

# HIF-Rapport

2002:6

## Background and Design

Report No 1

Gunnar Stangvik



# Finnmark University College

---

	<b>PUBLICATION NUMBER:</b> HiF-Rapport 2002:6  ISBN: 82-7938-069-8 ISSN: 0805-1062
<b>Title:</b> Background and Design Report No 1	<b>Antall sider:</b> 47  <b>Dato:</b> 14.11.2002  <b>Pris:</b> NOK 45,-
<b>Author:</b> Gunnar Stangvik	<b>Faculty:</b> Education and Liberal Arts
<b>Funding institution::</b> The Research Council of Norway and Finnmark University College	<b>Project:</b> Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-Cultural Study of Special Education Practice
<b>Summary:</b> This is the first of six reports from the project that studies special education in Russia, New Zealand and the USA. It consists of two parts. Part one describes the background of the project. Research studies of special education shows codes of practice and outcomes that are at best controversial, and studies of such practices by the author and collaborators, and by others, show that Norwegian special education is lagging behind its own adopted policies. The most prominent models of work simply do not match these policies. One explanation may be that stakeholders hold values that are not consonant with practices favoured by new policies. This is not a particular Norwegian problem, but a critical problem that seems to haunt nations with similar policies. The point of departure for the research is that it is necessary to know what stakeholders judge as 'best practices'. Answers to this question are necessary in order to do research evaluations of the practices and outcomes. The aim of the project described in part II is to afford some answers to this question. The global agenda of special education assumes that cross-cultural studies would have greater validity than single nation studies. Therefore the field studies of the project were undertaken in three countries - New Zealand, Russia and the United States. Part II describes methods, design and subject of these studies.	
<b>We order ____ copies of the publication</b>	
Navn: _____	
Adress: _____	



*Gunnar Stangvik*<sup>1</sup>

Special Education at the Bottom  
Line. A cross-cultural study of  
the quality of special  
education practice

Report No. 1  
Background and Design<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The address of the author is Gunnar Stangvik, Finnmark University College, Follums vei 31, N-9509, Alta, Norway. Phone (+47) 78 45 0150 and Email address [gunnar.stangvik@hifm.no](mailto:gunnar.stangvik@hifm.no)

<sup>2</sup> This is the first of six reports from the project. All reports are listed at the end of this report.



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Part one. The background .....	4
Conflicting codes of practice .....	4
The norwegian setting.....	5
Norwegian practices in a policy perspective.....	8
Reforms.....	9
Discussion .....	16
The concept of quality.....	17
Part two. The project design .....	19
The aim of the project .....	20
Subjects .....	21
Methods.....	22
Considering the methods used .....	23
Data Analysis .....	24
Field work .....	25
The Schedule.....	26
Concluding remarks .....	27
References .....	28
Appendix I a. Invitation to participate .....	30
Appendix I b: Invitation to participate - the Russian version .....	32
Appendix II. Guide for expert Interviews.....	34
The development of special education.....	34
The structure of special education .....	34
Management and resources.....	35
The present situation .....	35
Appendix III a. Rating the Importance of Special Education Practices.....	36
Appendix III b: rating the importance of special education practices - the russian version ....	39
Appendix IV: Research Questions.....	40
Appendix V a-c. Persons interviewed.....	42
List of reports .....	48





---

## **PART ONE. THE BACKGROUND**

---

The need for a new agenda for the management of disability has been voiced vigorously by many writers (Pijl, Meijer & Hegarty 1997). This raises the question of a new quality framework for special education that pays sufficient attention to changing ideas and principles of the role and functions of special education. Literature shows, however, a number of conflicting frameworks in the field dependent upon the perspectives, knowledge paradigms and social policies and interests of different audiences. Qualities, which are given high priority in one camp, get little attention in another. Gillian Fulcher's (1989) study comparing discourses on inclusion between countries and stakeholders excellently exemplifies this point. Such controversies create a number of problems. First, it becomes extremely difficult to agree upon what are 'best practices'. New principles are understood and acted upon differently. Secondly, research and evaluation easily become polarised in conflicting research communities favouring very divergent paradigms of knowledge. Report no. 2 of this project clearly shows this has been the case in special education. In this situation it seems important to keep the quality discourse going, and maybe to approach it somewhat differently. The point of departure of this project that the quality interpretations of people in the middle of the practices are significant constituents of those practices.

### **CONFLICTING CODES OF PRACTICE**

Evidently, questions of quality are dependent upon the knowledge base, ideology, the structure of the educational system, and professional preferences. Stangvik (1998, pp44-45) distinguished between two different codes of special education. The most prominent code defines special education in relation to the way subjects are organised in the school system and in terms of legal and administrative criteria related to this system. In Bernstein's terms this may be coined a collection code. This code is too restricted to serve as a basis for special education. A more holistic code is needed. The second code that was distinguished defines special education as one basic element of a number of elements in a cycle of adaptation to social life in society. It's a long-range goal is to improve quality of life. This may be regarded as an integrated code. These codes may be taken to represent very divergent perspectives on what special education is all about. Discussing "best practices" it should be kept in mind that fundamentally different paradigms compete for primacy in educational arguments. The alternative perspectives of constructivist, critical, and postpositive paradigms of knowledge

have strong implications for understanding the foundations of special education policy and practice. Clark, Dyson & Millward (1998) and Haug & Tøssebro (1998) discuss and summarise controversial issues in special education theory and practice. This indicates that special education cannot be defined objectively as implied by a medical model. Special education is socially constructed and created, and should be firmly located in the social and cultural context. Hence, the management of learning disabilities is dependent upon value systems, school systems, competence and level of welfare and economy of societies.

Discussing barriers to consensus in special education Paul and Marfo (1997) says:

*Another barrier to a consensus resolution of the policy debate stems from the multiple interpretations of data that rely heavily on paradigm-based assumptions and beliefs. Even the concept of "best practice," which seems so straightforward when viewed from a traditional perspective as validated knowledge, is disputed by those who, from a craft or social constructivist perspective, view knowledge as local. (4)*

In a post-modern vein Danforth (1997) exclaims:

*Teachers implement (or imitate) "best practices" only to find themselves attempting to technically adjust complex human and social webs with crude sledgehammers and dull butter knives. (292)*

The different theoretical approaches to special education and their consequences for practice are elaborated in report no. 2 from the project.

## **THE NORWEGIAN SETTING**

A number of Norwegian reforms aim to establish a heavily decentralised infrastructure for handling disabilities. Two important assumptions have to be pointed out. First, special education should be regarded as a part of a totality of services. Recent trends in the delivery of services and supports have been aimed at providing expanded opportunities for inclusion in school and community for adults with disabilities. Secondly, quality assurance involves the identification and articulation of certain values and beliefs, which serve as a foundation for the delivery of services and supports. Therefore, questions of quality have gained paramount

importance at a national level<sup>3</sup>. Stangvik (1987, 1994, 1995, 1997, and 1998 a, 1998b) outlines a framework for special education consonant with Norwegian policies. From a practical point of view quality is an overriding issue, and a clarification is mandatory in order to establish what should characterise effective special education programs. Evaluations of effects of such programs are dependent upon this. Stangvik, Rønbeck & Simonsen (1998) show that a social-functional concept that relates special education to long-range goals is consonant with Norwegian social and educational ideology, and occupies a prominent place in the policy rhetoric. Research indicates, however, a certain lack of contingency between the rhetoric and practical reality. A study recently published evaluates the work – organisation of special education (Stangvik, Rønbeck & Simonsen, 1998). In order to do so taxonomy of quality was developed. The basic categories of this taxonomy were 1) policies and principles, 2) organisation and 3) processes. They are all systemic qualities with few references to actual practices necessary for attaining goals. Each category was subdivided into a number of objectives to be achieved by special education. All of them were derived from central policy documents. For each subcategory a criterion of quality was established. In toto, 12 criteria were used to develop observation categories, a teacher rating form and an interview form the purpose of which was to validate teacher ratings. This was the point of departure for studying “good practices”.

<b>“GOOD PRACTICES”</b>		
<b>Policies</b>	<b>Work organisation</b>	<b>Work processes</b>
Social inclusion	Goal orientation	Systematic implementation
Total life planning	Co-ordination	Documentation
Orientation to specific needs	Interdisciplinary and integration of service sectors	Quality assurance
Individualisation	Width and variation	User participation

Quality assurance has to include all processes of goal attainment. Lakin (in Wheeler 1996 p. 295) describes quality assurance as a three-part process. First, this process includes the administration and related processes that administer and support the provision of direct services to persons with disabilities (i.e. the structure).

---

<sup>3</sup> An extensive reform has been launched by the State with the ambitious title “ Restructuring special education”, and a parallel research program has been launched under the auspices of the Norwegian Research Council. The objective of the program is to create a firm basis of knowledge for the development of special education. The reform is described and analysed critically in Stangvik, G. (1998), A critical analysis of a reform project in special education. In Peder Haug & Jan Tøssebro (E ds.)

Secondly, it includes the stage whereby information gathering and assessment of skills, needs, staff competencies are assessed, services are provided, and interagency collaboration results from individuals receiving services (i.e. the process). Thirdly, it includes the attainment of measurable outcomes to persons with disabilities such as the attainment of educational or vocational goals, employment, community living, level of satisfaction with services/supports, and community participation (i.e. the outcome). Wheeler (1996) draws attention to social validation as an important component in the assessment quality assurance.

*Social validation measures would include assessing the level of satisfaction of persons with disabilities, their families, and employers with services and supports and of outcomes attained. Social validation is critical for purposes of evaluating the full-effects of services and supports and their impact on the lives of each individual served. (p. 295)*

The ambition of this project is to distinguish which kind of special education practices and outcome stakeholders consider valid. Baez (1998) discusses how social facts are accomplished by the interaction of social actors.

*“That is, those between students, teachers, parents and educational agencies which generates certain social routines, specific to a certain country. Subsequently, a particular emphasis is placed on studying and comparing those actions, which constitute the social facts of special education ”(p63)*

This approach to special education links micro-empirical findings into a larger social science perspective (cf. Crossley & Broadfoot 1992). Hence quality orientations of teachers may be regarded as social facts which are the results of particular discourses and social interactions. As such they have to be related to social and cultural contexts.

The project described above was based on the assumption that special education quality could be achieved by a “regulatory circle of decision-making “ which consists of assessment and diagnosis, formulation of objectives and planning, implementation, evaluation, and implications (cf. Pijl & van den Boos 1998p114). Through this stepwise organisation work processes are successively adapted to the fulfilment of an objective or to satisfy a specific need. By cycling activities in this way quality criteria may be related meaningfully to the realisation of individual program. This cycle of decision-making is explained more fully in Stangvik (2001). Results showed that teachers transform policies to practice within a system of checks and balances. Teachers generally recognised and accepted at the cognitive level the

qualities on which the study was based. Reality and policy rhetoric, however, seem to belong to two different worlds as teachers do not adequately apply the qualities to which they agree to in their planning, implementation and evaluation. Haug (1999, p.209-213) describes this conflict between formulation and realisation as a central dilemma of special education in his overview of Norwegian special education. This dilemma is most clearly expressed by studies of inclusion. Norwegian special education is characterised by the paradoxical formulation *segregated integration* (Haug 1999, Haug, Tøssebro and Dalen 1999).

Standardisation procedures at the systems and the teaching levels do not seem to offer sufficient room for the qualities favoured by policy. Factor analyses of teacher ratings indicated a set of different teacher orientations to quality. Multivariate analysis of variance further indicated that these orientations to special education practice were dependent upon level of pupil needs, the size of the municipality, and the educational background of teachers (Stangvik 1998, pp84-103). The study showed that the quality orientations of a sample of Norwegian special education teachers could be grouped into a number of dimensions that could be rationally explained. Generally, the study openly expressed a conflict between policy construction and social, or systemic, construction of realities of teaching. To reduce this conflict is a question of making implications of changing policies for special education much explicit and a question of practical innovation and change.

## **NORWEGIAN PRACTICES IN A POLICY PERSPECTIVE**

Inclusion and participation are key principles in special education today. They underscore the relevance of competence and learning for mastery and maintenance of equal and valued social roles in all life domains. This seems to concur with the present value systems and most Western countries have adopted policies consonant with this orientation. This adoption has probably been most prominently expressed in Scandinavia – the birthplace of the principle of normalisation<sup>4</sup>. In Norway these developments have resulted in two national reforms that creates a totally new infrastructure. Special education is ascribed an important role in the implementation of this policy. However, special education research demonstrates conflicts between policy and practice. Special education has not adequately adopted the policy of these reforms and developments. This conflict sets the stage for this research.

---

<sup>4</sup> Kent Ericsson (From Institutional Life to Community Participation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala Studies in Education, Uppsala University, 2002, p.47) contends that a State committee in Sweden used the term for the first time in 1946.

Lack of consistency between policies and models of practice may be explained in different ways. It may be explained by a result of conflicting theoretical perspectives on learning disabilities and their treatment (Lewis 1998; Stangvik 1998a) or it may also be understood as implementation crises characterised by inadequate links between different levels of the policy implementation system (Stangvik 1994, pp94 – 95). It may also be explained by the political role of special education within schooling that may serve to maintain specific procedures and organisational forms, and by a lack of professional ability of special educators to translate policies into workable practices. And, of course, there is also both latent and manifest opposition to new management paradigms.

Considerable resources are allocated to special education<sup>5</sup>. These resources are not allocated in accordance with the new policy, but continues to be allocated to programs that lack qualities needed to implement the policy. In this situation there is a strong need for valid evaluations of the efficacy, efficiency and performance of programs<sup>6</sup>, and a new look at the quality assurance mechanisms. Such studies need valid evaluation criteria. Priorities and decisions have to be made as regards what quality criteria should monitor special education practice. As shown in the next chapter this is necessary, but not sufficient.

## **REFORMS**

Two Norwegian reforms in the nineties created a new architecture for the system of education and care for individuals with disabilities. To what degree was this policy architecture accompanied by new practices? To answer this question two projects were launched. These projects form an important frame of reference for the comparative studies undertaken. Therefore a summary is in place.

### **The background**

Decentralisation is a cornerstone in Norwegian policies. During the past 20 years, a number of political and administrative measures have transferred power from the central state to the municipalities. This has added momentum to the process of deinstitutionalisation of persons with disabilities that has been occurring at the same time. In the late 1980s, this resulted in

---

<sup>5</sup> According to public statistics 50 000 pupils in Norway get special education in some form or another, 40 % of the total number of hours is used for special education, and it costs NOK six billion a year.

<sup>6</sup> The bulk of research on relationships between special education programs and their effects on learning and development of students with learning disabilities is seriously flawed due to inadequate analysis of programs and weakly validated criteria of effects.

two important reforms. The "Health Care for the Mentally Retarded" reform made municipalities responsible for the care and education of individuals with mental retardation, and the reform called "Omstrukturering av spesialundervisning" (reorganisation of special education) made them responsible for special education for almost all groups of children with learning difficulties. What was the ideological basis of these reforms and what had become of them at the time of the studies?

### **The special education reform**

The title of this reform is «Omstrukturering av spesialundervisningen (My translation: «Restructuring special education»). The long-range goal is to reform special education. The school-based model of special education is judged too restricted and should be replaced by a quality of life based model characterised by relevance, ecological validity and that is cultural appropriate (Stangvik, Rønbeck & Simonsen 1998). Resources, which were previously delivered to special schools, are yet to be allocated to special education in the local setting. In order to reach this goal a new concept of service delivery has been created: The competency centre. Two categories of centres are established: The State competency centre and the regional competency centre. These are planned to be supportive mechanisms and facilitators in the process of assisting municipalities in reaching the goals of special education, and more specifically to assist municipalities in the process of educating low frequent and challenging categories of special education students. Stangvik (1998b) asserts that this reform is based on a concept of change, which is too restricted. «The expert becomes a voyeur looking from behind his curtain observing and evaluating without really participating in practice». The goal of social inclusion demands that special education is based on the specific educational needs of the person in the local setting, and resources ought to be allocated to this process. Presenting municipalities with a menu from a category-based cafeteria of services is a centralised specialist model, which may actually interfere with social inclusion by separating students from the mainstream. This is one main dilemma of the reform project: In order to create meaningful special education programs special education has to become an integral part of the generic services in the community. Specialist services are developed which are not sufficiently related to these services. Data from the research project show that more basic reforms of the process of special education are needed. Reallocation of resources to regions and flagging out experts are insufficient measures. The basic didactic of special education has to be changed if the Norwegian policy of special education is ever to be realised.

### **Service delivery**

Stangvik (1998a) argues for a holistic approach to special education by which the whole life space of the person has to be taken into account in the process of defining educational needs. Such needs have to be subjected to transactional understanding. They cannot be determined on the basis of disability per se, but have to have external reference to social goals and to the settings in which they are discovered. This approach is contrary to an individualistic and clinical approach, which attempts to base the process of special education primarily on individual parameters. Transactional understanding implies a systems approach in which the educational delivery systems(s) are focused. When social inclusion and quality of life is taken into account the education domain should be broadened to include all relevant social domains and not restricted to traditional schooling.

### **The reform model**

Special education should be based on valid definitions of educational needs. Assessment of these needs cannot be based only on mastery of traditional classroom practices, but has to be comprehensive, i.e. need assessment should include all quality of life domains and all relevant social networks. Comprehensive need assessment implies that special education has to include a broad variety of goals in order to give adequate room for education for social competency. And, according to Norwegian policy this work should take place within a context, which favours social inclusion. For special education to become comprehensive, accountable, based on specific needs and social inclusive it has to be interdisciplinary. Without a professional and parent networks ecological need assessment and planning are unattainable. In order to maintain a long-range individual focus in a context of social inclusion a new didactic is needed. The purpose of this is to maintain this focus across space and time. To achieve this a new model of professional work is needed. Need assessment, individual planning, implementation and evaluation and follow-up should form a meaningful gestalt, which does not dissolve into unrelated activities. The barriers for this model may be perceived as overwhelming. Delivery of special education services is often made dependent upon a complicated organisational infrastructure with no common denominator and which consists of corporate cultures with the self attributed right to be selective and to define their problems and solutions. This doesn't always create the best conditions for an individual focus. Hence, special education has to be changed in order to give room for comprehensive need assessment, flexible resource allocation and interagency planning, implementation and evaluation.



### **Generality of the model**

Special education needs may be judged to be of different degrees of specificity and severity and in demand of different degrees of intervention. Some are specific in demanding of minor adaptations in the traditional school setting, like additional teacher support and minor changes in content and methods. Other needs are more general and affecting both the selections of methods, content as well as the selection of space and time for teaching and learning. The special education model has to be able to do a valid assessment of special education needs and to cater for all of them.

### **The observed model**

The following sections describe briefly the main characteristics of the general intervention strategy inferred from the collected data.

#### Watering down the school curriculum

How do schools adapt to special education need? A factoranalysis shows that these may be meaningfully divided into three categories of intervention: Adaptations to individual differences by means of changes in content, methods and support; Adaptation of space and time for teaching; And adaptation of locations for teaching and utilisation of external competency. Results indicate that interventions are mainly of a school - type. For the bulk of the subjects their special education needs are defined in terms of teacher perceived mastery of school subjects, and special education is operationally defined in terms of somewhat different ways of teaching those subjects. Offering special education to students with specific needs in other settings and adaptation of content and methods to those settings is virtually non existent.

#### Special education and need assessment: In control of individual teachers

For most of the students with special education needs there is virtually no interagency communication. The special education teacher - to a certain degree in collaboration with teachers at the school unit develops individual special education teaching plans. For app 15 - 20 % of the sample an interagency model of planning is utilised. The greater part of the special education activities is controlled and monitored by the individual teacher. In order to change this standard operation procedure and to seek assistance from external partners there has to be some kind of «force majeure». The student may be judged «uneducable» in the traditional school setting, or may be judged to suffer from too severe disabilities to be

educated in ordinary school settings. In this way special education become an important basis for school differentiation. Results indicate that judgements of needs are mainly done by the schools itself and subsequently verified by the professional assessment apparatus. In this way they are offered the opportunity to be selective. In these processes the relationship of parents to special education seems to be of an informational character. Generally spoken, they do not feel to be participating in the special education of their children.

#### The special education process: Rhetoric and reality

The process of special education was studied by means of teacher ratings, interviews and classroom observations. The purpose was to compare the actual process to a recommended process of special education which systematise teaching processes into a number of successive stages from need assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation and follow-up. As pointed out earlier special education resulted only in minor adaptations for most of the students and lacks a comprehensive management approach to learning disabilities. This is in accordance with previous results. However, policy formulations, theoretical debates and external pressure for accountability create an important context for practitioners. This creates a dilemma. On the one hand they want to fulfil expectations. On the other hand the teaching-learning context is too restricted. Creating the rhetoric may be one way of solving this dilemma. Individualisation becomes synonymous with individual educational plans, formative evaluation becomes synonymous with half-year reports to authorities, segregation of children from ordinary classes becomes a tool for mainstreaming, etc., etc.

#### Social inclusion: The politics of special education

Our data shows that the far greatest part of our sample got their special education alone outside their ordinary classroom or in small groups. Trapped between a school model favouring subject oriented knowledge at the cost of long-range social goals and the ideology of a school for all children special education becomes a convenient solution which is not put on the political agenda. By attributing learning disabilities to individual dispositions exceptions may be made from the overriding goals of Norwegian public education. It doesn't seem very likely that one will get out of this goal trap by teaching special educators new tricks of the trade - even if this is necessary, too. The most acceptable way out seems to be to broaden the concept of ordinary education and bring this education in better accordance with the public goals set for this education. This, however, would move special education into the political agenda. Respondents were asked what kind of adaptations that were initiated in

ordinary classrooms. Our result, however, do not indicate that this a primary consideration in their schools.

#### Resource allocation and accountability: Differentiation or intervention

Studies of the distributions of special education teaching hours and years in special education tend to show that allocation of resources is best explained as some kind of «muddling through». In this process the internal demands of the school play an as important role as the learning problems of students do. Stability over years in special education for many students underscores the important role of special education in the process of school differentiation, and clearly indicates that the schools themselves mainly define the role of the student as special education student in school. This differentiation model where special education works as a cul-de-sac for many student with learning disabilities may be contrasted to an intervention model of special education which is intensive and competency oriented and measures its own success in terms of students permanently returned to their ordinary classes.

#### **The health and care reform**

This reform made municipalities, with a few exceptions, the basic context for education and care. In Norway today municipalities form the basic contexts for care and education of all individuals with disabilities. How will municipalities meet these challenges? How can we be sure that the reforms lead to improved education and quality of life? Normalisation has been a key concept of the reform policy. Normalisation implies that there is access to generic services in all sectors of the municipality, and that category-based services should be kept to a minimum as temporary solutions. The municipality has to adopt a programmatic approach to service and education, applying the normalisation principle to all service sectors as a rehabilitative intent. Normalisation is an ecological concept. To foster and maintain normal living conditions, characterised by community participation and social equality, all sectors should engage in joint problem-solving in order to validate priorities, allocate resources efficiently, and evaluate results. Competency development should be empirically based on helping service agencies and professional providers to distinguish between the rhetoric and reality of normalisation. This distinction is heavily blurred in Norway's public and professional discourse. Rehabilitative intent and competency are only two elements in the change process that must be supported by organisational development, but perhaps they are the starting points. Some relevant results from this project are summarised in the following sections.

### Normalisation as a rhetoric

Because the normalisation policy discourse has a rather long history in Norway, professional audiences offer no strong competing alternatives. The practical implications of the normalisation discourse are not, however, made explicit. Evaluations showed that participants accepted low standards of normalisation by rating program performance very high in spite of considerable segregation and institutionalisation.

### Changing traditional priorities

Planning for individual clients and the inclusion of families in planning groups may be an act of discovery that reveals parts of clients' lives, which had been virtually unknown to professionals in service agencies. This has exposed the service-centred character of traditional services.

### Toward a mainstream model

Human services have been predominantly characterised by agency-specific strategies for action legitimised by public sector cultures, which create their own discourses about what is important and how to do things. In order to adapt services to clients' life situations a new interdisciplinary discourse on goal fulfilment and quality of life for clients is necessary.

### Political and administrative support

There needs to be an influence that can cut through agency-centred planning and resource allocation so that an ecological view of life situations can be achieved. If this support is absent, an interdisciplinary normative approach will have no basic constituency in the service sector.

### Validation of progress

The mainstream model emphasises community contexts and services. An interdisciplinary normative approach has to be open and databased, using systematic analysis of information, goal-based planning and implementation, and operational definitions of evaluation criteria.

### Risking collective decision-making

In the traditional model, strategies and criteria for success are controlled by the service sector. When methods and resource allocation must be made legitimate through collective discourses that include individuals with disabilities and their families, this change in perspective may be perceived by the service sector as detrimental to freedom of choice.

### The status of the services

The lack of congruence between goals of reforms, on the one hand, and the administrative organisation of services and professional work, on the other, raises serious questions about the value base of present services in Norway. A new value base is fundamental to developing new competencies, and new competencies are evidently needed. There is also an obvious lack of theoretical foundation among the present models and programs. In spite of these deficiencies, we have observed an ambition at all levels to improve services and professional work in accordance with the intentions of the reforms.

## **DISCUSSION**

Special education is in desperate need of reforms in order to gain credibility. A necessary step in the right direction is to establish a new organisational infrastructure that allocates competency resources closer to learning disabled students than the traditional special school model do. This measure alone, however, is insufficient. To reform special education in the local setting is a necessary adjunct to this organisational change. The dominating model of differentiation should be substituted for a model of intervention, which makes it possible to capitalise on external competency. Presently, external competency plays a minor role in the every day life of special educators, and its individual focus mainly serve to reinforce a differentiation model of special education. Such competency ought to join daily special education practice in the municipalities with the common purpose of establishing a systematic, didactic model oriented towards social inclusion. Furthermore, this research clearly shows that schools have to interact more closely and efficiently with their local contexts in order to implement the new policies and to develop practices, which serve inclusion and transition. Establishing new infrastructures that link the school to society is an important part of that.

## THE CONCEPT OF QUALITY

Quality analysis is based on the assumption that some practices are better than other practices. Such assumptions have to be qualified. There are several sources for this qualification offering different criteria for judging quality. *Professional judgement* is probably the most usual basis for defining quality of practices. Research of the *if-then type* may sometimes offer conclusive evidence that some practices show better results than other does (i.e. the efficacy criterion). There may be political consensus about giving priority to some goals. This would imply that practices that achieve these valued goals are preferred to those that do not (i.e. the goal fulfilment criterion). Practices may also be subjected to cost-benefit analysis (i.e. the efficiency criterion).

When qualities of practices are discussed there may be differences of focus. A general distinction between foci may be made. *Interactive qualities* refer to judgements of the quality of pupil-teacher-setting-material interactions. *Systemic qualities* refer to those qualities judged appropriate at the systems level for the implementation of the appropriate *interactive* qualities. Practices at the systems level should only be judged as good and appropriate when they produce valued individual outcomes. A practical example: To adequately serve a child with a hearing disorder (i.e. *interactive quality*) teachers need to be a part of an interdisciplinary system that gives access to competence, aids and teaching material. Special education may be thought of as located somewhere between these two levels. Its main objective is to negotiate elements of the systemic and interactive levels in order to establish practices of education and care which achieve valued individual outcomes. Generally spoken special education is about competent transformation of these different types of resources into efficient learning and development processes. At the end of the line there is reason to believe that quality judgements in special education are not solely based on the accumulation of evidence from these different sources, but is dependent upon how disabilities are generally understood. There is ample evidence of conflicts between perspectives. Such conflicts may result in conflicting judgements as regard the quality of special education practices.

Previous studies have been seriously hampered by the fact that criteria, which have been applied, have not been adequately based on an analysis of the goals and means of special education in a changing world. To resolve the conflict research and discourse are needed to distinguish new qualities that ought to characterise special education. Due to globalisation the

scope of research should be widened to an international setting. There has been a substantial increase in educational research, which compares results between nations. So has also been the case in special education. This underscores the need for discourse of quality criteria. It seems reasonable to adopt a constructivist approach when studying perceptions of quality. Judgements of quality are intimately related to both goals and values and to present social, cultural and educational practices. Achievement and mastery may be regarded as the primary goals in one setting. Participation and social belonging may be preferred in another setting. Perceptions and judgements of quality may of course also be gravely restricted by what people consider possible in practical situations. Normalisation may be regarded as rather far-fetched in a system strongly institutionalised. Too often results of comparative studies are applied indiscriminately, overlooking the relationships of results to variations in social, educational, political, and cultural contexts. To become functional in planning and implementation of programs quality criteria have to become a part of professional discourse and practice.

---

## PART TWO. THE PROJECT DESIGN

---

There is a developing global agenda of education and special education today. The so-called PISA studies comparing academic achievement in different countries recently published raised public debate. This debate doesn't only concern achievement differences between countries, but also raises questions about the goal of schooling. Which qualities ought to be pursued by school systems? Lack of answers to this question makes it extremely difficult to decide what is good educational practice and valuable results of education. This is also a primary concern of special education. Efficacy research has a very long tradition in special education (Stangvik 1979, Carlberg and Kavale 1980, Kavale, Forness and Siperstein 1999). These studies analyse a very limited range of outcomes, however, and do not take sufficiently into consideration the broad social goals of education for individuals who have specific educational needs.

Presently there is a global agenda for special education. This agenda will be discussed more specifically in the following report from the project. Recently OECD published the report titled "Special Education Needs. Statistics and Indicators" (2000). Most of these are indicators of coverage and adequacy of provisions and there is no reference to process and/or outcome indicators that are central to this study. The OECD study does include *factors considered to be facilitators of inclusion and equity; and factors acting as barriers to inclusion and equity in the qualitative analysis* (p. 27). This acknowledges the fact that inclusion has become a global agenda of special education (Pijl, Meijer and Hegarty 1997). Statistical information on location and placement of students with special educational needs is an important condition for inclusion, but it is not a guarantee of an inclusive outcome for the students behind those statistics. Available resources and organisational opportunities are not always used to implement inclusive practices. In order to know if inclusion really takes place other types of studies are necessary. Information from the same OECD report describes the stage for comparative studies of special education.

*The data reveal large variations among countries in the number and gender of students registered in educational statistics with special educational needs, the extent and type of provision made, the resources available, and the places where these students are being educated; in brief, in the way the system works to support students in difficulty. (p. 103)*



A brief overview of comparative studies in special education is given by Pijl, Meijer and Hegarty (1997 p.1-6). Besides the kind of statistical research mentioned above most comparative studies in special education are predominantly descriptive (Meijer, Pijl and Hegarty 1994, Mazurek and Winzer 1994, Rijswijk, Foreman and Shipitsina 1996). Comparative studies normally consist of a number of country descriptions in which legislation, regulations, organisation and the practice of inclusion are described. Such studies may be enlightening and informative as regards differences and similarities between countries. But results may be very difficult to integrate in meaningful ways because of the contextual character of the information. Context inclusive studies require some kind of theoretical equivalence - something that may be kept constant across studies. This may be a model or a theory of a particular phenomenon in special education - for example integration. The available outcome studies in general education - studies like the PISA study and previous studies of the same type - may be regarded as context exclusive comparisons with weak comparability and conclusions may be misleading (cf. Pijl, Meijer and Hegarty 1997 p. 4). On this background one may safely conclude that comparative studies is no panacea for solving the problem of quality in special education. The aims of research have to be more modest.

## **THE AIM OF THE PROJECT**

A primary aim of this research is to understand the priority stakeholders make about qualities and the foundation of those priorities. It seems to me that these priorities should form an important basis for the development and evaluation of special education. The stakeholders are at the bottom line. This gives them a unique position to consider the needs, barriers and opportunities. Such studies may be more important today than before due to the fact that the qualities of education may be defined by external forces that have no proper interest in fostering individual educational goals but regard education mostly as a part of the rat race. Therefore, the aim of the project is to compare quality orientations of special education stakeholders in different national settings. The main question is: Which qualities do stakeholders (parents, teachers and administrators) perceive as most important for planning, implementation and evaluation of special education in the countries studied?

### **Questions and sub questions:**

1. What qualities do stakeholders (teachers, parents, researchers and administrators) judge most important for planning, implementation and evaluation of special education?
2. What are the differences and similarities between stakeholders and countries studied?
3. How do these judgements of quality compare to national policy?
4. Do stakeholders perceive that the qualities that they judge important are present in special education?
5. Are there any distinguishable relationships between judgements of qualities and the context of special education?
6. What seems to be the most prominent assumptions as regards disability on which judgements of qualities in special education are based?

### **SUBJECTS**

Approximately 15 people from each country were selected for the study. This number was found satisfactory for the analysis of the research questions when the methods of data collection, which is interview, are taken into account. Parents may often evaluate the special education, which their children receive very differently from teachers. Stangvik, Rønbeck and Simonsen (1998) found differences to be particularly pronounced for parents of individuals with severe disabilities. Therefore, to include parents' view on special education is of great importance and a group of parents were interviewed about how they perceive priorities and practices in their children's special education. Interview with researchers and administrators were necessary in order to get systems perspectives on the special education.

Some important changes of the research plan ought to be mentioned.

First, the possibility of random selection of respondents within the time frames and resources available for fieldwork showed to be overtly optimistic. They had to be selected by the help of the expert knowledge and networks of key persons in the different countries. In New Zealand and in the USA access to respondents was made possible by re-known professors of special education. In Russia the field was opened to me by the help of the project leader in a newly established institute for child development. It ought to be mentioned that a data collection was planned and started in Norway. This part of the research was aborted for two reasons. First, distances, finances and workload simply became too heavy and it would be difficult to end project in reasonable time. Secondly, the two projects and the researcher's professional

knowledge of the Norwegian situation were found to give sufficient background for comparisons and analysis of priorities.

The following table shows the distribution of the stakeholder in different countries. The actual participants in the three countries are found in Appendix V A-C.

<b>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</b>				
<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>New Zealand</b>	<b>USA</b>	<b>Russia</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parents	4	3	4	11
Teachers	4	4	4	11
Directors & Principals	3	1	4 <sup>7</sup>	8
Training & Research	4	7	1	12
Executives	1	1		2
Psychiatrist			1	1
Medical doctor			1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>47</b>

## **METHODS**

### **Interviews**

Selection and co-operation of the respondents was secured by the assistance of professionals in the particular countries participating in the research.<sup>8</sup> When participants had accepted to participate they received an invitation, which briefly described the research project and the researcher. This invitation and a Russian translation are found in Appendix I A and Appendix I B).

Then time and location of the interview was decided. Due to long distances some of the interviews were done by telephone. This was particularly the case in the USA. This made it possible to get access to leaders in the field who would otherwise not have been reached. Interviews in Russia were recorded on videotapes. All the other interviews were recorded on a minidisc.

First each respondent was interviewed. The main questions of the interview are presented in Appendix I. Interviews with professional experts were somewhat extended. A list of these

---

<sup>7</sup> Persons classified as directors in Russia are mostly professors (of medicine), medical doctors, or psychologists

<sup>8</sup> In New Zealand and in the USA I heavily relied on the support of re-known professors of special education, In Russia the project leader of an institute for child development supported me.

questions is found in Appendix II. The study of course demands insights into the educational context of the interview. Such information has to be collected from many sources. One of these sources was the expert interview. Appendix IV shows the questions raised in order to describe special education in the particular countries.

Questions had to be accommodated to different stakeholders. A parent interview tends to develop differently from an expert interview even if the themes are the same. After the interview each respondent completed a rating form. This form was also translated into Russian (Appendix III A and B). The ratings show how the respondents perceive the importance of different practical aspects of special education. These perceptions could not easily be registered during the frame of the time frame interview. For the bulk of the respondents interview and rating were completed within an hour.

### **Ratings**

The rating scale was based on factor analyses of previous research scales tapping different teacher orientations to special education. These scales tap the teacher orientations to decisions in the different stages of the “regulatory circle”. Previous research indicates that “User oriented planning”, “Method Oriented Preparation”, and “Individualisation” would be some appropriate categories for tapping orientations of special teachers in the preparation stage. The scale used also taps other orientations in other stages of the decision circle. The methods were applied successfully in Stangvik, Rønbeck & Simonsen (1998).

## **CONSIDERING THE METHODS USED**

First, there is a practical matter. In order to interview in Russia I needed a middleman - the interpreter. Translation and interpretation is a time consuming activity. As a result the interviews in Russia were bound to be shorter than the rest of interviews within the same time frame. This process may even have distorted meanings. In short, interviewing in Russia did not bring forward the views, perceptions and judgements in Russia to the same degree as in other countries. I also add that in order to understand the Russian context for special education I have been dependent upon accounts mostly written in English, and there seems to be few such accounts available at the present time.

Secondly, the persons interviewed are not representative of their countries in the statistical sense of the word. There is always a risk that other persons would have answered my

questions differently. They are, however, a selected group of people with intimate knowledge of the issues, and they are asked questions related to one of the most homogeneous systems in their own country - the educational system. This certainly caters for some national credibility to their answers. On the other hand it is pointed out that the main question here is not difference between the countries studied. This difference is mainly introduced in order to evolve a full array of qualities and to understand somewhat better their contextual contingencies.

I have no simple way of judging the validity of answers I have got through these interviews. This is further complicated by the regional location of my respondents. There is of course no way of saying that my respondents in Russia and the USA are representative of all possible respondents in those countries.

Secondly, an important development took place during the course of the study. Taking into account certain developments in special education - discussed in part two of this report - It became obvious to me that the way my respondents answer to my questions should not be separated from their interpretations of what special education is all about. And, that these interpretations may be strongly culturally bound. If this is the case answers could not be directly quantitatively compared, but should be evaluated with reference to metatheories of special education. The question became: Are there specific ways of looking at disability and special education that may unify the answers of my respondents as regards "best practices" of special education?

Based on this line of reasoning the research became more interpretative than it was planned from the start. Thirdly, the change of the approach had some consequences as regards research methods. Interviews became more open and unstructured. The practices of special education were still the main focus, but the reasoning of the respondents as regards special education was more strongly focused and question became less detailed.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

Results from the rating scale are analysed by quantitative methods in order to distinguish differences between groups. In order to understand possible differences one has to relate these "social facts" to the negotiation of the actors with the particular settings in which these "facts" are constructed. Data from the previous research project in Norway form a natural

frame of reference for the analysis. The author has made a try-out in New Zealand, which indicates that the instruments apply to this setting.

Interviews are primarily analysed thematically in relation to the questions raised. Theoretical approaches to the analysis are presented in report no. 2 of the project titled "Special Education in a Comparative Perspective". In this report it is shown that judgements of quality of special education do not take place in a vacuum, but are based on certain assumptions about disabilities and their management. In the introduction reference was made to a reductionist and a holistic paradigm of special education. This theoretical distinction between approaches to special education and the practical consequences of them are outlined in the second report. This serves as an important frame of reference when interviews are analysed.

## **FIELD WORK**

The fieldwork took place in Russia, New Zealand and the USA in the study year 1999 – 2000.

These countries are chosen for the following reasons: In a 10-year period New Zealand has radically changed its school system offering much greater freedom to local decision making than before. Quality criteria applied to schools as a part of the process of resource allocation may seriously influence special education. The size of the country makes comparisons with Norway feasible. The social situation in Russia may create a momentum for the study of conflicts between individualistic and collectivist values. Scandinavian history shows that this value dimension is fundamental for understanding the development of special education

The USA is a very natural choice due to its leading role as regards research production in the field of special education. Of particular interest is the impact of the combination of strong individualistic achievement orientation and the dominant role of consumer organisation and legal action on quality orientations of teachers. In addition, the researcher has access to professional networks in New Zealand and the USA after having spent sabbatical years at universities in both these countries. He has also served as an exchange teacher at the Pomor University in Arkhangelsk.

## **THE SCHEDULE**

The fieldwork took place in the study year 1999 - 2000. August - September was spent in Russia, October to February 2000 in New Zealand, and March – June 2000 in the USA.

## **REPORTS FROM THE PROJECT**

Including this report there are six reports from the projects. They may all be read independently. The second report summarises and analysis perspectives on special education relevant for a comparative analysis. The three following reports summarise studies of special education in Russia, New Zealand and the USA. Taken together the five first reports represent the empirical foundation for the conclusions in the sixth and last report about the quality of special education.

---

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

---

Special education policy has become successively broader in scope. This is the case in most Western countries. This is probably expressed most clearly in Scandinavia. Integration and normalisation are key words, which describe this development. However, it seems as if special education has lagged behind in the process of developing models of practice, which take sufficiently into account the full range of needs that are put in the forefront by the new policies. These policies demand an approach to quality that encompasses administrative structures, education and support processes as well as attainment of a variety of social and academic goals. The literature even indicates that there is a crisis in special education today because theory has lagged behind and that dominant theories are based on obsolete practices. This report also clearly indicates that the question of what are the best practices is a controversial issue in the professional community. In such a case it seems necessary to look for social validation of practices and criteria for evaluating quality in special education. The aim of the interviews with teachers, parents, researchers and administrators in special education was to come to grip with their priorities and which aspects of practice that are most relevant for them. As a global agenda of special education is imminent and research from different countries is compared and corroborated a cross-national study seems reasonable. The assumption of this approach is that the comparison of similarities and differences between countries may serve to broaden the concept of quality and to sort out some areas of common relevance.



---

## REFERENCES

---

- Baez, M. (1998). Comparative Special Education. In Peder Haug & Jan Tøssebro (Eds.). *Theoretical Perspectives on Special Education*. Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press, pp61 - 78
- Carlberg, C. G. and Kavale, K. A. (1980) The efficacy of special versus regular class placement for exceptional children: a meta-analysis, *Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 14 No 3, pp41-48
- Crossley, P. & Broadfoot, M. (1992). Comparative and International Research in Education: Scope, problems, and potential. *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 18, No 2, pp99 - 112
- Clark, C., Dyson, A. & Millward, A. (1998). *Theorising Special Education*. London: Routledge
- Danforth, S. (1997). Postmodernism, Narrative and Hope in Special Education. In James L. Paul et al (Eds.) *Foundations of Special Education*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, pp291-304
- Fulcher, G. (1989). *Disabling Policies. A Comparative Approach to Education Policy and Disability*. London: The Falmer Press
- Haug, O. (1999). *Spesialundervisninga i grunnskolen*. (Special education in elementary school). Oslo: Abstrakt as
- Haug, P & Tøssebro, J (Eds.). (1998). *Theoretical Perspectives on Special Education*. Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press
- Haug, P., Tøssebro, J., and Dalen, M. (1999 (Eds.) *Den mangfaldige spesialundervisninga* (The complexities of special education). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Kavale, K. A., Forness, S.R., and Siperstein, G. N. (1999) Efficacy of special education and related services. *Monograph. American Association on Mental Retardation*, Washington, D.C.
- Lewis, J. (1998). Embracing the holistic/constructivist paradigm and side – stepping the post – modern challenge. In Catherine Clark, Alan Dyson & Alan Millward (Eds.), p90 - 105
- Mazurek, K. and Winzer, M.A. (1994) *Comparative Studies in Special Education*. Gallaudet Press, Washington, D.C.
- Meijer, J.W., Pijl, S.J and Hegarty, S. (1994). *New Perspectives on Special Education. A six-Country Study of Integration*. London: Routledge
- Paul, J.L. and Marfo, K. (1997). Foundational Knowledge and Special Education. In James L. Paul et al (Eds.) *Foundations of Special Education*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, pp1-10

- Pijl, S. J. & van den Boos, K.P. (1998). In Cathrine Clark, Alan Dyson & Alan Millward (Eds.), p106 - 115
- Pijl, S.J., Meijer, C.J. W. & Hegarty, S. (1997). *Inclusive Education. A Global Agenda*. London: Routledge
- Rijswijk, K., Foreman, N. & Shipitsina, L. (1996). *Special Education on the Move Current Changes in Special Education in the Netherlands, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States of America*. Leuven / Amersfoort: Acco
- Stangvik, G. (1979). *Self-Concept and School Segregation*. Gothenburg Studies of Educational Sciences 27. Acta Univeritatis Gothoburgensis
- Stangvik, G. (1987). *Livskvalitet for funksjonshemmede*. (Quality of Life for the Disabled). 4.Opplag. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Stangvik, G. (1994). *Funksjonshemmede inn i lokalsamfunnet* (Including the Disabled in the Local Society). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Stangvik, G. (1995). Spesialpedagogikken mellom ideologi, politikk og samfunn (Special Education between Ideology, Politics, and Society). In Peder Haug (Red.) *Spesialpedagogiske utfordringer* (Special education challenges). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1995
- Stangvik, G. (1997). Beyond Schooling. Integration in a Policy Perspective. In Sip Jan Pijl, Cor J.W. Meijer & Seamus Hegarty (Eds.). *Inclusive Education. A Global Agenda*. London: London: Routledge, pp32-50
- Stangvik, G. (1998a). Conflicting Perspectives on Learning Disabilities. In Cathrine Clark, Alan Dyson & Alan Millward (Eds.), pp 137 - 155
- Stangvik, G. (1998b). A Critical-Theoretical Analysis of a Reform Project in Special Education. In Peder Haug & Jan Tøssebro (Eds.), pp145-164
- Stangvik, G. (1998c). Arbeidsmåter i spesialundervisningen: En kritisk analyse (Method and Procedures in Special Education: A Critical Analysis). In Stangvik, G., Rønbeck, A.E. & Simonsen, O., pp34 - 139
- Stangvik, G., (2001) Individuelle Opplærings- og habiliteringsplaner (Individual education and habilitation plans). Oslo: Abstrakt forlag AS
- Stangvik, G., Rønbeck, A.E. & Simonsen, O. (1998). Kvalitet i spesialpedagogisk arbeid. (Quality in Special Education). *HiF – Forskning* 1998:10, 1998
- Wheeler, J. J. (1996). The Use of Interactive Focus Groups to Aid in the Identification of Perceived Service and Support Delivery Needs of Persons with Developmental Disabilities and Their Families. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*-December 1996, pp294-303

---

## APPENDIX I A. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

---

Who am I?

I am Gunnar Stangvik, professor of education at Finnmark University College in Alta, Norway. I am courtesy professor at the University of Oregon, Eugene, USA. I am trained teacher and I have worked in regular and special classes. I have taught special education in Norway and Sweden. I have previously spent time as visiting professor at the University of Syracuse, USA, at the universities of Otago and Waikato, New Zealand, and at the Pomor University, Arkhangelsk, Russia. The main themes of my research have been efficacy of special education, self-concept development in different educational settings, construction of teaching material for mentally retarded children, quality of life, normalisation and social inclusion. If you have access to the Internet, you are welcome to visit my homepage, which will give you both professional and private information about me. The address is:

[http://www.hifm.no/hif/avdelingene/bsf/ped/ansatte/gunnar\\_stangvik/index.ht](http://www.hifm.no/hif/avdelingene/bsf/ped/ansatte/gunnar_stangvik/index.ht)

I am grateful to you for responding positively to take part in the interview. This is to inform you more about the project so that you know more fully what you are up to before you give your final agreement to participate.

The objective of this research project is to study special education work and policies in different cultures (i.e., Russia, Norway, New Zealand, and USA) from the perspectives of people related to the field as teachers, parents, administrators, policy-makers, or as researchers. I had just completed 15 interviews in Russia and 17 in New Zealand before I came here. Norwegian Research Council supports the research.

Moving towards a new millennium, there are conflicting views on how special education should develop. It is of great interest to try to observe both differences and commonalities in those views as they most certainly also will influence the agenda for years to come.

Professors Dianne and Phil Ferguson at the University of Oregon, Eugene kindly try to help me into the special education setting in the USA, including assisting me in setting up a list of potential persons for my interviews. When you are asked to share your views with me, that is because you are on that list.

You are kindly asked to spend approximately an hour together with me. We will start with an open interview that will take into account your specific background. After having identified yourself as regards your background and experience, the interview will revolve around the following main questions: What do you perceive to be the main problem(s) in special education in your setting/country? What do you regard as the main goal of special education? How do think this goal should be achieved? What is de facto done to achieve this goal? What types of goals are supported by society/schools? How? How do you perceive attitudes in your society? What barriers affecting special education do you observe? How do you compare the situation in your country as compared to other countries? How do you look upon the future of special education?

After the interview, which takes about 45 minutes, you will be asked to rate the importance of a set of statements about special education. This will take place in the same setting and take about 15 minutes. After this, I would greatly appreciate if we could spend an hour or so in your setting in order for us to get better known to each other and to exchange opinions as regards education and care in our two countries. What you may say in this chat will not be specifically related to you personally in any publication from this project.

Interviews will be taped, and I would appreciate being allowed to take a photo of you and your surroundings. They are only to support my work with the interviews, and will not be used in any type of publication without your written consent. All information will of course be treated anonymously, and you will be informed about the results of my research work in the USA.

If you need more information about the project, questions are of course welcome. I am staying in Eugene until June 20, 2000. I am doing fifteen interviews in the USA, and I hope to do so many as possible in the course of April and the beginning of May. If you accept my invitation to participate, please notify me as soon as possible, and give me the dates/times that suit you best.

I can be reached at these addresses and phone numbers:

Gunnar Stangvik, Specialised Training Program, 1235 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1235, phone 541-346-2488, fax 541-346-2471,

Or, Gunnar Stangvik, Heron Club, Apartment 11, 2050 Goodpasture Loop, Eugene, Oregon 97401 USA, phone 541-684-9392. I may also be reached by email:  
gunnar@oregon.uoregon.edu

---

## APPENDIX I B: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE - THE RUSSIAN VERSION

---

Гюннар Стангвик - профессор колледжа Финнмарка (Норвегия).

Сроки визита: 23.8 - 20.9

Область исследований: сравнительный исследовательский проект - цели и качество реабилитационной работы и работы специальных педагогов. Проект также включает Норвегию, Новую Зеландию и США. Поиск составляющих, которые являются необходимыми в работе с людьми с ограниченными возможностями (люди, которым требуется дополнительная помощь в обучении и развитии, социальных контактах), анализ результатов работы, на краткий срок и на перспективу.

Цель визита: взять интервью у людей, работающих в сфере реабилитации и специальной педагогики. 15 человек: 4 - родители, или имеющие ответственность за людей с ограниченными возможностями; 2 - ответственность административного \ политического характера (руководители); 9 - специалисты, напрямую работающие с людьми с ограниченными возможностями. Или: 10 - практические работники, 5 - научные работники, администраторы, родители. Все возрастные группы. Все виды патологий.

Требования к интервью: Наличие переводчика или владение английским или немецким языками. Продолжительность интервью 1 час. Основной вопрос: Какие результаты, по вашему мнению, самые важные в работе в сфере специальной педагогики и реабилитации? Что должно включаться в такую работу? Проблемы, возникающие в процессе работы? Причины их возникновения? Какие результаты возможно получить? Видео или аудио запись интервью. После общего интервью



---

## APPENDIX II. GUIDE FOR EXPERT INTERVIEWS

---

I will definitely need some expert knowledge. Therefore, I have tried to outline some issues that I need to discuss with you in order to interpret more correctly the material I have collected. I am very interested in discovering other prominent questions that you may have which may be necessary to raise in order to understand special education in the USA. I do not expect more than your views, and the information that you may convey to me through interviews.

The main ambition with the present project is to try to see special education practices from the point of view of the people who are embedded in those practices in terms of being teachers, parents, principles, etc. However, their view has to be contextualised. I do not regard their view as abstract, but imbedded in the patchwork of society and culture. The perceptions, motivations, observations and evaluations of special education by respondents give voices to how disability is “made real” when it “hits” a particular cultural and social setting. They are products of this setting. Their views have to be related to the role of schooling in a culture, to social values, as well as to parental aspirations and expectations and to professional values.

There doesn't seem to be an infinite number of issues, but, maybe, a number of general patterns. By analysing the parent discourse, the professional discourse, and the political discourse in a particular culture one may distinguish these patterns. However, background is needed in order to understand the generative logic of discourses.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. To what degree does the development of special education in the USA depart from an “established model” of development?<sup>9</sup>
2. What are the historic landmarks of this development?
3. What categories of disabilities have been focused in different time periods? Changes?
4. What have the influences of regular education been on special education?
5. Which are the most important laws and regulations for the development of special education in the USA?

### THE STRUCTURE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. How is special education organised? (The most prominent organisation models?)
2. How is teaching organised? (Full-time; part – time; paraprofessionals?)
3. Do teachers have special education training? What type? Years?
4. What is the role of parents in special education?
5. How is transition to society taken care of?

---

<sup>9</sup> Starting with the deaf and the blind, then the mentally retarded, the development of public schooling and law regulation relating to the unfit, the building of special schooling, dismantling special systems, inclusion....

## **MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES**

1. What is the role of the government in special education?
2. What is the role of schools and local government?
3. How is resources organised and distributed in special education?
4. Are there any differences between public and private schools?

## **THE PRESENT SITUATION**

1. What is the present policy? What is done to implement the policy?
2. What characterise to – days situation?
3. What are the most important issues?
4. How is the relation between special education and regular education defined?
5. How is inclusion understood?
6. What has research to say about special education in the USA?
7. What do YOU think are the most important criteria for the evaluation of special education?



---

## APPENDIX III A. RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PRACTICES

---

Your Name: .....

Role: (Please, underline) Teacher (Special-Regular-Primary-Intermediate-Secondary)  
Principal (Special-Regular-Primary-Intermediate-Secondary) Parent (Mother-Father)  
Researcher

Place:

Date:

This is a list of statements about special education practices. The focus is how you perceive these statements. You may regard each of them as more or less important. Rate their importance by selecting the appropriate value (1-7) from the ratings below. Write the values you choose in the brackets) after each statements. Please rate all statements. At the end you are asked to add statements which you think ought to belong to the list. Please select a value for that statement, too. (Remember: If your view is a political correct view or not is irrelevant).

Time: Max. 15 minutes.

Not important  
Slightly important  
Slightly more important  
Important  
Very important  
Most important  
Do not know

Participation and social inclusion is a goal for special education ()  
Special education services are based on the choice of those who receive them ()  
Special education is part of a comprehensive individual plan ()  
Assessment of possibilities and problems encompass all aspects of life ()  
Users of services are consulted in all stages of work ()  
Programmes and their results are reported continually ()  
Parents and pupils are asked to evaluate special education ()  
Special education improves mastery of ordinary and typical social roles ()  
Special education takes place in settings that may increase social interaction with ordinary people ()  
There is a priority of objectives based on personal needs ()  
Special education should be based on careful analysis of abilities and individual characteristics ()  
Special education has a documented practical relevance for the person ()  
Special education is based on needs perceived by the person and/or his/her environment ()  
Learning is continually assessed ()  
Special education takes place as close as possible to settings in which learning is to be used ()  
Evaluation of learning programs is based on standardised criteria ()

Pupils are grouped according to their learning characteristics ()

Special education furthers the mastery of school subjects ()

Special education furthers intellectual and psychological development ()

If you feel there is something missed out in the above, please write it down on the following line and give it a value from the scale

... ()

Further comments?

---

## APPENDIX III B: RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PRACTICES - THE RUSSIAN VERSION

---

Оцените важность каждого утверждения, поставив напротив него номер по следующей шкале:

- 1 - не имеет значения
- 2 - имеет маленькое значение
- 3 - имеет значение
- 4 - имеет важное значение
- 5 - имеет более важное значение
- 6 - имеет очень важное значение
- 7 - не знаю

Сначала прочитайте все утверждения, это может повлиять на Ваши ответы. Если Вы считаете нужным что-то добавить, внесите это в графу под таблицей.

Отвечайте быстро, используйте примерно 15 минут.

Благодарю за помощь.

Гюннар Стангвик

Утверждение	Степень важности
1. Цель специальной педагогики является участие и социальная адаптация во всех сферах жизни.	
2. Работа специальных педагогов базируется на выборе учеников \ родителей.	
3. Работа специальных педагогов - часть большого индивидуального плана.	
4. Исследования существующей проблемы и возможностей должно затрагивать все сферы жизни.	
5. Детям \ родителям даются консультации во всех фазах работы.	
6. По проблемам и результатам работы специальных педагогов регулярно представляется отчет.	

7. Родителей и детей просят оценить работу специальных педагогов.
8. Работа специальных педагогов облегчает овладение обычными и типичными социальными ролями.
9. Работа специальных педагогов проводится в окружении, увеличивающим социальное общение с другими людьми.
10. Приоритеты в работе специальных педагогов расставляются исходя из индивидуальных потребностей и целей.
11. Работа специальных педагогов основывается на всестороннем анализе возможностей и индивидуальных особенностей.
12. Результат работы регулярно оценивается.
13. Работа специальных педагогов проводится в окружении, максимально приближенном к реальному.
14. Программа обучения оценивается по стандартным критериям.
15. Ученики организовываются в группы согласно их особенностей.
16. Работа специальных педагогов позволяет улучшить восприятие школьных предметов.
17. Работа специальных педагогов улучшает интеллектуальное и психологическое развитие.

Если Вы считаете нужным что-то добавить, впишите это утверждение сюда и оцените его по вышеуказанной шкале.

Утверждение \_\_\_\_\_

Степень важности \_\_\_\_\_

---

## APPENDIX IV: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

---

In my attempt to compare special education in Russia, in the USA, and New Zealand I need some answers to the following questions<sup>10</sup>. I sincerely hope you may be able to assist me in answering some of these questions and/or draw my attention to relevant materials.

**What are the laws and regulations for educating children with disabilities?**

What policies are developed in order to implement the law?

**Is inclusion mandated in the law?**

Who are included? Who are excluded? Where do we find children with different types of learning disabilities? Factors affecting inclusion?

**How is special education defined?**

Who are entitled to education? To what education are they entitled?

**Who has the primary responsibility for their teaching? (Special education teacher – regular education teacher) How do they work together?**

How are the students with disabilities categorized? Where do they go to school?

**How is the funding of special education?**

Does the system of funding create incentives for inclusive or non-inclusive education?

How are children with disabilities identified?

**What are the procedural safeguards of the identification, referral, and placement process?**

**Are transition plans mandatory?**

What are the measures taken to secure transition?

**Is there a common set of goals for educating disabled and non-disabled children?**

Are those common goals adapted to the curricular level, and evaluated within a common framework?

**Is evaluation of outcomes of education mandatory?**

What are the procedures? Are there any measures mandated to secure a quality education?

**Is an IEP mandatory?**

**What support systems are mandated?**

How does the support system work?

How is teacher training organized? (Special v. regular?)

How are schools organized? Teacher stability across forms? Class size?

---

<sup>10</sup> Question in bold types indicates questions that may be answered by referring directly to public documents. To answer the other questions empirical and statistical information is needed.



## APPENDIX V A-C. PERSONS INTERVIEWED

<b>APPENDIX V A. PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN THE USA</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Place of Interview</b>
<b>Tom Hehir</b>	Former director of Special Education , Department of education, Washington, DC	Telephone
<b>Elisabeth B. Kozleski</b>	Director National Institute for Urban School Improvement 1380 Lawrence, Suite 650 D Denver, CO 80202	Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) conference in Vancouver, Canada
<b>Cleo Droege</b>	Teacher in the middle school, 6 <sup>th</sup> grade	Lincoln Middle School, Cottage Grove OR 7424
<b>Alfredo Artiles</b>	Assistant professor, Division of Urban Schooling, UCLA School of Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of Los Angeles (UCLA)405 Hilgard Ave, 3335 Moore Hall, Los Angeles	Telephone
<b>Robert H. Horner</b>	Professor & Head, DSECR; Dir. STP,	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1235
<b>Nancy Golden</b>	Director, Administrator Licensure Program, DELTA	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1235
<b>Dianne L. Ferguson<sup>11</sup></b>	Professor of Special Education, Director, Academic Support & Student Services,	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1235
<b>Jackie Lester</b>	Speech pathologist	Harrison Elementary School 1000 South 10 St, Cottage Grove OR 7424
Gerald Tindal	Department Head & Professor, Delta, Co-dir. BRT.	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1235
<b>Debbie Cunningham</b>	Director Latham Elementary School	Latham School, 32112 Latham rd,' Cottage Grove, OR 7424
<b>Kathy Dillon</b>	Learning Disabilities Specialist	Willamette High School, 1801 Echo Hollow Rd. Eugene, Oregon 97402
Anne Smith	Education Research Analyst, Office of Special	Telephone

<sup>11</sup> Dianne Ferguson is also the mother of a severely multi handicapped son

	Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, Washington, DC, SEP/USDE, 330 C St SW, Washington, DC	
Wendy Smith	Provide direct services to children with disabilities, ages 0-3, and their families PSC 47 Box 1109 APO AE 09470, UK <sup>12</sup>	Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) conference in Vancouver, Canada
Jan Loomis	Mother of child with services from Latham Elementary School	Latham School, 32112 Latham rd,' Cottage Grove, OR 7424
Philip Ferguson	Father of a multi-handicapped man <sup>13</sup>	Specialised Training Program, 1235 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1235
Judith Lerner	Mother of a daughter with Down Syndrome, and Attorney at Law	2510 Kincaid St. Eugene, OR 97405

<b>APPENDIX V B. PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN NEW ZEALAND</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Place of interview</b>
Colleen Brown	Mother of a son with Down Syndrome	Manukau Institute of Technology, Auckland
Karyn Hawkes	Assistant Principal Special Needs Melville High School, Hamilton	Melville High School, Hamilton
Richard Clarke	Principal Primary school	Vardon Primary School, 36 Cunningham rd. Hamilton
Gwyneth Williamson	Senior teacher	Vardon Primary School, 36 Cunningham rd. Hamilton .
John O'Neill	Teaching and Research	Massey University, P.B11222, Palmerston North
Sally Jackson	Chief Executive	The National Office of the Ministry of Education, 45 Pipitea St., Thorndon, Wellington

<sup>12</sup> US specialist presently staying in the UK

<sup>13</sup> Phillip Ferguson was interviewed in the capacity of being a father of a severely handicapped son, but he is also assistant professor of special education



Elva Sontag	3: Mother of daughter with Down syndrome	111F Victoria St., Cambridge
Jill Weidenbohm	1:Principal of a special school	Patricia Avenue Special School, Patricia Ave
Garth Ritchie	Father of son with learning disabilities <sup>14</sup>	Dep. of Ed. Studies, University of Waikato, Hamilton
Dr Adrian Pett	10:Parent. Father of a son with learning disabilities	Medical Practice. Verco rd, Hamilton
Jennie Roberts	9:Teacher at a Satellite school	Silverdale Satellite of Patricia Ave Special School, Hamilton
Chris Mills	7:Resource Teacher	Vardon Primary School,36 Cunningham rd. Hamilton
Andrew Tharrat	6:Resource Teacher	Vardon Primary School,36 Cunningham rd. Hamilton
Jill Bevan-Brown	Program Co-ordinator Education of Learners with Special Education Needs	Massey University, College of Education. Department of Learning and Teaching, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North, New Zealand
David Mitchell	Professor of Special Education	University of Waikato, Dept. of Ed. Studies, Hamilton
Keith Ballard	Professor of Education	University of Otago, Dunedin

<b>APPENDIX V C. PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND INTERPRETERS IN RUSSIA</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Place of interview</b>
Galina Goloukhova	Parent	Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Work: 7 8182 24 31 32 Home: 7 8182 26 11 06
Marina Mamalyzhenko	Special teacher	Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Work: 7 8182 24 31

<sup>14</sup> Dr Ritchie is also a university teacher and researcher

		32 Home:7 8182 44 19 18
Grigory Rezvyj	Psychiatrist	K. Marx St. 12 - 114, Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 43 50 53
Olga Bogdanova Svetlana Zinovjeva	Director and medial doctor	Rehabilitation Centre for Children with Cerebral Palsy (Reabilitatsionnyj tsentr dlja detej s tsrebraljnym paralichem), Strelkovaja St. 4-1, Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 44 08 54
Rimma Gontaruk	Parent	23 Gvardejskaja Divizija St. 10-1 - 41 , Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 23 96 83
Sysoeva Svetlana	Parent	Loginov St. 23-1 - 64, Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 49 42 77
Julia Voronina	Special teacher	Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Work: 7 8182 24 31 32
Nadezhda Belozjorova	Special teacher	Buljvar Stroitelej St. 21, Severodvinsk, Centre for Centre for children who are deaf or hard of hearing (Surdotsentr) Arkhangelsk Region Phone: 7 818 42 1 37 10
Elena & Andrej Marjandysheva	Parents	Naberezhnaja St. 114-16 , Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 23 98 66
Anatoly Borisov	Director and psychiatrist	Proletarskaja St. 59,

		Novodvinsk Home for Children with Mental Retardation (Detskij dom dlja detej s otstavaniem v psikhicheskom razvitii) Phone: 7 818 52 4 53 60
Anna Vakhrusheva	Special teacher	Home for Children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing (Detskij dom dlja glukhikh i slaboslyshashjikh detej), Badigin gt. 14, Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 47 59 11
Anatoly Gribanov	Director	Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Phone: 7 8182 24 09 06
Tatjana Zdanova		Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Email: I_child@pomorsu.ru
Ludmilla Mednikova	Special teacher	Institute for Child Development (Institut razvitija rebjenka), Badigin St. 3, Arkhangelsk Email: I_child@pomorsu.ru
Lev Levit,	Interpreter	e-mail: <a href="mailto:levit@arh.ru">levit@arh.ru</a>
Julia Govorova:	Interpreter	Phone: 0078182 43 96 34 , e-mail: <a href="mailto:jilia@mail.ru">jilia@mail.ru</a> , home page: <a href="http://www.chat.ru/~julia_911">http://www.chat.ru/~julia_911</a>

Olga Kagan,	Interpreter	Subsidiary of the North Norwegian Diaconate, Badigin st. 3, Arkhangelsk 163045 Russia Phone: 7 8182 24 00 70/7 8182 24 31 32/7 51295 16179/47 789 16179. Fax: 7 8182 24 00 70/7 51295 16179/47 789 16179 e-mail: nnd@arkhangelsk.ru & kagan@pomor.su.ru
-------------	-------------	---

---

## LIST OF REPORTS

---

Gunnar Stangvik (2002). Background and Design. Report No 1 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice". HiF-Rapport 2002:6, Finnmark University College

Gunnar Stangvik (2002). Special Education in a Comparative Perspective. Report No 2 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice", HiF-Rapport 2002:7, Finnmark University College

Gunnar Stangvik (2002). A Study of Special Education in Russia. Report No 3 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice", HiF-Rapport 2002:8, Finnmark University College,

Gunnar Stangvik (2002). A Study of Special Education in the United States of America. Report No 4 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice", HiF-Rapport 2002:9, Finnmark University College

Gunnar Stangvik (2002). A Study of Special Education in New Zealand. Report No 5 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice", HiF-Rapport 2002:10, Finnmark University College

Gunnar Stangvik (2002) Exploring the Issue of Quality in Special Education. Report No 6 from the project " Special Education at the Bottom Line. A Cross-cultural Study of the Quality of Special Education Practice", HiF-Rapport 2002:11, Finnmark University College

