

## 8. Erving Goffman: *Asylums*

We begin this part with Erving Goffman's work, not because it had anything specifically to say about special education, but because in 1968 it marked the beginnings of a questioning of the automatic assumption that separation of a portion of the public to segregated institutions must be a good thing. As Goffman points out, such institutions often present themselves as the rational and humane solution to people's difficulties, but they in fact operate merely as society's 'storage dumps'.

Goffman's *Asylums* became the kind of classic text that moves outside its original academic audience to a much wider public. The book comprises a series of papers about people placed in what Goffman called 'total institutions' – that is to say, places that separate their inhabitants from the outside world with locked doors and high walls. These include mental hospitals, boarding schools and so on.

The papers compiled in *Asylums* were originally published in academic journals. Although this was the case, *Asylums* caught the public imagination because it presented for questioning many shibboleths about helping services and the people who worked in them. Ideas taken to be truths and professional practices and social institutions that were previously beyond question became, with Goffman's work, open to question. Were these institutions really all they were supposed to be? Did the staff in them always act in the best interests of the inhabitants? Although Goffman was not the first to ask these questions, he was one of the first to put them in language that was accessible and interesting to the lay reader.

In *Asylums* Goffman looks at the people in these institutions and seeks to interpret their experience rather than justifying the system that contained them.

The special school is not a *total institution* in the way that Goffman writes about asylums. However, many of the questions that he asks of such institutions are relevant to special schools, and one sees those questions echoed in several other pieces in this volume. For example, what is the purpose of the special school, and of special education more generally? The implication of Goffman's piece is that institutions such as these are constructed to serve the purpose of the wider system rather than the inhabitants of the institution, and one can draw from this insight the possibility that the special school system may exist primarily for the convenience of the mainstream system rather than for the purpose of helping or improving the lives of those who are directed to the special system.

In the second part of the piece extracted below, Goffman refers to the 'paper trail' that accompanies patients as they move through the system. This is given as an illustration of the process that comes to dominate an institution: defensive action designed to protect staff rather than ensuring that the needs of patients are met. Here the insight – appropriate also to today's education – comes from seeing the 'flip-side' of a procedure: from seeing how a slogan such as 'protection' can in fact come to mean something altogether different.

### 32 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

In today's education system one can see a similar process operating as procedures set in place notionally to protect a child – such as an Individual Education Plan (IEP) or a statement of special educational needs – can in practice turn out to be hollow, comprising merely vacuous language devised to meet the needs only of the system, not the child. Thus a statement of special educational need, for example, will be couched in such general language that it could mean anything that the sponsoring local authority wants it to mean.

It is for this reason – for the 'flip-side' insights that it provides – that *Asylums* became a classic. And it is in the questioning of authority, authority's knowledge and the provision emerging from authority's edicts incorporated in those insights that it has relevance for our understanding of special education.

- “ Many total institutions most of the time seem to function merely as storage dumps for inmates, but, as previously suggested, they usually present themselves to the public as rational organizations designed consciously, through and through, as effective machines for producing a few officially avowed and officially approved ends. It was also suggested [earlier in *Asylums*] that one frequent official objective is the reformation of inmates in the direction of some ideal standard. This contradiction, between what the institution does and what its officials must say it does, forms the basic context of the staff's daily activity.

Within this context, perhaps the first thing to say about the staff is that their work, and hence their world, have uniquely to do with people. This *people-work* is not quite like personnel work or the work of those involved in service relationships; the staff, after all, have objects and products to work upon, not services, but these objects and products are people.

As material upon which to work, people can take on somewhat the same characteristics as inanimate objects. Surgeons prefer to operate on slender patients rather than fat ones, because with fat ones instruments get slippery, and there are the extra layers to cut through. Morticians in mental hospitals sometimes favour thin females over fat men, because heavy 'stiffs' are difficult to move and male stiffs must be dressed in jackets that are hard to pull over stiffened arms and fingers. Also, mismanagement of either animate or inanimate objects may leave tell-tale marks for supervisors to see. And just as an article being processed through an industrial plant must be followed by a paper shadow showing what has been done by whom, what is to be done, and who last had responsibility for it, so a human object moving, say, through a mental-hospital system must be followed by a chain of informative receipts detailing what has been done to and by the patient and who had most recent responsibility for him. Even the presence or absence of a particular patient at a given meal or for a given night may have to be recorded, so that cost accounting can be maintained and appropriate adjustments rendered in billing. In the inmate's career from admission suite to burial plot, many different

kinds of staff will add their official note to his case file as he temporarily passes under their jurisdiction, and long after he has died physically his marked remains will survive as an actionable entity in the hospital's bureaucratic system.

(Goffman [1961] 1968)

## 9. L.M. Dunn: Special education – is much of it justifiable?

In this article Dunn made a prescient case for the radical restructuring not just for special education but for education in general. It's an article frequently referred to in the academic literature as one of the markers of the beginnings of de-segregative thought.

It has to be remembered that Dunn was writing in 1968, before the substantial discussion that has brought us to where we are today in our thinking about inclusion. Dunn argues his case boldly and bravely – a case that would have attracted a great deal of opposition and resentment at that time. For special education, as Sally Tomlinson makes clear in the passage later in this part, was (and still is) seen by public and politicians as a Good Thing, and publicly to question it raised perplexity and hostility.

Many of his words predate much of the debate that is now going on. He makes the point that much of the problem with so-called 'learning disabled' children is merely to do with poverty. He suggests that '...we must stop labelling these deprived children as mentally retarded. Furthermore we must stop segregating them by placing them into our allegedly special programs.'

After the passage extracted here, Dunn goes on to outline a 'blueprint for change' in which he puts forward a far more clinical approach to assessment and teaching than many of us would now endorse, knowing what we now know about the very limited effectiveness of, for example, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching. Moreover, his call is only for a limited form of inclusion. However, Dunn's views preceded many of the changes that were subsequently talked about.

- “ *In lieu of an abstract to this article, I would like to preface it by saying this is my swan song for now – as I leave special education and this country for probably the next two years. I have been honored to be a past president of The Council for Exceptional Children. I have loyally supported and promoted special classes for the educable mentally retarded for most of the last 20 years, but with growing disaffection. In my view, much of our past and present practices are morally and educationally wrong. We have been living at the mercy of general educators who have referred their problem children to us. And we have been generally ill prepared and ineffective in educating these children. Let us stop being pressured into continuing and expanding*

### 34 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

*a special education program that we know now to be undesirable for many of the children we are dedicated to serve.*

A better education than special class placement is needed for socio-culturally deprived children with mild learning problems who have been labeled educable mentally retarded. Over the years, the status of these pupils who come from poverty, broken and inadequate homes, and low status ethnic groups has been a checkered one. In the early days, these children were simply excluded from school. Then, as Hollingworth (1923) pointed out, with the advent of compulsory attendance laws, the schools and these children 'were forced into a reluctant mutual recognition of each other.' This resulted in the establishment of self contained special schools and classes as a method of transferring these 'misfits' out of the regular grades. This practice continues to this day and, unless counter-forces are set in motion now, it will probably become even more prevalent in the immediate future due in large measure to increased racial integration and militant teacher organizations. For example, a local affiliate of the National Education Association demanded of a local school board recently that more special classes be provided for disruptive and slow learning children (Nashville *Tennessean*, December 18, 1967).

The number of special day classes for the retarded has been increasing by leaps and bounds. The most recent 1967–1968 statistics compiled by the US Office of Education now indicate that there are approximately 32,000 teachers of the retarded employed by local school systems – over one-third of all special educators in the nation. In my best judgment, about 60 to 80 percent of the pupils taught by these teachers are children from low status backgrounds – including AfroAmericans, American Indians, Mexicans, and Puerto Rican Americans; those from nonstandard English speaking, broken, disorganized, and inadequate homes; and children from other nonmiddle class environments. This expensive proliferation of self contained special schools and classes raises serious educational and civil rights issues which must be squarely faced. It is my thesis that we must stop labeling these deprived children as mentally retarded. Furthermore we must stop segregating them by placing them into our allegedly special programs.

The purpose of this article is twofold: first, to provide reasons for taking the position that a large proportion of this so called special education in its present form is obsolete and unjustifiable from the point of view of the pupils so placed; and second, to outline a blueprint for changing this major segment of education for exceptional children to make it more acceptable. We are not arguing that we do away with our special education programs for the moderately and severely retarded, for other types of more handicapped children, or for the multiply handicapped. The emphasis is on doing something better for slow learning children who live in slum conditions, although much of what is said should also have relevance for those children we are labeling emotionally disturbed, perceptually impaired, brain injured, and learning disordered. Furthermore, the emphasis of the article is on children, in that no attempt is made

to suggest an adequate high school environment for adolescents still functioning as slow learners.

**Reasons for change**

Regular teachers and administrators have sincerely felt they were doing these pupils a favor by removing them from the pressures of an unrealistic and inappropriate program of studies. Special educators have also fully believed that the children involved would make greater progress in special schools and classes. However, the overwhelming evidence is that our present and past practices have their major justification in removing pressures on regular teachers and pupils, at the expense of the socio-culturally deprived slow learning pupils themselves. Some major arguments for this position are outlined below.

Homogeneous groupings tend to work to the disadvantage of the slow learners and underprivileged. Apparently such pupils learn much from being in the same class with children from white middle class homes. Also, teachers seem to concentrate on the slower children to bring them up to standard. This principle was dramatically applied in the Judge J. Skelly Wright decision in the District of Columbia concerning the track system. Judge Wright ordered that tracks be abolished, contending they discriminated against the racially and/or economically disadvantaged and therefore were in violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. One may object to the Judge's making educational decisions based on legal considerations. However, Passow (1967), upon the completion of a study of the same school system, reached the same conclusion concerning tracking. The recent national study by Coleman, et al. (1966), provides supporting evidence in finding that academically disadvantaged Negro children in racially segregated schools made less progress than those of comparable ability in integrated schools. Furthermore, racial integration appeared to deter school progress very little for Caucasian and more academically able students.

What are the implications of Judge Wright's rulings for special education? Clearly special schools and classes are a form of homogeneous grouping and tracking. This fact was demonstrated in September, 1967, when the District of Columbia (as a result of the Wright decision) abolished Track 5, into which had been routed the slowest learning pupils in the District of Columbia schools. These pupils and their teachers were returned to the regular classrooms. Complaints followed from the regular teachers that these children were taking an inordinate amount of their time. A few parents observed that their slow learning children were frustrated by the more academic program and were rejected by the other students. Thus, there are efforts afoot to develop a special education program in D.C. which cannot be labeled a track. Self contained special classes will probably not be tolerated under the present court ruling but perhaps itinerant and resource room programs would be. What if the Supreme Court ruled against tracks, and all self contained special classes across the nation which serve primarily ethnically and/or economically

### **36 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today**

disadvantaged children were forced to close down? Make no mistake – this could happen! If I were a Negro from the slums or a disadvantaged parent who had heard of the Judge Wright decision and knew what I know now about special classes for the educable mentally retarded, other things being equal, I would then go to court before allowing the schools to label my child as 'mentally retarded' and place him in a 'self contained special school or class.' Thus there is the real possibility that additional court actions will be forthcoming.

The findings of studies on the efficacy of special classes for the educable mentally retarded constitute another argument for change. These results are well known (Kirk, 1964) and suggest consistently that retarded pupils make as much or more progress in the regular grades as they do in special education. Recent studies such as those by Hoelke (1966) and Smith and Kennedy (1967) continue to provide similar evidence. Johnson (1962) has summarized the situation well:

It is indeed paradoxical that mentally handicapped children having teachers especially trained, having more money (per capita) spent on their education and being designed to provide for their unique needs, should be accomplishing the objectives of their education at the same or at a lower level than similar mentally handicapped children who have not had these advantages and have been forced to remain in the regular grades [p. 66].

Efficacy studies on special day classes for other mildly handicapped children, including the emotionally handicapped, reveal the same results. For example, Rubin, Senison, and Retwee (1966) found that disturbed children did as well in the regular grades as in special classes, concluding that there is little or no evidence that special class programing is generally beneficial to emotionally disturbed children as a specific method of intervention and correction. Evidence such as this is another reason to find better ways of serving children with mild learning disorders than placing them in self contained special schools and classes.

Our past and present diagnostic procedures comprise another reason for change. These procedures have probably been doing more harm than good in that they have resulted in disability labels and in that they have grouped children homogeneously in school on the basis of these labels. Generally, these diagnostic practices have been conducted by one of two procedures. In rare cases, the workup has been provided by a multidisciplinary team, usually consisting of physicians, social workers, psychologists, speech and hearing specialists, and occasionally educators. The avowed goal of this approach has been to look at the complete child, but the outcome has been merely to label him mentally retarded, perceptually impaired, emotionally disturbed, minimally brain injured, or some other such term depending on the predispositions, idiosyncrasies, and backgrounds of the team members. Too, the team usually has looked for causation, and diagnosis tends to stop when something has been

found wrong with the child, when the why has either been found or conjectured, and when some justification has been found for recommending placement in a special education class.

In the second and more common case, the assessment of educational potential has been left to the school psychologist who generally administers – in an hour or so – a psychometric battery, at best consisting of individual tests of intelligence, achievement, and social and personal adjustment. Again the purpose has been to find out what is wrong with the child in order to label him and thus make him eligible for special education services. In large measure this has resulted in digging the educational graves of many racially and/or economically disadvantaged children by using a WISC or Binet IQ score to justify the label 'mentally retarded.' This term then becomes a destructive, self fulfilling prophecy.

What is the evidence against the continued use of these diagnostic practices and disability labels?

First, we must examine the effects of these disability labels on the attitudes and expectancies of teachers. Here we can extrapolate from studies by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1966) who set out to determine whether or not the expectancies of teachers influenced pupil progress. Working with elementary school teachers across the first six grades, they obtained pretest measures on pupils by using intelligence and achievement tests. A sample of pupils was randomly drawn and labeled 'rapid learners' with hidden potential. Teachers were told that these children would show unusual intellectual gains and school progress during the year. All pupils were retested late in the school year. Not all differences were statistically significant, but the gains of the children who had been arbitrarily labeled rapid learners were generally significantly greater than those of the other pupils, with especially dramatic changes in the first and second grades. To extrapolate from this study, we must expect that labeling a child 'handicapped' reduces the teacher's expectancy for him to succeed.

Second, we must examine the effects of these disability labels on the pupils themselves. Certainly none of these labels are badges of distinction. Separating a child from other children in his neighborhood – or removing him from the regular classroom for therapy or special class placement – probably has a serious debilitating effect upon his self image. Here again our research is limited but supportive of this contention. Goffman (1961) has described the stripping and mortification process that takes place when an individual is placed in a residential facility. Meyerowitz (1965) demonstrated that a group of educable mentally retarded pupils increased in feelings of self derogation after one year in special classes. More recent results indicate that special class placement, instead of helping such a pupil adjust to his neighborhood peers, actually hinders him (Meyerowitz, 1967). While much more research is needed, we cannot ignore the evidence that removing a handicapped child from the regular grades for special education probably contributes significantly to his feelings of inferiority and problems of acceptance.

### 38 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

Another reason self contained special classes are less justifiable today than in the past is that regular school programs are now better able to deal with individual differences in pupils. No longer is the choice just between a self contained special class and a self contained regular elementary classroom. Although the impact of the American Revolution in Education is just beginning to be felt and is still more an ideal than a reality, special education should begin moving now to fit into a changing general education program and to assist in achieving the program's goals. Because of increased support at the local, state, and federal level, four powerful forces are at work:

*Changes in school organization.* In place of self contained regular classrooms, there is increasingly more team teaching, ungraded primary departments, and flexible groupings. Radical departures in school organization are projected – educational parks in place of neighborhood schools, metropolitan school districts cutting across our inner cities and wealthy suburbs, and, perhaps most revolutionary of all, competing public school systems. Furthermore, and of great significance to those of us who have focused our careers on slow learning children, public kindergartens and nurseries are becoming more available for children of the poor.

*Curricular changes.* Instead of the standard diet of Look and Say readers, many new and exciting options for teaching reading are evolving. Contemporary mathematics programs teach in the primary grades concepts formerly reserved for high school. More programed textbooks and other materials are finding their way into the classroom. Ingenious procedures, such as those by Bereiter and Engelmann (1966), are being developed to teach oral language and reasoning to preschool disadvantaged children.

*Changes in professional public school personnel.* More ancillary personnel are now employed by the schools – i.e., psychologists, guidance workers, physical educators, remedial educators, teacher aides, and technicians. Furthermore, some teachers are functioning in different ways, serving as teacher coordinators, or cluster teachers who provide released time for other teachers to prepare lessons, etc. Too, regular classroom teachers are increasingly better trained to deal with individual differences – although much still remains to be done.

*Hardware changes.* Computerized teaching, teaching machines, feedback typewriters, ETV, videotapes, and other materials are making autoinstruction possible, as never before.

We must ask what the implications of this American Revolution in Education are for special educators. Mackie (1967), formerly of the US Office of Education, addressed herself to the question: 'Is the modern school changing sufficiently to provide [adequate services in general education] for large numbers of pupils who have functional mental retardation due to environmental factors [ p.5]?' In her view, hundreds – perhaps even thousands – of so called retarded pupils may make satisfactory progress in schools with diversified programs of instruction and



thus will never need placement in self contained special classes. With earlier, better, and more flexible regular school programs many of the children should not need to be relegated to the type of special education we have so often provided.

In my view, the above four reasons for change are cogent ones. Much of special education for the mildly retarded is becoming obsolete. Never in our history has there been a greater urgency to take stock and to search out new roles for a large number of today's special educators.

(Dunn 1968)

## 10. F. Christoplos and P. Renz: *A critical examination of special education programs*

After the shock waves that followed the publication of Dunn's article on desegregation and increasing integration, there ensued a major discussion about the place and the consequences of special education – a discussion that became a ferment during the 1970s and 1980s.

Christoplos and Renz were among the first to enter into the public debate, with this well argued and well referenced paper in 1969. In it they take pains to widen the discussion about the lack of success of special education, noting that Dunn's paper focused specifically on children categorized as having mild learning difficulties. They note that given Dunn's specific focus '... it seems appropriate to reevaluate the purposes of *all types* [emphasis added] of segregated classes for exceptional children on a philosophical as well as an empirical basis.'

- 66 Special educators have often taken satisfaction and pride in the rapid expansion of special education programs ([Dunn], 1967; Mackie, 1965; NEA, 1967). Recently, however, this pride has been shaken by criticisms emanating from several sources, the most noted among them being Lloyd Dunn (1968), who prefaced an article questioning the justification of special education programs with a plea that special educators 'stop being pressured into continuing and expanding a special education program that we know now to be undesirable for many of the children we are dedicated to serve' (p. 5).

Dunn's article was concerned only with special classes for educable and mildly retarded children, and his conclusions were based predominantly on empirical evidence. With the validity of such classes being widely discussed, it seems appropriate to reevaluate the purposes of all types of segregated classes for exceptional children on a philosophical as well as an empirical basis. Such is the intent of this paper.

The most commonly stated goal of special education programs is meeting the needs of exceptional children whose needs cannot be adequately met in regular programs (Baker, 1959; Cruickshank and

#### 40 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

Johnson, 1958; Dunn, 1963; Jordan, 1962; Kirk, 1962). The current proliferation of special education programs, however, cannot be explained on the basis of supporting evidence indicating progress toward such a goal.

Amorphous good intentions have often substituted for lack of more objective accomplishments. Throughout the substantial number of years special education programs have been in operation, research findings have consistently indicated no differences in performance between those placed in special classes and those placed in regular classes. We cannot ignore, therefore, the disquieting possibility that self-perpetuation may be a factor in the continuation and expansion of special education programs.

On the other hand, the complexity of the issues involved in identifying appropriate educational goals cannot be overlooked. Compulsory public school education in a heterogeneous society is a sensitive and emotionally charged assignment, especially when it is extended to include children who deviate widely from the norm. The schizophrenic dilemma of a society trying to reconcile goals of competition and cooperation, quality and equality has been pinpointed by Keppel (1966). Although he believes that quality is necessary for success in a competitive society, he cannot accept the concomitant idea that the teaching of cooperation, which is the foundation of a durable democracy, must suffer in consequence. An avoidance of clearly stated purposes allows educators to verbally support cooperation (and include most children in the educational system) then establish programs appropriate only for a segment of the population; those who are able to manage competition. Indeed, competition is emphasized, and conflicting philosophy and practice are maintained without modification of either. There can be little doubt that a clear establishment of the priority of cooperation, in practice as well as in philosophy, is critical for special education.

Competition has no place for individuals who, because of injury, illness, or congenital incompetence, are unable to produce . . . Social cooperation, with value attached to individual pursuits, performance in line with ability, freedom from anxiety, and social as well as economic security for all, are goals which need to be actively sought (Trippe, 1959, p. 175).

Carlson (1964) further clarified the conflict between philosophy and practice which is so apparent today in education. He categorized organizations in terms of the relationship between the organization and its clients. Public schools are of the organizational type in which there is no control over admission of clients (students), and in which the clients, in turn, have no choice but to accept the service being offered (education) regardless of its quality. There is no problem of the school meeting criterion goals at the risk of being abandoned. Regardless of the quality of the service, students will be available and financing of the schools will be relatively secure. Carlson identified two adaptive responses on the part of the public school to the problem of lack of control over

## **Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today 41**

selection of students: segregation and preferential treatment. These adaptations are made not for the purpose of meeting the client's needs, but rather:

to make the organization-client relationship more tolerable from the point of view of the organization. Through these mechanisms the organization is able to exercise a form of subtle internal selection and sorting of clients as it goes about rendering its service . . . to those students for which the school is geared to supply the most adequate service. Together, these mechanisms facilitate the fulfillment of the goals to which the school commits itself (pp. 272–273).

The rapidly increasing number of special education classes ([Dunn], 1967; Mackie, 1965; NEA, 1967) indicates that the goals and services of general education are not appropriate for exceptional children. Their segregation into special classes allows educators to attend predominantly to those students for whom the general educational service is beneficial.

Special education programs were not initiated in response to the needs of exceptional children, but rather as an expedient measure to resist a perceived threat to existing goals for 'normal' children who were being more or less adequately served by regular school programs. Parent movements pressured public schools to accept hitherto excluded children (Reynolds, 1967b) and hence forced the schools to initiate special education programs so as to avoid disturbing the traditional establishment.

There has been no reliable evidence produced to indicate that differential benefits, either social or academic, accrue to regular students as a result of either the exclusion or inclusion of exceptional students in regular classes. However, even if differential effects were found favoring the former, a democratic philosophy would dictate that the most justifiable course of action in dealing with exceptionality would be the altering of classroom practices whenever possible, rather than the segregation of the deviant individuals. The rapid growth of special classes, in the face of lack of either supporting evidence or acceptable democratic social philosophy, has but limited justification.

Within the logic of the above argument, exceptionality is defined by the nature of society, not by the nature of individuals. Exceptionality in education becomes *the condition of NOT meeting one or more critical general education goals which are of such importance to educators that failure to achieve them on the part of some students is intolerable to the educators and results in total or partial, single or group, segregation of these students.*

A brief review of some of the literature comparing effects of differential placement will serve to clarify the above definition. The problem of special classes may be seen as an extension of the problem of homogeneous versus heterogeneous grouping within regular classes or regular programs. An excellent survey published by the U.S. Office of Education

## 42 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

(Franseth and Koury, 1966) found no clear support for either homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping in terms of academic achievement or social/emotional adjustment. The only exceptions to the long line of null results were found when personality variables such as achievement motivation or anxiety formed the basis for grouping (Atkinson and O'Connor, 1963). Sears (1963), Flanders (1964), and Thelan (1967) have also suggested that differential effects may be found when groups are patterned on criteria other than ability *per se*, yet the strongest arguments for grouping the handicapped together have been based on ability.

In spite of the lack of evidence supporting the positive value of ability grouping, a consistent and periodic pressure continues for the establishment of ability grouped classes in the public schools. Teachers and parents prefer ability grouping (Franseth and Koury, 1966, p. 50). Social and personal values appear to be more critical factors than academic realities in explaining the preference for ability grouped classes.

The academic consequences of special class placement on educable mentally handicapped (EMH) children also have been found to be negligible (Bacher, 1965; Baldwin, 1958; Blatt, 1958; Carroll, 1967; Cassidy and Stanton, 1959; Diggs, 1964; Goldstein, Moss and Jordan, 1965; Kern and Pfaeffle, 1962; Mayer, 1966; Meyerowitz, 1962, 1967b; Porter and Milazzo, 1958; Stanton and Cassidy, 1964; Thurstone, 1959). At times, a slight advantage from regular class placement for academic skills and a slight advantage from special class placement for social/emotional-adjustment has been found. However, varying definitions of academic skills and social/emotional adjustment make questionable even these slight differences. In addition, the selective factors involved in determining placement of EMH children in special classes or their retention in regular classes are critical (Robinson and Robinson, 1965, p. 465).

One of the most impressive investigations of the comparative effects of special and regular classes, in which the student selection bias was carefully controlled, was conducted by Goldstein, Moss and Jordan (1965). Blackman (1967) succinctly summarized this study and concluded:

Goldstein, Moss, and Jordan (1965) controlled for methodological inadequacies which had characterized previous investigations and conducted what was perhaps the most definitive study to date of the efficacy of special class training for the educable mentally retarded with respect to intellectual development, academic achievement, and social and personal development . . . What emerges is the sobering generality that this methodologically sophisticated study of the efficacy of special classes for mentally retarded children blends into the long line of negative findings that have characterized this area of research for the past 30 years (p. 8).

The possibility of attitudinal effects on parents whose children have been given special class placement should not be minimized. Meyerowitz

(1967a) examined the attitudes and awareness of *parents* of EMH children in special classes and in regular classes. He found that parents of EMH children in special classes generally showed greater awareness of their child's retardation but tended to derogate and devalue their child to a greater degree than did parents of EMH children in regular classes. Meyerowitz cautioned that special classes may lead, in the long run, to increased maladaptive behavior.

It is difficult moreover, to find research on the effects on *the regular students* of the inclusion in regular classes of various kinds of exceptionalities. If, as the present argument suggests, such effects are the major concern of educators, such research is critically needed. Deliberate inclusion of exceptionalities so as to determine the academic and social effects on regular students demands the researcher's attention.

The research on special class placement for gifted children has produced results similar to those obtained for the handicapped (Balow and Curtin, 1965).

Since gifted children are usually smart enough to know how to avoid interfering with the school's unwritten social mores, there is little school pressure to isolate them. Efforts to make special provisions for gifted children usually emanate from pressure applied on school personnel by industrial and other non-school people, who wish to utilize the gifted upon completion of their schooling. These efforts are generally concerned with refining the quality or accelerating the rate of doling out the educational fare (Pressey, 1963) or with early school admission (Reynolds, 1967a).

Special programs for brain-injured children (with recognition of the proverbial teapot tempest over nomenclature) and emotionally disturbed children are clearly established for reasons of intolerable social behavior. But so-called special methods recommended for these children are likely to be equally beneficial (or equally ineffective) for normal children in regular classrooms.

Placing orthopedic, blind, deaf, or even trainable children in regular classrooms is not usually considered feasible. Yet their isolation has frequently been cited as producing adverse effects. Cutsforth (1962) has found that vocation adjustment for the blind is handicapped by institutionalization with its 'parental type supervision' and 'lack of opportunity to develop aggressive social attitudes' (p. 183). A similar criticism of all special classes in public schools would not be remiss. Pintner (1942) found that the more able students tended to leave special classes for the visually handicapped, while the less able remained. This may also imply that regular classes contribute to making the more able child *even more* able, whereas the special class has the reverse effect. Meyerson (1963) found similar results with children who had impaired hearing. He concluded that 'present evidence indicates that a child may be well adjusted regardless of the method by which he is taught, the way in which he communicates, or his place of residence' (p. 138).

#### 44 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

Another case in point is a study done in Scotland by T.T.S. Ingram (1965) with 200 cerebral palsied patients from the cities of Dundee and Edinburgh, and from surrounding rural areas. School placement of these children had been determined by the type of school locally available, rather than through 'optimum placement.' Ingram compared the vocational and social adjustments of the rural patients, who were generally in a 'sink or swim' situation, with those of the urban pupils, who had 'specialized' programs.

The rural patients managed to hold a place in normal schools or they did not receive education. They either remained in touch with normal people or they became housebound. There were no clubs for the handicapped and no special buses to take them for picnics. *It can be seen that there were more children in open and niche employment in the small towns than in Dundee and Edinburgh* (italics added). It seems possible that this may have been because patients in the small towns were kept in touch with their families and with normal people throughout their childhood. Segregation was avoided (p. 11).

Ingram's argument is that special educators must consider the value for out-of-school life adjustment of what they are teaching exceptional children. Not only the purposelessness of much of the special class curriculum, but also the deleterious effects of the pressure to learn is at issue here. If clearly beneficial objectives, unique for a particular exceptionality, cannot be identified, then the exceptional group in question should not be segregated from normal society, to suffer the additional hardship of categorization in a demeaned minority group.

Even if children with obvious and severe physical exceptionalities are assumed to require highly specialized teaching, unique for each exceptionality (and this assumption is questionable), isolation in special classes is not thereby the only action feasible. Special helping teachers (itinerant or school-based), resource rooms, and other well-known educational manipulations are possible alternatives. *Anticipated interference with social intercourse resulting from regular class placement of exceptional children is an indefensible explanation for their placement in special classes.*

Considering the overall picture of research evidence, what guidelines can be proposed in planning for the exceptional child? First, it should be recognized that the adjustment of the exceptional child to the normal world is unlikely to occur unless he has frequent and familiar interaction with it. The risk that such interaction may contribute to a greater *mal-adjustment* of the exceptional child is undeniable, yet adequate adjustment is dependent on taking such risks. Care must be taken lest the discomfort and anxiety of the normal population at the possibility of having daily and close interaction with deviant individuals become the cause of restriction of such interaction. That segregation is for the good

of the exceptional, rather than for the comfort of the normal population, may be a deluding rationalization.

Secondly, lack of intimate knowledge about, and experience with, deviants denies the *normal* individual opportunities for social learning which may have the broadest implications for the understanding of human differences (Doll, 1966). An example is Billings' (1963) study which highlights the problem of segregation as it affects *normal* children. She examined attitudes of non-crippled children toward crippled ones and found that after third grade the attitudes of the non-crippled toward the crippled became more unfavorable and that *students judged to be high in social and emotional adjustment had the most unfavorable attitudes toward crippled children!* Surely it is appropriate to ask, 'What price social adjustment in our public schools?' The positive effects of familiar intercourse with exceptionalities is exemplified by Bateman's (1962) study whereby sighted children who knew blind children were found to be more positive in their appraisals of blind children's abilities than were those who did not know any blind children.

The possibility that special education is a solution to the 'problem' of educators in achieving their own goal of social homogeneity, instead of educational goals for children, should not be ignored. Specifically identified educational goals for children can insure that such improper solutions do not occur. Amorphous goals allow for surreptitious manipulation of a variety of behaviors far removed from those ethically in the realm of educational concern. This problem is common to the education of all children, but is more blatant with handicapped children, whose greater dependency and vulnerability may facilitate a wider use of unjustifiable manipulations. Before an exceptional child is segregated from the regular classroom, those behaviors which he must master for re-entry into it need to be identified and, if possible, programmed into his education. Such an identification can elicit a more frequent and healthy analysis of *why* certain specified behaviors are desirable or mandatory and whether all those students not segregated exhibit the desirable (or omit the undesirable) behavior. Considering handicapped children in terms of behaviors rather than in terms of classified exceptionalities would inhibit the establishment of segregated classes for any minority based on anything other than specifically-delineated educational goals.

### **The exceptional as a minority group**

The 1954 Supreme Court decision on segregation in public schools (Warren, 1954) assumes great significance when applied to exceptional children as well as to racial minorities. Consider the following excerpts in which the underlined words have been changed to make the text apply to exceptional children:

Segregation of *regular and exceptional* children in public schools has a detrimental effect on the *exceptional* children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating *the*

#### 46 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

*students* is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the *exceptional* group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of the law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of *exceptional* children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a *totally* integrated system . . . We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal (pp. 10–11).

Considering educationally exceptional persons as a minority group is not new (Barker, 1948; Tenny, 1953; Wright, 1960). However, as in Jordan’s discussion (1963), attempts have been made to differentiate between the benevolent attitudes shown toward some minorities (e.g., the handicapped) and the malicious attitudes shown toward others (e.g., Negroes). This is begging the question. As long as any type of individual is segregated, the majority group avoids familiar interaction with it, thus avoiding having to make changes in its own values. The previously-identified distinction between benevolence and maliciousness on the part of the majority appears to parallel the difference between high and low potential for independence and power on the part of the minorities. It is not difficult to feel more benevolent toward handicapped minorities, who are more vulnerable to majority manipulations, than toward a struggling and militant racial minority. But it appears equally difficult for a majority group member to associate with either minority!

Another social analogy to educational exceptionality is that of delinquent youth. Empey (1967) wrote about delinquency in ways which special educators may find disquietingly pertinent to their own problems. He noted that only within special programs are delinquents’ attitudes being changed:

But somehow these changes are not translated to the community where the offender’s adjustment is submitted to the ultimate test . . . Delinquency and crime, and reactions to them, are social products and are socially defined. Society, not individuals, defines rules, labels those who break rules, and prescribes ways for reacting to the labeled person. The labeling process is often a means of isolating offenders from, rather than integrating them in, effective participation in such major societal institutions as schools, businesses, unions, churches, and political organizations (pp. 4–5).

Empey also believes that the basis of programming decisions for the delinquent should be clear with specific identification of goals:

When there is no consensus on objectives, there is no logical means for choosing one approach over another, one kind of staff over another, one program component over another. It would not make



sense to initiate an experimental effort unless objectives were made explicit and a set of priorities chosen (p. 81).

A final aspect of special education programs to be considered is the possibility that once segregation becomes institutionalized, it is most difficult to eliminate. Any initial steps toward educational segregation should therefore be cautious, judicious, and adequately supported by research before wide implementation or dissemination is initiated. The difficulty is magnified if current special education programs are administratively well-entrenched and continue to multiply, giving rise to the very real danger that the primary goal of special education may become self-perpetuation. There are indications that this has already occurred to some degree.

In conclusion, we ought to point out that attitudes of fear and rejection are concomitants of unfamiliarity. Familiarization with deviation, via inclusion of deviants in regular classrooms should minimize undesirable attitudes on the part of the 'normal' population. So, too, should familiarization with the 'normal' world have beneficial effects on the deviants. Evidence of difficult interactions between deviant and normal individuals in an integrated situation should lead to medial manipulations of the environment before segregation is considered as an alternative. This approach would be consistent with the establishment of a general pattern of positive reaction to, and inclusion of, the strange or different. Such positive valuing of differences is consistent with Francis Keppel's (1966) urgent message that we must not lose sight of the cooperative basis that must underlie our competitive society. The replications go beyond special education and general education to our national goals of world-wide understanding, peace, and cooperation. ”

(Christoplos and Renz 1969)

## 11. R.A. Weatherley and M. Lipsky: Street-level bureaucrats

In this much quoted article, Weatherley and Lipsky study the introduction of a new law in Massachusetts ('Chapter 766') that required school systems to identify and meet children's special needs. Weatherley and Lipsky examine the consequences of this new legislation for practice on the ground – at 'street level'. In an in-depth study they look at the problems that emerge from the expectations that surround the new policy, especially where that policy is not accompanied by additional funds or major changes in the structure of financing. In many ways these problems are the ones still facing local authorities today in implementing inclusive policy, in both the US (see Hehir in this volume, p. 101) and in the UK (see *Audit Commission, 1992*): no new finance, and little fundamental restructuring of financial arrangements, but many new expectations.

The consequence, Weatherley and Lipsky found, has been compromise.

#### **48 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today**

Coping systems such as rationing and the short-circuiting of procedures emerged. (It is as much the case today as it was then.) And in this particular study it was found that even the behaviour of professionals became unhelpful. In short, as the authors say, the professionals sought to secure their own environments. What they call 'street level bureaucrats' end up by 'routinizing procedures, modifying goals, rationing services, asserting priorities, and limiting or controlling clientele'. The further consequence is that the consumers of services – parents and children – become 'relatively insignificant'.

As a result, the 'policy' that is delivered is vastly different from the one the government with its legislation intended. What ultimately emerges is something that may have effects contrary to those intended. Much of the opposition of the teaching profession to inclusion comes from its realization that this is the case – that real world implementation is different from mandated or theoretical implementation. Constant guard has to be kept up about this, and in particular about the fact that adequate financial arrangements often do not accompany changes of the kind discussed here. It is important to note that the need for new money is not necessarily being talked about here, but rather the intelligent redirecting of existing money to new purposes and priorities. The problem has often been that in innovative inclusive enterprise money stays in the old system as expensive initiatives are demanded of the mainstream.

From the conclusion:

- “ In September 1974, Massachusetts school systems confronted challenges to their management capabilities and to their deployment of personnel. They were obliged by the commonwealth to identify all pupils with special education requirements, including those not previously so classified. Moreover, this responsibility extended to a population both younger and older than the population the schools had previously had to serve. The systems were charged with assessing the special needs of children through consultation with a variety of specialists and with the complete involvement of parents. And they were responsible for designing individualized programs appropriate to those needs, regardless of cost. They were expected to do this with virtually no authoritative assertion of priorities and without firm assurance that they would be entirely reimbursed by the state for increased expenditures. Administrators were caught between the requirements to comply with the law, which they took quite seriously although the state's initial monitoring effort was much weaker than had originally been indicated, and the certainty that their school committees would rebel against expenditures that led to increased taxes. While they had the support of parent groups and others actively concerned with special education, school administrators were dubious about this support because these groups tended to be unsympathetic to any approach that implied that a school system would do less than the law required.

## **Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today 49**

Special education personnel thus experienced pressures to accomplish enormous tasks in a short period of time with no certainty of substantially greater resources. Many school systems had already been moving in the direction indicated by Chapter 766 [the Comprehensive Special Education Law of Massachusetts], but now they had to accomplish what had previously been a matter of voluntary educational policy. Under the circumstances, special education personnel had to cope with their new job requirements in ways that would permit an acceptable solution to what theoretically appeared to be impossible demands.

That the systems we studied processed hundreds of children while maintaining the levels of services they did provide is a tribute to the dedication of school personnel and to the coercive, if diffuse, effects of the law. However, in certain respects the new law, by dictating so much, actually dictated very little. Like police officers who are required to enforce so many regulations that they are effectively free to enforce the law selectively, or public welfare workers who cannot master encyclopedic and constantly changing eligibility requirements and so operate with a much smaller set of regulations, special education personnel had to contrive their own adjustments to the multiple demands they encountered.

While not, for the most part, motivated by a desire to compromise compliance, school personnel had to formulate policies that would balance the new demands against available resources. To this end, school systems, schools, and individuals devised the following variety of coping patterns.

They rationed the number of assessments performed. They neglected to conduct assessments; placed limits on the numbers that were held; and biased the scheduling of assessments in favor of children who were behavior problems, who were not likely to cost the systems money, or who met the needs of school personnel seeking to practice their individual specialties.

They rationed services by reducing the hours of assignment to specialists, by favoring group over individual treatment, and by using specialists-in-training rather than experienced personnel as instructors. They short-circuited bureaucratic requirements for completing forms and for following the procedures mandated and designed to protect the interests of parents. They minimized the potentially time-consuming problem of getting parents to go along with plans by securing prior agreements on recommendations and by fostering deference to professional authority.

In short, they sought to secure their work environment. As individuals, teachers referred (dumped) students who posed the greatest threat to classroom control or recruited those with whom they were trained to work. Collectively, they sought contractual agreements that the new law would not increase their overall responsibilities.

These responses are not unique to special education personnel, but are typical of the coping behaviors of street-level bureaucrats. ”

## 50 Arguments and evidence against segregation – 1960s to today

From the introduction:

“ . . . ‘street-level bureaucrats,’ as we have called them, interact directly with citizens in the course of their jobs and have substantial discretion in the execution of their work. For such public workers, personal and organizational resources are chronically and severely limited in relation to the tasks that they are asked to perform. The demand for their services will always be as great as their ability to supply these services. To accomplish their required tasks, street-level bureaucrats must find ways to accommodate the demands placed upon them and confront the reality of resource limitations. They typically do this by routinizing procedures, modifying goals, rationing services, asserting priorities, and limiting or controlling clientele. In other words, they develop practices that permit them in some way to process the work they are required to do. The work of street-level bureaucrats is inherently discretionary. Some influences that might be thought to provide behavioral guidance for them do not actually do much to dictate their behavior. For example, the work objectives for public-service employees are usually vague and contradictory. Moreover, it is difficult to establish or impose valid work-performance measures, and the consumers of services are relatively insignificant as a reference group. Thus street-level bureaucrats are constrained but not directed in their work.

These accommodations and coping mechanisms that they are free to develop form patterns of behavior that become the government program that is ‘delivered’ to the public. In a significant sense, then, street-level bureaucrats *are the policymakers* in their respective work arenas. From this perspective, it follows that the study of implementation of policy formulated at the federal or state level requires a twin focus. One must trace the fate of the policy in traditional fashion, from its authoritative articulation through various administrative modifications, to discover the ways this policy affects the context of street-level decision making. At the same time, one must study street-level bureaucrats within their specific work context to discover how their decision making about clients is modified, if at all, by the newly articulated policy. This turns the usual study of implementation on its head. Now the lowest levels of the policy chain are regarded as the makers of policy, and the higher level of decision making is seen as circumscribing, albeit in important ways; the lower level policymaking context. The relationship between the development and implementation of policy is of necessity problematic since, in a sense, the meaning of policy cannot be known until it is worked out in practice at the street level.

(Weatherley and Lipsky 1977)

## 12. Gerv Leyden: Psychologists and segregation

The following excerpt, written by educational psychologist, Gerv Leyden in 1978, comes from *Reconstructing Educational Psychology*, a book that assumed