

LADISLAV ZILCHER, VLASTIMIL CHYTRÝ,
MARKÉTA KEŽOVKŠÁ

Univerzity of Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem
Czech Republic



INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN THE VIEW OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC PRINCIPALS

ABSTRACT: Contemporary trends in education more and more point to inclusive direction but there still seems to be pervasive occurrence of integrative approach. A number of Czech teachers discuss the issues of inclusive trends in relation to artificial diversity in schools which may result in more work for pedagogical staff, but fewer opportunities for average and talented students etc. However such interpretation is not very precise. This article aims to cast more light on the issue of inclusion and education based on analysis of systems in two countries which differ so much from the Czech model, but the ideas lead to the same goal which focuses on the rights of a child to be educated.

KEYWORDS: education, inclusion, school, school system in Finland, school system in England.

OUTCOMES OF FOREIGN STUDIES

Contemporary trends in education more and more point to inclusive direction but there still seems to be pervasive occurrence of integrative approach. A number of Czech teachers discuss the issues of inclusive trends in relation to artificial diversity in schools which may result in more work for pedagogical staff, but fewer opportunities for average and talented students etc. However such interpretation is not very precise. This article aims to cast more light on the issue of inclusion and education based on analysis of systems in two countries which differ so much from the Czech model, but the ideas lead to the same goal which focuses on the rights of a child to be educated. The goal is primarily to create equal opportunities in education. Inclusion in schools should become equity and equality of all and within

all differences. It shouldn't matter to what extent we are different from each other, if our beliefs, skin, learning style, skill level, problems, sexual orientation, socioeconomic situation or anything else differ. We should assure that everyone will get support to develop his/her potential to maximum possible levels. Inclusive education is not about superior focus on individuals with special educational support, but about saturation of as many needs found among as many students possible. There are many casuistic examples of how inclusion cannot fit into the Czech environment, how it cannot work in our system and an explanation that inclusion does not help our children develop but even makes them suffer. This article dares comment that if such accusations were made, they did not describe inclusion, rather than dysfunctional integration. In such situations it is natural that if we cannot create an environment which can fulfil the needs of the whole class by any means, than the system is and will remain not functional. There is still no unified approach in what type of children belong yet to the mainstream elementary schools and which children are to be put in special schools or children that require so much attention that it is nearly impossible for them to place in a bigger group of children to ensure safety for the majority. This chapter takes an attempt to examine a variety of studies and principles which were presented by pedagogical professionals who dealt with the concepts of inclusive school and this way we would like to define and answer many issues regarding inclusion including implicit and explicit questions which are frequently asked by Czech, foreign, professional or the society general.

The center for inclusive education studies has defined inclusion in several points:

- praising and appreciating both students and the staff,
- increasing student class participation in culture, curriculum and community of local schools,
- decreasing the amount of learning barriers at schools for all students not just those who are labelled as „students with specific learning disabilities“,
- comparison of the school policy structure, culture and practice which should reflect the nature of students living in a specific area,
- see differences among students as an opportunity and sources more than just problems which need to be solved,
- realize that students have the right to go to school in their local area,
- develop school ethos not just for students but for school staff as well,
- emphasize the role of school and community values in the same way as the performance levels,

- support relationship between parents, school and its local community,
- Knowledge of inclusion in education: it is just one aspect of inclusion within society (SICE, 2011).

According to the previously mentioned set of definitions it is apparent that inclusion is not just about children with disabilities, but about the structure of a specific location, the school staff and mainly it is about HOW to make a school better place which can efficiently work with all pupils and students.

INCLUSION AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE

There seems to be a rather lively discussion among professionals about inclusion which focuses on social aspects of young life, development of children in relation to the system of social values. Many studies have been conducted regarding this issue. Some studies confirm that inclusion has positive influence on social aspects of children at schools (Rafferty, Piscitelli & Boettcher, 2003). Other studies evaluated different acceptance among young peers during children camps that implemented inclusive approach to its management and leadership. This particular study showed that inclusive school camps presented higher acceptance towards children with mental disability, meaning that disabled children were referred to as equal (Siperstein, Glick & Parker, 2009), even though in the standard configuration without any previous experience of children with disabled people were these children regarded as less likely to become popular among friend within a specific group (Avramidis, 2012). These studies however point at the ideas of inclusion which have no opponents among teachers and parents, but the studies also warn against the risk of teaching quality decrease and the fear of low goals of “majority” or “intact” children. Their folk fear in this issue can be however eased by a number of arguments.

According to PISA studies the school systems which have inclusive parameters (UK, Italy, Finland) have better results in PISA/PIRLS tests mainly in reading comprehension and science, than segregated educational systems (PISA, 2006). Better text comprehension is also determined by cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Říčan & Pešout, 2013; Doulík & Škoda, 2010). Experts from Finland agree that high performance of Finnish students is occurring mainly because of the special support at schools. Finland was at the top in reading comprehension in 2003 and best in task comprehension in science and second in maths problem solving in 2006 (Kivirauma & Ruoho, 2007). Students

get continuous support every time they need it. This includes all children not only those with diagnosed disorders or disabilities. This type of support is provided in majority of cases by a special teacher who teaches the same knowledge and skills by a variety of methods for smaller groups of children or with the use of supportive gadgets or tools (Arinen & Karjalinen, 2007).

Another aspect of this can be derived from concrete research outcomes, which were oriented towards inclusive education in schools and children performance of intact individuals. Many of these studies show neutral to more positive effect of inclusion on intact students. No significant difference was detected in academic achievements among students without special educational needs. These students attended both inclusive and noninclusive classrooms (Ruijs, Van Der Veen a Peetsma, 2010). In order to prove such findings another study was conducted which divided intact children into two groups according to performance levels: average, above average and under average. Again, all students came from both inclusive and noninclusive (segregated) schools. There was no significant difference detected in the progress of students under, above or average, which truly shows that inclusion has no significant negative impact on the overall school performance of intact students (Dessemonted & Bless, 2013). Studies on the other hand showed higher success and progress among students with specific learning needs. Dessemonted, Bless & Morin (2012) discovered a significant development in reader's comprehension skill among students with specific educational need in inclusive schools, but not among students with special needs in noninclusive special schools. This way we can state that when a successful inclusive environment is created, there is no need to fear any negative impulsive impacts on students who are average or above average in their performance, but inclusive education can have a significant benefit for children with special educational needs who attend special schools. If we take in account the effect of social learning, peer learning, suitable ethos (social climate) which inclusive education always should have in its concepts, then we can almost idealistically note: inclusion truly has many positives. These positives are pervasive and don't overshadow general fear of decreasing of learning quality for "normal" children. This element has to be taken as essential and recommendative for professional and folk society.

Previously mentioned research studies have incorporated an example mainly from the British educational model and from its specifics which were the main variables within these studies. These specifications will be defined in the following part of the text.

INCLUSION AND THE VALUE SYSTEM OF CHILDREN

Students of Czech schools have to implement competence between different school subjects according to RVP ZV (Czech national curriculum) and other documents. This way student should know elementary social value system and affective levels of educational goals. These interdisciplinary relations can include e.g. the European ethos, intercultural education, etc. (Hábl, 2011). However each didactic manual for teachers defines also, that affective goals are not simple for children to be acquired, teachers have to give a live example or teachers have to develop deeper cognitive knowledge and skills among students and develop higher thinking skills. This is however nothing new in the area of general didactics, but both of these principles show that value orientation can change when it comes in contact with experience or critical thinking. Many foreign experts were interested in this area and tried to find out attitudes of children towards children with disadvantages. It was revealed that those students who are educated in heterogeneous environment have better relationship and attitude towards people with disadvantages compared with those who are educated in homogenous environment (Cairns & McClatchey, 2013). Concerning the results, experts decided to define this matter in a specific way: Inclusive school teaches children how to live together, how to gain values from each other, how to help benefit other than the way I am, and how to accept the contribution of others due to their differences (Helus, 2007). Other studies came to similar conclusions. The primary element of inclusion can be that systems with more proinclusive schools have more adequate requirements on their students with disadvantages and they are able to apply any relevant support thanks to their prior experience with students with disadvantages. Thanks to the prior experience were students able to create suitable measurements for helping others. The most interesting fact is that students from proinclusive schools statistically defined the support to be important on the emotional, social and psychological basis. Children are more interested in the person who has disadvantages in terms of his/her personality, a human being, who needs a friend and can be a friend, someone with whom you can spend your time. On the other hand, children from noninclusive schools focused mainly on physical help they could provide e.g. how to raise the person once he fell down, pick up his/her bag, hand over a pen etc. There was an alarming absence of a simple thought of being friends with such a person, or to even communicate with each other (Pennicard, Cairns,

Hamilton, Hyndman, Reid & Sawers, 1990). Several other studies proved that the knowledge of and interaction with disabled individuals influences the attitudes of children towards children with disadvantages (Ison, McIntyre, Rothery, Smithers-Sheedy, Goldsmith, Parsonage & Foy, 2010; Moore & Nettelbeck, 2013). It is the awareness of children that needs to be supported as much as we can, because if children are not aware of variety and differences within society and they will not change and develop their attitudes towards otherness and then we can expect further social pathologic phenomena such as school bullying to occur. Anyone who differs from majority or resembles as different can become a victim of bullying. Our society is still based on „punishing“ those who differ from majority no matter his origin of the otherness e.g. small sized clothing, skin complexion, being slow at school, physical appearance, sexual orientation, or even being too smart. Studies in the area of bullying show that individuals with any kind of disadvantages (visible or invisible at first sight) have experienced some time in their lives examples of bullying more frequently than their intact classmates (Carter & Spencer, 2006).

Firstly students who have more positive approach towards disadvantaged students have higher chance of including anyone into their own social group. At the same time an elementary goal of inclusion (to allow each individual fully participate in a society which will respect his/her human dignity) is fulfilled. (Osadán-Burrage, 2014)

APPLICATION MODELS OF INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT

Until now we have focused mainly on ideological and theoretical aspects of inclusion and evaluated performance levels of students. This part of the text aims at practical perspective of inclusion. We would like to answer a single hypothesis: „How we can implement inclusion into our schools?“, or more formal „how can we make inclusion happen?“ Naturally, it is almost impossible to give a direct answer on this question, however under certain circumstances we are able to foreshadow certain recommendations, if we can change the current political situation, school organization, national curriculum, didactic aspects and inclusive patterns in Czech education. Dyson diversified implementation of inclusion into two elementary levels, that is the political reform, which should appeal to a change in the area of special schools and inclusive schools. Then the second level is the pragmatic set of

reforms in schools, meaning creation of practical recommendations in order to transform the schools (1999). Knoster (2000) and Ainscow (2005) created two different patterns for schools to open towards inclusion. Many other specific guidelines for school evaluation have been made e.g. Hammeken (2000) or Booth (2011), but of the earlier models seem the most effective to be applied in Czech education.

INCLUSIVE PATTERN ACCORDING TO ANISCOW

Mel Anisow called his pattern „levers for change“ (2005), he defined six elements for creating inclusive schools which have to be complexly connected with political spectrum, clinical practice and culture within one region or community (2001):

- Starting with existing practice and knowledge
- Seeing differences as opportunities for learning
- Scrutinising barriers to participation
- Making use of available resources to support learning
- Developing a language of practise
- Creating conditions which encourage risk-taking.

Then the pattern was configured into two other levels: the action level with big influence, which supports the systém change. Another phase was the school level with lower influence, which can simply create changes within the school, but cannot change the overall systém. The activities with low influence represent e.g.: Head teachers (principals) participation at conferences, writing official documentation, professional course participation etc. Thanks to focusing on activities with high influence we can gradually prepare schools for higher diversity and make the school truly inclusive (Aldaihani, 2010). Hooker (2009) defined specific activities which can appeal to proinclusive change within a particular school seen from the position of the head teacher/administrator/principal, which is focused on:

- Setting of a specific direction: share a clear school vision, values and group goals
- School staff development: individual support of all school staff, emotionally motivate and support them towards their own development
- Rebuild relationships in schools: interact with the local community, create good links with parents so they could perceive the connection of the school to the local community.

All these points lead to development of a professional school Framework, e.g. community schools which increase their awareness of the school connection to its local community and will make the parents interested in participation in school activities (Aldaihani, 2010)

INCLUSIVE PATTERN ACCORDING TO KNOSTER

Knoster defined a general Framework for a complex change in organisations. In our case this will be connected with the school organisation in relation to proinclusive school development. This pattern is simply based on vision, knowledge, experience, motivation, sources and action plan (table no.1). Any change of the system takes place when combining any of the previously mentioned values in a systematical and positive manner, which should prevent any negative aspects of anger, ignorance, anxiety, resistance, frustration, or going in circles (Knoster et al, 2000).

Fig. 1: Knoster's Framework

Vision	Knowledge	Skills	Incentives	Resources	Plan	Change
?	Knowledge	Skills	Motivation	Resources	Plan	Confusion
Vision	?	Skills	Motivation	Resources	Plan	Ignorance
Vision	Knowledge	?	Motivation	Resources	Plan	Anxiety
Vision	Knowledge	Skills	?	Resources	Plan	Resistance
Vision	Knowledge	Skills	Motivation	?	Plan	Frustration
Vision	Knowledge	Skills	Motivation	Resources	?	Treadmill

Source: (Knoster et al, 2000).

This general model was then recreated for inclusive school development in five comprehensive and simple steps which have good results in practice in relation to the previously mentioned pattern.

- Build a vision of inclusive schooling within a community
- Develop educators' skills and confidence to be inclusive educators
- Create meaningful incentives for people to risk embarking on an inclusive schooling journey

- Reorganize and expand human and other resources for teaching for and towards diversity
- Plan and take strategic action to present people in schools with an exciting new picture.

Many authors view school vision as an elementary base for proinclusive changes within schools. The vision should be clear, comprehensive for all, shared among school and the community, or shared with supporting government organisations, school staff, parents and students themselves. Only clear and exemplary vision can help to persuade others of the functionality and effectivity of inclusion. Without any strategic vision the school change becomes incomprehensive and confusing for colleagues, which decreases the level of trust in change. (Topping & Maloney, 2005). To change the vision into real life conditions in schools it requires extended knowledge and skills possessed by principals and school staff remembering that teachers should be educated in the area of inclusion as well. Professional leadership needs to prepare all staff towards new directions (Topping & Maloney, 2005).

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION ROUND THE WORLD

Following there are several elementary differences found world wide that focus on practical use of inclusive school management and configuration. Generally we can define two diametrically different models. Finland among European countries seems to be a remarkable example, where children, pedagogical staff and the parents have higher competence and freedom than anywhere else. Everything is based on mutual and self-trust, having confidence in with others, warm and open approach towards communication. There is no school inspection recognized in Finland, the head teacher doesn't need to do hospitiation lessons as in case of the Czech schools, there is no compulsory education required by the state, these are the parents who have the duty to make their child educated to fulfil national standards. School is only one of many tools in order to get education. In comparison quite different seems to be education in the UK, where the school is a strong element in a child's life and has a high strategic position. School knows, how to educate children and this is its main mission. School has more rights than parents. Schools are quite strict in terms of manners and code, pupils have to wear uniforms and mobile phones are prohibited on the school premises. These rules apply to school staff, visitors and parents as well.

Both of these models function well and they are quite unique in Europe. It took over several decades before educational system has developed into these specific models and even today is trying to undergo further changes. Both of these models can be described as inclusive and beneficial for school, parents, children and pedagogical staff as well, but none of the model can be exactly copied and completely applied in Czech environment. The goal of this text is therefore not to point out foreign systems, but try to motivate Czech pedagogical society to get inspired by foreign concepts. The text also informs about possibilities of inclusion which are used by foreign educational systems and this way to open a path towards a new fresh approach in the Czech Republic education.

ENGLAND

One of the elementary milestones among the model of inclusive education in Great Britain was Warnock report (1978). This almost 400 page document viewed current opinions of professionals on educational system for children with disabilities including specific measures in a wider spectrum (DES, 1978). This document was presented to the House of Representatives which accepted the proposition as its official policy in 1981. As a result students with special educational needs had to be educated in classic mainstream schools, if the conditions of the schools allowed it. Originally the document contained four elementary conditions for integration: The student had to be given suitable support so teaching of other students within one class would not be disturbed. The family support and configuration had to use certain „effectivity of sources“ (Norwich, 2008). This legislative framework assured start of greater need of special teacher's support at primary schools, still allowing special schools for their further existence. After several legislative changes the Framework is basically the same, however the conditions have been narrowed into two main areas: integration has to be supported by parents and must not disturb other students within the class. These changes caused a decrease of children amount in special schools during the period of 1983-2001 and statistically revealed a change from 1.87% to 1.3% of children in British special schools (Norwich, 2002).

Following inclusion started to be called inclusion at schools, which evoked political appeal to social inclusion. The concept of social inclusion contained wider spectrum of population, not only individuals with special educational

needs, but everyone, who is different from any perspective – this means that everyone should be taught in classic schools. Inclusion was therefore understood as the right for education and this way it helped to start change in order to fulfill the needs of everyone, who is different (Ainscow, 1999). During the last several years a wave of opposition against inclusive education has risen among British society. Similarly as in the Czech Republic fear against inclusion was the main issue which slowed the process. It was fear and prejudice which caused political sphere to discuss this issue in 2010: „we do believe that the most endangered children deserve most of our care. We shall develop our diagnostics of school children, prevent unnecessary closing of special schools and we will try to erase prejudice against inclusion“ (Runswick-Cole, 2011). Other offensive studies have stated that there is no type of education which is more effective for fulfilling special educational needs of all children (DfE, 2011). Professor Booth gave the most contemporary opinion on the issue of inclusion, stating that it can never be successful, unless it is regarded as a specific goal to be achieved. Inclusive education is only one of many paths that lead towards high quality education of all students (Booth, 2011).

FINLAND

To start with general information and numbers regarding Finnish education system, we have to state that in general the education levels are quite similar to the Czech ones, or even in some cases the system seems to be further divided from the Czech model. Finnish children start school at the age of seven. Students have the opportunity to attend first year when they are six years old, but this year is not compulsory. Lower elementary level includes the years from 1 to 6 and higher primary level takes another 3 years to complete. Then students have an opportunity to choose a professional training school, or mainstream general secondary school. Entrance assessment is evaluated by the results of test grades taken during the last year of elementary school. Schools offer free lunches for everyone on a daily basis. Just to bring more insight, 25% of all children at lower elementary level and 16% of them in higher elementary would fit Czech requirements for special pedagogical support. Out of the total 8,1% of children attend special schools. Finland compared to other countries in the world seems to have largest number of children with special educational needs and even

teachers in Finland state that the numbers will increase in the near future (Vislie, 2003). On the other hand, we have to view special education support differently than as we see it in case of Czech educational system. Children who need support from special teachers are not considered as disadvantaged, but only viewed as children who need help occasionally in order to get educated (Itkonen & Jahnukainen, 2007). An increased state funding is provided only for students with full support and that means 1,5 coefficient per one student (Honkanen, Suomala, 2009). Czech Republic has a five level model of support which does not segregate students anymore according to the type or nature of disability in the horizontal level, but divides them according to the level of support they require in order to maximally develop his/her potential, which is the vertical level. This model comes from the need of support and includes years 1 to 5 in span (561/2004 Sb., § 16). This legislative change took Czech educational system closer to the one in Finland. Finland has only three levels support system in each of them an individual education plan is created, but the first two levels have to be in match with the state curriculum which requires fulfilling specific educational goals. The third level makes it possible to individualize and customize its educational content. That is different from the Czech model of support, here in Finland the first level of support can be filled with school environment which can be achieved only by the class teacher, teacher assistant, partial support of a special teacher or with the use of peer education to individualize educational content (Risku, 2015). These supportive measures are provided for all students who need them. The need of supportive measures however is not dependent on any diagnosed special needs. As it has been previously mentioned, students are not considered as people with problems or handicaps, but only as anyone, who needs explanation of something, wants to try something in a different way or revise. This is where the main difference can be observed, because Czech educational system requires from child to get through a complicated diagnostic process in order to be provided with a teacher assistant. Special teachers in Czech schools are considered more of a luxury than something common. The Ministry of Education in Finland (2007) stated that an early intervention and support is considered as the most important for all children who have any problems in education and such support should be offered immediately when any problems occur. First teachers try to solve the problems individually with the students. If this support is not enough, then every school has to have a special teacher as part of their staff. Majority of special teachers therefore can be found not

in special schools but at elementary ones. Current fear for employment loss by special teachers in the Czech Republic is irrelevant, because the need of special teachers in mainstream inclusive education is becoming higher and it has already been proved. This could never happen in case of the integration model. As the most ideal model of support in Finland, the pull-out model (Takala, Pirttimaa & Tormanen, 2009) can (as the title suggests) pull one of the students from the class and can be placed into a different one, or a child can work with a special teacher within his/her class. This way not only a single child with special needs can be individually educated, but even a small group of them. If the student has more serious problems, then there is a possibility to suggest full support system to the child inside a special class, which however requires consistent diagnostics and investigation in the case of a certain child to receive such support. If the child is after all placed in a special class with maximum support, then he/she stays in the same school, but in a special class. Finland reported only 1% of children attending special classes, which are just a small minority overall (Kuorelahti, 2014). Geographical issues and infrastructure makes long distances to travel around Finland, which makes schools adapt to different needs of children as well, because it is a quite common practice that children travel sometimes up to 80km in order to get to school in the morning (e.g., Rovaniemi,). The Finnish Council of Education Professionals agree that the continuous support of all children who need occasional support (without any diagnostics or individual plan) has direct influence on successful rates of Finnish children in PISA tests (Kivirauma & Ruoho, 2007; Arinen & Karjalainen, 2007). Another reason of such high success in these tests can be related to high qualification of teachers in Finland. All teachers in Finland have to finish postgradual study at universities with a MA or higher degree received before they can get employed. This law requirement was established in 1980 (Hausstatter & Takala, 2008).

MENTALLY CHALLENGED CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS

Teachers and pedagogical specialists perceive students with mental disabilities as individuals with serious obstacle in education process and the professionals also don't expect inclusion to have positive impact on this type of a student. Quite opposite approach was described by the study carried out by Hrebeňárová who showed a research (In Forema, Kellyho-Arthura,

Pasco & King 2004) where video recordings and direct observations were the main methods used to find out. Communication interaction took place in total 49 % of time in a normal classroom and only 27 % time in special classes. It further showed that 56 % of the time student did not interact with a communication partner, whereas in normal class this was only 31 % of time (Pančocha, 2010). Education and communicative interaction are the main and most efficient therapy for students with mental disability and these methods help them being socialized and included into society (Lehta, 2010). Czech educational law and principles recognize the terminology of children with disabilities, however differently by definition, compared to other countries, mark children with diagnosis such as MLD or SLD which labels the students as not disadvantaged, but the ones with learning problems. A change of the definition of children who are not successful in the mainstream education has to take place in the near future. Some of these children do not belong to the category of an average mental disability, but children with specific learning disabilities, hyperactivity disorders and others who might experience failure in transmissivity and instructive system. A research conducted on a group of 122 children with mild mental disability has proven that peer education, observation or projects are more effective than classic forms of education (Pujar & Gaonkar, 2008). It is mainly inclusively oriented education that can help to maintain a higher number of students with mental disabilities at primary schools. After the modification of the curriculum a change is possible that would allow teachers to use parallel activities in a class where children with mental disabilities are present. Parallel activities are ideal for diverse classes, where all children participate and work on the same task, but with different product of their work e.g.: majority of students within one class have to solve a math problem, majority can multiply, others can only add up numbers, and other students can just copy specific numbers down. No child is therefore excluded from the group and everyone participates in solving the same math problem (more in Hammeken, 2010).

PRACTICAL CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INCLUSION IN UK AND FINLAND (ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES)

The Project Way to Inclusion: from segregation to positive diversity in school, reg. No. CZ.1.07/1.2.00/47.0008 was funded by the European social fund

and the state budget of Czech Republic. The project helped to realize over 100 international internships for school principals and administrators in education. These study visits were implemented in two countries: Finland and England. Each participant of the study created a final report which should reflect their opinions and experiences with inclusive education experienced at schools which the participants visited during their study period. The feedback focused mainly on possible application of observed inclusive methods and models, particular pedagogical situations found in Czech schools and feedback and then focused on the description of interesting facts taken from observations.

FINLAND

According to the school administrators Finnish schools were much more hospitable than the Czech ones. The overall atmosphere was extremely open. Some of the colleagues even defined such freedom as not healthy. The school head teacher from Usti on Laba strongly criticized the fact that children could choose with what they wanted to write and the fact that they did not sit properly at their desks which causes damage to their bodies – motor skills and posture issues. This however cannot be commented without the fact, that Finnish students are free to express themselves. This freedom and independence has been defined as follows: „students learn to be independent in their decision making, beginning with individual selection and serving of food by themselves in the cafeteria, ending with the used strategy for learning in order to fulfil didactic goals. This approach would however never get approved by the Czech hygiene institutions and ČSI “(one of the reports from the study visit in Turku, 2015). Another colleague quite pertinently described, that „Czech schools have everything organized, prepared in advance and according to teachers’ demands. Finnish education system is more open toward children with no pressure at all. “(One of the reports from the study visit in Turku, 2015). The biggest problem in southern Finland seems to be a high percentage of immigrants which represent almost 50% of other nationalities in schools there. This phenomenon was solved by opening a class for children of the immigrants. This class focused only on the language skills of children in order to be able to understand the fundamentals of Finnish language. If a student is not able to reach a specific level of communicative skills, he or she can still join the first year, but with an

individual plan with a specific programme and schedule, which practically means that the child will only have to attend more study groups. Immigrants in Finnish schools have also possibility to improve their first language so some schools teach over 11 foreign languages which is very complicated for overall and schedule organisation including the staff.

The students of lower elementary classes are assessed only by reports without grades and only strong sides of each child are emphasized. Everyone at school has the same goal: to make all children happy and to help them according to their skills achieve maximal success in their work, to help them feel successful no matter their nationality, social background and skill. Everyone has the right to be educated. I was very surprised by open, kind and easy-going atmosphere in the schools we visited“ (one of the reports based on the study visit in Rovaniemi, 2015). Some administrators also noted that the teachers' work in Finnish schools is more active, however a teacher is concerned with „his/her issues“ and all the rest regarding documentation and administration is left to other professionals (one of the reports based on the study visit in Vanhaa, 2015).

The question therefore remains: is it good to teach all children together in mainstream schools? Yes, but only if children with special needs are assisted by special teachers. The success of Finnish education does not only come from the way that all children learn together and from each other, but also because of the fact that special teachers and psychologists get involved. (Report based on the study visit in Finland, 2014, 2015). Finland therefore has a system of full support for children in small and larger classes which can be related to similar conditions in Czech special schools, but in this case, all children attend the same school.

A possibility of another additional study year (also called motivational year) can be offered to a student who was not successful at the end of his 9th grade. This motivational year does not revise all knowledge and skills, but rather focuses on projective methods of education and connecting already familiar skills and knowledge with practice.

ENGLAND

Opposite to Finland, education in Great Britain is much stricter towards children. There seems to be less freedom in the sense of inclusion. These differences are quite obvious for the first time independent observer visit to

a comprehensive school. In Finland the observer may see a variety throughout the whole spectrum. Aside from just human variety, one may see different styles of clothing; hairstyles of children, accessories they wear, piercings, some children can walk with no shoes at school etc. These internal aspects have no rules. England sees that differently. One of our colleagues in his final report created a quite comprehensive definition of English inclusion: “inclusion is defined differently and in a wider perspective, than in Czech Republic. It is a process which does not have just the goal of integrating „visibly“ disabled children and students, meaning those with physical, mental or social disadvantages, but here we see the effort to eliminate all obstacles for all children and students, and this way to allow them to (and after my experience with English schools I can say not only „allow“, but also „make“ them) use all capacity and possibilities in order to be successful in school they already attend, during the process of further education and preparation for a suitable and well paid job in the future (a participant of the study visit in Derby, 2014, from Chomutov). The enthusiasm of teachers is very high which was captured by a colleague from Ostrava, who commented that in our (Czech) conditions would an average Czech teacher last only around a week and in best situation it might be prolonged to a month. We underline the expression in our environment for purpose, because it shows different amount of staff in schools allowed. This situation means that teachers in Czech Republic would be considered overpaid for administration and attendance control, while their prime role is to teach and plan, not to administrate. In reality under current circumstances then everything leads to underestimating students to get the best results possible the reason is obvious: Schools are measured by national comparison tests and the whole education system is built on constant testing and assessment. Schools are not evaluated according to the grades of its children, or according to their point rate, but according to their progress over time. The main criteria of assessment are student’s development from one testing to another. This way it can prevent situations, in which some schools would be full of „lower grade students“. Evaluation and assessment is always positive, with its progress emphasized but never in comparison to the progress of another student. If students do not fit the standard progress rate, the school is evaluated with level four, meaning that the head teacher of such school needs to be replaced and for six weeks the school is run under the control of the school inspection. If the level reaches 3, then the head teacher stays, but the school inspection controls the school once half a year. During the evaluation and

testing process race and ethnicity are counted considering the time the student has lived in England. We can take an example from Babington community College in Leicester, where the head didactician Mark Penfold presented us a situation: „we need to collect data in order to evaluate, which students are not developing properly. If Indian children prosper compared with their Romanian peers who are not doing progress, then we have to take measures which will help us make the situation better before next testing. If the situation doesn't get better, the inspection comes and asks us what we did to make the Romanian children have similar results to the rest of the children. If we don't give clear ideason the measures we want to take up, then the head teacher will be forced to resign. We have to continuously test and asses in order to be one of the best schools“. One of the issues which we still try to solve is the attendance of students from socially excluded areas. In England this problem is very strictly observed, because each absence is regarded as a problem. Students are praised and rewarded for having no absence record during a week or month at school and this is taken further into a school competition where the winner is the student or class with minimal absence. When it comes to negative motivation, when the absence gets up to 5% parents are informed, but when the absence reaches up to 15% social services get informed. In order to make children go to school on time and early, breakfast clubs are established, where students, their parents and siblings can have breakfast together, which motivate them to wake up and go to school. It is said that in some cases, some children are the only ones in their families who attend these breakfast clubs and have breakfast this way. If breakfasts are not enough to make children come to school, social workers are sent to homes to wake children up by a phone call, or by picking them up and driving them to school. Food and uniforms are provided for socially weak children but this information is not shared with anyone in the school. Everything is organized so children do not see differences between each other. Cell phones are forbidden in schools not just for students, but for teachers as well, which again strengthens equality among all.

Behavioural problems are dealt with in many different ways. The largest restrictions come from the process of a student being expelled from school. The head teacher can expel a student from one up to five days alone, or from five to 15 days with an approval of the social department. When it comes to minor behavioural transgressions, mediations were the most successful method. In severe cases it is possible to place students into special schools for children with behavioural disorders. This is only a temporary solution

for children. It is in the interest of everyone to help these children to get back to school the student previously attended, which means that students still go to some classes, then gradually classes are added until the student is taken back to his/her primary school full time.

Almost all schools have applied compulsory rules on wearing uniforms. Uniforms represent belonging to a specific school. This element creates a specific ethos (social climate) of the school, in which the feeling of solidarity and responsibility increases, which is highly appreciated both by students and the teachers.

Working as a British teacher differs from the work in the Czech Republic. Individual work is required, many colleagues have defined such approach as Montessori pedagogy, and teachers pointed out that children worked more with printed worksheets than with textbooks. Students are used to working outside of the classroom and they work quietly and with a decent amount of interest in their doing. In order to make everything functional, many reports included information stating that „cooperation on the lesson preparation between assistants and teachers is the essential precondition for success“ (Report based on the study visit in Leicester, 2015). During the visit an interesting element paid our attention which was the exercise book corrections and assessment which is never done by a red pen or a marker, but changes were made in green. During the assessment number of mistakes is not counted, quite the opposite: correct written items are praised and counted for in the final mark which is much more motivating than an exercise book that has red scratches all over. Teachers more implement the elements of metacognitive strategies which can be observed in the example of one of our study visits: „Maths lesson was very interesting, it was a simple revision that should help them in their testing which was supposed to take place in the course of 3 weeks. The second part of the lesson amazed me. The children stopped learning and discussed what they should do in order to do better in Maths. Their task was to pick five strategies of Maths learning, test them all and then find out which one suits them best.“ (Study visit report in Derby, 2014).

CONCLUSION

We tried to introduce elementary ideas, ideologies and models of inclusive education in two countries. We also looked into two completely different educational systems. On one hand freedom found in Finland, and on the

other “teaching no matter its costs” in England, the systems which are both indeed very functional and inclusive in their nature. It is important to realize that not seeing explicitly student’s problem does not mean that the problem is non-existent.

The remarks included grasp important issues, but words won’t be of any use, unless they are connected with acceptance and active step forward. We hope that the use of this material will turn inclusive values into a positive direction, so we could increase shared participation not only in the field of education but in learning and social relationship as well. (Booth, T., Ainscow, M. 2011).

REFERENCES:

- AINSCOW, M., (1999), *Understanding the Development of Inclusive Schools*. London: Falmer press.
- AINSCOW, M., (2005), *Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change?* Journal of Educational Change, 6 (2).
- AINSCOW, M., WEST, M., BERESFORD, B. HARRIS, M., (2001), *Creating the conditions for school improvement*. London: David Fulton.
- AKDAIHANI, M., (2010), *A comparative study of inclusive education in Kuwait and England*. Dissertation.
- ARINEN, P. KARJALAINEN, T., (2007), *PISA 2006 ensituloksia (first results from PISA)*. Opetusministerion julkaisu: 38/. Helsinki: University Press.
- AVRAMIDIS, E., (2012), *Facts and Figures on Hearing Loss and Tinnitus*
- BOOTH, T. AINSCOW, M., (2011), *Index for Inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*, Bristol, CSIE.
- CARTER, B. B. SPENCER, V. G., (2006), *The fear factor: bullying and students with disabilities*, International Journal of Special Education, 21 (1).
- DES (Department of Education and Science) (1978), *Special Educational needs: report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (The Warnock Report)*. London: HMSO.
- DESSEMONTED, R. S. BLESS, G., (2013), *The impact of including children with intellectual disability in general education classrooms on the academic achievement of their low-, average- and high-achieving peers*, Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 38.
- DESSEMONTED, R. S., BLESS, G. A MOORIN, D., (2012), *Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities*, Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 56 (6)

- DfE (Department of Education) (2011) *Support and Aspiration: a new approach to special educational needs and disability – a consultation*
- DYSON, A., (1999), 'Inclusion and exclusions: theories and discourses in inclusive education' In Daniels, H. and Garner, P. (eds.) *World yearbook of education 1999. Inclusive education: supporting inclusion in education systems*, London: Kogan Paul.
- HÁBL, J., (2011), Character Formation: A Forgotten Theme of Comenius's Didactics. *Journal of Education and Christian Belief*, vol. 15, no. 2.
- HAMMEKEN, P., (2000), *Inclusion: 450 Strategies for Success: A Practical Guide for All Educators Who Teach Students With Disabilities*.
- HELUS, Z., (2007), *Sociální psychologie pro pedagogy*. Praha: Grada.
- KIVIRAUMA, J. RUOHO, K., (2007), *Excelence through special education? Lesson from the Finnish School Reform*. *International Review of Education*, 53 (3)
- KNOSTER, T., VILLA, R. AND THOUSAND, J., (2000), 'A framework for thinking about systems change.' In Villa, R. and Thousand, J. (eds.) *Restructuring for caring and effective education: piecing the puzzle together*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.
- LECHTA, V. (ed.), (2010), *Základy inkluzivní pedagogiky: Dítě s postižením, narušením a ohrožením ve škole*. Praha: Portál. p. 435.
- Norwich, Brahm. (2002), *Special School Placement and Statements for English LEAs 1997-2001*. report for CSIE, University of Exeter.
- Norwich, Brahm. (2008), *What futur efor special schools and inclusion? Conceptual and profesional prespectives*, *British Journal of Special Education*, 35 (3).
- OSAĐAN, R., BURRAGE, A. I., (2014), *Social Inclusion of Children from Disadvantaged Family Background*, (in:) Klimaszewska, A. and Jagiełło, E. (eds.) *Wyzwania i zaniechania w wychowaniu przedszkolnym i ksztalceniu wczesnoszkolnym*, Siedlce.
- PANČOCHA, K., (ed.), (2010), *Životní dráha jedince v inkluzivním prostředí*. Brno: MU.
- PENNICARD, I., CAIRNS, B., HAMILTON, E., HYNDMAN, K., REID, J. SAWERS, R., (1990), *A description and evaluation of integration at Greenburn and Maxwellton Schools*. Scottish Office Education Department/ Regional Psychological Sevices. Working with Individuals and Groups. Professional Development Initiatives (1990-1991).
- PISA (Programe for International Student Assessment), (2006) *Results*.
- PUJAR, V. GAONKAR, L., (2008), *Instructional strategies to accelerate science learning among primary school children*. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 21 (4).
- RAFFERTY, Y., PISCITELLI, V. BOETTCHER, C., (2003), *The impact of inclusion on langure development and social kompetence among preschoolers with disabilities*, *Eceptional Children*, 69 (4).

- RUIJS, N. M., VAN DER VEEN, I. PEETSMA, T. T. D., (2010), *Inclusive education and students without special educational needs*, *Educational Research*, 52 (4)
- RUNSWICK-COLE, K., (2011), *Time to end the bias towards inclusive education?*, *British Journal of Special Education*, 39 (3).
- SIPERSTEIN, G. N., GLICK, G. C. PARKER, R. C., (2009), *Social inclusion of children with intellectual disabilities in recreational petting*, *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 47 (2).
- TOPPING, K. MALONEY, S., (2005), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in inclusion*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- VILLA, R. THOUSAND, J., (ed.), (2005), *Creating an inclusive school*. 2nd ed. Alexandria (VA): Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

REFERENCE TO ELECTRONIC SOURCES:

- Doulík, P. & Škoda, J., (2010), *Inovativní cvičebnice obecné didaktiky* [online]. Ústí nad Labem: PF. Retrieved from: <http://cvicebnice.ujep.cz/>.
- Hooker, M., (2008) *GeSCI and the inclusive education agenda in Ghana: a question of 'diversification' or 'leverage'?* [online] Available from: <http://www.gesci.org/old/files/docman/IEiGhana-DiversificationLeverageFinal.pdf/> [Retrieved 1st March 2009]

NOTE ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Zilcher Ladislav - mgr, Faculty of Education, Department of Pedagogy, University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem. Scientific interests: Inclusive education, Special education, Multicultural education. E-mail: ladislav.zilcher@ujep.cz

Chytrý Vlastimil - Ph.D. Katedra preprimárního a primárního vzdělávání Pedagogické fakulty Univerzity Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, (Faculty of Education, Department of Preschool and Primary Education, University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem). Scientific interests: Teaching instructions in mathematics, Teacher training, Preschool & Primary education. E-mail: vlastimil.chytry@ujep.cz

Kežovská Markéta - mgr, Katedra preprimárního a primárního vzdělávání Pedagogické fakulty Univerzity Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, (Faculty of Education, Department of Preschool and Primary Education, University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem). Scientific interests: Preschool & Primary education. E-mail: marketa.kezovska@seznam.cz