Maynooth University
National University of Ireland Maynooth

Special Topic Research Paper SO303A2

How inclusive is the inclusive model of education in Ireland? A comparative study of absenteeism and attitudes towards school of children with Special educational needs and children without Special educational needs.

Student Name: **Lisa Mc Cormack**

Subject: **Sociology**

Special Topic Director: **Dr Delma Byrne**

Date Submitted: **5/4/2023**

Table of Contents:

Contents

Table of Abbreviations

ADHD	Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder
ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorder
CSO	Central Statistics Office
DEIS	Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools
EBD	Emotional and Behavioural Disorders
EPSEN	The Education for Persons with Special Educational Needs Act
GUI	Growing up in Ireland Study
ID	Intellectual Disability
NCSE	National Council for Special Education
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SNA	Special Needs Assistant
UNESCO	The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

List of Tables

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank all the staff at Maynooth Sociology Department for the past three years, particularly Prof Mary Corcoran, Prof Colin Coulter and Dr Mary Benson. Their enthusiasm for their sociology subjects shone through in their lectures and inspired me to learn more about the subject. I would especially like to thank my special topic leader Dr Delma Byrne whose support, encouragement, and guidance helped me bring this research paper together.

I would also like to thank my family and friends who helped and supported me over the past year. My dad, who helped with childminding duties, and my granddaughter, who missed a few trips to the playground so Nana could work on her research project, deserve special mention. Finally, a special thanks to my son Jamie, whose own journey through the Irish educational system inspired me to choose this subject for my special topic research paper.

Abstract:

Inclusive education is a process that aims to address and respond to students' diverse needs; it involves breaking down barriers to ensure that each student gets the most out of their education. Previous research has shown that students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) encounter unique difficulties in the educational system when compared to students without SEN. The objective of this research is to compare SEN students' perceptions of the Irish educational system to those students without an SEN. This paper uses data from a longitudinal study of 7525 13-year-olds and employs a child-centred research method to investigate whether children with SEN experience school differently than those without SEN. This paper will focus on absenteeism rates and reasons for absenteeism, as well as levels of encouragement and belongingness to measure inclusiveness in schools. The findings suggest that students with SEN in Ireland are far more likely to be absent from school and for a longer period than those without SEN. Additionally, those with SEN are more likely to miss school because of issues with other children or school refusal. Furthermore, those with SEN hate school more than those without SEN. However, while feelings of encouragement from teachers were found to be similar for those with SEN than those without SEN, those with SEN were more likely to never be asked questions by teachers than those without SEN. Finally, the findings revealed that those with SEN encountered more disciplinary measures than those without SEN. The findings of this study highlight the challenges that students with SEN face in attaining full inclusion in the Irish educational system.

Chapter 1:

Introduction

In the 1990s, Ireland saw a shift away from the segregated educational system and toward a more inclusive educational model. In response to international demands for a more equitable and inclusive education system, new frameworks such as the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO 1994) were formed, and the Irish education system followed suit and began to promote the development of inclusive schooling. This led to the 2004 EPSEN Act, which specified that the aim is to educate children with special needs in an inclusive environment with children who do not have special needs. In recent years, policy in Ireland has sought to shift provision for students with SEN from specialised to mainstream education settings. Ireland currently employs a hybrid educational framework, with some children educated in mainstream schools, special classes attached to mainstream schools, and special schools. Within a mainstream setting, children are typically placed in either a special class within the school or in a mainstream class with extra support in the form of a Special Needs Assistant (SNA) or resource teaching hours (NCSE 2014). However, previous research has indicated that the 'inclusive' environment may not be as welcoming for children with SEN (Special Educational Needs) as had been envisioned. Children with SEN have been reported to dislike school and have lower levels of life satisfaction than those who do not have SEN (McCoy, Banks, and Shevlin 2016; Swift et al. 2021; Mihut, McCoy, and Maître 2022). Similarly, children with SEN are more likely to be absent and excluded from school than their peers without SEN (Brennan and Browne 2019; Anderson 2021; Tanya Lereya et al. 2022). The attitudes of teachers are crucial to the effectiveness of inclusion for children with special needs. A recent study in Ireland discovered that teachers' views toward the inclusion of children with ASD were unfavourable or indifferent. Findings revealed that teachers who

considered they had sufficient support to encourage inclusion had much more favourable attitudes toward inclusion (Leonard and Smyth 2022). Thus, highlighting children with SEN have a different experience with the educational system than those without SEN.

Special education was first shaped by the medical model of disability, which perceives individuals as flawed due to “their deficits and views them as victims with illnesses that must be cured (Barton 1993). The social model of disability has attempted to depict disability as a result of social organisation instead of impairment. The individual is disabled not by their impairment, but by society's failure to recognise and organise around difference (Oliver 1996; Shakespeare 2009). This research paper will attempt to determine whether there are any barriers to inclusive education for children with SEN using the GUI data. Additionally, Bourdieu's' theory of Social Capital will be employed to evaluate children's feelings of belonging in school. According to recent research, a sense of belonging in education and social capital are significantly positively correlated (Ahn and Davis 2020).

While previous research has employed GUI (Growing up in Ireland Study) to explore the experiences of SEN students in the Irish education system, most of it has concentrated on wave one of the child cohorts aged 9 (McCoy and Banks 2012; Banks, Shevlin, and McCoy 2012). Although some have focused on wave 2 of the child cohort, they have specifically focused on transitions to secondary school (McCoy, Shevlin, and Rose 2020) and the academic and socioemotional outcomes of SEN students (Mihut, McCoy, and Maître 2022). This wave cohort is particularly interesting for research since it is the age of transition to secondary school, and negative transitions can have a detrimental effect on a child's socio-emotional well-being. Research has found children with SEN are more likely to experience significant transition difficulties (Smyth 2016). However, minimal research has been conducted on levels of inclusion and absenteeism. Therefore, this research paper will attempt

to address a gap in research by evaluating if children with SEN feel included in school at the age of 13 in comparison to those without SEN.

This research paper aims to conduct a comparative study of absenteeism and experiences of inclusion in schools of children with and without SEN. Specifically, this research paper will address the following questions. What factors lead children with SEN to be absent from school, and are there any disparities between them and students without SEN? How do children with SEN feel about the school learning environment in contrast to those without SEN? Is there a variation in SEN children's feelings of inclusion and encouragement in their class compared to those without SEN? Do children with SEN get into trouble more in school than those with SEN? This study will also evaluate the variable of the severity of the child's disability to determine if it has an impact on their experience in the inclusive school environment. Inclusive education has been shown to be beneficial for individuals with moderate to severe disabilities (Downing and Peckham-Hardin 2007).

Chapter 2:

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction.

According to Barton (1997), inclusive education encompasses two functions: promoting participation and eradicating exclusionary barriers. There are numerous sociological theories that address these functions of inclusive education. This literature review will begin by discussing prior research on inclusion and absenteeism in school. Following this, the paper will address the theoretical framework of the social model of disability and how it relates to inclusion, as well as Bourdieu's theory of capital and how feelings of inclusion may result in increased social capital.

2.2 Previous Research.

A fully inclusive learning environment values and respects all students, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, capability, socioeconomic class, or special educational need. According to research, fully inclusive environments produce better academic and social outcomes for children than segregated environments. In a 5-year longitudinal study of a large cohort of children with and without SEN, Anderson (2021) observed that the more inclusive the environment, the fewer disciplinary occurrences, and better attendance. Additional research has found a positive correlation between feelings of belonging and the levels of inclusivity in educational settings, as well as higher attendance rates (Stiefel et al. 2018; Gottfried et al. 2019. Absenteeism rates are higher for children with SEN however this varies depending on

the disability. Children with emotional/behavioural difficulties (EBD) have been found to have high rates of absenteeism (Banks, Maître, and McCoy 2015; Gottfried et al. 2019). However, a recent longitudinal study conducted in the United Kingdom revealed that students with SEN who had a physical disability had the largest levels of absenteeism, preceded by those with behavioural, emotional, and social challenges (Tanya Lereya et al. 2022). Similarly, students with SEN are absent from school for varied reasons than those without SEN. Recent research found that those with ID (intellectual disability) were more likely to be absent due to emotional distress (Melvin et al. 2023). Additional studies have shown that school refusal behaviour is common in ASD students (Munkhaugen et al. 2017). Therefore, the type of disability a student has impacts how they engage with the education system.

Children's school experiences and attitudes towards school vary depending on the type of SEN they have. McCoy and Banks (2012) found that Irish students with SEN, notably those with combined disabilities and EBD, are more inclined to dislike school compared to those with different forms of SEN. Furthermore, those from lower economically disadvantaged households are more prone to report disliking school. In contrast, a separate study discovered that students from disadvantaged backgrounds and those attending DEIS schools are significantly more likely than their peers to be identified with having a special educational need, such as emotional behavioural problems (Banks, Shevlin, and McCoy 2012). Students with SEN frequently encounter socially constructed and reinforced perceptions of difference in educational settings. Children with SEN often have access to a Special Needs Assistant (SNA), and a resource teacher in schools, and sometimes attend schools outside of their catchment areas (O'Brien 2022) emphasising a difference from their peers. Children with SEN are conscious that they are different and that they are treated differently by peers and teachers. According to MacArthur et al. (2007), disabled children felt and were made to feel different because of a variety of institutional barriers, including separate provisions for

disabled students and peer and teacher attitudes about diversity. Much previous research has indicated that children with SEN experience the educational system differently from those without SEN and that the more inclusive the academic setting, the higher level of feeling included.

A sense of belonging in school is pivotal to children's socio-emotional well-being and academic success. Teachers are in an influential position to influence students' sense of belonging to school. Ma (2003) identified that students' academic achievement is not essential for their sense of belonging to school; what matters is the presence of nurturing peers and teachers, as well as a greater level of attention and encouragement towards their schoolwork and academic success. According to Osterman (2000), students' feelings of acceptance influence many aspects of their behaviour, and schools can implement organisational practises that undermine students' sense of belonging. However, for children with SEN a sense of belonging is crucial for feelings of inclusion in school. A recent study in a large secondary school in Ireland discovered that students with SEN had a lower sense of belonging than their non-SEN peers and faced a wide range of barriers that impacted their sense of connection to school (Cullinane 2020). Similarly, other research has found that levels of belonging vary depending on the type of disability. Dimitrellou and Hurry (2019) revealed that students with SEN are not a unified group, as students with EBD had a lower sense of belonging than students with learning difficulties. The same research found that both groups' sense of belonging was linked with their positive perceived relationships with teachers and the inclusiveness of school (Dimitrellou and Hurry 2019). Thus, emphasising the significant impact an inclusive environment can have on a student with SEN's socioemotional well-being.

According to research, students with special educational needs appear to perform better in inclusive settings than in non-inclusive settings (Ruijs and Peetsma 2009). Lindsay's (2007)

meta-analysis study, on the other hand, found no differences or a positive effect for children with SEN in an inclusive setting in terms of academic achievement. In terms of socio-emotional outcomes, inclusion appears to be more significant. Wiener and Tardif (2004) found that children with SEN who were placed in more inclusive settings had stronger social and emotional functioning. Similarly, children in inclusive classes had more meaningful relationships with their peers, were less lonely, and presented with fewer problem behaviours than children in Special Classes (Wiener and Tardif 2004). Additionally, children who do not have a SEN can benefit from an inclusive educational model. In their review of studies on the social effects of inclusion, Salend and Garrick Duhaney (1999) concluded that children in inclusive settings demonstrated increased acceptance, understanding, and tolerance of individual differences.

2.3 Theoretical Framework.

There are three major sociological theories that characterise the function of education: conflict theory, functionalism, and symbolic interactionism. According to conflict theorists, the educational system reinforces social inequalities caused by differences in class, gender, race, and disability (Collins 1971). This is noteworthy since some SEN students are segregated into separate Special classes within a mainstream school. As of 2021, there are 2,118 special classes in Irish schools, serving 12,700 students with autism, learning disabilities, and other special needs (Mc Bride 2021). The duration of time an SEN student integrates into the mainstream setting varies depending on the child; some will integrate for small periods while some will be fully integrated into the mainstream setting with support. Recent research, however, has observed that requiring students to withdraw from class for supports such as resource hours may not be beneficial to the promotion of inclusive practise (Rose and Shevlin 2020). Symbolic interactionism (Mead 1934) in education is concerned with individuals' social interactions in school settings and how they affect the learning

environment. The functionalist perspective emphasises the positive aspects of schools, such as socialisation, and how they contribute to social stability and order. Although each of these theories is beneficial for studying SEN, the conflict theory of Bourdieu's Social Capital will be applied in this research paper.

Prior to the 1970s, disability was viewed as a medically defined deficiency in the individual, which resulted in significant barriers for those with disabilities' in participating in employment and other major aspects of social life. Mike Olivers' (1983) theory of the social model of disability argued that it is the way society is organised, not a person's impairments or medical diagnosis, that is disabling. This model, however, has been criticised since it is centred on physical disability and unfairly generalises other disabilities (Anastasiou and Kauffman 2013). Nevertheless, the social model of disability will be employed for the objectives of this research since it identifies social prejudices, inaccessible environments, discriminatory work arrangements, and segregated education as disabling societal features (Oliver 1996 :33). Thus, it is the most suitable theoretical framework for conducting research on inclusion in school for students with SEN.

2.3.1 Bourdieu's Theory of Social Capital and Inclusion.

According to research, individuals with disabilities have less social capital than people without disabilities (McPhedran 2010 ;Mithen et al. 2015). Bourdieu argues that social capital activity promotes social reproduction when it is linked to individual education. Students can be primary agents in their own life, developing skills that will help them enhance their social capital resources (Bourdieu 1986). Relationships and connections with peers and teachers are important in building social capital within the education system. However, students with SEN particularly those with EBD often have poor relationships with teachers and peers (Murray

and Greenberg 2006; Broomhead 2019). Capital in the form of wealth and status is produced through social connections with various groups and communities (Bourdieu 1986). Thus, school is considered one of the most important places to develop social capital. Yet, children with SEN are more likely to be excluded and suspended from school than those without SEN (Brennan and Browne 2019; McCluskey et al. 2019). The school environment is an ideal setting to build social skills which in turn builds social capital. However, students with specific disabilities will have difficulty with social skills; therefore, feeling included in an educational setting can equip them with the opportunities to enhance their social skills, thereby generating social capital.

2.3.2 Social Model of Disability.

Historically, the medicalization of disability tended to see disabled persons as having a defect (Oliver 1996). Disability movements advocated for a shift away from medical discourses concerning disability and toward a social model of disability in the 1970s, and thus theories of inclusion began to emerge. The social model demonstrates that the difficulties that disabled people experience are the result of societal oppression and marginalisation, rather than individual deficiencies (Oliver 1996; Shakespeare 2009; Barnes 2019). Therefore, disabled individuals, per the social model, are disabled not because of their deficiencies, but because society refuses to acknowledge their needs. The primary objective of inclusive education is to remove barriers that stop students with special needs from receiving equal access to education. This corresponds to the social model of disability of altering the environment to match the needs of these students and enabling participation and inclusion in schools. However, Oliver (1996) claims that problems arise in 'inclusive' environments when it is not recognised that disability is caused by social organisation and illness is caused by

disease, because those who adopt an 'inclusive' approach fail to distinguish between illness and impairment and are frequently discussed as the same thing.

Chapter 3

Methodology.

3.1 Introduction.

The objective of this paper is to conduct a comparative analysis of absenteeism and perceptions of inclusion in Irish schools of children with and without SEN. According to the EPSEN Act of 2004, children with special educational needs should be educated in an inclusive environment alongside children who do not have special educational needs whenever possible. Although this practice occurs in Irish schools, this research paper examines whether children with SEN feel truly included in school. According to Barton (1997), inclusive education involves two functions: increasing participation and removing exclusionary barriers. This paper will employ the Social Model of Disability and Bourdieu's' theory of Social Capital to explore whether children with SEN experience inclusion in school. This chapter will describe the methods for obtaining the data from the GUI to address this research question.

3.2 Research Design.

The research design that will be employed in this study is a cross-sectional, quantitative study that will use secondary data analysis based on the Growing Up in Ireland-the National Longitudinal Study of Children in Ireland (GUI). The aim of the GUI is to explore the broad range of factors that either promote or adversely affect the wellbeing of Irish children. The GUI employs Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, which claims that we must consider not only the child and their immediate environment but also the interplay of the

wider environment (Thornton et al. 2016). The primary objective of GUI is to examine the factors that contribute to or detract from the well-being of children in Irish families. The GUI intends that the findings will assist in the development of appropriate and effective child-related policies.

The research data will be derived from the child cohort 2012 wave 2 aged 13 years. The first wave of this cohort, which included 8,568 child participants, was interviewed in 2008 when they were 9 years old. The second wave consisted of 7,525 participants. The findings at 13 represent the shift from childhood to adolescence. The transition to adolescence can have a wide-ranging influence on a child's life. Thus, young people with SEN may have a vastly different transitional experience than those without SEN. The Growing Up in Ireland study offers a unique opportunity to evaluate the multidimensional and multi-layered factors that influence children's development (McCoy et al., 2012).

A cross-sectional design will be employed in the proposed study. A cross-sectional research structure enables researchers to evaluate numerous variables at the same time (Bryman 2016). The GUI data will be the primary source of information for this research. It will rely on parental questions to determine the type of SEN the child has and how it affects their daily lives and their children's rates of absenteeism. Similarly, it will draw on the children's responses to determine their feelings of belonging and inclusion within their school environment

3.3 Variables.

3.2.1 Independent Variables

As mentioned, the aim of this research paper is to measure how inclusive the educational environment is for children with SEN in comparison to those without SEN. To establish this, an independent variable of disability will be used to determine the research question. To

determine the disability status of each child information was obtained from the primary caregiver questionnaire. Questions included whether the child had a disability and whether the child had multiple diagnoses. The survey specifically asks, "Does your child have a disability, chronic health problem, mental health challenge, or sickness, and what is the nature of this condition?" The primary carer was also asked if their child had any of the following diagnoses/disabilities: a physical/sensory disability, a specific learning disability, a learning disability, an emotional/behavioural disorder, or a speech/language difficulty. This question specifies how many conditions/disabilities the child has, and the responses will serve as the independent variable in this study.

3.1.2 Dependent Variables.

The dependent variables are the rates of absenteeism and the reasons for being absent the questions are part of a caregiver questionnaire that outlines how many days the child was absent from school in the previous year and what were the primary factors for absence. Absenteeism can impact a child's academic performance as well as their social development, potentially putting them at a disadvantage (Thornton et al., 2013). The second research question attempts to establish if children with SEN a sense of have belonging in school. It aims to find out whether children with SEN dislike school more than those who do not have SEN by asking the children how they feel about school with feelings being the dependent variable. A sense of belonging is crucial for positive student outcomes. Finn (1989) found that if children do not feel like they belong in school, they will gradually disengage or drop out. The third question attempts to quantify feelings of inclusion and engagement by asking students whether they are encouraged or asked questions by teachers in class. Student-teacher relationships have a significant impact on how well children perform in school. These relationships have an influence on the social, behavioural, and emotional development of children. McGrath and Van Bergen (2015) discovered that negative relationships with

teachers have an adverse effect on student behaviour, adjustment, and performance. The fourth dependent variable, difficulty in school, seeks to assess whether children with SEN experience greater difficulty in school than those without SEN by asking how frequently they have been suspended or got in trouble in school. According to Southwell (2006), truancy/school skipping can be considered an important predictor of unmet educational needs. Similarly, suspension and expulsion have been linked to negative developmental outcomes and increase the probability of a student encountering the criminal justice system (Skiba, Arredondo, and Williams 2014, Mowen and Brent 2016).

3.3 Organisational Methods.

To contextualise how disability impacts absenteeism and feelings of belonging for students with SEN, this study focused on factors such as how children with SEN feel about school, whether they are encouraged by their teachers, and their levels of engagement with school. To formalise these influences, both the parent and child data were scanned within the GUI to find the most appropriate variables for the research question. Both parents' and children's responses were recorded as variables. Parents' responses aimed to determine the nature, duration, and limitations of the illness or disability as well as the number of days the child was absent from school during the year. The children's responses sought to understand their perception and experience of school, as well as whether their SEN hindered their school experience.

Table 1. Organisational Methods

	Conceptualisation	**Organisational**
Disability	• **Prevalence of disability**	• **Does the child have any on-going illness, mental health issue or disability?** • **How many conditions or disabilities does the child have?**

Absenteeism	• **Do absenteeism rates differ for students with SEN?** • **Are reasons for absenteeism different for students with SEN?**	• **How many days was child absent from school?** • **What are the main reasons for being absent from school?** 1.
Inclusion	• **Do children with SEN like school?** • **Do children with SEN feel encouraged in school?** • **Do children feel a sense of belonging within the school setting?**	• **How does the child feel about school?** • **How often does the following happen in school?** 1. You are told by a teacher that your work is good. 2. You are encouraged to ask questions in class 3. A teacher praises you 4. You are given out to by teacher for untidy work 5. You are asked questions by the teacher 6. You are given out for misbehaving in class. • **Over the last 12 months how often do the following things happen to you?** 1. I was late for school 2. I got in trouble for not following the rules 3. I skipped class 4. I had to extra work as punishment 5. I had to do detention 6. I was suspended from school

3.4 Analytical approach.

To begin the GUI analysis, SPSS cohort wave 2 data was downloaded and saved to two separate files titled: *Special Topic Research (Working file)* and *Special topic Research (Master file)*. Univariate analysis of each variable was conducted to formulate a summary of statistics (table 2). This was achieved by opening the SPSS working file and selecting the option analyse, then frequency, and finally adding the variables to be analysed into the select box. The mode was then selected from the statistics category to run the univariate analysis. The distributions of the two dependent variables were then calculated. Univariate analysis was utilized to establish whether the child had a disability, illness, or mental health problem. Additionally, univariate analysis was used to determine the type of SEN the children had, as well as any SEN comorbidities. Using bivariate analysis of cross-tabulation, analysis was

conducted to determine if there was a relationship between SEN and absenteeism and inclusion. Discovering relationships between variables involves searching for evidence that variation in one variable corresponds to variation in another (Bryman 2016:339). The models in the analysis were performed in two steps, first with absenteeism variables and then with inclusion variables. Since the variables were both ordinal, two crosstabulation analyses were performed to assess absenteeism rates and reasons for absence among SEN students. The remaining variables were also ordinal, thus three bivariate crosstabulations were performed on the inclusion variable to examine levels of belonging, inclusion, and exclusion. Chi-square tests were subsequently used to put the hypothesis of the study to the test. The Chi-square enables us to determine how certain we are that there is a relationship between the two variables (Bryman 2016:348).

3.5 Limitations.

The classification of children with SEN was a significant limitation of the research. GUI was not designed specifically to examine children with special educational needs, and the SEN classification method is not perfect. Cosgrove et al. (2014) used the GUI study to classify the different types of SEN in children. However, they found that the number of children in some of the SEN groups is insufficient to comment on their specific SEN in the context of the study. Therefore, the specific SEN category was not utilized in this research paper for this reason. Another limitation is the research method applied in the GUI. Qualitative data would have been preferable since it can provide a more in-depth understanding of the lives of children with SEN. Likewise, the use of secondary data for research has some limitations. Since the GUI data was unfamiliar, it took some time to understand how the variables in the dataset were classified and organised. Additionally, due to the small number of participants in some of the response categories, several variables had to be recoded. The GUI data set was large and complex, and it lacked some variables that would have been useful for conducting

research on SEN students. For example, there was no variable for exclusion or expulsion from school, in parent/guardian questionnaires which would have been beneficial to compare data for both pupils with SEN and those without SEN. Thus, the lack of a variable for exclusion from school hindered the ability to accurately measure inclusiveness for students with SEN.

3.6 Ethical Issues.

In social research, ethical problems commonly arise around recurring issues. Diener and Crandall (1978) identified four key ethical principles: whether participants are harmed; whether there is a lack of informed consent; whether there is a violation of their privacy; and whether dishonesty is involved. The GUI adhered to these ethical guidelines. When studying children and families, the importance of ethical guidance cannot be overstated. The prime concern in the GUI was the protection of the children who participated in the research. All staff working on GUI were Garda-vetted in accordance with child protection procedures informed by the Children First Guidelines. Prior to data collection, participants were provided with information leaflets and informed that the study was completely voluntary. Likewise, signed consent was obtained from all parents or guardians before the collection of data. Additionally, as per ethical guidelines, none of the interviewers were to be left unsupervised with any of the children and were advised to report any concerns about the children to their project directors. Since the staff working on the GUI were employed by the CSO they were legally required to maintain the confidentiality of all information obtained during the research project.

Chapter 4.

Findings.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the key findings of the research and consider whether the hypotheses of do children with SEN have higher absenteeism rates and feel less included in school than children without SEN are valid. The findings demonstrate an association between high absenteeism rates and having a SEN, but the results for levels of inclusion and belonging are mixed. This will be discussed in greater depth below.

4.2 Univariate Analysis.

4.2.1 Independent Variable.

The independent variable in this research paper is SEN (disability). The ESPEN Act of 2004 defines SEN as a restriction in a person's ability to participate in and benefit from education due to an enduring physical, sensory, mental health, or learning disability, or any other condition that causes a person to learn differently than someone who does not have that condition. To determine the prevalence of disability, the answers to the parents' questions about whether their child had a disability were run through univariate analysis. When asked, "Does your child have an ongoing disability, illness, or mental health issue?" the analysis revealed that only 10.2% of respondents had a disability. However, when asked, "does your child have any of the following disabilities?" The prevalence rates altered. The responses to this question indicated a greater prevalence of SEN. Physical/sensory disabilities accounted for 6.1% of responses, Learning Disability 8.8%, ASD 1%, Emotional/Behavioural 1.3%, Speech/Language difficulty 1.6%, Slow progress 1.2%, and other 1.1%, for a total prevalence of 21.1%. Notably, the reported prevalence altered again when a univariate analysis was

conducted on the number of disabilities a child had. Several studies have been conducted on the prevalence of comorbidity in SEN. ADHD, for example, has been linked to other SEN such as conduct disorder, anxiety disorders, and learning disabilities (Biederman, Newcorn, and Sprich 1991). Similarly, those with ASD are more likely to have comorbid diagnoses of ADHD, social anxiety disorders, and oppositional defiance disorder (Simonoff et al. 2008). This is supported by the univariate analysis results on the prevalence of multiple SEN among students in the GUI dataset. 13.2% of participants have one disability, 2.6% have two disabilities, 0.9% have three disabilities, and 0.7% have four or more disabilities. This results in an overall prevalence of SEN of 17.4%. This is almost consistent with the findings of Cosgrove et al. (2018), who discovered a 17.9% prevalence of SEN among Irish schoolchildren aged 13. Therefore, this result will act as the independent variable in determining the prevalence of disability among students in the GUI dataset. However, due to the small number of respondents in the three and four number of disabilities categories, the number of disabilities dataset had to be recoded, and the groups needed to be combined.

Table 2: Table of Summary Statistics

Summary of Statistics	**N**	**%**
Does Child have a Disability?		
Yes	765	10.2
No	6757	89.8
Missing	3	0
Type of Disability		
Physical/Sensory	461	6.1
Learning Disability	666	8.8
ASD	73	1.0
Emotional/Behavioural	96	1.3

Speech/Language difficulty	123	1.6
Slow progress	88	1.2
Other	84	1.1
None	6210	82.5
Missing	50	0.
Number of Disabilities		
0	6210	82.5
1	990	13.2
2	197	2.6
3 plus	118	1.6
Missing	10	0.1
School Absenteeism		
0 days	1153	15.3
1 -3 days	2841	37.9
4-6 days	1782	23.7
7-10 days	1008	13.4
11-20 days	517	6.9
20 plus	194	2.6
Missing	30	0.4
Reasons for Absenteeism		
Health reasons	5107	67.9
Problems with weather/Family Holiday/Family Crisis	791	10.5
School Refusal/Problems with other children / Problems with transport	68	0.9
Did not miss School	1160	15.4
Missing	399	5.3
Feelings about School		
I like it very much	2314	30.8
I like it quite a bit	2465	32.8
I like it a bit	1879	25.0
I don't like it very much	535	7.1
I hate it	181	2.4
Missing	151	2.0
<u>Feelings of Encouragement</u>		
Encouragement in class		
Very often	1480	19.7
Often	2185	29.0
A few times	2696	35.8
Never	1068	14.2
Missing	96	1.3
Asked Questions in class		
Very Often	1719	22.8
Often	3664	48.7
A few times	1925	25.6
Never	124	1.6
Don't Know	4	.1
Missing	89	1.2

Difficulties in School		
Suspension from school		
Never	7292	96.9
Quite Often /all the time	139	1.9
Missing	94	1.2
Got in Trouble at School		
Never	4539	60.3
Now and Again	2544	33.8
Quite Often	284	3.8
All the time	63	0.8
Missing	95	1.3

4.2.2 Dependent Variables.

The primary goal of the univariate analysis is to provide an overview of the data to explore patterns in the data. This research paper's hypothesis is to explore absenteeism and inclusion rates among children with SEN and compare them to children without SEN. The section that follows will first look at absenteeism variables including absenteeism rates and reasons for absenteeism based on parent/caregiver responses. The succeeding section will concentrate on children's responses and analyse variables such as feelings about school, teacher encouragement, and suspension to establish levels of inclusion from the children's perspective.

Absenteeism

The primary caregiver responses were analysed to determine absenteeism levels among schoolchildren in this study. The number of days the child was absent during the previous school year was included in the answers. "0 days," "1-3 days," "4-6 days," "7-10 days," "11-20 days," and "more than 20 days" were the response categories. Results indicate that most children (37.9%) in this wave of the GUI missed 1-3 days of school. The next most common number of days missed was 4-6 days, which was reported by 23.7% of the caregivers. Missing

0 days was the subsequent most common response, with 15.3% of care givers reporting that their child missed 0 days of school. 13.4% of children missed 7 -10 days and 6.9% missing 11-20 days according to parents' responses. Finally, according to the findings of the univariate analysis, 2.6% of children missed 20 days or more of school.

Given the significant amount of missing data in the responses to the reasons for absenteeism, this variable had to be recoded. Missing data occurs when respondents fail to answer a question, either by accident or because they choose not to (Bryman 2016:333). After the variables were recoded, a new variable titled ‘did not miss any school was created'. The findings of the univariate analysis of reasons for a child's absence revealed that health reasons (67.9%) were the most common explanations for absenteeism. Family holidays, weather issues and family crises were the next most prevalent cause for absence, with 10.5% of caregivers citing them as the reason for their absence. Approximately 0.9% of students were absent from school due to problems with transport, problems with other children and school refusal. Finally, the recoded variable revealed that 15.4% of respondents missed no school. The Univariate analysis provides a broad understanding of the frequency and circumstances of school-related absences.

Inclusion.

To establish levels of inclusion among children "How do you feel about school in general?" served as a variable. These responses came from the children themselves, enabling us to obtain the children's own views and perspectives on their educational life. Most of the children,32.8% reported that they “like school quite a bit”. 30.2 % of children reported “liking it a lot” while 25% stated they “liked it a bit”. 7.1% of children indicated that they "didn't like it very much," while 2.4% stated that they "hated it." Finally, a small percentage of the data was missing: 2.0%. The Univariate analysis of this variable is important since it determines the child's perception and experience of school as well as assessing school engagement.

Encouragement.

To understand and evaluate feelings of encouragement experienced by students from educators, responses to the question "In general, how often do the following things happen in school?" were analysed. Two responses were measured to assess feelings of encouragement. The responses "you are encouraged to ask questions in class" and "you are asked questions in class by the teacher" were analysed for this research paper. The responses to being "encouraged to ask questions in class" are as follows: 35.8% of children were encouraged to ask questions “a few times” ,29% were encouraged to ask questions “often”,19.7% were encouraged “very often” while 14.2% were “never” encouraged. There was also 1.3% of missing data.

The second univariate analysis and variable chosen to measure encouragement perceptions were how frequently children were encouraged to ask questions in class. 48.7% of children responded that they were "often" asked questions by the teacher in class. 25.6% were asked a "few times" while 22.8% responded to being asked questions "quite often" by their teacher. 1.6% of children were "never" asked questions by their teachers. 0.1% of respondents were unsure if they were asked questions, and 1.2% of data was missing.

Difficulties in School.

Difficulties in school can result in a negative association with school for students with and without SEN. This univariate analysis of student suspension rates attempts to identify factors related to school engagement and performance in school. Most of the children (96.9%) responded that they were never suspended from school. 1.5% of children said they were suspended "now and then," while 1.4% said they were suspended "quite often/all the time." Given the considerable number of "never" responses, this variable had to be recoded, so the answers "now and then" and "quite often/all the time" were combined.

To assess student misbehaviour in school, a univariate analysis was performed on the question "How often do you get in trouble in class for not following the school rules?" The vast majority 60.3% of children stated that they never got into trouble at school. 33.8% of students reported getting in trouble now and again, while 3.8% disclosed getting in trouble quite often. Finally, 0.8% of respondents indicated that they were in trouble all the time.

4.3 Bivariate Analysis.

The premise of this research paper assumes that students with SEN will have different school experiences than students without SEN. This analysis will focus on how children with SEN perceive the school environment, with an emphasis on absenteeism, feelings of encouragement, and whether children with SEN like school more than those without SEN. To investigate the relationships between these variables, a bivariate analysis will be performed on each to determine whether the variables are related. The bivariate analysis findings will be addressed further below.

Absenteeism.

By first conducting a bivariate analysis of absenteeism levels, this paper seeks to determine whether children with special needs miss more school than children without special needs. School absenteeism is a significant social problem that has long-term negative consequences for the development of children and adolescents. When analysing the Chi-square below (Table 3) the results show the Chi-square is <0.05, thus, there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the groups are related. However, the Phi value of 0.103(Table 13) suggests that the strength of association is low. The crosstabulation analysis for absenteeism and SEN reveals clear differences in absenteeism rates between children with SEN and those without SEN. The main finding of the absenteeism variable analysis is that children with SEN miss

more days of school than those without SEN. Table 3 illustrates that children with SEN are more than twice as likely as children without disabilities to miss 20 or more days of school. Absenteeism rates for 7-10 days, 11-20 days, and 20 days or more were all higher for students with SEN compared to those without. However, results vary according to the number of disabilities/conditions a child has. Children with SEN who had three or more disabilities were twice as likely as children who only had one disability to miss 20 or more days of school. These findings suggest that children with more complex Special Educational Needs have a higher incidence of absenteeism.

Table 3. "How many days absent in the last 12 months?"

	Number of Disabilities									
Days Absent	**0**		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
0	976	15.8	132	13.4	25	12.7	20	17.2	1153	15.2
1-3	2423	39.1	312	31.7	67	34.0	35	30.2	2837	37.9
4-6	1465	23.7	252	25.6	36	18.3	26	22.4	1779	23.8
7-10	793	12.8	157	16.0	39	19.8	17	14.7	1006	13.4
11-20	400	6.5	88	9.0	20	10.2	9	7.8	517	6.9
20 plus	133	2.1	42	4.3	10	5.1	9	7.8	194	2.6

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square $x^2 = 57.158$, df 16 $P < 0.01$

This is consistent with previous research indicating that children with SEN miss more school days than those without SEN. The high number of students with SEN who miss 20 days, or more is particularly notable.

According to the findings of the univariate analyses, the most significant single factor associated with school absences is health reasons. The chi-square analysis results (Table 15)

indicate that the value is less than 0.5, suggesting that there is a relationship between the variables. The strength of association, however, is weak, as the Phi value is 0.043(Table 16). The crosstab analysis reveals that health reasons are the primary reasons for absenteeism in both children with and without SEN. However, children with SEN are more likely than their peers to miss school because of problems with other students or school refusal. Those with 3 disabilities or more are the most likely to be absent from school for these reasons (Table 4).

Table 4: What was the main reason for being absent from school?"

	Number of Disabilities									
Reasons for Absence	**0**		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Did not miss school.	977	16.6	135	14.6	25	19.3	22	19.3	1159	16.3
Health Reasons	4205	71.4	674	72.8	142	76.8	79	69.3	5100	71.7
Family Crisis/Holiday	661	11.2	102	11.0	15	8.1	11	9.6	789	11.1
Refusal/Problems with other Children	48	0.8	15	1.6	3	1.6	2	1.8	88	1.0

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square x^2 =13.385, *df* 9, *P* 0.146

Inclusion.

To attain high levels of inclusion for students with SEN, they should feel a sense of belonging in the educational environment. The chi-square results show that the value is 0.01 and thus the null hypothesis is rejected (Table 18). The Phi value is 0.083(Table 19), indicating a weak association. Following a crosstabulation, it is clear that there is a strong correlation between those who enjoy school and those who hate it. Students with SEN are considerably more likely than those without SEN to dislike or hate school. Just 2.2% of students without SEN hate

school, compared to 7% of students with three or more disabilities (Table 5). This result is noteworthy given that it may assess feelings of inclusion and belonging in school.

Table 5 "How do you feel about school in general?"

	Number of Disabilities									
Inclusion	**0**		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Feelings about school.										
I like it.	1956	32.0	263	27.2	51	26.3	41	41.0	2311	31.4
I like it quite a bit.	2074	34.0	318	32.9	52	26.8	18	18.0	2462	33.4
I like it a bit.	1513	24.8	276	28.6	63	32.5	26	26.0	1878	25.5
I don't like it very much.	429	7.0	79	8.2	18	9.3	8	8.0	534	7.3
I hate it.	132	2.2	30	3.1	10	5.2	7	7.0	179	2.4

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square $x^2 = 57.150$, *df* 16, $P<0.01$.

Feelings of Encouragement.

To determine feelings of inclusion, levels of encouragement were assessed by determining how frequently children were asked questions by their teachers and how often they were encouraged to ask questions in class. A chi-square test (Table 21) was used to determine if there is an association between the variables. The results indicate that since the p-value is < 0.5, the null hypothesis can be rejected, implying that the variables are related. The Phi value is 0.035(Table 22), indicating that the association is weak. The crosstab analysis (Table 6) reveals that children with SEN are asked questions by the teacher "very often" compared to those without SEN. Furthermore, those with multiple disabilities are more likely to be asked questions by their teacher than those with a single disability. However, while a greater proportion of children with

SEN are more likely to be "never" asked a question by a teacher, the percentage is quite small in comparison to those who are asked "very often". These findings point to encouraging inclusive practises among teachers in these children's schools.

Table 6: "Are you encouraged to ask Questions in class?"

	Number of Disabilities									
	0		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Encouraged to ask questions.										
Very Often	1245	20.2	182	18.7	33	16.9	19	18.8	1479	19.9
Often	1817	29.5	269	27.6	61	33.3	34	33.7	2181	29.4
A few times.	2204	35.8	379	38.9	70	35.9	39	38.6	2692	36.3
Never.	883	14.4	144	14.8	31	15.9	9	8.9	1067	14.4

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square x^2 =8.840, *df* 9, *P* 0.492.

Table 7: "Are you asked questions by teacher?"

	Number of Disabilities									
	0		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Asked Questions by teacher										
Very Often	1454	23.6	187	19.2	46	23.6	29	28.7	1716	23.1
Often	3065	49.8	475	48.8	84	43.1	36	35.6	3660	49.3
A few times.	1538	25.0	290	29.8	62	31.8	32	31.7	1922	25.9
Never.	95	1.5	22	2.3	3	1.5	4	4.0	124	1.7

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square x2 =31.597, df 9, P <0.01.

Turning to the question "Are you encouraged to ask questions in class?" the outcomes are comparable to those mentioned above. Since the chi-square result was less than 0.5, it suggests an association between the variables (Table 24). The Phi value is 0.065(Table 25), indicating

that the strength of the association is weak. According to the crosstabulation, children with SEN are slightly more inclined than those without SEN to never be asked questions by their teachers (Table 7). 1.5% of children without SEN are never asked a question compared to 4% of children with three or more SEN (Table 7).

Difficulties in School.

How children with SEN are disciplined may also contribute to lower levels of inclusion; therefore, to measure this, an analysis of suspension rates among students and if they get into trouble with the teacher will be conducted. The chi-square value from the analysis of how frequently students get in trouble in school is <0.01 indicating an association between the variables (Table 27). The association is weak, as indicated by the Phi value of 0.073(Table 28). The crosstabulation findings reveal that pupils with SEN are noticeably more likely to get into trouble than those without SEN. 3.5% of students without SEN get in trouble "quite often," while 6.9% of those with three or more disabilities get in trouble " quite often." Students without SEN make up only 0.7% of those who are in trouble all the time, whereas 4% of those with three or more comorbid disabilities get in trouble all the time (Table 8). These findings suggest that students with SEN are more likely to get in trouble, notably those with multiple disabilities, than those without.

Table. 8. "How often did you get into trouble for not following school rules?"

Number of Disabilities.

	0		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
Got in trouble /rules	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Never	3812	62.0	570	58.5	98	50.3	55	54.5	4535	61.1
Now & Again	2079	33.8	344	35.3	82	42.1	35	34.7	2540	34.2
Often	217	3.5	49	5.0	11	5.6	7	6.9	284	3.8
All the time	41	0.7	12	1.2	4	2.1	4	4.0	61	0.8

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square x^2=39.290, *df* 9, *P* <0.01

School suspension has been shown to have a negative impact on students' future life opportunities. The chi-square value from the evaluation of student suspension is <0.01 which rejects the null hypothesis and confirms a relationship between the variables (Table 30). The phi value is 0.066, inferring a weak relationship between the variables (Table 31). The findings of the crosstabulation analysis suggest that, while most pupils are not suspended from school, those with SEN are far more likely to be suspended than those without SEN. Only 1.2% of children with no SEN get suspended often/ time whereas children with SEN are more than twice as likely to be suspended from school (Table 9).

Table 9: "How often are you suspended from school?"

Number of Disabilities.

	0		**1**		**2**		**3 plus**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Suspension										
Never	6059	98.5	944	96.8	184	94.4	97	96.0	7284	98.2
Often/All the time.	91	1.5	31	3.2	11	5.6	4	4.0	137	1.8

Statistical Significance Index: Pearson Chi-Square x^2=32.113, *df* 3, *P* <0.01.

The findings of the bivariate analysis of variables related to absenteeism and levels of inclusion for students with SEN indicate that those with SEN encounter significant differences in the educational system. In comparison to students without SEN, students with SEN are more likely to be absent, hate school, get into trouble at school, and be suspended from school. Thus, the findings point to low inclusion levels for students with SEN in Irish schools.

Chapter 5.

Conclusion

One of the main aims of the 2004 ESPEN Act has been to ensure that students with SEN are educated in an inclusive environment as much as possible. The objective of this research paper was to determine whether the Irish "inclusive" educational setting was truly "inclusive" by analysing data from a child-centred perspective. This paper used the data from the Wave 2 cohort of children aged 13 years. The GUI's prime objective is to conduct evidence-based research on children's development and well-being as they grow, as well as to explore the factors that influence their developmental trajectory (Thornton et al. 2016). One objective of this research was to determine whether students with SEN experienced the educational setting differently than students without SEN. To determine this, this research evaluated data from the GUI, focusing on absenteeism levels, reasons for absenteeism, and feelings of inclusion. The data was collected from both students with SEN and those without SEN and compared to see if there was any variation between the two. The findings suggest that students with SEN have a different school experience than those without SEN, implying that the school environment is not as inclusive as initially assumed.

One of the GUI's overarching goals is to identify the long-term negative effects that contribute to social disadvantage and exclusion, educational difficulties, poor health, and deprivation (Thornton et al. 2016). Through using GUI, the findings of this research paper indicated that pupils with SEN are at a greater disadvantage in the educational system than those without SEN. When comparing absenteeism rates in the GUI, it is evident that pupils with SEN miss more school days than those without SEN. This is consistent with recent UK

research, which found that students with SEN are more than twice as likely as those without SEN to miss school (Gov.UK 2022). When exploring the reasons why students are absent, the findings indicate that those with SEN are more likely to be absent due to school refusal or problems with other children than those without SEN. Anxiety issues have been associated with an increased likelihood of school refusal behaviour in students with SEN (Neal et al., 2016) Similarly, other studies have shown that children with ASD and ADHD are more likely to refuse school due to bullying (McClemont et al. 2021). This is consistent with the findings of this study, which show that students with three SENs are more than three times more likely to miss school due to refusal or problems with other students. A noteworthy finding is that children with three or more disabilities are the group most likely to miss no school days; however, this could be related to children with SEN such as ASD or ADHD, where routine is critically important for their well-being (Henderson et al. 2011; Harris et al. 2014).

Previous research using the GUI 9-year-old dataset found that students with SEN dislike school more than those without SEN, and that attitudes towards school varied depending on the type of disability the child had (McCoy and Banks 2012). The findings of this study, which used a 13-year-old GUI dataset, were similar. However, the findings of this study revealed that students with SEN hated school more than those without SEN. Those with three conditions/disabilities were nearly four times more likely to hate school than those with no disabilities. These findings are consistent with previous research that found students with SEN may struggle with social participation, which influences how they feel about school. Koster et al. (2010), found students with SEN have fewer friends, have fewer interactions with classmates, and are less accepted than students without SEN. Attitudes towards school are significant since SEN students who were in more inclusive settings had better social and emotional functioning (Wiener and Tardif 2004).

To assess levels of belongingness (another indicator of inclusion) in schools, answers about feelings of encouragement were obtained from the dataset. The findings suggest that students with SEN were just as likely to be asked questions and to be encouraged to asked question as those without SEN. While these findings suggest that Irish teachers use inclusive practises, this is determined by the kind of disability students have. A recent study in Ireland observed that teachers had more negative attitudes toward the inclusion of children with ASD in mainstream education (Leonard and Smyth 2022). The outcomes of the question "How often are you asked questions in class?" appear to suggest that this is also the case. According to the findings, pupils with SEN are less likely to be asked questions by teachers.

According to the findings of this study, students with SEN encounter more disciplinary difficulties at school than those without SEN. This research paper explored suspension levels among students with SEN. Children who are suspended from school miss out on a variety of experiences and activities that are classified as indicators of inclusion and belonging (Brennan and Browne 2019). The findings from this research indicate that students with SEN are four times more likely to be suspended "now and again" compared to those without SEN. This is consistent with Brennan and Browne's (2019) finding that one in every four students with SEN is suspended from school. The results additionally indicate that students with four or more disabilities are more likely to be suspended from school. The research further indicates that those who get in the most trouble at school have SEN, and those with multiple disabilities are even more likely to get in trouble. Getting into trouble at school can have an impact on a student's educational outcomes.

The theoretical frameworks of Social Capital and the Social Model of Disability are applicable to this research to further analyse data on levels of inclusion in school. Social capital is produced through social connections, which are facilitated by institutions such as the educational system. The findings of this study highlight that since absenteeism and

suspension rates are higher for students with SEN, these results suggest that pupils with SEN have less social capital than those without SEN. Furthermore, because relationships with teachers are important in developing social capital, the findings of this study suggest that students with multiple SEN appear to have a more negative relationship with their teachers, implying that students with multiple disabilities have even less social capital. Thus, Bourdieu's theory is particularly relevant in this study because it reinforces how people with disabilities are frequently marginalised. By applying the Social Model of Disability to this research, it is possible to determine whether schools are fully inclusive. The findings indicate that schools are not fully inclusive in accordance with the Social Model of Disability framework. According to the findings, students with SEN are more marginalised than those who do not have SEN. Higher levels of absenteeism, suspensions, discipline issues, feeling less included, and hating school more than their peers support this argument. Thus, Olivers (1996) hypothesis on how problems can arise in so-called "inclusive environments" is supported by the findings of this research paper.

By using the unique GUI dataset, this study attempted to illustrate the significant disparities that students with SEN face in the Irish educational system. The study's objective was to explore how inclusive Irish education is by analysing absenteeism levels and feelings of inclusion in students with SEN and comparing the research results to students without SEN. Since there have been limited studies on inclusion in Ireland's educational system, the results may assist with Special Education research. The overall research findings indicate that there is little evidence of an inclusive educational system in Ireland. While a review of the 2004 ESPEN Act is currently in progress, with specific consultation from students with SEN and members of the public, the findings of this paper imply that the inclusive strategies outlined in the 2004 ESPEN Act are not being implemented fully in Irish schools.

Bibliography

Ahn, Mi Young, and Howard H. Davis. 2020. “Sense of Belonging as an Indicator of Social Capital.” *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 40(7/8):627–42.

Anastasiou, Dimitris, and James M. Kauffman. 2013. “The Social Model of Disability: Dichotomy between Impairment and Disability.” *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy: A Forum for Bioethics and Philosophy of Medicine* 38(4):441–59

Anderson, Kaitlin P. 2021. “The Relationship Between Inclusion, Absenteeism, and Disciplinary Outcomes for Students with Disabilities.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 43(1):32–59.

Banks, Joanne, Bertrand Maître, and Selina McCoy. 2015. *Insights into the Lives of Children with Disabilities: Findings from the 2006 National Disability Survey*. ESRI and the National Disability Authority.

Banks, Joanne, Michael Shevlin, and Selina McCoy. 2012. “Disproportionality in Special Education: Identifying Children with Emotional Behavioural Difficulties in Irish Primary Schools.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 27(2):219–35.

Barnes, Colin. 2019. “Understanding the Social Model of Disability: Past, Present and Future.” in *Routledge Handbook of Disability Studies*. Routledge.

Barton, Len. 1993. “The Struggle for Citizenship: The Case of Disabled People.” *Disability, Handicap & Society* 8(3):235–48.

Barton, Len. 1997. “Inclusive Education: Romantic, Subversive or Realistic?” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 1(3):231–42.

Biederman, J., J. Newcorn, and S. Sprich. 1991. “Comorbidity of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder with Conduct, Depressive, Anxiety, and Other Disorders.” *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 148(5):564–77.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. “Habitus, code et codification.” *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 64(1):40–44. doi: 10.3406/arss.1986.2335.

Brennan, Deborah, and Harry Browne. 2019. “Education, Behaviour and Exclusion: The Experience and Impact of Short School Days on Children with Disabilities and Their Families in the Republic of Ireland.” *Reports*. doi: https://doi.org/10.21427/ydac-px30.

Broomhead, Karen E. 2019. “Acceptance or Rejection? The Social Experiences of Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities within a Mainstream Primary School.” *Education 3-13* 47(8):877–88.

Bryman, Alan. 2016. “Social Research Methods” Oxford university press.

Bunreacht na hÉireann. 2004. “Education for Persons with Special Educational Needs Act 2004 – No. 30 of 2004 – Houses of the Oireachtas.” Retrieved November 25, 2022 (https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/bills/bill/2003/34).

Collins, Randall. 1971. “Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification.” *American Sociological Review* 36(6):1002–19.

Cosgrove, J., C. McKeown, J. Travers, Z. Lysaght, N. O’Bhrion, and P. Archer. 2014. “Educational Experiences and Outcomes for Children with Special Educational Needs.”

Cullinane, Michael. 2020. “An Exploration of the Sense of Belonging of Students with Special Educational Needs. | REACH: Journal of Inclusive Education in Ireland.”

Diener, Edward, and Rick Crandall. 1978. *Ethics in Social and Behavioural Research*. Oxford, England: U Chicago Press.

Dimitrellou, Eleni, and Jane Hurry. 2019. “School Belonging among Young Adolescents with SEMH and MLD: The Link with Their Social Relations and School Inclusivity.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 34(3):312–26

Downing, June E., and Kathryn D. Peckham-Hardin. 2007. “Inclusive Education: What Makes It a Good Education for Students with Moderate to Severe Disabilities?” *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* 32(1):16–30.

Finn, Jeremy D. 1989. “Withdrawing From School.” *Review of Educational Research* 59(2):117–42.

Gottfried, Michael A., Leanna Stiefel, Amy Ellen Schwartz, and Bryant Hopkins. 2019. “Showing Up: Disparities in Chronic Absenteeism between Students with and without Disabilities in Traditional Public Schools.” *Teachers College Record* 121(8):1–34.

Gov.UK. 2022. “Pupil Absence in Schools in England: Autumn Term, Autumn Term 2021/22.” *Https://Explore-Education-Statistics.Service.Gov.Uk/Find-Statistics/Pupil-Absence-in-Schools-in-England-Autumn-Term*. Retrieved March 17, 2023 (https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/pupil-absence-in-schools-in-england-autumn-term).

Leonard, Noelle M., and Sinéad Smyth. 2022. “Does Training Matter? Exploring Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder in Mainstream Education in Ireland.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 26(7):737–51.

Lindsay, Geoff. 2007. “Educational Psychology and the Effectiveness of Inclusive Education/Mainstreaming.” *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 77(1):1–24.

Ma, Xin. 2003. “Sense of Belonging to School: Can Schools Make a Difference?” *The Journal of Educational Research* 96(6):340–49.

MacArthur, Jude, Sarah Sharp, Berni Kelly, and Michael Gaffney. 2007. “Disabled Children Negotiating School Life: Agency, Difference and Teaching Practice Children as Social Actors.” *International Journal of Children’s Rights* 15(1):99–120.

Mc Bride, Michelle. 2021. “‘Serious Upskilling Is Required’: Schools Adjust to Rapid Growth in Special Classes.” *The Irish Times*. Retrieved February 18, 2023

(https://www.irishtimes.com/news/education/serious-upskilling-is-required-schools-adjust-to-rapid-growth-in-special-classes-1.4718148).

McClemont, Abbey J., Hannah E. Morton, Jennifer M. Gillis, and Raymond G. Romanczyk. 2021. "Brief Report: Predictors of School Refusal Due to Bullying in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder." *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 51(5):1781–88.

McCluskey, Gillean, Ted Cole, Harry Daniels, Ian Thompson, and Alice Tawell. 2019. "Exclusion from School in Scotland and across the UK: Contrasts and Questions." *British Educational Research Journal* 45(6):1140–59.

McCoy, Selina, and Joanne Banks. 2012. "Simply Academic? Why Children with Special Educational Needs Don't like School." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 27(1):81–97.

McCoy, Selina, Joanne Banks, and Michael Shevlin. 2016. "Insights into the Prevalence of Special Educational Needs." *James Williams, Elizabeth Nixon, Emer Smyth, Dorothy Watson (Ed.), Cherishing All the Children Equally? Ireland 100 Years on from the Easter Rising, Chapter 8, Pp. 153-174.*

McCoy, Selina, Michael Shevlin, and Richard Rose. 2020. "Secondary School Transition for Students with Special Educational Needs in Ireland." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 35(2):154–70.

McGrath, Kevin F., and Penny Van Bergen. 2015. "Who, When Why and to What End? Students at Risk of Negative Student–Teacher Relationships and Their Outcomes." *Educational Research Review* 14:1–17.

McPhedran, Samara. 2010. "Regional Living and Community Participation: Are People with Disability at a Disadvantage?" *AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL POLICY* (9):111–35.

Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist.* University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Melvin, G. A., M. Freeman, L. J. Ashford, R. P. Hastings, D. Heyne, B. J. Tonge, T. Bailey, V. Totsika, and K. M. Gray. 2023. "Types and Correlates of School Absenteeism among Students with Intellectual Disability." *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 67(4):375–86.

Mihut, Georgiana, Selina McCoy, and Bertrand Maître. 2022. "A Capability Approach to Understanding Academic and Socio-Emotional Outcomes of Students with Special Educational Needs in Ireland." *Oxford Review of Education* 48(3):271–88.

Mithen, Johanna, Zoe Aitken, Anna Ziersch, and Anne M. Kavanagh. 2015. "Inequalities in Social Capital and Health between People with and without Disabilities." *Social Science & Medicine* 126:26–35.

Mowen, Thomas, and John Brent. 2016. "School Discipline as a Turning Point: The Cumulative Effect of Suspension on Arrest." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 53(5):628–53.

Munkhaugen, Ellen Kathrine, Elen Gjevik, Are Hugo Pripp, Eili Sponheim, and Trond H. Diseth. 2017. "School Refusal Behaviour: Are Children and Adolescents with Autism Spectrum Disorder at a Higher Risk?" *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* 41–42:31–38.

Murray, Christopher, and Mark T. Greenberg. 2006. "Examining the Importance of Social Relationships and Social Contexts in the Lives of Children with High-Incidence Disabilities." *Journal of Special Education* 39(4):220–33.

NCSE. 2014. "Choosing a School – National Council for Special Education – Working to Deliver a Better Special Education Service." Retrieved November 25, 2022 (https://ncse.ie/choosing-a-school).

Neal, S., F. Rice, T. Ng-Knight, L. Riglin, and N. Frederickson. 2016. "Exploring the Longitudinal Association between Interventions to Support the Transition to Secondary School and Child Anxiety." *Journal of Adolescence* 50:31–43.

O'Brien, Carl. 2022. "Special Needs Children Bussed out of Their Communities Due to Shortage of School Places." *The Irish Times*. Retrieved November 21, 2022 (https://www.irishtimes.com/ireland/education/2022/10/04/special-needs-children-bussed-out-of-their-communities-due-to-shortage-of-school-places/).

Oliver, Michael. 1983. *Social Work with Disabled People*. London: Macmillan Education UK.

Oliver, Michael. 1996. *Understanding Disability: From Theory to Practice*. New York, NY, US: St Martin's Press.

Osterman, Karen F. 2000. "Students' Need for Belonging in the School Community." *Review of Educational Research* 70(3):323–67. Rose, Richard, and Michael Shevlin. 2020. "Support Provision for Students with Special Educational Needs in Irish Primary Schools." *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 20(1):51–63.

Ruijs, Nienke M., and Thea T. D. Peetsma. 2009. "Effects of Inclusion on Students with and without Special Educational Needs Reviewed." *Educational Research Review* 4(2):67–79.

Salend, Spencer J., and Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney. 1999. "The Impact of Inclusion on Students with and Without Disabilities and Their Educators." *Remedial and Special Education* 20(2):114–26.

Shakespeare, Tom. 2009. "Social Models of Disability and Other Life Strategies." *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 6(1):8–21.

Skiba, Russell J., Mariella I. Arredondo, and Natasha T. Williams. 2014. "More Than a Metaphor: The Contribution of Exclusionary Discipline to a School-to-Prison Pipeline." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 47(4):546–64.

Simonoff, Emily, Andrew Pickles, Tony Charman, Susie Chandler, Tom Loucas, and Gillian Baird. 2008. "Psychiatric Disorders in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders: Prevalence, Comorbidity, and Associated Factors in a Population-Derived Sample." *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 47(8):921–29.

Smyth, Emer. 2016. “Social Relationships and the Transition to Secondary Education.” *The Economic and Social Review* 47(4, Winter):451–76.

Southwell, Neil. 2006. “Truants on Truancy – a Badness or a Valuable Indicator of Unmet Special Educational Needs?” *British Journal of Special Education* 33(2):91–97.

Stiefel, Leanna, Menbere Shiferaw, Amy Ellen Schwartz, and Michael Gottfried. 2018. “Who Feels Included in School? Examining Feelings of Inclusion Among Students with Disabilities.” *Educational Researcher* 47(2):105–20.

Swift, Ann, Edurne Garcia Iriarte, Philip Curry, Roy McConkey, Robbie Gilligan, and Marisa Antunes. 2021. “How Disability and Other Socio-Economic Factors Matter to Children’s Socio-Emotional Outcomes: Results from a Longitudinal Study Conducted in Ireland.” *Child Indicators Research* 14(1):391–409.

Tanya Lereya, Suzet, Sarah Cattan, Yeosun Yoon, Ruth Gilbert, and Jessica Deighton. 2022. “How Does the Association between Special Education Need and Absence Vary Overtime and across Special Education Need Types?” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 0(0):1–15.

Thornton, Maeve, Merike Darmody, and Selina McCoy. 2013. “Persistent Absenteeism among Irish Primary School Pupils.” *Educational Review* 65(4):488–501.

Thornton, Maeve, James Williams, Cathal McCrory, Aisling Murray, and Amanda Quail. 2016. *Growing Up in Ireland: Design, Instrumentation and Procedures for the Child Cohort at Wave Two (13 Years). Report*. Department of Children and Youth Affairs.

UNESCO. 1994. “The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education - UNESCO Digital Library.” Retrieved November 13, 2022 (https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427).

Wiener, Judith, and Christine Y. Tardif. 2004. “Social and Emotional Functioning of

Children with Learning Disabilities: Does Special Education Placement Make a Difference?”

Learning Disabilities Research & Practice 19(1):20–32.

Appendix.

Table 10: List of Variables

Variable name.	Question asked.	Response Catorgries	Level of Measurement
bpch02	Does child have a disability?	Yes=1 No=2	Nominal
bpch05	Is child hampered by their disability?	Yes severely=1 Yes, to some extent=2 No=3	Nominal
bpch34 recoded to bpch34new	How many disabilities does child have?	0=0 1=1 2=2 3=3plus	Ordinal
bpce05	Number of Days absent	0 days=1 1-3days=2 4-6days=3 7-10days=4 11-20days=5 20plus=6	Ordinal
Bpce06 recoded to reasons2	Reasons for absence	Did not miss school=0 Health reasons=1 Refused/problems=3 Family Holiday/crisis=4 Unknown=99	Nominal
bcce14	How do you feel about school?	I like it very much=1 I like it quite a bit=2 I like it a bit=3 I don't like it=4 I hate it=5	Ordinal
bcce42b	You are encouraged to ask questions by teacher	Very Often=1 Often=2 A few times=3 Never=4	Ordinal
bcce42c	A teacher asks you questions	Very Often=1 Often=2 A few times=3 Never=4	Ordinal
bcce48b	Got in trouble for not following school rules	Never=1 Now & again=2 Quite often=3 All the time =4	Ordinal
Bcce48g recoded to bcce48gnew	Suspended from school	Never=1 Often /all the time=2	Ordinal

Table 11 Crosstab: How many days absent?

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
E6a. During the last 12 months, about how many days was child absent from school for any reason?	0 days	Count	976	132	25	20	1153
		% within Number of disabilites	15.8%	13.4%	12.7%	17.2%	15.4%
	1 - 3 days	Count	2423	312	67	35	2837
		% within Number of disabilites	39.1%	31.7%	34.0%	30.2%	37.9%
	4 to 6 days	Count	1465	252	36	26	1779
		% within Number of disabilites	23.7%	25.6%	18.3%	22.4%	23.8%
	7 to 10 days	Count	793	157	39	17	1006
		% within Number of disabilites	12.8%	16.0%	19.8%	14.7%	13.4%
	11 to 20 days	Count	400	88	20	9	517
		% within Number of disabilites	6.5%	9.0%	10.2%	7.8%	6.9%
	More than 20 days	Count	133	42	10	9	194
		% within Number of disabilites	2.1%	4.3%	5.1%	7.8%	2.6%
Total		Count	6190	983	197	116	7486
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 12 Chi-square: How many days absent?

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.158[a]	16	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	51.218	16	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.296	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	7364		

a. 5 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .90.

Table 13 Symmetric measures: How many days absent?

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.103	<.001
	Cramer's V	.059	<.001
N of Valid Cases		7486	

Table 14 Crosstab: Reasons for absence

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Reasons for not attending school	Did not miss school	Count	977	135	25	22	1159
		% within Number of disabilites	16.6%	14.6%	13.5%	19.3%	16.3%
	Health reasons	Count	4205	674	142	79	5100
		% within Number of disabilites	71.4%	72.8%	76.8%	69.3%	71.7%
	Transport/Refused/Problem with Children	Count	48	15	3	2	68
		% within Number of disabilites	0.8%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	1.0%
	Weather/Family Holiday/Family Crisis	Count	661	102	15	11	789
		% within Number of disabilites	11.2%	11.0%	8.1%	9.6%	11.1%
Total		Count	5891	926	185	114	7116
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 15 Chi-square: Reasons for absence

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.385[a]	9	.146
Likelihood Ratio	12.629	9	.180
Linear-by-Linear Association	.026	1	.871
N of Valid Cases	7116		

a. 2 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.09.

Table 16 Symmetric measures: Reasons for absence

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.146
	Cramer's V	.025	.146
N of Valid Cases		7116	

Table 17 Crosstab: How do you feel about school?

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Q5x. How do you feel about school in general?	I like it very much	Count	1956	263	51	41	2311
		% within Number of disabilites	32.0%	27.2%	26.3%	41.0%	31.4%
	I like it quite a bit	Count	2074	318	52	18	2462
		% within Number of disabilites	34.0%	32.9%	26.8%	18.0%	33.4%
	I like it a bit	Count	1513	276	63	26	1878
		% within Number of disabilites	24.8%	28.6%	32.5%	26.0%	25.5%
	I don t like it very much	Count	429	79	18	8	534
		% within Number of disabilites	7.0%	8.2%	9.3%	8.0%	7.3%
	I hate it	Count	132	30	10	7	179
		% within Number of disabilites	2.2%	3.1%	5.2%	7.0%	2.4%
Total		Count	6104	966	194	100	7364
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 18 Chi-square: How do you feel about school?

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.158[a]	16	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	51.218	16	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.296	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	7364		

a. 5 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .90.

Table 19 Symmetric measures: How do you feel about school?

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.083	<.001
	Cramer's V	.048	<.001
N of Valid Cases		7364	

Table 20 Crosstab: Encouraged to ask questions

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Q5a2. You are encouraged to ask questions in class	Very often	Count	1245	182	33	19	1479
		% within Number of disabilites	20.2%	18.7%	16.9%	18.8%	19.9%
	Often	Count	1817	269	61	34	2181
		% within Number of disabilites	29.5%	27.6%	31.3%	33.7%	29.4%
	A few times	Count	2204	379	70	39	2692
		% within Number of disabilites	35.8%	38.9%	35.9%	38.6%	36.3%
	Never	Count	883	144	31	9	1067
		% within Number of disabilites	14.4%	14.8%	15.9%	8.9%	14.4%
Total		Count	6149	974	195	101	7419
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 21 Chi-square: Encouraged to ask questions.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.840[a]	9	.452
Likelihood Ratio	9.169	9	.422
Linear-by-Linear Association	.945	1	.331
N of Valid Cases	7419		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.53.

Table 22 Symmetric measures: Encouraged to ask questions.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.035	.452
	Cramer's V	.020	.452
N of Valid Cases		7419	

Table 23 Crosstab: Asked question by teachers

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Q5a5. You are asked questions in class by the teacher	Very often	Count	1454	187	46	29	1716
		% within Number of disabilites	23.6%	19.2%	23.6%	28.7%	23.1%
	Often	Count	3065	475	84	36	3660
		% within Number of disabilites	49.8%	48.8%	43.1%	35.6%	49.3%
	A few times	Count	1538	290	62	32	1922
		% within Number of disabilites	25.0%	29.8%	31.8%	31.7%	25.9%
	Never	Count	95	22	3	4	124
		% within Number of disabilites	1.5%	2.3%	1.5%	4.0%	1.7%
Total		Count	6152	974	195	101	7422
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 24 Chi-square: Asked question by teachers

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.597[a]	9	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.792	9	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.759	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	7422		

a. 2 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.69.

Table 25 Symmetric measures: Asked question by teachers

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.065	<.001
	Cramer's V	.038	<.001
N of Valid Cases		7422	

Table 26 Crosstab: Got in trouble for not following school rules.

			Number of disabilities				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Q10b. I got into trouble for not following school rules	Never	Count	3812	570	98	55	4535
		% within Number of disabilities	62.0%	58.5%	50.3%	54.5%	61.1%
	Now & Again	Count	2079	344	82	35	2540
		% within Number of disabilities	33.8%	35.3%	42.1%	34.7%	34.2%
	Quite Often	Count	217	49	11	7	284
		% within Number of disabilities	3.5%	5.0%	5.6%	6.9%	3.8%
	All the Time	Count	41	12	4	4	61
		% within Number of disabilities	0.7%	1.2%	2.1%	4.0%	0.8%
Total		Count	6149	975	195	101	7420
		% within Number of disabilities	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 27 Chi-square: Got in trouble for not following school rules.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.290[a]	9	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	31.268	9	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.505	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	7420		

a. 3 cells (18.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

Table 28 Symmetric measures: Got in trouble for not following school rules.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.073	<.001
	Cramer's V	.042	<.001
N of Valid Cases		7420	

Table 29 Crosstab: Suspension

			Number of disabilites				
			0	1	2	3 plus	Total
Suspended from School	Never	Count	6059	944	184	97	7284
		% within Number of disabilites	98.5%	96.8%	94.4%	96.0%	98.2%
	Often/All the time	Count	91	31	11	4	137
		% within Number of disabilites	1.5%	3.2%	5.6%	4.0%	1.8%
Total		Count	6150	975	195	101	7421
		% within Number of disabilites	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 30 Chi-square: Suspension

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.113[a]	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	24.714	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.206	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	7421		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.86.

Table 31 Symmetric measures: Suspension

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.066	<.001
	Cramer's V	.066	<.001
N of Valid Cases		7421	