# IDH@ECER 2023 in Glasgow
# Präsentationen zum SNF-Projekt "Primarschulen im Spannungsfeld von Inklusion und Bildungsstandards"

## Students Perspectives on Good Practice for Inclusive Teaching

**Franziska Oberholzer**
PH FHNW, Switzerland
*Presenting Author:* **Oberholzer, Franziska**

Since the 1990s, inclusion has been present in the international discourse as a guiding concept for the development of educational systems (Biewer & Schütz, 2016; Powell 2018; Zahnd, 2017). It first appeared prominently with the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO 1994). Inclusive education in the sense of international law takes "its starting point from the rights of vulnerable and marginalized people [...], [argues] for their participation in all areas of life [...] and [aims] at a structural change of regular institutions in order to meet the diversity of conditions and needs of all users" (Biewer 2017, 204). Thus, valuating diversity and finding forms of teaching and learning sensible to all forms of diversity without excluding students is at the core of inclusive education.

Although the demand for inclusive education has already been on the international agenda for several decades, its implementation has so far been insufficiently accomplished worldwide (Köpfer, Powell & Zahnd 2021). The (insufficient) implementation can be observed on different levels of the education system, e.g. on the level of legal and educational policy requirements, in the design of schools or also on the level of teaching. This also applies to Switzerland, which has taken up the international demands, but has not implemented inclusive education with the utmost consistency. It is evident that despite prioritizing inclusive solutions, Switzerland still adheres to the separation of mainstream and special schools (Powell 2018). Beyond these fundamental problematics in the educational system, however, fundamental problems also emerge in the implementation of inclusive teaching and thus in the creation of learning spaces that welcome all forms of diversity and enable all students to learn together – inclusive publics schools remain a desiderata in Switzerland (Moser Opitz, 2014).

In the context of this broad problem area, this contribution focuses on first results of my field work as a PhD-student. The presented data was collected in a research project, entitled "Primary schools in the tension between inclusion and educational standards" (Wagner-Willi & Zahnd 2019), which aims to further develop inclusive teaching in Switzerland. The project is founded by the Swiss National Science Foundation and uses – besides other methodical approaches – a participatory research framework. Following the insight that the students perspective is crucial to the development of inclusive education (e.g. Buchner 2018, Florian & Beaton 2018), my dissertation is focusing on the student-perspectives collected in this project. In this context, the question is addressed to what extent the perspectives of the students can be used to identify good practice for (inclusive) teaching. This good practice should on the one hand allow all students to participate in the learning process and on the other hand enable the social inclusion of all students.

*Methodology, Methods, Research Instruments or Sources Used*

The project started with a research workshop for all students. During this workshop, the students are introduced to the different research methods (research diary (Wöhrer et al. 2017) and photovoice (von Unger 2014)). Likewise, the following research questions - with the dual focus of learning process and social participation – were introduced to the students as guiding questions for their research process:

- Are there any situations in which you have especially enjoyed learning or in which you have especially enjoyed learning something? (focus on learning together)
- Are there situations in which you especially feel comfortable in the class? (Focus on social participation)
- In which situation did you have difficulties or did you not understand what you had to do? (Focus on learning together)
- When are you not able to participate even though you would like to? (Focus on collaborative learning & social participation)
- What learning material (assignment sheets, tasks in the book, etc.) was not clear for you to understand or was difficult for you to figure out? (Focus on collaborative learning)

After the introduction to the project, the students were asked to collect data during the school day over the time span of one school year. On the basis of this data, regular (once a week to every two weeks) reflection meetings took place in small groups of 5-6 students each. In these, possible problems and irritations were worked out and the data was summarized together with me as researcher. The reflection meetings were recorded and then transcribed. In the dissertation project, the transcripts of these reflection meetings with the students are used as data for the analysis. In addition, I was engaged in participant observation in the field. The field notes from these observations were also used as data. Both – field notes and transcripts – were afterwards analyzed with Grounded Theory Methodology (Strauss & Corbin 1996). The focus, though, will be on the narratives of the students.

*Conclusions, Expected Outcomes or Findings*

Based on empirical material from two classes which I accompanied during one school year each, I will show which irritations and problems are mentioned by the students and how these can be included in the further development of inclusive teaching. In particular, the data shows that the students experience a certain "lack of orientation" in everyday school life, which leads to mutual misunderstanding between students and teachers. Following Florian and Beaton (2018) as well as Buchner (2018), the first available data of the dissertation project shows the importance of students' perspectives in the further development of (inclusive) teaching. As a consequence, the dialogue between students and teachers seems to be of central importance for students to feel understood (Zahnd & Oberholzer 2022).

*References*

Biewer, G. (2017). Grundlagen der Heilpädagogik und Inklusiven Pädagogik (3. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage Ausg.). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt (UTB).

Biewer, G., & Schütz, S. (2016). Inklusion. In I. Hedderich, G. Biewer, R. Markowetz, & J. Hollenweger (Hrsg.), Handbuch Inklusion und Sonderpädagogik (S. 123–127). Julius Klinkhardt.

Buchner, T. (2018). Die Subjekte der Integration. Schule, Biographie und Behinderung. Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt.

Florian, L., & Beaton, M. (2018). Inclusive pedagogy in action: getting it right for every child. International Journal of Inclusive Education(22(8)), S. 870-884.

Köpfer, A., Powell, J. J., & Zahnd, R. (2021). Entwicklungslinien internationaler und komparativer Inklusionsforschung. In A. Köpfer, J. J. Powell, & R. Zahnd (Hrsg.), Handbuch Inklusion international. Globale, nationale und lokale Perspektiven auf Inklusive Bildung (S. 11-41). Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich..

Moser Opitz, E. (2014). Inklusive Didaktik im Spannungsfeld von gemeinsamem Lernen und effektiver Förderung. Ein Forschungsüberblick und eine Analyse von didaktischen Konzeptionen für inklusiven Unterricht. In Jahrbuch für Allgemeine Didaktik (S. 52-68). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.

Powell, J. J. (2018). Inclusive Education: Entwicklungen im internationalen Vergleich. In T. Sturm, & M. Wagner- Willi (Hrsg.), Handbuch schulische Inklusion (S. 127-142). Opladen/ Toronto: Barbara Budrich.

UNESCO. (1994). Final Report. World conference on special needs education: Access and quality. Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO.

von Unger, H. (2014). Partizipative Forschung. Einführung in die Forschungspraxis. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.

Wöhrer, V., Arztmann, D., Wintersteller, T., Harrasser, D., & Schneider, K. (2017). Partizipative Aktionsforschung mit Kindern und Jugendlichen. Von Schulsprachen, Liebesorten und anderen Forschungsdingen. Wiesbaden: Springer .

Wagner- Willi, M., & Zahnd , R. (2019). Primarschulen im Spannungsfeld von Inklusion und Bildungsstandards. Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz.

Zahnd, R. (2017). Behinderung und sozialer Wandel. Eine Fallstudie am Beispiel der Weltbank. Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt.

Zahnd, R. & Oberholzer, F. (2022). Stolpersteien und Wegweiser auf dem Weg zu inklusiven Lernarrangements. Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Heilpädagogik: Nr. 12: Inklusive Bildung.

### Pedagogical Interactions in Organisations – Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Trial Within the Scope of the Praxeological Sociology of Knowledge

**Katharina Papke**
PH FHNW, Switzerland
*Presenting Author:* **Papke, Katharina**

Ulrich (2018: 75) points out that inclusion – in a pedagogical definition – dodges the aspiration of formalization that organisations process. Instead, it remains in the undefined which refers to the unavailability of the mental systems and attitudes of the organisational members (cf. ibid.: 74). This indirectly describes an empirical research program that is dedicated to the question of what exactly happens when organisations (such as schools) work inclusively – or claim to do so. More precisely – in terms of the level of pedagogical interaction following the systems theory sensu Luhmann (2002) – it would be to speak of an underdetermination: the decisions made at the organisational level tend to take on a form that contours the operational level (e.g., the classroom interaction) but does not determine it extensively (cf. Kuper 2008: 153). In this sense, organisations specify the rather diffuse expectations on the part of society and translate them into concrete programs (e.g., via curricula, timetables, cf. ibid.) or prevent them from being overwhelmed – as not all decisions can be made in the classroom itself (cf. Luhmann 2002: 121). On the other hand, freedom is created for professionalised actions, which cannot be oriented towards rules, since it always must deal with individualised clients (cf. Stichweh 1996: 60).

In this view, there is drawn a complex relationship between the interconnection and disconnection. Subsequently, research questions should not only focus on the orientations and practices of teachers, but also on the organisational structural condition for the interaction (cf. Bohnsack 2017: 135). In this context, Bohnsack – following Luhmann (2000: 222ff.) – describes it as a characteristic of organised social systems that they are based on decisions enabling further decisions. Consequently, interactions within organisations differ categorically from those outside since the latter do not know such (decision-based) frameworks (cf. Bohnsack 2017: 135). In this respect, the *praxeological sociology of knowledge* speaks of a *constituting framing* since it is of constitutive importance for organisations (cf. ibid.).

The question of how the specific framing is contoured can function as a 'yardstick' of professionalised action, because it focuses on the necessary processing of the demands on the part of the organisation as well as on the part of the interactions with the clients (cf. Bohnsack 2020: 109). Bohnsack thus addresses a tension that has already been raised in existing theories of professionalised action (cf. Oevermann 1996) but outlines it differently – especially regarding the question of how the individualised clients (Stichweh 1996: 60) are thought. The present contribution wants to use this framework within an empirical study.

*Methodology, Methods, Research Instruments or Sources Used*

As Feuser (1996) emphasizes, it should actually be an inherent pedagogical concern to focus on what a person can become according to his or her possibilities – and not on how he or she appears to us at the moment. However, the word 'actually' already indicates that this is often not the case – also in pedagogy that operates as inclusive. Wagener (2020: 118), for example, observes in his classroom study the consolidation of 'disabled identities' in Swiss secondary school class settings with an inclusive orientation. As Bohnsack (2020, 28f.) points out,

these 'constructions of total identities' (Garfinkel 1976) are not clearly illuminated in theories of (professionalised) pedagogical action: Oevermann (1996: 148-149), for example, speaks of the fact that the pupil is to be grasped in its totality as a whole person (ibid.: 149). Bohnsack (2020: 29) opposes such delimiting tendencies by pointing out the 'degradation ceremonial' (Garfinkel 1976) potentially associated with this. Instead, he works out that persons are to be thought of as products of social systems (cf. Bohnsack 2020: 42). Thus, professionalised action is conceived as handling the discrepancy between the normative requirements of the organisation and the constitution of a shared practice with the clients (ibid.: 31).

As tertium comparationis with the aim of making the specific characteristics of the different professionalised practices visible, this approach was used for the analysis of empirical data in the SNF project "Primary schools in the field of tension between inclusion and educational standards" (Wagner-Willi and Zahnd 2020) – more precisely: in the sub-project, which pursues a reconstructive case comparison. This sub-project systematically examines classroom practice through group discussions with class teams (class teachers, special needs teachers, assistants) and pupils, as well as classroom videography in the different class settings of mainstream and inclusive classes (4th-5th grade). Both settings are entrusted with the implementation of integrative solutions (cf: D-EDK 2018: 5), but differ in terms of composition and resources: While three to five pupils in integrative classes receive so-called 'enhanced measures' (ibid.: 4) and a permanent double staffing with class teacher and special needs teacher is structurally provided, in mainstream classes, support can only be claimed on a need-oriented basis (up to five lessons/week).

*Conclusions, Expected Outcomes or Findings*

Initial data evaluated (using the documentary method, Bohnsack 2017) show a shift towards an arbitrary mode of interaction, especially in the integration classes – and to the detriment of the pupils who receive enhanced measures. Thus, it can be observed how moralisations, e.g. being 'negligent' in dealing with technical equipment, or incompetence attributions, e.g. via shifts in the assignment, are processed in relation to these pupils. This has consequences for the constituent framing, which tends to be broken through this. Thereby, it can be demonstrated that this does not coincide with the potential for action that the respective pupils show in the concrete teaching situation. In this sense, the teachers fail in connecting their assessment to the way these pupils participate within the interaction system (cf. Bohnsack 2020: 78).

In accordance with previous research findings (cf. Wagener 2020), the danger of total identity constructions is particularly evident in the case of integration classes. This raises the question of the extent to which the organisational coupling of personnel resources with the diagnostically justified and specifically assigned need for so-called enhanced measures encourages the observed forms of an arbitrary mode of interaction. Regarding such an undermining of a professionalised practice, it is important to clarify in further analyses – by comparing cases – how this unfolds in the classroom cooperation of class teachers and special needs teachers.

*References*

Bohnsack, Ralf. 2020. Professionalisierung in praxeologischer Perspektive. Opladen/Toronto: Budrich.

Bohnsack, Ralf. 2017. Praxeologische Wissenssoziologie. Opladen/Toronto: Budrich.

D-EDK. 2018. Sonderschulung und Lehrplan 21. https://www.regionalkonferenzen.ch/sites/default/files/2019-02/FB%20Sonderschulung%20Lehrplan%2021_2018-01-31.pdf

Feuser, Georg. 1996. Zum Verhältnis von Menschenbild und Integration – «Geistigbehinderte gibt es nicht!». http://bidok.uibk.ac.at/library/feuser-geistigbehinderte.html

Garfinkel, Harold. 1976. Bedingungen für den Erfolg von Degradierungszeremonien. In Seminar Abweichendes Verhalten III, ed. Klaus Lüderssen und Fritz Sack, 31–40. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Kuper, Harm. 2008. Entscheiden und Kommunizieren. In Pädagogische Professionalität in Organisationen, ed. Werner Helsper, Susann Busse, Merle Hummrich, und Rolf-Torsten Kramer, 149–162. Wiesbaden: VS.

Luhmann, Niklas. 2002. Das Erziehungssystem der Gesellschaft. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, Niklas. 2000. Organisation und Entscheidung. Opladen/Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Oevermann, Ulrich. 1996. Theoretische Skizze einer revidierten Theorie professionalisierten Handelns. In Pädagogische Professionalität, ed. Arno Combe und Werner Helsper, 70–182. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Stichweh, Rudolf. 1996. Professionen in einer funktional differenzierten Gesellschaft. In Pädagogische Professionalität, ed. Arno Combe und Werner Helsper, 49–69. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Ullrich, Stephan. 2018. Organisationen – der blinde Fleck inklusiver Pädagogik. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer.

Wagener, Benjamin. 2020. Leistung, Differenz und Inklusion. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Wagner-Willi, Monika und Raphael Zahnd. 2020. Primarschulen im Spannungsfeld von Inklusion und Bildungsstandards. https://data.snf.ch/grants/grant/188805