



ORGANIZATION OF LEARNER-TEACHER PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Reshma Tabassum Abdul Karim Syed

Independent Research Scholar, California Public University, Delaware, United States of America

Cite This Article: Reshma Tabassum Abdul Karim Syed, "Organization of Learner-Teacher Pedagogical Relationships in the Framework of Inclusive Education", *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education*, Volume 9, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 21-25, 2024.

Copy Right: © R&D Modern Research Publication, 2024 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract:

Nowadays at the process of globalization the system of value orientations and educational traditions are undergoing noteworthy modifications represented in the Concept of Inclusive Education Development (2010) in Ukraine. The research demonstrates the conception of organization of pedagogical relationships of the participants of art-therapeutic process as a component of inclusive education. The problem of the investigation defined the choice of the empirical research methods such as observation, interview, testing, study of the products of the activities of the subjects, study, and generalization of pedagogical experience. As a framework for the research it was used the model of five different aspects of the therapeutic relationship described by Clarkson (1995). One of the most significant finding to emerge from the study is that inclusive education is much wider than the opportunity for everybody to visit neighbourhood schools, deeper than deletion of distinctions between "general education" and "special education" programs. Findings of this study suggest that elements of art therapy should become an integral part of work with both the disabled and displaced (refugees or immigrants) students. The results allow singling out some means for the modern teacher to organize pedagogical relationships as a dialogue of the equal partners in the art-therapy-oriented education process. Application of Role-play refers here to the special technique used at the art-oriented activity for studying interpersonal behavior of the participants. This promoted a better understanding between participants, empathy, and frankness that removed psychological and emotional barriers in their verbal and non-verbal communication, and stimulated the process of self-actualization.

Key Words: Pedology Relationship; Inclusive Education, Children with Special Needed.

Introduction:

Teachers play a vital role in the process of ensuring that primary school students get an education that is both effective and inclusively organised. Taking into consideration the implementation of lifelong learning, shifts in approaches to financing inclusion (from centralised to decentralised), systematic updates to legislation, and the development of a teachers' training and skills enhancement programme in the field of inclusive education, there is a necessity to study the primary trends and characteristics of inclusion models in EU countries. This study will focus on the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Finland. The need to convert models is brought about by a variety of circumstances, both within and external to the organisation. In several countries of the European Union (EU), the change of the role of teachers in the organisation of inclusive education as well as the reform of inclusive education itself became a concern throughout the period of 2014-2018. (Nxumalo, 2018). The implementation of school inclusion reform must always begin with an integrated strategy in the modern day.

Objectives of the Study:

- Studying and generalization of research results on the organization of inclusion of primary school children in Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the United Kingdom.
- Analysis of tasks, functions of teachers in the organization of inclusion of junior schoolchildren in Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the United Kingdom.

Methodology:

The inquiry is predicated on an integrated methodology that includes aspects of segregation, differentiation, and integration in the teaching of primary school students in European countries (Nxumalo, 2018). The investigation was based on the study of (Goransson, Lindqvist, Klang & Magnusson, 2018; Magnusson, 2015; 2020), where the methodology is based on studying recent publications on the characteristics of the organisation of inclusion and confirmation of the most recent trends in statistics and legislation. The conceptual basis of the investigation was the study of (Goransson, Lindqvist, Klang & Magnusson, 2018; Magnusson, 2015; 2020). Consequently, the following strategies are being used in the investigation:

- The secondary analysis of studies and publications for the period 2015-2020, where the role of teachers in the organisation of inclusion is outlined, which allowed us to compare the disadvantages and advantages of different inclusion models, as well as the organisation of teachers' work as a key element in the effectiveness of inclusion;
- The inclusion models of Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the United Kingdom for the 2016/2017 academic years were analysed using statistical data, which enabled the identification of the conditions for the organisation of instructors;
- Study and generalisation of publications on the organisation of teachers' work to support or refute the hypothesis that there are regional differences in the role that teachers play in the organisation of inclusive education. analysis of legislative documents from Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the United Kingdom that regulate the organisation of teachers at the national and local level.

In this article, a bibliometric study of scientific research on the topic of the role of teachers in inclusive teaching of students during the period of time spanning from 2000 to 2020 was carried out. During the course of the study, the databases Research Gate, Crossruff, and Science Direct were used. The investigation of the information included in the databases has been carried out using the following standards: The publication need to include the findings of empirical research conducted between 2015 and 2020; these results ought to evaluate the part played by teachers in the process of include primary school students. In this study, qualitative research were not taken into consideration at all.

Due to the fact that these are the countries where inclusion is actively implemented at all educational levels and where experimental studies of the role of teachers in inclusive teaching of pupils are conducted, data from Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the United Kingdom have been used to conduct an analysis. This is because these are the countries that have the most inclusive educational systems. The statistics were chosen from the website of the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education for the period covering the academic year 2016/2017. We made use of statistical and comparative study of inclusive education indicators across the nations. According to the International Standard Classification of Education, the data for ISCED 1 (primary education) have been evaluated. Primary education often starts at age 5, 6, or 7, and continues for a normal total of six years from that point on (OECD, Eurostat & UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2015).

Results:

The EU member states' policies and procedures for the organisation of inclusive education for students are somewhat dissimilar from one another, and these differences may be attributed to social-demographic, political, and cultural issues. The model for inclusive education that is used in Germany is based on a system that includes special educational institutions, institutions of inclusive education, pedagogical centres for psychological and pedagogical support, and inclusion support services that are funded by the various local governments. There is also the potential for students to attend general schools for their education, provided that these general schools have instructors who are qualified in their subject areas.

The strategy that is used in the United Kingdom is one that is built on a public-private partnership that provides funds for the instruction of students who have special educational needs. Both private and public schools are required to implement inclusive education programmes (with specially equipped classrooms). When students reach the secondary level of education, they are each assigned an assistant who acts as a liaison between them, the classroom instructor, and the other students.

In Italy, the concept of full inclusion has been used for more than thirty years; it is based on the organisation of training in general educational institutions. In addition, Italy has been a leader in this field. Support and assistance is given to educators by consultative professionals. Professionals in the healthcare industry provide advice and guidance to parents depending on their children's diagnoses. Assistant teachers are employed in schools; their primary responsibility is monitoring the academic development of students, and they also provide assistance to students when necessary.

According to Swedish practise, inclusive education is implemented in regular educational institutions across the nation; nonetheless, special establishments continue to play an important role in inclusive education. Within the scope of the inclusion model are located child rehabilitation facilities and resource centres. On the other hand, recent studies carried out in the nation have shown that there are "issues of greater segmentation of kids at special educational institutions, and pupils are restricted in their choice of school" (Magnsson, 2020).

In Norway, where the education system has been modified to achieve complete inclusion of all educational institutions, the practise of inclusive education is an indication of the efficiency of inclusion organisation. Pupils have the right to free choice of school. Certain students get aid from the state via several centres.

The number of students enrolled in primary schools throughout these nations varies greatly; the United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy have the highest primary school student populations, respectively. Both Sweden and Norway have a relatively low number of students enrolled in elementary school. In the United States, about one hundred percent of primary school students are enrolled in regular courses; in the United Kingdom, however, this percentage is just 92.18 percent, as seen in Table 1.

The number of children who are nine years old also varies significantly from country to country. Germany has the highest number of children who are nine years old (729,8 thousand), followed by Great Britain with 677,0 thousand children and Italy with 567,7 thousand youngsters. According to Table 2, the percentage of nine-year-olds who are enrolled in education at any educational institution in any country, with the exception of the United Kingdom (91.86 percent), is close to one hundred percent.

Table 1: Population and enrollment of ISCED 1 level in the 2016/2017 academic year

Indicator	Italy	Sweden	Germany	Norway	The UK
Actual population of children/pupils	2825058	700662	2904278	447901	4121640
Children/ pupils enrolled in all formal educational settings	2792414	701973	2954775	444638	3839280
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream formal educational settings	2790790	696448	-	443993	3799382
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream formal educational settings (share from actual population)	98,79%	99,40%	-	99,13%	92,18%
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream groups/classes for at least 80% of the time	2790790	696448	2868444	442592	3792916
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream groups/classes for at least 80% of the time (share from actual population)	98,79%	99,40%	98,77%	98,81%	92,02%

Source: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2020d, 2020e)

Table 2: Age samples of nine-year-olds children/pupils enrolled in all formal educational settings in the 2016/2017 academic year

Indicator	Italy	Sweden	Germany	Norway	The UK
Population aged	567680	117707	729770	63409	677079
Children/ pupils enrolled in all formal educational settings aged	558757	-	728748	62830	621986
Children/ pupils enrolled in all formal educational settings aged (share of population aged)	98,43%	-	99,86%	99,09%	91,86%
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream formal educational settings aged	558516	-	-	-	614574
Children/ pupils enrolled in mainstream groups/classes for at least 80% of the time aged	558516	-	702213	-	613344

Source: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2020d, 2020e)

Table 3 shows that the percentage of students in Sweden and the United Kingdom who are enrolled in primary school and who have an official determination of SEN is the lowest of any kind of education. This percentage is 0.89% and 2.31%, respectively. While the indicator is high in Germany and Norway, the level of the indicator in Italy is considered to be average there.

The organisation of primary school education varies greatly from country to country as well: "in Italy and Norway, 98.66% and 93.31% of primary school pupils, respectively, study in the mainstream settings (classes) of general secondary schools; in Sweden, only 11.60% of primary school pupils study in the mainstream settings (classes) of general secondary schools; in Germany and the United Kingdom, half of the primary school pupils (47.82% and 55.77%) study in the mainstream setting" (Therefore, inclusion models are drastically diverse from one nation to the next; this might be because of the varying degrees of mental and physical impairments as well as the requirements of special education in each country. In light of this, 1,34% of primary school students in Italy and 2,11% of primary school students in Norway attend separate special schools; in Sweden, 88.40% of primary school students attend separate special schools; in Germany and the United Kingdom, 52.18% and 40.23% of primary school students respectively attend separate special schools. The statistics presented indicate that different types of instructors play different roles in the structuring of inclusive education for primary school students. As a direct consequence of this, "educators are more competent owing to the presence of national qualification and training programmes, growth of competencies" in Italy and Norway (Tangen, 2005).

Table 3: Children/pupils with an official decision of SEN in the 2016/2017 academic year

Indicator	Italy	Sweden	Germany	Norway	UK
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN in any form of education	90845	6250	165457	30582	95238
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN in any form of education (share from actual population of children/learners, see table 1)	3.22%	0.89%	5.70%	6.83%	2.31%
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN educated in mainstream groups/classes for at least 80% of the time	89628	725	79126	28536	53114
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN educated in mainstream groups/classes for at least 80% of the time (share of any form of education)	98,66%	11,60%	47,82%	93,31%	55,77%
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN educated in separate special (pre)schools	1217	5525	86331	645	38314
Children/ pupils with an official decision of SEN educated in separate special (pre)schools (share of any form of education)	1,34%	88,40%	52,18%	2,11%	40,23%

Source: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2020d, 2020e)

The establishment of a legislative framework for the regulation of inclusive education as well as the education and training of teachers is another area in which countries vary in their approaches. In Italy, the legal framework for special education began to develop between the years 1971 and 1977, when inclusion at general and specialised schools was declared; in 1992, the basic law on the problems of pupils with disabilities was adopted (provided for the work of assistants, full integration of pupils); in 2000, the "integrated system of interventions and social services" was definitively stated; and in 2003, equal conditions for the education and training of teachers were ensured. In Italy, in 2015, the financing of training and education of teachers was officially designated (40 million euros were given for professional training), and 9,000 inclusion experts were hired. The amount of money that is spent annually on social inclusion is greatest in Italy. In Italy, education is based on a cooperation between the home, the school, and the community. Primary education in Italy is based on a degree programme that lasts for a total of four years and is called Primary Education Science (Scienzedellaformazioneprimaria). When students are required to write their own learning agreements, they must choose certain classes from their curriculum with the assistance and cooperation of their professors. An essential component of the inclusion implementation process is the peer-to-peer method. Help for teachers is provided by specialised employees as well as by Territorial Support Centers (CTS) (network of schools). It is important for educators to do internships. The first internship only accounts for 20% of the training, while support for specialisation makes up the other 100%. The objective of risk identification courses for teachers should focus on assessment techniques and advice, as well as pedagogic measures that are to be implemented by instructors in regard to both the individual student and the group of students in the classroom.

In Germany, the legal framework varies across the territories and districts, each of which defines its own principles of inclusion according to the educational and cultural features that it has, but the whole federal state is simultaneously responsible for these principles. Common legal papers, such as the "Basic Law (Grundgesetz, Art. 3 - R1), Book Twelve of the Social Code (Sozialgesetzbuch XII - Sozialhilfe), and the Lander constitutions (R14-29), and specific ones - legal documents of the lands and districts," are used as the foundation for the inclusion regulations. This allows for the discussion and sharing of techniques and experiences pertaining to the organisation of inclusion. Since 2004, professional development opportunities for educators have been available. More than ninety percent of the financing comes from the municipal budget, and in certain instances, the state contributes to it as well. The education of future educators often consists of two stages: first, a course at a university, and then, pedagogical training in the classroom. According to the particular needs of teachers, it takes 4.5 years to train as a teacher at the university, followed by an additional 1.5-2 years of practical training in the classroom.

In the 1970s, throughout the course of performing tests on the integration of children with disabilities into public schools, the foundation for the first approaches to the organisation of inclusion in Germany was laid. But in 2009, Germany became one of the countries that officially ratified the UN Convention (Klemm, 2015). Before the ratification, several schools already had inclusive education programmes in place on a voluntary basis; with the ratification, however, inclusion became mandatory for the

whole educational system. As a result of the territories of Germany having sovereignty in the sphere of education, the convention was incorporated into federal legislation. This enabled the territories to exercise their sovereignty. This resulted in regional variances in the structure of inclusion, including requirements for inclusion, financing, access to school for pupils, and parental choices of schools. As a result, there is less of a selection of schools available, whether public or specialised. Because of the many different organisational considerations involved, students are divided up across many courses (Paseka & Schwab, 2020). The number of inclusive education spots available at the school is directly proportional to the rights of the parents. The following factors have had an impact on the statistics on inclusive education: In Germany, SEN students make up around 7.1% of the overall student population and number close to 524 000. In the last decade, the inclusion rate has grown from 18.4% in 2008 to 39.3% in 2006. This refers to the percentage of students with special educational needs who have attended inclusive courses in comparison to the total number of students with special educational needs. There is a drop from 67.0% (kindergarten) to 46.9% (primary schools) and 29.9% (secondary schools) (statistics for the 2013/14 academic school year), which can be seen in the inclusion rate discrepancies across preschool, primary, and secondary schools. The German model is regarded to be somewhat integrated in comparison to international data and models used in other EU countries: on average, 52.7% (Statistics of the European Agency for Inclusive Education 2014). There are geographical disparities in degrees of inclusion in Germany; for example, the percentage ranges from 82.8% in the city-state of Bremen to 26.3% in Bavaria.

The fact that children with a variety of requirements are accommodated at public schools requires instructors to use a variety of instructional strategies, according to the findings of study. The fundamental criteria consist of the following: learning strategies; the formulation of goals and criteria for achieving the success of inclusion; the formation of stages of performance of tasks by students; the adaptation of tasks according to available resources and the needs of students; the differentiation of teaching materials; constant monitoring of efficiency; feedback; exercises and repetition of material; interactive forms of learning; additional tasks and exercises. Learning strategies that are inclusive demand a more individualised approach from instructors toward pupils, as well as differentiation and collaboration. The concept of personalization requires educators to see their pupils as unique people and to devise new methods of communication with their classes. The ability to recognise the strengths of younger students who have special educational needs and the support they require, the ability to create engaging content, teaching methods, and the ability to cope with the shortcomings of students are the fundamental competencies required of teachers in this scenario. Utilizing a variety of instructional approaches and having the skill to adapt those approaches according to the requirements of each individual student are both essential components of differentiation. Indicators of the efficacy of differentiation include the degree to which various methods of instruction are used in the classroom in conjunction with engaging content. Establishing positive relationships not only with the children but also with the staff is necessary for effective cooperation. This is particularly important between general education instructors and special education teachers and/or psychologists.

The organisation of inclusive practises for primary school pupils should be ensured by teachers in three different directions: inclusive culture, inclusive policy, and inclusive practises. The development of a trustworthy atmosphere and the construction of inclusive principles are both essential components of an inclusive culture. The process of coordinating support for diversity via the proposal of a number of different initiatives is included in inclusive policy. Inclusionary practises entail the coordination of education and the pooling of resources in order to provide an environment that is conducive to learning and leisure activities (providing technical equipment and an acceptable class space).

Recent research indicates that educators who employ a wider variety of inclusive teaching strategies, as well as those that allow for differentiation and customization of instruction, have a more favourable attitude toward inclusive education.

In inclusive education, the resources that are available may be broken down into three categories: persons (teaching and non-teaching staff), teaching and learning materials, and special resources (Schneider, Klemm, Kemper & Goldan, 2018). In light of this, inclusive culture, inclusive policy, and inclusive practises may all be seen as resources within the context of inclusive education. The absence of resources, particularly human resources, that are able to satisfy the particular educational requirements of pupils is, as a general rule, the primary barrier that prevents the effective implementation of inclusion policies. The quantity of resources available and the degree of freedom with which they may be used vary substantially throughout Europe. However, having qualified human resources available is essential to the success of inclusive education. In the event that there are insufficient staff members, schools in Germany are permitted to turn away prospective students (Klemm, 2015). The amount of perception that instructors have of inclusive education is determined by the availability of resources as well as the level of provision of human resources: a high level of positive attitude is related with a high level of provision of personnel.

Decentralized administration characterises Sweden's approach to social inclusion. Since 2010, an effort has been under way to modernise the legislative framework; in 2020, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child was ratified by the government of the nation. In order to comply with the law, local authorities are tasked with ensuring that educational institutions meet their inclusion objectives. Educators are accountable for a variety of operational responsibilities. The organisation of education for primary school students is legally enshrined in the Curriculum for the compulsory school, pre-school class, and the recreation centre. This curriculum defines the norms of behaviour, values, knowledge and competences, responsibility of teachers, and other conditions for organising the inclusion of students. Inclusion spending accounts for 15% of the total budget for the municipality. The instructors in Sweden have access to help from resource centres. When it comes to getting an education to become a primary school teacher in Sweden, there are three different types of specialisations available. These include studying for one to three years in order to work with primary school pupils and completing training programmes in order to work with children who have special educational needs.

In the eyes of many in the global world, the comprehensive education system that the Swedish government has established is the most successful model. However, over the past few years in Sweden there has been a rise in the practise of segregating students based on their academic performance as well as their socioeconomic status, the country of immigration origin of students, and groups of students who have special educational needs (Magnson, 2020). Recent studies have noticed the relationship between the expansion of the capacity to pick a school and the decrease of disparity among various groups of pupils,

resulting in growing social segregation within the educational system. At the same time, racial and socioeconomic factors are playing an increasingly significant role in the segregation of schools in Sweden (Bunar & Ambrose, 2018).

Conclusion:

The paradigms of inclusive education used in Italy, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Great Britain have been broken down and examined in this article. The extent to which instructors have a part in the administration of an inclusive education for primary school students is dependent on a number of criteria. There are a variety of institutional levels that are responsible for providing support and assistance to teachers across the world. In Germany, this is accomplished through the centre for psychological and pedagogical support, inclusion support services; in Great Britain, this is accomplished by assistants; in Italy, this is accomplished by consultants and healthcare service professionals; in Sweden, this is accomplished through resource centres; in Norway, this is accomplished through state centres. In these nations, efforts have been taken to encourage both the ongoing professional development of teachers as well as the financial incentive of teachers. As a result, these policies have a favourable impact on the process by which primary school students are integrated into society.

References:

1. Adderley, R. J., Hope, M. A., Hughes, G. C., Jones, L., Messiou, K., & Shaw, P. A. (2015). Exploring inclusive practices in primary schools: focusing on children's voices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 30(1), 106-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.964580>
2. Arthur-Kelly, M., Sutherland, D., Lyons, G., Macfarlane, S., & Foreman, P. (2013). Reflections on enhancing pre-service teacher education programmes to support inclusion: Perspectives from New Zealand and Australia. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(2), 217-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778113>
3. Avissar, G., Reiter, S., & Leyser, Yo. (2003). Principals' views and practices regarding inclusion: the case of Israeli elementary school principals. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 18(3), 355-369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0885625032000120233>
4. Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration / inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056>
5. Bunar, N., & Ambrose, A. (2018). Urban polarization and market losses. In M. Dahlstedt & A. Fejes (Eds.). *School, market and future*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.
6. Cole, B. A. (2005). Mission impossible? Special educational needs, inclusion and the re-conceptualization of the role of the SENCO in England and Wales. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20(3), 287-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250500156020>
7. Cook, N., & Kiru, E. W. (2018). Disproportionality in special education: A synthesis of international research and trends. *The Journal of Special Education*, 52(3), 163-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466918772300>
8. Corbett, J. (1999). Inclusive education and school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 3(1), 53-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136031199285183>
9. Domović, V., Vlast, V. V., & Bouillet, D. (2017). Student teachers' beliefs about the teacher's role in inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(2), 175-190.
10. Efthymiou, E., & Kington, A. (2017). The development of inclusive learning relationships in mainstream settings: A multimodal perspective. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1304015 <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1304015>