



Inclusive Classroom: Some Lessons From The UK

Rina Windiarti[✉], Rebecca Adderley

DOI 10.15294/ijeces.v4i2.9464

Department of Early Childhood Teacher Education, Faculty of Science of Education,
Semarang State University, Indonesia

Article Info

Received September 2015
Accepted October 2015
Published November 2015

Keywords:
inclusive; classroom; lesson

Abstract

The aims of this study is to portray the inclusive classroom in a school in the UK. What teachers do to handle the Special Educational Needs (SEN) children or children in needs, what are the equipments and facilities to cope the difficulty, and how to increase the SEN childrens' abilities. One of the challenges faced by education systems in around the world is inclusion. It is not simply about placing pupils with SEN in mainstream classrooms, but also examines about the quality of education received by all groups of learners and includes student's presence, participation, acceptance, and achievement. This research was held in the UK which has been implemented this system for years. This study was designed in the case study with one single case design. In this case, school AS was the single case and researcher investigated three different ranges of classrooms with different ranges of age groups. The researcher chose case study design to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of inclusive practice related to teachers' programmes and strategies for the children with SEN in the learning process within the mainstream schools in England. The result showed that the teachers were very engage with the children and the environment. The supporting system within the school also influent teachers' performance to handle the classroom.

How to cite

Rebecca Adderley, R. (2015). Inclusive Classroom: Some Lessons From The UK. Indonesian Journal Of Early Childhood Education Studies, 4(2), 115-126. doi:10.15294/ijeces.v4i2.9464

INTRODUCTION

The term 'special educational needs' in England emanated from the language of the Warnock report in 1978 (Stakes & Hornby, 2000; Thompson, 2010). The concept was to avoid stereotyping and break down the barriers between 'handicapped' and 'normal' children and to support children to meet their needs within schools. The children with disabilities were looked upon as deficient, rejected and being denied the right to education (Thompson, 2010; Warnock, 1978; Warnock & Norwich, 2010). In addition, the meaning of disability stated in the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA, 1995), is a person who has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Many children who have Special Educational Needs (SEN) will also be defined as being disabled under the DDA; though not all disabled children under the DDA will have SEN, for example, pupils with diabetes and not all SEN children will be defined as having disability under the DDA (Farrell, 2003; Learningtrust, n.d.).

One of the challenges faced by education systems in around the world is inclusion. The evolution of inclusive education in English education system began with the election of New Labour 1997 (Hodkinson, 2006). According to Gaad and Almotairi (2013), inclusion is a phenomenon which needs attention from the educators as a means of providing an appropriate education for all students. From the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE), Wall (2011) concluded that inclusion involves 'the processes of increasing the participation of students in, and reducing their exclusion from, the cultures, curricula and communities of local schools'. Different to integration, inclusion is more to suit and restructure the setting with children needs in mind so that they can be able to access all facilities in the community and be fully included (CSIE, 2010; Farrell, 2001). Corresponding to this, Symes and Humphrey (2012) and Humphrey (2008) proposes that inclusion also examines about the quality of education received by all groups of learners and includes student's presence, participation, acceptance, and achievement.

However, inclusion is not simply about placing pupils with SEN in mainstream classrooms. Rose and Howley (2007b) argue that pupils must be enabled to socialise with their peers and be afforded opportunities to learn at an appropriate pace and level within the school community. This statement is supported by the DfES

which stated that inclusion is about engendering a sense of community and belonging and encouraging mainstream and special schools and others to come together to support each other and pupils with special educational needs (DfES, 2001a).

The statistical report issued by the Department of Education Sanctuary Buildings (DfESB, 2013) cited that there were 229,390 pupils with statements of SEN across all schools in England. This proportion represents about 2.8% of all pupils in the English schools system. While, pupils without statements numbered 16% in all schools. One question that needs to be asked, however, is whether schools can include all children and enable them to participate and achieve. One of the functions of schools as learning organisations is to provide quality education for all its pupils. A school's approach to inclusion depends upon its teachers' attitudes and professional competencies with regard to SEN pupils and how teachers distribute all the accessible resources in the mainstream classroom (Ainscow, 1993; Ališauskas et al., 2011; Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

Difficulties with early numeracy can interfere with the acquisition of mathematics skills. Children with SEN easily get confused with the process of maths and may have problems in answering questions which have been posed. There are key principles that are recognised for teaching maths to weaker pupils. Ablewhite (1969) mentions eight main principles such as pace, awareness, vocabulary, the concept of number, motivation, presentation, readability and vocabulary. Thus, in order to carry out these principles, the content of maths lessons needs to be more practical. Moreover, the experience will indicate to the teacher which mathematical terms cause the most difficulties (Stakes & Hornby, 2000). Further research by Van Luit and Schopman (2000) found out that early math intervention is beneficial for young children with SEN. This is to introduce children the early concept of mathematics in a more structured or generally more realistic way (Van Luit & Schopman, 2000). Thus, this may influence how pupils can understand the concept which will enable them to solve early numeracy problems by themselves. Early numeracy is a basic mathematical skill and it is important to giving children enough opportunities to practice their skills in mathematics which can strengthen the link between child's early abilities in maths and the acquisition of mathematical knowledge in school (Bisanz, 2011). Therefore, early math intervention is an important issue for pupils with SEN.

Even so, Hardin and Hardin (2002) mention three simple techniques that can be implemented by teachers who work with SEN pupils in the classroom, those are peer tutoring, cooperative learning, and reverse inclusion. These aspects would assist children with special needs to do the same task with other children and teachers encourage the SEN and non-SEN children to collaborate within the mixability classroom. However, Harrell et al. (1997) argue that although the principal elements of cooperative learning may seem simple, successful implementation of collaborative groups requires considerable work and the ongoing involvement of educational teams.

The curriculum is central to the process of teaching and learning in schools. It is a concept that needs to be done in practice. Cullingford (2005) defines curriculum as a monumental edifice, imposing, arcane and impersonal. For Loreman et al. (2010) the term of the curriculum has to do with the teaching and learning knowledge, skills and attitudes. The National Curriculum is intended to deliver an entitlement to all children. Therefore, the curriculum that has been set up should be tailored carefully by the teachers to the needs of the child.

Even so, Knight and Farmer (1992) argue that many years ago teachers had the freedom to devise their own schemes of work, define their own targets for individual children, and set their own tests/tasks for their pupils, but the introduction of a curriculum made them less productive. This view is supported by Clough (2005) who affirms that a statutory National Curriculum in the UK affects the education of all learners, and the degrees of freedom open to teachers in their selection of curricula are considerably more limited.

Although some research has been carried out on the limitations, the statement in the National Curriculum section two namely the school curriculum in England (DfE, 2013) stated that schools are free to include other subjects or topics of their choice in planning and designing their own programme of education. From this statement, it may be implied that schools are free to let their teachers determine their own teaching approaches and content to deliver the learning in the inclusive classroom. However, Christensen and Baker (2005), and Kenny et al. (2005) concluded that access to the curriculum is a social achievement.

Difficulties arise, however, when staff are faced with the dilemma of accommodating the requirements of the National Curriculum with the level of work of some pupils with SEN in

their classes (Stakes & Hornby, 2000). Moreover, Stakes and Hornby (2000) mention that the problem of the learning difficulties pupils are they will forget the task easily. One question that needs to be asked, however, is whether these difficulties are able to be minimised and whether differentiation can be helpful.

All of the curriculum matter is underpinning to engage SEN pupils in teaching and learning. The curriculum that is already stated in the government document must be followed by the schools to ensure that all pupils have the chance to succeed, whatever their individual needs and the potential barriers to their learning. This seems to be the challenge of inclusive education in the curriculum within mainstream schools. Hence, Kenny et al. (2005) assert that a key policy priority should, therefore, be to plan for the long-term care for students with disabilities to have real opportunities to full access to the curriculum and full involvement in the social life of the school. Even so, the objective of this study is to portray the inclusive classroom in a school in the UK. What teachers do to handle the SEN children or children in needs, what are the equipments and facilities to cope the difficulty, and how to increase the SEN childrens' abilities.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study was designed in the case study (Creswell, 2007) with one single case design. In this case, school AS was the single case and researcher investigated three different ranges of classrooms with different ranges of age groups. The researcher chose case study design to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of inclusive practice related to teachers' programmes and strategies for the children with SEN in the learning process within the mainstream schools in England. This purpose was supported by Merriam (1998), Kumar (2014), and Yin (2009), who mention that the aim of using the qualitative case study as a research design is to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context. Research design also assumes that reality is varied and numerous and that it is best understood through interpretation of people's perceptions and interactions.

To gain an access for this research, the researcher asked for a permission to conduct the research in school AS and followed the agreed timetable that was given by the head teacher. Once permission was obtained, the school was asked to fill in an institutional consent form (see Appen-

dix 3). By filling in the consent form, the school then formally agreed to participate and so the research could be conducted. In term of the access issue, this research used a non-probability sampling with convenience sampling as a technique. According to Cohen et al. (2007), the technique in convenience sampling is used to select what is easily accessible to the researcher. The range of age groups in different classrooms had been chosen by the researcher to achieve the purpose of this study. Therefore, the researcher asked the Head to involve three teachers within a different range of age groups to be the respondents. The researcher also asked for the SENCO and SEN TA to enrich the findings. Thus, in total there were 5 adults who involved in this research. As for the method of research, researcher used semi-structured interview, observation, and archival records.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From question "How Does the Curriculum Suit for All Learners?", 3 themes appeared to be the common aspects occurred in the process. Those themes were (1) curriculum implementation, (2) intervention programme, and (3) methods of assessment.

Curriculum Implementation

The implementation of the curriculum was conducted by the school and the teachers in accordance with the programme within the school. Managing curriculum became one of the factors that teachers should fully prepare. When the teachers were asked about their opinion on how they implemented the curriculum in the classroom, most of their answers mentioned using the National Curriculum as their guidance in the learning process. In reception, however, teacher "I" mentioned that there was no specific curriculum was used, and the learning process was based on the children's needs. She further explained that she was using the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) as her guideline and the children did not follow the National Curriculum until they move into the next class. Moreover, she clarified that the learning process, which was based on the children's mental development stage, was carried out alongside EYFS as its guidance.

From the document analysis, the targets in reception were all listed based on age and subject, where some of the children might have improved their abilities in accordance with their age. The subjects were divided into personal, social and emotional development, communication and language, physical development, literacy, mat-

hematics, understanding the world, and expressive arts and design. Each of the subjects had its own indicator. Based on age and subject, teachers were able to tick the boxes provided on the EYFS form. In term of the curriculum, the SENCO mentioned that National Curriculum was for children in year 1 and year 2.

According to the teachers, curriculum division for SEN pupils helped teachers to implement their programmes. Teacher "N" admitted that the National Curriculum would be a problematical thing in the learning process because its contents would be difficult for children with SEN and it would need some adjustments. Furthermore, she mentioned that the P-Scales divided the learning process in details for every subject, so SEN pupils could go through it step by step.

Intervention Programme

According to the SENCO, the intervention programme within the school AS catered for all pupils, including children in needs. The range of the children with SEN in the setting was diverse, such as children with (a) autistic spectrum, (b) emotional and behavioural needs, (c) global delay development, (d) difficulties with phonological awareness, and (e) fine motor difficulties

As one of the intervention programmes, the children with different special needs were located in different classrooms. Each classroom was provided with teachers and TAs or SEN TAs. In the classroom that had children with autistic spectrum or down syndrome, a designated SEN TA was required to stay with the child as the one-to-one interaction was needed. The intervention programme for SEN pupils in this setting was integrated into the daily activities and learning the process, without creating any obvious differences. Throughout the observation, this activity was seen when teachers, TAs, and supporting staff were involved in establishing the desired achievements for all the pupils.

During the interview with the teachers regarding the curriculum and their programme, two things were pointed out in relation to intervention programme; those are focusing on improvements which highlighted the points of intervention for children with SEN that had been identified, and targeted on the IEPs by the SENCO as the coordinator for SEN pupils in the school; and intervention approach which emerged six points such as: (a) Keeping records of the difficulties arose, (b) Areas of learning, (c) Child-centred learning, (d) Targeted time and task, (e) Tools or specific equipment, and (f) Teacher Training.

Methods of Assessment

The third finding that was pointed out in relation to the suitability of the curriculum for all pupils was the methods of assessment. From the interview, observation, and document analysis, the researcher noted a range of assessment tools the teachers used, such as B squared, P Scales, The IEP, Progress Sheets, and alteration of the questions in some parts of the worksheet to cater for the SEN pupils' needs. The implementation of these assessments in different classrooms was done in different circumstances, such as in the quiet rooms, on the carpet time, or at the end of the session. The purpose of these assessments was to engage SEN pupils with the teaching learning and to ensure that the targeted group did not miss out on the broad curriculum. Furthermore, if those programmes did not work or were not effective, then the teachers and support staff would change the provision or they would do a further assessment to see if there were any other underlying needs that they had missed.

In a question about "What Strategies Do Teachers and Support Staff Use in the Inclusive Classroom", the researcher found three points from the data analysis; those were (1) team effort, (2) lesson management, and (3) methods of intervention. Team effort consists of Teacher collaboration and collaboration with parents to provide a successful learning process. The second point that emerged from the analysis obtained in relation to the second question of this research was lesson management. In this context, planning, preparing, and enhancing the lesson were three categories that are inseparable in lesson management. The points noted from data analysis in this term were: (a) Target of learning, (b) Prepare the resources, (c) Learning through play, (d) Repetition, and (e) Sign language.

The last theme found in term of strategies for teachers and support staff issue from the data was methods of intervention. This theme seemed very practical because it contained some techniques from teachers to intervene the difficulties in learning for children with SEN. The resources, methods or tools which exposed from the data analysis divided into three parts of intervention, they were: (1) Intervention in reading: by using Learn board, Clicker, Special computer, Focus in phonics, Reading stories, Singing, and Lots of easy talks.

On the other hand, for more specific needs pupils, teacher N emphasised to their understanding of something. For example, children could distinguish on or under, as well distinguish things such as pencil or table. She added, with one word

SEN pupils could develop their vocabulary. If pupils could comprehend it, they moved into the next phrases and sentences but depending on what they have trouble with the concept.

For intervention in writing, teachers do: Build the words, Story writing, Matching pictures and words, and Story building. Intervention in calculating/maths, teachers usually do: Number recognition and counting, Using games/cards, Exploring and playing. In counting, exploring and playing was important to engage children with difficulties to understand the concept. This was also brought to the flexibility and support in maths to working with SEN pupils. Besides all of it all, other tools specialist equipment like writing slopes, pen/pencil grips or 'easy-grips' scissors were provided by the school for high-level needs. Besides all of these resources and methods, the intervention needed extra times to deal with the SEN pupils. Teachers would have taken the notes from the TAs to home and observed it. If there was something needed to change, teachers would have changed the plan in the evening for doing the activity on the following day.

For the last question about "how do teachers and support staff manage the challenges?", I found that the challenge with inclusive classroom within the mainstream school was managing the difficulties. From the interview, teachers mentioned some difficulties that they had to face such as children were not ready to writing, struggled to concentrate, the problem with not understand the concept, hard in reading, forget things easier, move in very slowly, and language difficulties. One of the teachers said it was always going to be hard, and it would be really a lot of repetition and practical things, where those are already discussed previously. From data analysis, the issue of managing the challenges brought to the points to answering the third research question. Those points are (a) Group transformation, (b) Break down the group, (c) Change the task, (d) Task division, and (e) Independent learning.

The development of SEN in England has endured a long journey and has created a phenomenon of inclusive practice within the mainstream school. This might spark some criticism whether SEN pupils would be able to get along and work together with non-SEN pupils in the learning process, and how teachers and support staff would deal with the challenge. This research has drawn together findings from three research methods on the research questions mentioned earlier. The first research question addressed in this research was "How does the curriculum/programme suit for all?" As the result, the

data analysis showed three common themes, which were: curriculum implementation, intervention programme, and methods of assessment.

On the implementation within the inclusive classrooms, all teachers were using the National Curriculum as their guideline for teaching and learning. Yet, the implementation of the learning processes was adjusted with children ability based on the flexibility of the learning and referred to the child centred. However, this created a dilemma, as stated by one of the teachers, that to apply the National Curriculum to the learning programme for SEN pupils was something that had its own challenges. This statement supported by Lewis (1995) and White (1991) who stated that one might anticipate that if the National Curriculum is inappropriate and irrelevant for children with special needs then this would be particularly evident in special schools. In contrast, Fagg et al. (1990) and Sebba et al. (1993) claim that the National Curriculum has been a useful antidote to narrowing the gap between special schools and mainstream schools.

Until now, these divergent views about whether the implementation of the National Curriculum caters for all pupils in mainstream schools still cause dilemmas (Booth et al., 1997; Dyson & Millward, 2000; Norwich, 2008; Rose & Howley, 2001). One thing for sure, the National Curriculum emphasises on the equal opportunities to be given to all children in their education (Lewis, 1995). Even though there still are different perspectives on the curriculum in the mainstream schools, the purpose of the curriculum as the key centre of the learning process is indeed needed and at the same time taking the inclusive design within the mainstream school as a formal institution into consideration.

The IEPs as programmes for individual SEN pupils has been mentioned and was used to individually map a child's needs in a detailed manner. All teachers in the classrooms who were involved in this study always used the IEPs to help the SEN children in achieving their goals. According to Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009), IEP clarifies and helps teachers to design their teaching strategies, any short-term targets for the pupil, the success criteria, and monitor what each child has achieved. Furthermore, teachers schedule in preparing the targets and the strategies in this setting helps teachers to implement the daily activities. Wall (2011) asserts that IEP is a tool to ensure the learning process correspond to the Curriculum, simultaneously considering a child's individual needs.

According to the findings, the design of the

IEP in this setting broke down to the individual needs which were done by the SENCO. Therefore, it provided teachers to briefly outline how those objectives will be addressed in the context of the lesson. On the contrary, Goodman and Bond (1993) argue, besides the advantages of the IEP, it also forcing teachers to predetermine instructional decisions, deemphasise methods of instruction as useful goals, and limit modes of evaluation to the clearly measurable. Thus, the IEP should be limited to the function it was intended to perform: that of reviewing, not structuring, priorities (Goodman & Bond, 1993).

Other than that, based on the finding teachers were admitted that the P Scales was helpful to assess SEN pupils within the inclusive classroom. The DfE (2011a) explains that the P-Scale is a set of assessment criteria that supplements the National Curriculum by setting specific objectives at 8 levels within subjects, with level 1 representing the lowest level of attainment. P Scales and IEPs are the main points in managing programmes and executing interventions to make sure the needs of SEN pupils are managed and met. This statement supported by Benner and Grim (2013) who describes planning, assessing, interpreting, and evaluating as the most critical distinction of the context-based approach to assessment. On the other hand, Wearmouth (2009) explains that in order to assess SEN pupils, it is important for teachers to consider the wider cultural and social factors, the school and curriculum context, and factors related to the children as an individual. Therefore, teachers need to thoroughly examine the way the SEN children interact and behave in the learning process.

Regarding the suitability of the Curriculum to all pupils, the practical approach of methods of learning is adjusted to allow every child to achieve their goals to their most ability. In the process of teaching and learning, it will be more effective when it is done in a pleasant, fun, and enjoyable situation. Loreman et al. (2010) assert that it is important to cater for a range of learning styles in the classroom, and in order to do this a variety of alternative materials should be provided to students. Therefore, it is essential for SEN pupils to be offered a wide range of learning techniques and materials to assist them in achieving their goals specified on the IEPs. It is important to keep in mind that teachers should understand how essential it is for the learning process to be done within the adequate pace that suits the pupils' ability, and contributing to the pupils' improvement needs to be taken into account when it comes to developing the curricu-

lum (Brennan, 1985).

The second research question addressed in this research was “What strategies do teachers and support staff use in the inclusive classroom?” The results obtained from the interview, observation, archives and documents showed that teachers used various strategies in the inclusive classroom such as team effort which led it to the collaborations among the teachers, support staff, and parents. This statement supported by Wolfendale (1992) who states that collective responsibility for meeting children’s learning and other needs in the setting will be executed by different personnel, singly, or combinations, at any one time.

However, according to the teachers, somehow the partnership with parents creates difficult choices for the parents of children with learning difficulties. This condition also stated by Edwards (2001) that such parents may need support in order to synthesise the aims, and to work together with schools to achieve the most appropriate balance for their child. Their role as a partner in a decision-making process in education indeed needed to enhance and to support SEN pupils’ abilities. Furthermore, the importance of parents, carers and practitioners working in collaboration with the child can improve the quality of education for all which can also affect the school improvement (Glazzard et al., 2010).

Moreover, the important role of external agencies which stated by the SENCO is also crucial to ensure that the programmes and intervention are right for children with SEN. According to Wall (2003), recently, early years practitioners need to work together with colleagues from other disciplines and agencies to support their work with children and their families. The legislation and guidance in interagency working enhance the quality of teaching and learning process within the inclusive classroom.

The inclusion of children with SEN is intended to give them an opportunity to participate in “normal” school culture and academics as much as is possible, and at the same time allowing them to have specialised assistance when it is necessary. Managing learning and resources of intervention were the two other aspects that were referred as supporting tools to facilitate the children in achieving their goals. The findings from the data analysis showed that teachers used target of learning, preparing the resources, learning through play, repetition, and sign language as ways of managing and delivering the lessons. These aspects were encouraged to recognise the special needs of all children. Wolfendale (1992)

describes that teachers need to manage their classrooms and to posit separate types of children with learning and behaviour difficulties.

This point of view is related to the extra time which was mentioned by the teachers. Wilson (2003) asserts that most children can have benefit from individual accommodations to the schedule at times. However, the ‘spare time’ allocated to enhance SEN pupils in learning should be viewed as benefits aspect for children, even though it is a hard work for teachers in their implementation (Lewis, 1995). Regarding the individual programmes, all teachers explained that they implemented and evaluated the individual programmes to support the development of specific skills in their own terms. Therefore, managing time for SEN pupils helps teachers to organise the mainstream of the classroom, and enable them with justification and to call upon TAs to help the children who struggle more (Wolfendale, 1992).

Based on the response from the teachers, the intervention in reading, writing, and counting using multiple methods were done step by step in order to understand the children’s views. Teachers and other educational service providers in school AS were responsible for finding ways to support the children, to help them to be able to make a connection between the subjects they were learning and the knowledge they already had about the subjects. It stated in the findings that the teachers and support staff encouraged the children to enhance their abilities by focusing on their individual needs in a flexible way. This is in accordance with Daniels and Hedegaard (2011) who mention that the application of flexible methods dominates pupils’ voices in the field. One of the teachers asserted that even after teachers finalised the targets in a programme that would enhance pupils’ ability to read, write, and calculate, the process towards reaching those targets was often moving slowly and in small steps. One major drawback of this approach is that it is important to consider the content and the type of method that will be used (Moss, 1995).

However, the success of the learning process in the inclusive classroom is related to the children and their social life. Bryan (1997) argues that students often do not accept their peers who have disabilities. This situation can be solved by introducing a course that teaches important skills to form a friendship with the children, which could be a very effective form of an intervention (Gross, 2002). The implementation of this intervention was seen when SEN TA brought pupil “J” to the friendship room to meet four of his friends. Through the programme that had been

arranged by the teacher in the friendship room, pupil J learned how to communicate and socialise with the other children. Thus, it is important to provide students with disabilities all the supports they need in inclusive classrooms to encourage their sense of acceptance and belonging amongst their more general school peers (Pavri & Luftig, 2000).

This is also mentioned by some researchers who suggest that while high achievers may be more insightful about learning and more able to adopt the perspective of others (Pedder & McIntyre, 2006), lower achievers may be less forthcoming in their views (Daniels & Hedegaard, 2011). This was experienced by pupil "A" and pupil "J" who found the literacy subject was very challenging. However, Wearmouth (2009) argues that there is no simple recipe for a one-size-fits-all solution to raise the literacy levels of students who experience difficulties.

A computer programme specially designed for children with SEN was made available by the school. This special software offers ways for children with SEN to address their difficulties in reading and writing. The teachers unanimously agreed that the computer programme was very beneficial for SEN children to learn phonics and writing. According to Florian and Hegarty (2004), computer technology can build the potential ways for meeting the needs of children defined as having SEN.

The third research question addressed in this research was "How do teachers manage the challenges that arise?". In spite of difficulties which related to managing the teaching and learning, teachers and support staff had made the programmes of intervention and strategies for SEN pupils in the inclusive classroom. Based on the findings, teachers managed the classroom by dividing the children into different groups based on their abilities. These groups, including the group with SEN pupils in it, were given different tasks suitable for their levels.

One question that needs to be asked, however, is whether this method provides an equal access to what is deemed of value and essential for all. According to Doddington (1996), when teachers are implementing a differentiation method, they are trying to ensure the pupils are able to access lessons effectively and to develop their analysing skills successfully. Referred to Y2 teacher that she grouped the children based on their abilities supported by Barr and Dreeben (2000), Kulik (1984), and Vaughn (2007) which stated that most teachers provided same-ability instruction within their classrooms by dividing students

into three or four groups.

CONCLUSION

Grouping in learning, break down the group, changing the task, and independent learning is the strategy for teachers to manage the children with different abilities. Furthermore, the assessment that they have done based on the National Curriculum inclusion which set a suitable learning challenges, response to pupils' diverse needs, and overcome potential barriers to learning and assessment.

REFERENCES

- Ablewhite, R. C. (1969). *Mathematics and The Less Able*. Heinemann.
- Ainscow, M. (1993). *Policy Options for Special Educational Needs in the 1990s: Towards Effective Schools for All*. Stafford: Nasen.
- Ališauskas, A., et al. (2011). Meeting of pupils' special needs in the context of inclusive education: UK experience. *Special Education*, (1), 91-104. Retrieved from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ejh&AN=65412009&site=ehost-live>
- ASCEVCIS. (2014). *Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Information Report*. ASCEVCIS.
- Barr, R., & Dreeben, R. (2000). Grouping students for reading instruction. In Kamil, M. L., et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume III*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Benner, M., & Grim, J. C. (2013). *Assessment of Young Children with Special Needs: A Context-Based Approach* Retrieved from <http://reader.vlebooks.com/reader/open?accId=10081&cite=1&isbn=9781136882081&maxCopy=28&maxPrint=28>
- Bisanz, J. (Producer). (2011, 3/10/2014). Numeracy: How Important is it? *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development*. Retrieved from <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/en-ca/numeracy/how-important-is-it.html>
- Booth, T., et al. (1997). Understanding inclusion and exclusion in the English competitive education system. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(4), 337-355.
- Brennan, W. K. (1985). *Curriculum for Special Needs*. Milton Keynes Open University.
- Bryan, T. (1997). Assessing the personal and social status of students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 12, 63-76.
- Christensen, C. A., & Baker, C. D. (2005). Pedagogy, observation and the construction of learning disabilities. In Nind, M. (Ed.), *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education: Values Into Practice*. London RoutledgeFalmer.
- Clough, P. (2005). Exclusive tendencies: concepts,

- consciousness and curriculum in the project of inclusion. In Nind, M. (Ed.), *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education: Values into Practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cohen, L., et al. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.). London Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage.
- CSIE. (2010). Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools. Retrieved 1/8/2014 www.csie.org.uk/publications/inclusion-index-explained.shtml
- Cullingford, C. (2005). Lessons from learners about inclusive curriculum and pedagogy. In Nind, M. (Ed.), *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education: Values into Practice*. London RoutledgeFalmer.
- Daniels, H., & Hedegaard, M. (2011). *Vygotsky and Special Needs Education Rethinking Support for Children and Schools* Daniels, H. & Hedegaard, M. (Eds.), Retrieved from <http://www.hull.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=661028>
- DDA. (1995). Disability Discrimination Act 1995. Retrieved 26/7/2014 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1995/50/contents>
- DfE. (2013). *The National Curriculum in England*.
- DfES. (2001a). *Inclusive Schooling: Children with Special Educational Needs*.
- Doddington, C. (1996). Grounds for differentiation: some values and principles in primary education considered. In Bearne, E. (Ed.), *Differentiation and Diversity in the Primary School*. London Routledge.
- Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (2000). *Schools and Special Needs: Issues of Innovation and Inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Edwards, S. (2001). *Independence for All: Strategies for Including Pupils with Special Educational Needs*. Tamworth NASEN.
- Fagg, S., et al. (1990). *Entitlement for All in Practice: A Broad, Balanced and Relevant Curriculum for Children and Young People with Severe and Complex Learning Difficulties in the 1990's*. London David Fulton.
- Farrell, M. (2003). *The Special Education Handbook* (3rd ed.). London David Fulton.
- Farrell, P. (2001). Special education in the last twenty years: have things really got better? *British Journal of Special Education*, 28(1), 3. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ejh&AN=5643732&site=ehost-live>
- Florian, L., & Hegarty, J. R. (2004). *ICT and Special Educational Needs A Tool for Inclusion*. Maidenhead Open University Press.
- Gaad, E., & Almotairi, M. (2013). Inclusion Of Student With Special Needs Within Higher Education In UAE: Issues And Challenges. *Journal of International Education Research*, 9(4), 287. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1442471712?accountid=11528>
- Glazzard, J., et al. (2010). *Teaching Primary Special Educational Needs*. Retrieved from <http://lib.mylibrary.com?id=298030>
- Goodman, J. F., & Bond, L. (1993). The individualized educational program: a retrospective critique. *Journal of Special Education*, 26(4), 408-422. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?sid=59e90689-1bb7-461b-8c5a-1d565c813e77%40sessionmgr110&vid=0&hid=107&data=JnNpdGU9ZWZWhvc3QtbG12ZQ%3d%3d>
- Gross, J. (2002). *Special Educational Needs in The Primary School: A Practical Guide* (3rd ed.). Buckingham Open University Press.
- Hardin, B., & Hardin, M. (2002). Into the mainstream: practical strategies for teaching in inclusive environments. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 175.
- Harrell, L. G., et al. (1997). Recent development in social interactions to enhance inclusion. In Zionts, P. (Ed.), *Inclusion Strategies for Students with Learning and Behavior Problems: Perspectives, Experiences, and Best Practices*. Austin, Tex. : Pro-Ed.
- Hodkinson, A. (2006). Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education - one year on a critical analysis of Newly Qualified Teachers' knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *Research in Education*, (76), 43-55. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ejh&AN=23290392&site=ehost-live>
- Hodkinson, A., & Vickerman, P. (2009). *Key Issues in Special Educational Needs and Inclusion*. Los Angeles, [Calif.]; Sage.
- Humphrey, N. (2008). Including pupils with autistic spectrum disorders in mainstream schools. *Support for Learning*, 23(1), 41-47. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ejh&AN=30047151&site=ehost-live> doi:10.1111/j.1467-9604.2007.00367.x
- Kenny, M., et al. (2005). Living and learning: the school experience of some young people with disabilities. In Nind, M. (Ed.), *Curriculum and Pedagogy in Inclusive Education: Values into Practice*. London RoutledgeFalmer.
- Knight, P., & Farmer, A. (1992). History and children with special educational needs in the national curriculum. In Jones, N. & Docking, J. (Eds.), *Special Educational Needs and the Education Reform Act*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Kulik, C. C., & Kulik, J. A. (1984). Effects of Ability Grouping on Elementary School Pupils: A Meta-Analysis *ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 255-329*.
- Kumar, R. (2014). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-step Guide for Beginners* (Fourth edition. ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Learningtrust (Producer). (n.d., 24/7/2014). The Learning Trust's Approach to SEN. Retrieved from www.learningtrust.co.uk/special_needs/general.../docs/sen_doc_1c.doc
- Lewis, A. (1995). *Primary Special Needs and The National Curriculum* (2nd ed.). London Routledge.
- Loreman, T., et al. (2010). *Inclusive Education: Supporting Diversity in the Classroom* (2nd ed.). Abing-

- don Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moss, G. (1995). *Planning Special Programmes*. London Routledge.
- Norwich, B. (2008). *Dilemmas of Difference, Inclusion and Disability: International Perspectives and Future Directions*. London Routledge.
- Pavri, S., & Luftig, R. (2000). The social face of inclusive education: Are students with learning disabilities really included in the classroom? *Preventing School Failure*, 45(1), 8. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/228454949?accountid=11528>
- Pedder, D., & McIntyre, D. (2006). Pupil consultation: the importance of social capital. *Educational Review*, 58(2), 145-157.
- Rose, R., & Howley, M. (2001). Entitlement or denial? The curriculum and its influences upon inclusion process. In O'Brien, T. (Ed.), *Enabling Inclusion: Blue Skies ... Dark Clouds?* London: Stationery Office.
- Rose, R., & Howley, M. (2007b). *The Practical Guide to Special Education Needs in Inclusive Primary Classrooms*. London Paul Chapman
- Sebba, J., et al. (1993). *Redefining The Whole Curriculum for Pupils with Learning Difficulties*. London: David Fulton.
- Stakes, R., & Hornby, G. (2000). *Meeting Special Needs in Mainstream Schools: A Practical Guide for Teachers* (2nd ed. ed.). London David Fulton.
- Symes, W., & Humphrey, N. (2012). Including pupils with autistic spectrum disorders in the classroom: the role of teaching assistants. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27(4), 517-532. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=82575106&site=ehost-live> doi:10.1080/08856257.2012.726019
- Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs*. Harlow Longman.
- Van Luit, J. E. H., & Schopman, E. A. M. (2000). Improving early numeracy of young children with special educational needs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(1), 27. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/236319157?accountid=11528>
- Vaughn, S., et al. (2007). Teaching elementary students who experience difficulties in learning. In Florian, L. (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Special Education*. London: Sage.
- Wall, K. (2011). *Special Needs and Early Years: A Practitioner's Guide* (3rd ed. ed.). London SAGE.
- Warnock, M. (1978). *Special educational needs: report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People*. London: HMSO.
- Warnock, M., & Norwich, B. (2010). *Special Educational Needs: A New Look* Terzi, L. (Ed.) Retrieved from <https://www.dawsonera.com/Shibboleth.sso/Login?entityID=https://shiblogin.hull.ac.uk/idp/shibboleth&target=https://www.dawsonera.com/shibboleth/ShibbolethLogin.html>
- Wearmouth, J. (2009). *A Beginning Teacher's Guide to Special Educational Needs*. Maidenhead McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- White, J. (1991). The goals are the same - are they? *British Journal of Special Education*, 18(1), 7-25.
- Wilson, R. A. (2003). *Special Educational Needs in the Early Years* (2nd ed.). London RoutledgeFalmer.
- Wolfendale, S. (1992). *Primary Schools and Special Needs: Policy, Planning, and Provision* (2nd ed.). London Cassell.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, Calif.; Sage.