes and Roberts (2002), in which the authors acknowledge the constraints of rigid criteria for inclusion in a review.

With these cautions in mind, our intention is to provide an overview of trends that are seen to be emerging in policy and practice in English primary schools on the basis of a broadly based engagement with an extensive literature which ranges from practitioner research to randomised controlled trials. We have focused on the contested areas of how best to ensure equality of opportunity between those with special educational needs and those without, within a context of the changing agendas set by the *Every Child Matters* framework. In this review we have drawn on research concerning children for whom schools are seeking specialist support, as indicated by the reference to the stage of the SEN Code of Practice *School Action Plus*, as well as those whose learning needs have been formally recognised as requiring additional resources through the statementing procedure.

REGULATION OF THE FIELD: LEGISLATION, POLICY AND PRACTICE

The development of policy and practice in the field of special educational needs education has a long and convoluted history, and has often been (and remains) highly contested. The field has witnessed political struggles between single interest lobby groups, practitioners and their professional associations, economists and

administrators, amongst others. The recent history of the legislation and official guidance bears testament to the continuing complexity of the field. Although by no means the starting point for the debate, the Warnock Report (DES 1978) is often taken as the moment at which the question of the location of provision for pupils with SEN was brought to the attention of a wide constituency of policy makers and practitioners. The international equivalent is the somewhat later Salamanca Statement (UNESCO 1994). The general move has been from policies and practices of segregation in special provision, through a phase where debates were concerned with the integration of individual children into existing systems, and on to the consideration of ways in which systemic responsiveness to a broad diversity of needs could be built in the name of inclusion. In English schools the *number* of pupils with statements[1] in maintained mainstream schools increased by over 95,000 from 1991 to 2000 (90 per cent of the total increase in pupils with statements). However, the number of pupils with statements in special schools stayed relatively constant. By 2000 the *proportion* of pupils with statements educated in special schools had fallen considerably, to around one third in 2000 from around a half in 1991. Both the actual numbers and proportions have since remained broadly constant in mainstream and special schools (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee 2006: p88). By January 2007 some 229,100 (or 2.8 per cent of) pupils across all schools in England had statements of SEN, a slight fall when compared to 2006. The percentage of pupils with statements of SEN placed in maintained mainstream schools (nursery, primary, and secondary) was 57.2 per cent – down 1.5 per cent from the previous year. In 2007 there were 1,333,400 pupils with SEN but without statements, representing 16.4 per cent of pupils across all schools. The 2007 data show an increasing proportion of children with *new* statements of SEN being educated in special schools (up 3 per cent), with a corresponding fall in the proportion educated in maintained mainstream schools (down 2 per cent) or in units in maintained mainstream schools (down 1 per cent) (DfES 2007). However, an overview of the period 1991–2007 suggests that, given that the numbers in special schools remain almost constant, the overall rise in the numbers of pupils with statements explains the decrease in the proportion educated in special schools. Due to changes in placement categories, there may be some discontinuity in the time-series data which renders more detailed analysis problematic (DfES 2007).

The meanings associated with the terms 'segregation', 'integration', and 'inclusion' have witnessed considerable variation over time, culture and context. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2000) has provided startling empirical evidence of variation in interpretation in rates of incidence, even across normative categories of sensory impairment. The field is marked by a profusion of documents that can easily confuse a lay reader or busy practitioner with regard to what is legally enforceable and what is either recommended or advisable. Parliamentary Acts introduce enforceable law. Sections of these are then articulated by enforceable regulations. However, the widely cited 2001 Code of Practice provides guidance. Local policy makers and practitioners must 'have regard to the provisions of the Code'. The latest version of this Code (DfES 2001a) came into effect in England in 2002, having replaced the original guidance

---

[1] A statement of SEN is a legal document which sets out a child's special educational needs as assessed by the Local Authority (LA); sets out the provision (support) which the LA feels is needed; and names the school, type of school or other provision which will give this support.

(DfEE 1994). One clear change was with respect to the advice it provided on the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA) 2001, which became legally enforceable at the same time that this new Code was published. SENDA brought the full force of anti-discrimination legislation to bear on education, which had been specifically exempt from such scrutiny in the past. Statutory guidance was issued in *Inclusive Schooling: children with special educational needs* (DfES 2001b) alongside the non-statutory guidance available in the *SEN Toolkit* (DfES 2001c). However, there is considerable scepticism from both official and academic perspectives about the effectiveness and efficiency of much of the guidance (Farrell 2001). In 1992 the Audit Commission noted a lack of consistency in the degree of need presented by a child who is taken to merit a statement, and the absence of a consistent threshold at which the LA takes over responsibility for the child's education. Both these factors create a number of difficulties, particularly for parents who move from one LA to another (Audit Commission/HMI 1992: note 23). Arguably this account witnesses the effects of a social circumstance which persists today. A considerable body of enforceable legislation and statutory and non-statutory guidance creates a complex set of requirements and suggestions, which allow for a very high degree of local, highly situated interpretation (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee 2006; Ofsted 2004; and Audit Commission Report 2002).

These interpretations often appear to arise as 'trade offs' made between contesting policy agendas, as witnessed in attempts to improve standards as well as to advance the development of inclusive practice. As Ainscow, Booth and Dyson note in their recent ESRC-funded policy analysis:

> From the ground-breaking work of Fulcher (1989) onwards, there has been a powerful tradition in the inclusion literature of scepticism about the capacity of policy to create inclusive systems, either because the policy itself is ambiguous and contradictory, or because it is 'captured' by non-inclusive interests as it interacts with the system as a whole.
>
> Ainscow, Booth and Dyson 2006: p305.

Armstrong (2005) is also critical of New Labour policy, suggesting that interventions with technicist orientations have failed in their own terms to meet narrow performance criteria. He argues that the prevention of social exclusion requires a much broader view of risk and resilience than is embedded in policy. There is some empirical support for this argument. Wilkin *et al* (2005) noted that school exclusion statistics for 2002–2003 show that children with statements of their SEN were nine times more likely to be excluded than children without statements. Jacklin *et al* (2006), with respect to children in public care, and the Audit Commission (2007), with respect to out of county placements, suggest that the consequences for primary school children who embark on a marginal career involving multiple fixed term exclusions, and for whom home life is a significant challenge, face uncertain prospects in the provision that is made by the state for those who 'fall out' of systems.

This scepticism about the policy environment has been followed by concern about the practices that have arisen during this period. Mary Warnock (2005) herself has also recently argued that the policy of inclusion and the associated practice of issuing statements need to be reviewed. The recently convened Select Committee noted significant concerns about the demands and tensions that had arisen in the field:

> The Warnock SEN framework is struggling to remain fit for purpose, and where significant cracks are developing in the system – most starkly demonstrated by the

failure of the system to cope with the rising number of children with autism and social, emotional or behavioural difficulties (SEBD) – this is causing high levels of frustration to parents, children, teachers and local authorities.

House of Commons Education and Skills Committee 2006: p104.

In a controversial report funded by the National Union of Teachers (NUT), MacBeath *et al* (2006) interviewed teachers, children and parents at 20 schools in seven local authorities and concluded that current practice placed far too many demands on teachers and schools. They make particular reference to the need for schools to work together in order to meet the diversity of needs that may be present in any particular community:

Inclusion should not rely on individual schools struggling to contain children with special needs but should be conceived as a collaborative effort, sharing resources in a spirit of mutual support. Special schools should have a significant role to play as an expert resource for mainstream schools while they in turn have a supporting role to play in partnership with special schools.

MacBeath *et al* 2006: p65.

In many ways MacBeath *et al* echo the assertions made in the DfES report *Removing the Barriers to Achievement* (DfES 2004a); that integration with external children's services, earlier intervention, better teacher training and improved expectations would reduce educational difficulty (DFES 2004a: p133).

However, the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee (2006) suggest that the notion of 'flexible continuum of provision' being available in all local authorities to meet the needs of all children is not embedded in much of the guidance (p27). This suggestion is evidenced in the Croll and Moses (2000) study, which drew on interviews with special and mainstream head teachers and education officers to show that there was much support for inclusion as an ideal – but which was not evidenced in policy. They found evidence of significant concerns about feasibility, given the extent and severity of individual needs and structural constraints on the practices of mainstream schooling.

Prevalence of statementing

In the context of almost thirty years of legislation and government guidance, it is perhaps surprising that the level of statementing in primary schools is remarkably static with 1.6 per cent of pupils attracting additional resources. At one level this suggests that schools are, in general, fairly resistant to providing for larger numbers of pupils with SEN. This figure masks the variation between local authorities, with figures for 2006 indicating a range of 0.3 per cent to 3.1 per cent (DfES 2006a). It is likely, given our discussion below, that this reflects not only differences in policies between authorities but also differences between the populations they serve.

Which children are most likely to receive a statement? Figures for 2006 indicate that the most prevalent type of SEN was 'Speech, Language and Communication Needs' (DfES 2006a), a group that challenge teachers to provide access to the curriculum but who typically also require input in the form of speech and language therapy (Lindsay *et al* 2005). Statementing is therefore important for access to health resources and advice as teachers feel particularly unsupported to meet the needs of this group, and few authorities (less than 1 in 10) have dedicated specialist resources. The second largest group amongst those statemented in primary schools are children with autism, who constitute 17.6 per cent of statemented children; a higher proportion than children with moderate learning difficulties, or those with social,

emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD). While the overall prevalence of moderate learning difficulties is higher, fewer children will be statemented. Again it is important to recognise that there will be differences between regions; Scott *et al* (2002) speculate that differences with respect to autism are likely to reflect levels of professional awareness, funding requirements, family migration as well as environmental factors. In addition, we might question whether it also reflects differences in the need for non-educational advice and support, the confidence and attitudes of teachers, along with an increased focus on whole class teaching.

Children with statements however, constitute a relatively small proportion of children for whom teachers have concerns. Some authorities have as many as a further 21 per cent of children who have special needs but no statement, with an average across authorities of 17 per cent. In contrast to figures on statements, the proportion of children with SEN but no statements has steadily increased and is higher in primary schools than secondary. This group is particularly vulnerable when it comes to school admissions (Wilkin *et al* 2005) as schools may recognise their legal obligation to accept pupils with statements but argue a lack of resources for those without. The largest group on School Action Plus are those with moderate learning difficulties with similar proportions of children with SEBD as with Speech, Language and Communication Difficulties and remarkably few (given the statementing level) of children with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD).

On the basis of visits to 115 schools, OFSTED (2004) concluded that just as many school age children and young people were being educated outside the mainstream in 2003 as there were in 1999. This report also found that most schools had not taken appropriate steps to ensure that disabled pupils and pupils with SEN were included effectively in mainstream classes. In an IPPR discussion paper, Peacey (2005) notes the faltering progress towards inclusion and cites specific difficulties that have been understood for some time yet continue to cause problems. Examples include unrecognised language and communication difficulties (Redmond and Rice 1998); classroom acoustics (Shield and Dockrell 2004; Shields, Dockrell, Jeffrey and Tachmatzidis 2002); unfounded assumptions about the learning implications of specific impairments (Nunes and Moreno 1997); the quality of teacher talk and understanding (Dockrell and Lindsay 2001); and instructional planning / curriculum design for groups of children with diverse and often fluctuating needs (Dockrell and Lindsay 2001; Scruggs and Mastropeiri 1996; Wishart and Manning 1996).

Attitudes

There is a clear trend in a number of small-scale surveys and overviews towards an acceptance that the attitudes of teachers, parents and pupils are crucial in the development of inclusive practice (for example Rose 2001; Sebba and Sachdev 1997; Zigmond and Baker 1995). The SEN Review Group of Nind *et al* (2004) found empirical support for inclusion in that it brought about changes in children's attitudes, including improved attitudes toward reading and writing and their own views of their competence, acceptance and self-worth in mainstream settings (p71).

The expectations and attitudes of all those involved when a child with special needs is placed in a mainstream classroom appear to be crucial. MacBeath *et al* (2006) note the pressures that can arise, and suggest the need for adequate preparation, training and support. Talmor, Reiter and Feigin (2005) surveyed 330 Israeli primary school teachers and found that, contrary to the hypothesis of the research, the more positive attitudes to inclusion were associated with teacher 'burnout'. Additionally, the

likelihood of burnout was influenced by the amount of social support the teacher received. Dolton and Newson (2003) surveyed 316 London primary schools and found an association between teacher turnover and pupil progress: the slower the pupil progress the higher the rate of turnover. On the basis of in-depth qualitative data collected from primary and secondary school teachers, pupils and parents, Mujherjee, Lightfoot, and Sloper (2000) note the strongly-felt need for more support when pupils with chronic health conditions are placed in mainstream schools.

DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS

An important question to be asked of primary schools in the light of the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 concerns equality of opportunity. All primary schools are required to have a Disability Equality Scheme in place by December 2007. Schools will be expected to set out their plans for actively promoting disability equality, and for monitoring the impact of their actions on disabled pupils. Equally all authorities and other public bodies, including the DCSF and Ofsted, have a statutory duty to look more closely at children with special educational needs as well as those with a disability but no special educational needs. Recognition of procedures that lead to bias with respect to gender, ethnicity and poverty will form an important part of this. Below we look in more detail at research that explores these issues.

The pervasiveness of gender bias is explored by Sacker *et al* (2001), both with respect to identifying children with SEN and also in the provision of support. Their analysis of historical data is reflected in current figures which continue to confirm the higher incidence of boys than girls, both with and without statements, and with schools recognising difficulties earlier in boys than girls (DfES 2006a). Sacker *et al* (2001) also report on biases with respect to class, revealing that – although more children from manual working class homes were receiving help in school – when scores in reading, mathematics and social adjustment were taken into account, children from professional homes were more likely to be receiving help than those from manual working class homes. They argue with respect to this secondary analysis of data from two cohort studies of children in 1969 and 1980 that schools in areas of deprivation are not given sufficient resources to meet their children's needs.

Croll (2002), analysing more recently-collected data aggregated at school level, draws similar conclusions with respect to both bias and funding. He finds a moderately strong correlation between the level of poverty (as measured by free school meals) and levels of SEN in a school, and an even stronger correlation with achievement. He also finds a difference between children described as having learning difficulties, with those in the least deprived schools being on average one year behind their peers in reading compared to those in the most deprived being on average two to three years behind. Mittler (1999) and Riddell *et al* (1994) have both noted the domination in provision for children of the most powerful and articulate parents who are supported by strong lobby groups and who over-represent the needs of children with dyslexia and autism. There is, therefore, a question over whether current funding arrangements for resource allocations perpetuate inequalities within the system. As Croll states:

> […] if resource allocation for special needs is to be based on audits at the level of such needs in schools, an audit based on schools' own characterization of their pupils will not fairly represent the distribution of such needs.

> Croll 2002: p52.

His research makes a strong case for funding on the basis of social deprivation.

Turning now to look at the over-representation of other groups, Lindsay *et al* (2005) found that even after controlling for the effects of socio-economic disadvantage together with gender and year group, children from some ethnic groups were more likely to be identified as having SEN, particularly with respect to certain types of need. The small group of children with Irish Heritage are 2.6 times more likely to be identified than White British pupils and are more likely to have learning difficulties (specific, moderate and severe) and SEBD, but less likely to be identified with respect to ASD. While Black Caribbean pupils have a similar rate of identification, they are 1.5 times more likely to be identified as having SEBD. Sensory impairment is higher amongst Pakistani and Bangladeshi pupils, while pupils of Chinese origin have the lowest occurrence of identified SEN. Explanations for differences between groups are not simple and again there is considerable variation between LAs:

> 'an interaction between a number of inter-related and often self-perpetuating factors[…] including: teachers' perceptions and expectations of ethnic minority pupils, their understanding of different cultures, pupils' responses and reactions to this, and teachers' reactions to behaviours they consider challenging.

<div align="right">Lindsay et al 2005: p9.</div>

It is perhaps unsurprising that research suggests no single or simple solution to raising achievement, but rather a package of measures designed to impact on ethos, curriculum organisation, teaching approaches and collaboration with parents and the wider community – all more general characteristics of effective schools (Lindsay and Muijs 2006).

SUPPORT

The SENCO[2] has long been seen as the school based mainstay of support for teachers. This is recognised by the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee (2006), which proposes a number of conditions for effective SENCO functioning including training in order to support the work of their colleagues. Yet this key role in the development of inclusive practice is highly pressurised. Crowther *et al*. (2001) warn of the dilemma that exists for SENCOs as they seek to manage limited time resources between slavish compliance to external accountability demands and proactive support for classroom practice. On the basis of the responses of SENCOs in primary schools to a survey undertaken in three local education authorities in the north-east of England, Crowther, Dyson, and Millward (2001) advocate the development of a more proactive role but despair at the 'lack of prospect of legislation or guidance creating the circumstances in which their anticipated role can be realized'. They outline a number of key elements in the transformation to a more proactive role, from a specific example in which a SENCO became:

- Instrumental in articulating a clear and forceful values position for the school, based on a commitment to inclusion and entitlement. As part of this, the language of special education was reconstructed to emphasize success, potential and achievement, rather than the traditional notions of failure, limited ability and underachievement.

---

2   Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator

- Focused on a role that stressed review and development of the processes of teaching and learning, rather than support for individual pupils. This involved using the 'resources' of special education in a direct way to develop pedagogy, rather than to spread them ever more thinly across increasing numbers of pupils experiencing difficulties.

Crowther, Dyson, and Millward 2001: p96.

Four years later, Ellis and Tod (2005) argued that the recent initiatives on behaviour and attendance – for example the National Strategy's 'Behaviour and Attendance' strand (DfES 2003a, 2004b), and the 'Behaviour and Attendance' pilot materials from the Primary National Strategy (DfES 2003a, 2003c, 2003d and 2003e) provide an opportunity for SENCOs to move to adopt such a proactive position and take up a position which is oriented to added value rather than compensation. Cowne (2005) has also noted the need for time, school management and LA support for the development of the work of SENCOs. Webb and Vulliamy (2002) report the findings of the Social Work in Primary Schools (SWIPS) project, which involved qualitative research in 15 schools and a national questionnaire survey, and conclude that primary schools' growing social work responsibilities should be acknowledged by policy makers and resourced adequately, in part through the freeing of SENCO time from teaching responsibilities. As Dyson *et al* (2004) concluded from their DfES-funded study of inclusion and pupil achievement:

> Highly-inclusive and high-performing schools adopt a model of provision based on flexibility of grouping, customisation of provision to individual circumstances and careful individual monitoring, alongside population wide strategies for raising attainment.

Dyson *et al* 2004: p1.

They attribute this approach to a school level commitment, which in their earlier work they suggest can be promoted by SENCOs. In turn, this form of practice is commensurate with forms of distributed leadership that have been advocated elsewhere in the development of inclusive schools (Mayrowetz and Weinstein 1999).

Support from outside the school and interaction between specialist and mainstream provision has also been shown to be important for the prevention of exclusion from both primary and secondary schools. Hallam and Castle (2001) provide evidence that Multi-Disciplinary Behaviour Support Teams (MDBSTs), secondment of mainstream teachers to Pupil Referral Units, and In-School Centres (ISCs) all help to prevent exclusion. Davis and Hopwood (2002) have shown how the provision of additional support can lead to inclusive practice, and that this is most likely to occur when specialist and mainstream staff work in partnership to share their knowledge and diversify their roles.

Dyson and Ainscow (2003) have shown that the local context also influences the way teaching strategies are interpreted, adapted and implemented. Their experience is that evidence from research can be useful in stimulating teachers to reflect upon existing practices and to experiment with new approaches. Florian and Rouse (2001) also found school structures to have an important influence. Their study investigated teacher *knowledge and use* of the strategies thought to promote inclusive practice. They found that, contrary to the literature which suggests that teachers lack knowledge about inclusive practices, they were actually quite knowledgeable, but that *knowing* and *doing* were very different things.

Approaches to teaching

A number of recent reviews of the literature have questioned the assumption, inherent in the definition of 'Special Educational Needs', that some groups of children require a specialised approach to teaching. One of the impediments to such reviews is the paucity of research studies, both with respect to design (as noted in our introduction) and to coverage. Dockrell, Peacey and Lunt (2002) highlight in particular the small sample size of many studies and the lack of longitudinal studies. Davis and Florian (2004b), in a scoping study for the DfES entitled *Teaching Strategies and Approaches for Pupils with Special Educational Needs*, find that although certain teaching approaches are associated with specific categories of SEN they are not sufficiently differentiated from those which are used to teach all children. They acknowledge the importance of the work of Norwich and Lewis (Lewis and Norwich 2001; Norwich and Lewis 2001) on SEN pedagogy. The Lewis and Norwich analysis suggests that effective practice is 'not distinctively different teaching but more practice, more examples, more experience of transfer, and more careful assessment than their peers' (Norwich and Lewis 2001: p326).

A more extensive review followed (Lewis and Norwich 2005), underpinned by two key questions, asking firstly if differences between learners could be 'identified AND systematically linked with learners' needs for differential teaching?' They also asked an important second question 'What are the key criteria for identifying pedagogically useful groups?' Each of the contributors to this book cite the difficulty of definitions and the presence of co-occurring difficulties and in consequence heterogeneous groups. For most of the 15 groups there was no indication of need for specialised programmes with the exception of pupils with a sensory or dual-sensory loss. In two further chapters the respective authors argue for specific pedagogy – in relation to ASD (Jordan 2005) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (Cooper 2005), despite the acknowledged heterogeneity of the group. The commonality of notionally specialist strategies is also evident, with variations of strategies used for children with dyslexia, dyspraxia, moderate and severe learning difficulties, also being useful for other children. Drawing together their review, Lewis and Norwich argue that there is still a value in seeing pedagogic strategies as a continuum with differentiation (or specialisation) being a process of intensification, albeit that strategies at the far end of the continuum may be seen as different in kind and reflect the viewer's stance about learning.

Their analysis also indicates the importance of teachers having relevant knowledge about the nature of the special needs group (particularly in relation to development) which acts as a kind of filter and interacts with knowledge about oneself as a teacher, particularly in relation to value positions; the psychology of learning (for example knowing about self-regulation); and knowledge of curriculum areas and general pedagogic strategies.

Davis and Florian (2004b) draw on Alexander's (2004) suggestion that pedagogy is best thought of in terms of knowledge as well as skill. Their attention is directed towards the ways in which an effective pedagogy may be developed. They conclude their report as follows:

> We found that there is a great deal of literature that might be construed as special education knowledge but that the teaching approaches and strategies themselves were not sufficiently differentiated from those which are used to teach all children to

> justify the term SEN pedagogy. Our analysis found that sound practices in teaching and learning in mainstream *and* special education literatures were often informed by the same basic research [...] The term special education is often used to refer to the process of making such accommodations […] this process of making accommodations does not constitute pedagogy but is an element of it. Our view is that questions about a separate special education pedagogy are unhelpful given the current policy context, and that the more important agenda is about how to develop a pedagogy that is inclusive of all learners.

<div align="right">Davis and Florian 2004b: pp33-34.</div>

There is a common root here with the suggestion put forward by Gulliford (1985) more than 20 years ago when he advocated a problem-solving approach to teaching:

> It is easy, therefore, for teachers to be over-impressed by external influences or the latest new fashion and to underestimate the knowledge and understanding they acquire through the close experience of teaching individuals and classes. Much can be gained from the stimulus of other conceptions and the help of other expertise but the heart of the matter is trying to teach a child who is hard to teach – and learning from the experience.

<div align="right">Gulliford 1985: p32.</div>

A conclusion of there being limited evidence to support the case for specialist pedagogy can refer to the lack of an evidence base as much as to no evidence, or to unsupportive evidence. As with other aspects of provision, the position taken by reviewers is underscored by the values and assumptions they perceive to underpin notions of specialist pedagogy. Despite differing positions of the reviews, one over-arching implication is that there is no simple response that can be made; no single toolkit that can be invoked to solve a particular group of children's difficulties in learning. Elsewhere, Florian and Kershner (in press) argue that teachers need to be able to draw on a combination of teaching strategies with multimodal responses to students whilst recognising the contextual nature of children's learning experiences. Teachers require a good knowledge base to do this.

Collaborative working

This problem-solving approach carries with it significant demands for an individual teacher working in isolation, and yet perhaps the greatest challenge that the move towards an effective form of inclusive education has presented is that of moving to a more collaborative form of practice in which individuals work together within and across professional boundaries. Norwich and Daniels (1997) and Creese *et al* (1998) have shown that teachers value means by which they can support each other and be supported in their work concerning special needs matters within primary schools. Effective collaboration between teachers and teaching assistants (TAs) has been cited as a well established and pervasive response to the demands of teaching in diverse classrooms (Lee and Mawson 1998). Despite the lack of clarity in the definition of the role (Kerry 2005), their work has been seen to be effective as part of the support for pupils with SEBD in primary schools (Groom and Rose 2005). TAs have developed their role from helper to assistant teacher during the period of rapid expansion of numbers of children with statements that occurred during the 1990s, and numbers of TAs expanded greatly after the publication of the first Code of Practice (Webb and Vulliamy 2006). On the basis of a survey of 267 Key Stage 1 (KS1) and KS2 teachers, Galton *et al*. (2002) reported that more half of the teachers received more than five hours help per week from a paid assistant. Smith *et al*. (2004) further suggested that

the highest level of such support was to be found in KS1. Webb and Vulliamy (2006) summarise the work of TAs with respect to special needs support. They:

- gave individual pupils one-to-one support
- monitored individual pupils' attitudes, behaviours and approaches to learning
- developed IEPs
- explained tasks
- further differentiated tasks by providing additional resources and support

in order to:

- meet the needs of individual children
- helped pupils to remain on task
- improved pupil motivation and self esteem
- encouraged and reinforced positive behaviour.

All these activities are highly valued by headteachers, although a lingering concern remains about the additional management role that the presence of TAs in classrooms places on classroom teachers (Webb and Vulliamy 2006).

The *Every Child Matters* (ECM) (DfES 2003b) agenda introduces an emphasis on five broad outcome measures (being healthy, staying safe, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution to society, and achieving economic well-being). The desired practices of inter-agency working, establishing lead professionals and extended services demands a major effort to bring professionals together across the boundaries which have proved to be particularly resistant to change over the years (Leadbetter *et al* 2007). Benefits have been shown to arise from collaborative work between Educational Psychologists and teachers (for example Atkinson *et al* 2006), despite the challenges (for example Norwich and Kelly 2006); teachers and Child and Adolescent Mental Health service professionals, educational psychologists and schools (for example Maddern *et al* 2004); and, in general, between special and mainstream services (for example Mittler 2005). Mentors have been shown to add benefit to efforts to respond to children with behaviour problems in primary schools (St James-Roberts and Singh 2001) and collaborative work between a school-based family social work service and schools has been shown, through a broadly-based cost benefit analysis, to lead to a 250 per cent saving on interventions costs (Pritchard and Williams, 2001). Given the concerns MacBeath *et al* (2006) raise about children with mental health difficulties, which remain undiagnosed even in cases of anxiety and depression in very young children, it is important to note that Stallard (2002, 2005) has shown that collaboration with school nurses in schools in the delivery of short-term group administered cognitive behavioural therapy leads to reductions in both anxiety and depression in primary school children. This effective collaboration with the health services is also witnessed in the positive evaluation of parenting programmes as an intervention with conduct disordered children (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, in collaboration with Social Care Institute for Excellence, 2005).

For many years, collaboration with parents has been discussed as a crucial element of education and as being of particular importance for pupils with special needs (for

example Cunningham and Davis 1985; Mittler and Mittler 1982; Mittler *et al* 1986). Croll (2001) reviewed progress over 20 years, and identified clear markers of improvement. Whilst cautions have been raised concerning the lack of an analysis of power in professional and parent partnerships (for example Todd and Higgins 1998; Riddell, Brown and Duffield 1994), Dockrell, Peacey and Lunt (2002) note that a lack of parental knowledge about specialist services may be ameliorated through community based intervention (see also Wesley, Buysse and Tyndall 1997). They also note that parents in relatively inclusive settings are more positive in their orientation to children with disabilities and difficulties than their counterparts in less inclusive settings (Bennett, DeLuca and Bruns 1997; Duhaney and Salend 2000; Guralnick *et al*. 1995), whilst parents of children with special needs remain concerned about attitudes of child peers and the quality of support available (Petley 1994; Riddell, Brown and Duffield 1994).

PERSONALISATION AND 'PUPIL VOICE'

Alongside the ECM agenda, the Primary Strategy (DfES 2003b) introduces the notion of personalisation of public services, which is being promoted as the next step in the modernisation of the welfare state (Leadbeater 2004). The proposal is that clients become co-producers of services and take a central part in the design and formulation of the particular service that is made available. Personalisation requires citizens who are capable of participating in dialogues about their needs and desires as well as about their own interpretations of their current situation. Just as Black and Wiliam (1998) argued that teachers and pupils should be prepared for self assessment in schools, so the personalisation agenda brings questions about the ways in which the most vulnerable are to be prepared for participating in dialogues about their futures. While most people know what their interests and aspirations are and often have good strategies for achieving them, people with learning difficulties sometimes need carefully negotiated 'reciprocal' help and support with these processes (Shakespeare 2000). Policy has placed an increasing emphasis on the right of all children to have a 'voice' in educational decisions, both with respect to location of provision and, in the later educational years, in negotiating the curriculum. There is a growing body of literature that addresses the ways in which we elicit the voice of children and young people with difficulties in learning (including Lewis and Porter 2004, 2007). This has highlighted the dilemmas of providing a communication system or structure that does not constrain the message or infer a misplaced meaning for pupils with special needs (for example Porter *et al* 2001; Grove *et al* 2000) or, indeed, for other pupils (Fielding 2001). Participation, however, is more than the simple expression of choice and preferences. The ethos of provision where learners have the security and self-esteem to reflect on their relative strengths and difficulties in a process of self-determination has also been shown to be important. Wedell (2005) argues that, whilst the continued emphasis on the 'standards agenda' and the assumption that this is best achieved through whole class teaching persists (p5), it will fail to provide a context in which special educational needs can be effectively addressed.

SEN AND EXCLUSION

Clearly the needs of some pupils are not being effectively addressed if we look at who gets excluded. Accurate figures on exclusion are particularly difficult to gather,

with schools using a variety of (unofficial) responses including lunchtime exclusions, internal exclusions and offering parents the choice of taking their child out of school (Daniels *et al* 2003; Pavey and Visser 2003; MacQuire *et al* 2003; Vulliamy and Webb 2001; Wilkin *et al* 2005). Taking account of these limitations, which indicate greater or lesser degrees of under-reporting, official figures suggest that children with special needs are more likely to be excluded than children without special needs. DfES figures for 2004/5 suggest they are more than three times more likely to be permanently excluded than the rest of the population. This is particularly true of children during the primary school years (Parsons *et al* 2000), where overall levels of exclusion are generally low. Figures for 2004/5 indicate that both permanent and fixed period exclusions reach a peak at age 10, with the highest rates of permanent exclusion being attributed to disruptive, aggressive or threatening behaviour. It is therefore unsurprising that pupils with behavioural difficulties are most at risk (Wilkin *et al* 2005), although other groups are also over-represented (including pupils with ADHD and ASD). Schools report that they tolerate a higher level of unacceptable behaviour from pupils with SEN and are reluctant to exclude them when there is no available alternative provision (Wilkin *et al* 2005). Although exclusion may be drawing attention to the need for further assessment and additional support, it not only damages the child's self esteem but also slows the formal process of assessment (Hayden 1997).

Exclusion has been seen to exacerbate problems in circumstances that the child already finds difficult and can shape life trajectories. There is some evidence that pupils with SEN excluded from primary school are more likely to have records of offending (Parsons *et al* 2001). A number of factors have been cited reflecting the tensions that schools face between inclusion and raising standards, with the hard to reach being those who are more vulnerable to exclusion given an institutional emphasis on league tables and demonstrating 'value-added' in pupil performance (Hayden 1997; Hallam and Castle 2001; Maguire *et al* 2003). Hayden aptly describes the children as being 'severely disadvantaged by the workings of the current education system' (Hayden *et al* 1997: p40).

Follow-up studies of excluded children suggest that children continue to experience difficulties and in many instances require further additional support or changes in school placement (Hayden 1997; Parsons *et al* 2001). This suggests that the primary school is key in determining a better future for these children. A range of interventions have been used in school, some geared towards individual skill development; for example anger management or anti-bullying techniques. Some of these have been more explicitly therapeutic, such as counselling or play therapy, and others focus on the wider context, such as 'Circle of Friends'. In an evaluation of DfES-funded pilot studies, Hallam and Castle (2001) suggest that successful intervention in school is likely to be a whole school issue, to include parents and to also give pupils the skills for managing their own behaviour. Parental contact has been found to be an essential aspect of managing exclusion (Wilkin *et al* 2005). A review of parent-training programmes identified a number of characteristics that are common to successful programmes, including the use of social learning theory to inform a structured 'curriculum', and the inclusion of strategies to improve or enhance relationships (Gould and Richardson 2006).

EVALUATING PROVISION

In common with other areas of education, evaluation research has been driven by the simple question 'What works' (Sebba and Sachdev 1997) and has largely ignored a number of technical and conceptual issues (Florian *et al* 2004). Typically the focus has been on outcome measures, often without explicit underpinning by a theoretical account of the mechanisms for change (Porter and Lacey 2005). A review of research on provision for children with SEN suggested that the focus has more typically been on evaluating interventions for children with SEN in relation to outcome measures such as cognitive gains, language and memory, attitudes, social acceptance, and friendship patterns (Porter and Lacey 2005).

Such evaluation studies could be described as naturalistic with at best quasi experimental designs. Gersten *et al* (2000) put forward a number of recommendations to improve the quality of research, with specific reference to evaluating specialist provision. They suggest a more explicit attention to providing more detail, both in relation to the sample and to the intervention, with explicit use of fidelity checks to ensure that the intervention is being implemented as described. They also point to the importance of control groups matched before assignment to conditions, with group sizes that are sufficiently large given the heterogeneity of the population. Elsewhere, others have criticised the lack of detail on teacher characteristics and on the subtleties of implementation (Nind *et al* 2004).

The development of a national database collecting pupil data keeps the focus on a rather narrowly defined set of attainment outcomes. Theoretically, the data provided through the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) will enable comparisons to be made between groups of pupils receiving different types of provision over time so that schools are able to monitor their relative success compared to other schools. However, there are a number of technical issues that make the usefulness of this data problematic. Pupils are treated as a homogeneous group within their designated category. Evidence has already been cited to illustrate the considerable variation between authorities and schools in whether a pupil receives a statement. Although the statementing process is viewed as more straightforward for those with medical needs (Ofsted 2006), these categories still belie a wide range of needs. A simple look at the profile of children with autistic spectrum disorder reveals considerable variation (Jordan 2005), and that of children with ADHD reveals the co-occurrence of disability (Cooper 2005). The presence of additional needs within the populations of pupils with specified needs make for a group with diverse and complex needs. As Florian *et al* (2004) ask, 'what does it mean to describe a student as having "moderate learning difficulties" as a primary need and "emotional and behavioural difficulties" as a secondary need, rather than the other way around?' (p117).

From 2007 it is likely that schools will be required to record the achievement of pupils working below level one of the national curriculum using the 'P Scales'. Considerable concern has been raised about the sensitivity of these scales to provide a measure of progress in all children (Male 2000; Lewis *et al* 2003). These scales are increasingly used in primary schools to inform the curriculum using commercially available database systems for recording.

In addition to quantifying progress, research has looked at ways of identifying the costs associated with services (Sleed *et al* 2006; Romeo *et al* 2006) owing much to the notion of 'best value'. A distinction to be made, between studies that compare the relative benefits of provision/services, the cost utility, and those of cost effectiveness,

is how much it costs to produce a particular outcome. Crowther *et al* (1998), looking specifically at the costs of resourcing provision for pupils with moderate learning difficulties, raise a concern that too little attention is paid to the question of efficiency, effectiveness and equity in the deployment of resources. Education may bear the lion's share of service costs in the primary school years (Knapp *et al* 1999), with an equally high cost to those borne by the family (Knapp *et al* 1999; Romeo *et al* 2006), demonstrating the importance of involving all stakeholders in the evaluation process.

From 2007 schools will be producing schemes to demonstrate how they will be monitoring the impact of their policies and practices on children with disabilities. OECD interpret equity with respect to four measures:

- Equity of access or equality of opportunity;

- Equity in terms of learning environment or equality of means;

- Equity in production or equality of achievement; and

- Equity of realisation or exploitation of results.

<div align="right">OECD 2004: p17.</div>

A recent study by Ofsted (2006) found no difference between mainstream and special schools with respect to pupils with SEN making 'outstanding progress', but highlights the strength of resourced provision, particularly with respect to ethos, the provision of specialist staff and the provision of focused professional development for staff.

At a school level, we would argue, the process of evaluation should be informed through consultation with pupils. This opens out the possibility for schools of getting a clearer notion of what contributes to pupils' sense of wellbeing. Recognition of the importance of eliciting children's views is enshrined in legislation around the Code of Practice, echoing the torrent of global initiatives setting out children's rights (Lewis and Porter 2007). Caveats have often been given with respect to age and ability, and it is noticeable in the research literature how much has focussed on children of secondary school age. However, a recent study by Stafford *et al* (2003) contrasts the enthusiasm with which primary age children respond to consultation to the more measured and perhaps cynical approach of pupils in the secondary years. The study highlights the importance of being aware of children's priorities and their agendas.

A number of methods have been developed for use with less articulate children, including those with language difficulties. Aubry and Dahl (2006), in a review of the literature with reference to children who are vulnerable and have special educational needs, suggest the importance of activity-based methods and the attractiveness of computers. They highlight the relationship between question format and responsiveness, an issue pursued further by Dockrell (2004) in an exploration of the linguistic and cognitive demands placed on children through the use of interviewing techniques. Questions may not be the most useful format for children with special educational needs; Lewis (2002) suggests the value of using statements and Arksey *et al* (2005) of using social stories – particularly with children with ASD. Research has pointed to the importance of the ethos of the school in facilitating consultation (Norwich and Kelly 2006), with a study by Woolfson *et al* (2006) hearing from children about their need for an appropriate environment with approachable people and the availability of an advocate.

> Consultation should be a genuine attempt to listen seriously to young people's views and act on them, not just a window-dressing exercise conducted for the benefit of adults about issues already decided.
>
> Stafford *et al* 2003: p365.

It is important that the diversity of pupil views is heard.

CONCLUSION

This review has put forward the trends in emerging policy and practice, given a diverse and methodologically challenged literature on primary aged children with learning difficulties. Little has been stated specifically in relation to special schools, largely reflecting the tendency historically to make few distinctions in the literature on special schools between children of primary and secondary school age (until the point of transition from school). Instead we have focussed on the contested areas of how best to ensure equality of opportunity between those with special educational needs and those without, within a context of the changing agendas set by the *Every Child Matters* framework.

Despite the rhetoric of policy documents, nationally collected statistics suggest that there is a relatively stable proportion of children who are identified for additional resources and that the percentage of those pupils who are ultimately placed in specialist provision is also stable. This, however, belies an increasing number of pupils for whom teachers have concern, and who are placed at School Action Plus on the Code of Practice. Two groups of pupils are more likely to be statemented in the primary school – those with Speech Language and Communication Needs and those with Autistic Spectrum Disorder – and we have no historic data on pupil categories to enable us to identify the extent to which this reflects an increased emphasis on speaking and listening and whole class teaching, or whether it simply reflects the procedures necessary to access non-educational support.

The current system allows for a local, highly-situated interpretation and it is apparent that the methodology for allocating resources privileges some children over others. Children with dyslexia and autism have powerful lobby groups and are over-represented within the system. There is clear evidence that family background makes a difference with children from more affluent backgrounds receiving more help, *and* for less significant levels of difficulty, than those from poorer homes. There is a pervasive gender bias, with not only a higher incidence amongst boys than girls but earlier recognition of boys' difficulties. Children from certain ethnic minority groups are more likely to be identified as having SEN than others, controlling both for gender and socio-economic disadvantage. Finally, pupils with SEN are more likely to be excluded – particularly during the primary school years, exacerbating the child's difficulties and shaping their life trajectory.

As we have seen, categories of learning difficulty have different meanings in different settings and this variation is made more prominent when coupled with widely varied levels of statementing across authorities. Arguably this makes it difficult to place much reliance on the use of aggregated data. It also calls to question the system for allocating resources; Croll (2002) has argued powerfully for the advantage of an allocation system based on free school meals. The introduction of the Disability Equality Duty will further highlight these anomalies and the disadvantages faced by pupils with SEN.

The contesting policy agendas of raising standards in attainment and of inclusive schooling create considerable tensions within school. Data on the relationship between positive teacher attitudes and burnout are evidence of the challenges faced by teachers. It is perhaps unsurprising in this context that Ofsted (2006) favours resource centres, given a lack of difference in the progress of pupils in mainstream and special schools.

The mainstay of support for teachers in primary schools has long been the SENCO although in primary schools this may well be taken on by the head or deputy, making the management of limited time and the demands of procedures for external accountability even more onerous. Research suggests that approaches for teaching pupils with difficulties in learning are not distinctively different, although the knowledge that underpins their use may be. There is much to be gained from more collaborative forms of practice with individuals working together across professional boundaries in a problem-solving way. This has been found to be particularly effective with respect to children with conduct disorders and those at risk of mental health problems, two groups that are most at risk of exclusion.

Policy has placed an increasing amount of emphasis on 'children's voice'; indeed the importance of this is well represented by the requirement of schools to set out their plans for actively promoting equality of opportunity through consultation with disabled groups. This is highly consistent with the personalisation agenda and the increased participation of pupils in decisions about their learning. Primary schools play an important role in developing pupils' capacity for dialogues about their learning, including self-assessment and target setting.

We started this review with concerns about the quality of the evidence base and we finish with concerns about the national focus on narrowly-defined attainment outcomes that arguably marginalise further those pupils who experience difficulties in learning. Decision-making on the basis of single indicators, coupled with the use of a category system that assumes comparability, privileges some groups to the detriment of others – namely those with special educational needs. If the field is to move forward then research has to achieve a more decisive focus on the process rather than the outcome, with an identification of the mechanisms for change, for it to clearly inform policy and practice.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., and Dyson, A. (2006) 'Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England.' *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 10(4–5): pp. 295–308.

Alexander, R.J. (2004) 'Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education.' *Cambridge Journal of Education* 34(1): pp. 7- 33.

Arksey, H., Kemp, P.A., Glendinning, C., Kotchetkova, I., Tozer, R. (2005) *Carers' Aspirations and Decisions Around Work and Retirement.* Department for Work and Pensions Research Report, Vol. 290. Corporate Document Services: Leeds.

Armstrong, D. (2005) 'Reinventing ''inclusion'': New Labour and the cultural politics of special education'. *Oxford Review of Education* 31(1): pp.135–151.

Atkinson, C., Regan, T. & Williams, C. (2006) 'Working collaboratively with teachers to promote effective learning'. *Support for Learning* 21(1): pp.33-39.

Aubrey C. and Dahl S., (2006) 'Children's Voices: the views of vulnerable children on their service providers and the relevance of services they receive'. *British Journal of Social Work* 36: pp. 21-39.

Audit Commission (2002) *Special Educational Needs – a mainstream issue*. London: HMSO.

Audit Commission (2007) *Out of Authority Placements for Special Educational Needs.* London: HMSO.

Audit Commission / Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1992) *Getting in on the Act: provision for pupils with special educational needs: the national picture.* London: HMSO.

Bennett, T., DeLuca, D. and Bruns, D. (1997) 'Putting inclusion into practice: perspectives of teachers and parents'. *Exceptional Children* 64: pp.115-131.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D (1998) 'Inside the Black Box: raising standards through classroom assessment'. *Phi Delta Kappan* 80(2): pp.139-148.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. & Wiliam, D. (2003) *Assessment for Learning: putting it into practice.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Cooper, P. (2005) 'AD/HD', in A. Lewis & B. Norwich (Eds) (2005) *Special Teaching for Special Children? Pedagogies for Inclusion.* Maidenhead: Open University.

Cowne, E. (2005) 'What do special educational needs coordinators think they do?' *Support for Learning* 20(2): pp.61-8.

Creese, A. Norwich, B. and Daniels, H. (1998) 'The prevalence and usefulness of collaborative teacher groups for SEN: results of a national survey'. *Support for Learning* 13(3): pp.109 – 114.

Croll, P. (2001) 'Teacher contact with parents of children with special educational needs: a comparison over two decades'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 1(2): online at www.nasen.uk.com/ejournal.

Croll, P. & Moses, D. (2000) 'Ideologies and utopias: education professionals' views of inclusion'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 15(1): pp.1–12.

Croll, P. (2002) 'Social deprivation, school-level achievement and special educational needs'. *Educational Research* 44(1): pp. 43 – 53.

Crowther, D. Dyson, A. & Milward, A. (2001) 'Supporting Pupils with special educational needs: issues and dilemmas for special needs coordinators in English primary schools'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 16(2): pp. 85 – 97.

Crowther, D., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (2001) 'Supporting pupils with special educational needs: issues and dilemmas for special needs coordinators in English primary schools'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 16(2): pp. 85–97.

Crowther, D., Dyson, A., Elliott, J. & Milward, A. (1998) *Costs and Outcomes for Pupils with Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) in Special and Mainstream Schools.* London: DfEE.

Cunningham, C. & Davis, H. (1985) *Working with Parents.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Curtin, M. & Clarke, G. (2005) 'Listening to young people with physical disabilities' experiences of education'. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education* 52(3): pp. 195 – 214.

Daniels, H. Cole T., Sellman, E., Sutton, J., Visser, J. & Bedward, J. (2003) *Study of Young People Permanently Excluded from School.* Nottingham: DfES.

Davis, P. & Florian, L. (2004a) 'Searching the literature on teaching strategies and approaches for pupils with special educational needs: knowledge production and synthesis'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 4(3): pp. 142 – 147.

Davis, P. & Florian, L. (2004b) *Teaching Strategies and Approaches for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: A Scoping Study.* London: DfES.

Davis, P. & Hopwood, V. (2002) 'Including Children with a Visual Impairment in the Mainstream Primary School Classroom'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 2(3): pp. 1-11.

Department of Education and Science (1978) *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People* (The Warnock Report). London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1994) *The Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001a) *Special Educational Needs Code of Practice.* London: DfES.

DfES (2001b) *Inclusive Schooling: children with special educational needs.* London: DfES.

DfES (2001c) *SEN Toolkit.* London: DfES.

DfES (2003a) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Behaviour and Attendance Training Materials: Core Day 1.* London: DfES.

DfES (2003b) *Every Child Matters (Green Paper).* London: DfES.

DfES (2003c) *Primary National Strategy: Behaviour and Attendance: Developing Skills* (pilot materials). London: DfES.

DfES (2003d) *Primary National Strategy: Developing Children's Social, Emotional and Behavioural Skills: a whole-curriculum approach* (pilot materials). London: DfES.

DfES (2003e) *Primary National Strategy: Developing Children's Social, Emotional and Behavioural Skills: Guidance* (pilot materials). London: DfES.

DfES (2004a) *Removing Barriers to Achievement: the Government's strategy for SEN.* http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/senstrategy (accessed 14 April 2004).

DfES (2004b) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Behaviour and Attendance Training Materials: Core Day 2.* London: DfES.

DfES (2006) *First Release. Special Educational Needs in England, SFR 23/2006.* London: DfES.

DfES (2007) *First Release. Special Educational Needs in England, SFR 20/2007.* London: DfES.

Dockrell, J.E. (2004) 'How can studies of memory and language enhance the authenticity, validity and reliability of interviews?' *British Journal of Learning Disabilities* 32(4): pp. 161–165.

Dockrell, J.E. & Lindsay, G. (2001) 'Children with specific speech and language difficulties: the teachers' perspective'. *Oxford Review of Education* 27(3): pp. 369-394.

Dockrell, J., Peacey, N. & Lunt, I. (2002) *Literature review: meeting the needs of children with special educational needs.* London: Institute of Education.

Dolton, P. & Newson, D. (2003) 'The relationship between teacher turnover and school performance'. *London Review of Education* 1(2): pp. 133-140.

Duhaney, L.M. & Salend, S.J. (2000) 'Parental perceptions of inclusive placements'. *Remedial and Special Education* 21(2): pp.121-128.

Dyson, A. & Ainscow, M. (2003) *Standards and inclusive education: schools squaring the circle, unpublished paper.* University of Manchester, Faculty of Education.

Dyson, A., Farrell, P., Hutcheson, G. & Polat, F. (2004) *Inclusion and Pupil Achievement.* London: DfES.

Dyson, A., Howes, A. & Roberts, B. (2002) 'A Systematic Review of the Effectiveness of School-Level Actions for Promoting Participation by All Students', in *Research Evidence in Education Library.* London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London. www.eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/review/review_groups/inclusion/review_one.htm.

Ellis, S. & Tod, J. (2005) 'Including SENCOs in behaviour improvement: an exploration of the behaviour and attendance strands of the National Strategies'. *Support for Learning* 20(2): pp. 83-89.

Farrell, P. (2001) 'Special education in the last twenty years: have things really got better?' *British Journal of Special Education* 28(1).

Fielding, M. (2001*) '*Target Setting, Policy Pathology and Student Perspectives: learning to labour in new times', in M. Fielding (Ed.) *Taking Education Really Seriously: Four Years Hard Labour.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Florian, L. & Kershner, R. (in press) 'Inclusive Pedagogy', in Daniels, H., Lauder, H. and Porter, J. (Eds.) *The Routledge Education Companion*. London: Routledge.

Florian, L. & Rouse, M. (2001) 'Inclusive practice in secondary schools', in R. Roseand & I. Grosvenor (eds.) *Doing Research in Special Education*. London: David Fulton.

Florian, L., Rouse, M., Black-Hawkins, K. & Jull, S. (2004) 'What can national data-sets tell us about inclusion and pupil achievement?' *British Journal of Special Education* 31(3): pp. 151-121.

Fulcher, G. (1989) *Disabling policies: a comparative approach to educational policy and disability.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Galton, M., MacBeath, J. with Page, C. & Steward, S. (2002) *A Life in Teaching? The impact of change on primary teachers' working lives*. London: National Union of Teachers.

Gersten R., Baker, S. & Lloyd, J.W. (2000) 'Designing High-Quality Research in Special Education: group experimental design'. *The Journal of Special Education* 34(1): pp.2 -18.

Gould, N., & Richardson, J. (2006) 'Parent-training/education programmes in the management of children with conduct disorders: developing an integrated evidence-based perspective for health and social care'. *Journal of Children's Service* 4(4): pp. 47-60.

Groom, B. & Rose, R. (2005) 'Supporting the inclusion of pupils with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in the primary school: the role of teaching assistants'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 5(1): pp. 20 – 30.

Grove, N., Porter, J., Bunning, K., & Olsson, C. (2000) 'Interpreting the Meaning of Communication by People with Severe and Profound Learning Difficulties: theoretical and methodological issues'. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* 12(3): pp.190-203.

Gulliford, R. (1985) *Teaching Children with Learning Difficulties.* Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Guralnick, M.J., Connor, R.T. & Hammond, M. (1995) 'Parent perspectives of peer relationships and friendships in integrated and specialised programs'. *American Journal on Mental Retardation* 99(5): pp. 457-476.

Hallam, S. & Castle, F. (2001) 'Exclusion from school: what can help prevent it?' *Educational Review* 53(2): pp.169-179.

Hayden C. (1997) 'Exclusion from Primary School: children "in need" and children with "special educational need"'. *Emotional and behavioural Difficulties* 2(3): pp. 36-44.

House of Commons Education and Skills Committee (2006) *Special Educational Needs: Third Report of Session 2005–06, Volume I*. London: The Stationery Office.

Jacklin, A., Robinon, C. & Torrence, H. (2006) 'When lack of data is data: do we really know who our looked-after children are?' *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 21(1): pp. 1 – 20.

Jordan, R., (2005) 'Autistic Spectrum Disorders', in A. Lewis & B. Norwich (Eds.) *Special Teaching for Special Children? Pedagogies for Inclusion*. Maidenhead: Open University.

Kerry, T. (2005) 'Towards a typology for conceptualising the roles of teaching assistants'. *Educational Review* 57(3): pp 20-30.

Knapp, M, Scott, S., & Davies, J. (1999) 'The Cost of Antisocial Behaviour in Younger Children'. *Clinical Psychology and Psychiatry* 4(4): pp. 457-473.

Law, J., Dockrell, J.E., Castelnuovo, E., Williams, K., Seeff, B. & Normand, C. (2006) 'Early years centres for pre-school children with primary language difficulties: what do they cost, and are they cost-effective?' *International Journal of Language* 41(1): pp. 67–81.

Leadbeater, C. (2004) *Personalisation Through Participation: A new script for public services.* London: Demos.

Leadbetter, J., Daniels, H., Brown, S., Edwards, A., Middleton, D., Popova, A., Apostolov, A. & Warmington, P. (2007) 'Professional learning within multi-agency children's services: researching into practice'. *Educational Research* 49(1): pp. 83 – 98.

Lee, B. & Mawson, C. (1998) *Survey of Classroom Assistants*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Lewis, A. (2002) 'Accessing children's views about inclusion and integration'. *Support for Learning* 17(3): pp. 110-116.

Lewis, A., Lindsay, G. & Phillips, E. (2003) 'Assessment in special schools: national early assessment procedures and pupils attending special schools in England'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 18(2): pp. 141-153.

Lewis, A. & Norwich, B. (2001) 'A Critical Review of Systematic Evidence concerning Distinctive Pedagogies with Pupils with Difficulties in Learning'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 1(1): http://www.nasen.org.uk

Lewis, A. & Norwich, B. (2005) *Special Teaching for Special Children? Pedagogies for Inclusion.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Lewis A., & Porter J. (2007) 'Research and Pupil Voice', in L. Florian (Ed.) *Handbook of Special Education.* London: Sage.

Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J.E., Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2005) 'Local education authorities' approaches to provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 20(3): pp. 329 – 345.

Lindsay, G. and Muijs, D. (2006) 'Challenging underachievement in boys'. *Educational Research* 48(3): pp. 313 – 32.

MacBeath, J., Galton, M., Steward, S., MacBeath, A. & Page, C. (2006) *The Costs of Inclusion*. London: National Union of Teachers.

Maddern, L., Franey, J., McLaughlin, V. & Cox, S. (2004) 'An evaluation of the impact of an inter-agency intervention programme to promote social skills in primary school children'. *Educational Psychology in Practice* 20(2): pp. 135 – 155.

Maguire, M., Macrae, S. & Milbourne, L. (2003) 'Early interventions: preventing school exclusions in the primary setting'. *Westminster Studies in Education* 26(1).

Male, D. (2000) 'Target setting in schools for children with severe learning difficulties: headteachers' perceptions'. *British Journal of Special Education,* 27(1): pp. 6-12.

Mayrowetz, D. & Weinstein, C.C. (1999) 'Sources of leadership education: creating schools for all children'. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35(3): pp. 423 – 449.

Mittler, P. (1999) 'Equal opportunities for whom?'. *British Journal of Special Education* 26: pp. 3 – 7.

Mittler, P. (2005) 'Building bridges between special and mainstream services'. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal* 16(1): pp. 3 – 15.

Mittler, P. & Mittler, H. (1982) *Partnership with Parents.* Stratford-upon-Avon: National Council for Special Education.

Mittler, P., Mittler, H. & McConachie, H. (1986) *Working Together: guidelines for collaboration between professionals and parents of children and young people with disabilities.* Paris: UNESCO.

Mujherjee, S., Lightfoot, J. & Sloper, P. (2000) 'The inclusion of pupils with a chronic health condition in mainstream school: what does it mean for teachers?' *Educational Research* 42(1): pp. 59 – 72.

National Institute For Health And Clinical Excellence/ Social Care Institute For Excellence (2005) *Overview Parent-training/education Programmes for Children with Conduct Disorders.* London: NICE.

Nind, M. and Wearmouth, J. with Collins, J., Hall, K., Rix, J. & Sheehy, K. (2004) *A systematic review of pedagogical approaches that can effectively include children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms with a particular focus on peer group interactive approaches.* EPPI-Centre: London.

Norwich, B. & Daniels, H. (1997) 'Teacher support teams for SEN in primary schools: evaluating a teacher focused support scheme'. *Educational Studies*, 23(1): pp. 5-23.

Norwich, B., Kelly, N. & Educational Psychologists in Training (2006) 'Evaluating children's participation in SEN procedures: lessons for educational psychologists'. *Educational Psychology in Practice* 22(3): pp. 255 – 271.

Norwich, B. & Lewis, A. (2001) 'Mapping a Pedagogy for Special Educational Needs'. *British Educational Research Journal* 27(3): pp. 313 – 329.

Nunes, T. & Moreno, C (1997) 'Solving Word Problems with Different Ways of Representing the Task: how do deaf children perform?' *Equals: Mathematics and Special Educational Needs* 3(2): pp. 15 – 17.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2000) *Special Needs: Statistics and Indicators.* Paris: OECD.

OECD (2004) *Equity in Education: students with disabilities, learning difficulties and disadvantages.* Paris: OECD.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2004) *Special Educational Needs and Disability: towards inclusive schools.* Manchester: Ofsted.

Ofsted (2006) *Inclusion: does it matter where pupils are taught?* Manchester: Ofsted.

Parsons, C., Godfrey, R., Howlett, K., Hayden, C. & Martin, T. (2001) *Excluding Primary School Children – The Outcomes Six Years On.* Oxford: NAPCE.

Parsons, C. & Howlett, K. (2000) 'Investigating the reintegration of permanently excluded young people in England'. *INCLUDE* (http://www.include.org.uk/) .

Pavey S. & Visser J. (2003) 'Primary Exclusions: are they rising?' *British Journal of Special Education* 30(4): pp. 180-186.

Peacey, N. (2005) *Are All Children Special? A Discussion Paper.* London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Petley, K. (1994) 'An investigation into the experiences of parents and head teachers involved in the integration of primary aged children with Down's Syndrome into mainstream school'. *Down's Syndrome: Research and Practice* 2: pp. 91-96.

Porter J., Downs C., Morgan M. & Ouvry, C. (2001) 'Interpreting Communication of People with Profound and Severe Learning Difficulties'. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities* 29(1): pp. 12-16.

Porter J, & Lacey P. (2005) *Researching Learning Difficulties: A Guide for Practitioners* London: Sage.

Pritchard, C. & Williams, R. (2001) 'A three-year comparative longitudinal study of a school-based social work family service to reduce truancy, delinquency and school exclusions'. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 23(1): pp. 23 – 43.

Redmond, S.M & Rice, M.L (1998) 'The Socio-Emotional Behaviors of Children with SLI [specific language impairments]: social adaptation or social deviance?' *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing* 41: pp. 688-700.

Riddell, S., Brown, S. & Duffield, J. (1994) 'Parental power and special educational needs: the case of specific learning difficulties'. *British Educational Research Journal* 20(3): pp. 327-344.

Romeo, R., Knapp M., & Scott, S (2006) 'Economic cost of severe antisocial behaviour in children and who pays it'. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 18(8): pp. 547- 553.

Rose, R. (2001) 'Primary school teacher perceptions of the conditions required to include pupils with special educational needs'. *Educational Review* 53(2): pp. 147-156.

Sacker, A., Schoon, I. & Bartley, M. (2001) 'Sources of bias in special needs provision in mainstream primary schools: evidence from two British cohort studies'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 16(3): pp. 259 – 276.

Scott, F.J., Baron-Cohen, S., Bolton, P. & Brayne, C. (2002) 'Brief Report Prevalence of autism spectrum conditions in children ages 5–11 years in Cambridgeshire, UK'. *Autism* 6(3): pp. 231 – 237.

Scruggs, T. & Mastropeiri, M. (1996) 'Teacher Perceptions of Mainstreaming and Inclusion'. *Exceptional Children* 63(1): pp. 59-74.

Sebba, J. & Sachdev, D. (1997) *What Works in Inclusive Practice?* London: Barnardos.

Shakespeare, T. (2000) *Help.* Birmingham: Venture Press.

Shield, B.M. & Dockrell, J.E. (2004) 'External and internal noise surveys of London primary schools'. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 115: pp. 730-738.

Shield, B.M., Dockrell, J.E., Jeffrey, R. & Tachmatzidis, I. (2002) *The effects of noise on the attainments and cognitive performance of primary school children.* Report to the DOH/DETR.

Sleed, M., Beecham, J., Knapp, M., McAuley, C. & McCurry, N. (2006) 'Assessing services, supports and costs for young families under stress'. *Child: Care, Health and Development* 32(1): pp. 101 – 110.

Smith, P. Whitby, K. and Sharp, C. (2004) *The employment and deployment of teaching assistants.* (LGA research report 5/04) Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

St James-Roberts, I. & Singh, C.S. (2001) 'Can mentors help primary school children with behaviour problems?' *Home Office Research Study 233,* London: Home Office Research.

Stafford, A., Laybourn, A., Hill, M. & Walker, M. (2003) '"Having a say": children and young people talk about consultation'. *Children and Society* 17: pp. 361 – 373.

Stallard, P. (2002) *Think Good – Feel Good: A Cognitive Behaviour Therapy Workbook for Children and Young People.* Chichester: John Wiley.

Stallard, P. (2005) *A Clinicians Guide to Think Good Feel Good: the use of CBT with children and young people.* Winchester: John Wiley.

Talmor, R., Reiter, S. & Feigin, N. (2005) 'Factors relating to regular education teacher burnout in inclusive education'. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 20(2): pp. 215 – 229.

Todd, E.S. & Higgins, S. (1998) 'Powerless in professional and parent partnerships'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 19(2): pp.227-240.

UNESCO (1994) *Final Report: World conference on special needs education: access and quality.* Paris: UNESCO.

Vulliamy, G. & Webb, R. (2001) 'The social construction of school exclusion rates: implications for evaluation methodology'. *Educational Studies* 27(3): pp. 357-370.

Warnock, M. (2005) 'Special Educational Needs: a new look'. *Impact No 11.* London: Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.

Webb, R. & Vulliamy, G. (2002) 'The social work dimension of the primary teacher's role'. *Research Papers in Education* 17(2): pp. 165–184.

Webb, R. & Vulliamy, G. (2006) *Coming full circle?: New Labour's education policies on primary school teachers' work.* London: Association of Teachers and Lecturers.

Wedell, K. (2005) 'Dilemmas in the quest for inclusion'. *British Journal of Special Education* 32(1): pp. 3-11.

Wesley, P.W., Buysse, V. and Tyndall, S. (1997) 'Family and professional perspectives on early intervention: an exploration using focus groups'. *Topics in Early Childhood Education 17*: pp. 435-456.

Wilkin, A., Archer, T., Ridley, K., Fletcher-Campbell, F. & Kinder, K. (2005) *Admissions and Exclusion of Pupils with Special Educational Needs.* London: DfES.

Wishart, J.G. & Manning, G. (1996) 'Trainee teachers' attitudes to inclusive education for children with Down's Syndrome'. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 40: pp. 56-65.

Woolfson, R, Harker, M., Lowe, D., Shields, M., Banks, M., Campbell, L., & Ferguson, E. (2006) 'Consulting About Consulting: young people's views of consultation'. *Educational Psychology in Practice* 22(4): pp. 337–353.

Zigmond, N. & Baker, J.M. (1995) 'Current and future practices in inclusive schooling'. *The Journal of Special Education* 29(2): pp. 245–250.

APPENDIX 1

THE PRIMARY REVIEW PERSPECTIVES, THEMES AND SUB-THEMES

The Primary Review's enquiries are framed by three broad perspectives, the third of which, primary education, breaks down into ten themes and 23 sub-themes. Each of the latter then generates a number of questions. The full framework of review perspectives, themes and questions is at www.primaryreview.org.uk

The Review Perspectives

P1   Children and childhood
P2   Culture, society and the global context
P3   Primary education

The Review Themes and Sub-themes

T1   Purposes and values
    T1a   Values, beliefs and principles
    T1b   Aims

T2   Learning and teaching
    T2a   Children's development and learning
    T2b   Teaching

T3   Curriculum and assessment
    T3a   Curriculum
    T3b   Assessment

T4   Quality and standards
    T4a   Standards
    T4b   Quality assurance and inspection

T5   Diversity and inclusion
    T5a   Culture, gender, race, faith
    T5b   Special educational needs

T6   Settings and professionals
    T6a   Buildings and resources
    T6b   Teacher supply, training, deployment & development
    T6c   Other professionals
    T6d   School organisation, management & leadership
    T6e   School culture and ethos

T7   Parenting, caring and educating
    T7a   Parents and carers
    T7b   Home and school

T8   Beyond the school
    T8a   Children's lives beyond the school
    T8b   Schools and other agencies

T9   Structures and phases
    T9a   Within-school structures, stages, classes & groups
    T9b   System-level structures, phases & transitions

T10   Funding and governance
    T10a   Funding
    T10b   Governance

APPENDIX 2

THE EVIDENTIAL BASIS OF THE PRIMARY REVIEW

The Review has four evidential strands. These seek to balance opinion seeking with empirical data; non-interactive expressions of opinion with face-to-face discussion; official data with independent research; and material from England with that from other parts of the UK and from international sources. This enquiry, unlike some of its predecessors, looks outwards from primary schools to the wider society, and makes full though judicious use of international data and ideas from other countries.

Submissions

Following the convention in enquiries of this kind, submissions have been invited from all who wish to contribute. By June 2007, nearly 550 submissions had been received and more were arriving daily. The submissions range from brief single-issue expressions of opinion to substantial documents covering several or all of the themes and comprising both detailed evidence and recommendations for the future. A report on the submissions will be published in late 2007.

Soundings

This strand has two parts. The *Community Soundings* are a series of nine regionally based one to two day events, each comprising a sequence of meetings with representatives from schools and the communities they serve. The Community Soundings took place between January and March 2007, and entailed 87 witness sessions with groups of pupils, parents, governors, teachers, teaching assistants and heads, and with educational and community representatives from the areas in which the soundings took place. In all, there were over 700 witnesses. The *National Soundings* are a programme of more formal meetings with national organisations both inside and outside education. National Soundings A are for representatives of non-statutory national organisations, and they focus on educational policy. National Soundings B are for outstanding school practitioners; they focus on school and classroom practice. National Soundings C are variably-structured meetings with statutory and other bodies. National Soundings A and B will take place between January and March 2008. National Soundings C are outlined at 'other meetings' below.

Surveys

30 surveys of published research relating to the Review's ten themes have been commissioned from 70 academic consultants in universities in Britain and other countries. The surveys relate closely to the ten Review themes and the complete list appears in Appendix 3. Taken together, they will provide the most comprehensive review of research relating to primary education yet undertaken. They are being published in thematic groups from October 2007 onwards.

Searches

With the co-operation of DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA and OECD, the Review is re-assessing a range of official data bearing on the primary phase. This will provide the necessary demographic, financial and statistical background to the Review and an important resource for its later consideration of policy options.

Other meetings (now designated National Soundings C)

In addition to the formal evidence-gathering procedures, the Review team meets members of various national bodies for the exchange of information and ideas: government and opposition representatives; officials at DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA, GTC, NCSL and IRU; representatives of the teaching unions; and umbrella groups representing organisations involved in early years, primary education and teacher education. The first of three sessions with the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee took place in March 2007. Following the replacment of DfES by two separate departments, DCSF and DIUS, it is anticipated that there will be further meetings with this committee's successor.

APPENDIX 3

THE PRIMARY REVIEW INTERIM REPORTS

The interim reports, which will be released in stages from October 2007, include the 30 research surveys commissioned from external consultants together with reports on the Review's two main consultation exercises: the community soundings (87 witness sessions with teachers, heads, parents, children and a wide range of community representatives, held in different parts of the country during 2007) and the submissions received from large numbers of organisations and individuals in response to the invitation issued when the Review was launched in October 2006.

The list below starts with the community soundings and submissions reports, which have been written by the Review team. Then follow the 30 research surveys commissioned from the Review's consultants. They are arranged by Review theme, not by the order of their publication. Report titles may be subject to minor amendment.

Once published, each interim report, together with a briefing summarising its findings, may be downloaded from the Review website, www.primaryreview.org.uk .

REPORTS ON PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

1. *Community Soundings: the Primary Review regional witness sessions* (Robin Alexander and Linda Hargreaves)

2. *Submissions received by the Primary Review*

PURPOSES AND VALUES

3. *Aims and values in primary education*. Research survey 1/1 (John White)

4. *The aims of primary education: England and other countries*. Research survey 1/2 (Maha Shuayb and Sharon O'Donnell)

5. *The changing national context of primary education*. Research survey 1/3 (Stephen Machin and Sandra McNally)

6. *The changing global context of primary education.* Research survey 1/4 (Hugh Lauder, John Lowe and Rita Chawla-Duggan)

LEARNING AND TEACHING

7. *Children's cognitive development and learning*. Research survey 2/1a (Usha Goswami and Peter Bryant)

8. *Children's social development, peer interaction and classroom*. Research survey 2/1b (Christine Howe and Neil Mercer)

9. *Teaching in primary schools*. Research survey 2/2 (Robin Alexander and Maurice Galton)

10. *Learning and teaching in primary schools: the curriculum dimension*. Research survey 2/3 (Bob McCormick and Bob Moon)

11. *Learning and teaching in primary schools: evidence from TLRP*. Research survey 2/4 (Mary James and Andrew Pollard)

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

12. *Curriculum and assessment policy: England and other countries*. Research survey 3/1 (Kathy Hall and Kamil Øzerk)

13. *The trajectory and impact of national curriculum and assessment reform*. Research survey 3/2 (Harry Torrance, Dominic Wyse, Elaine McCreery and Russell Jones)

14. *Curriculum alternatives for primary education.* Research survey 3/3 (James Conroy and Ian Menter)

15. *Assessment alternatives for primary education*. Research survey 3/4 (Wynne Harlen)

QUALITY AND STANDARDS

16. *Quality and standards in primary education: national evidence.* Research survey 4/1 (Peter Tymms and Christine Merrell)

17. *Quality and standards in primary education: international evidence*. Research survey 4/2 (Chris Whetton, Graham Ruddock and Liz Twist)

18. *Monitoring, assuring and maintaining quality in primary education*. Research survey 4/1 (Peter Cunningham and Philip Raymont)

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

19. *Children in primary education: demography, culture, diversity and inclusion.* Research survey 5/1 (Mel Ainscow, Alan Dyson and Jean Conteh)

20. *Learning needs and difficulties among children of primary school age: definition, identification, provision and issues*. Research survey 5/2 (Harry Daniels and Jill Porter)

21. *Children and their primary schools: pupils' voices*. Research survey 5/3 (Carol Robinson and Michael Fielding)

SETTINGS AND PROFESSIONALS

22. *Primary education: the physical environment*. Research survey 6/1 (Karl Wall, Julie Dockrell and Nick Peacey)

23. *Primary education: the professional environment*. Research survey 6/2 (Ian Stronach, Andy Pickard and Elizabeth Jones)

24. *Teachers and other professionals: training, induction and development*. Research survey 6/3 (Olwen McNamara, Rosemary Webb and Mark Brundrett)

25. *Teachers and other professionals: workforce management and reform.* Research survey 6/4 (Hilary Burgess)

PARENTING, CARING AND EDUCATING

26. *Parenting, caring and educating*. Research survey 7/1 (Yolande Muschamp, Felicity Wikeley, Tess Ridge and Maria Balarin)

BEYOND THE SCHOOL

27. *Children's lives outside school and their educational impact*. Research survey 8/1 (Berry Mayall)

28. *Primary schools and other agencies*. Research survey 8/2 (Ian Barron, Rachel Holmes, Maggie MacLure and Katherine Runswick-Cole)

STRUCTURES AND PHASES

29. *The structure and phasing of primary education: England and other countries*. Research survey 9/1 (Anna Eames and Caroline Sharp)

30. *Organising learning and teaching in primary schools: structure, grouping and transition*. Research survey 9/2 (Peter Blatchford, Judith Ireson, Susan Hallam, Peter Kutnick and Andrea Creech)

FUNDING AND GOVERNANCE

31. *The financing of primary education.* Research survey 10/1 (Philip Noden and Anne West)

32. *The governance, administration and control of primary education*. Research survey 10/2 (Maria Balarin and Hugh Lauder).

The Primary Review is a wide-ranging independent enquiry into the condition and future
of primary education in England. It is supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation,
based at the University of Cambridge and directed by Robin Alexander.
The Review was launched in October 2006 and aims to publish its final report in autumn 2008.

FURTHER INFORMATION

www.primaryreview.org.uk

General enquiries: enquiries@primaryreview.org.uk

Media enquiries: richard@margrave.co.uk