

Index for Inclusion of Social School Culture

Prejeto 05.04.2018 / Sprejeto 10.12.2018

Znanstveni članek

UDK 373.5:316.4.063.3

KLJUČNE BESEDE: šola, socialna in inkluzivna kultura, politika in praksa, prepreke pri učenju in sodelovanju, podpora različnostim

POVZETEK – Pri pojmovanju šole kot vzgojno-izobraževalne ustanove se je v večini primerov pisalo o njenih organizacijskih in institucionalnih problemih, zato se je šolske teorije v preteklosti najpogosteje interpretiralo kot teorije šolske organizacije. Današnje šolske teorije se trudijo zajeti šolo v celoti, z globljim razumevanjem njene socialne, pedagoške in inkluzivne biti. Zato je cilj tega dela dobiti odgovor na vprašanje, v kolikšni meri se v raziskavo zajetih osnovnih in srednjih šolah ustvarja in razvija inkluzivna kultura, oblikuje inkluzivna politika in promovira inkluzivna praksa. Rezultati kažejo, da morajo šole, še zlasti srednje, skupaj s starši in skupnostjo prevzeti večjo odgovornost in medsebojno deliti filozofijo inkluzivne vzgoje in izobraževanja. Šolo bi bilo treba kontinuirano razvijati kot varno skupnost, ki sprejema, sodeluje in upošteva, daje podporo in kaže toleranco, razvija skupne inkluzivne vrednote, ki usmerjajo odločanje o šolski politiki in praksi. Različne oblike podpore in sredstva morajo biti bolje koordinirani (usklajeni), strokovnost šolskega osebja pa se mora bolj razvijati in nadgrajevati pri iskanju odgovora na vprašanje "Kako odgovoriti na različnosti med učenci?". Indeks inkluzivnosti se prepozna kot pomembno kulturno, politično in gospodarsko vprašanje, ki je vitkano v socialno, inkluzivno in pedagoško bit šole. Teži k zmanjšanju vseh oblik diskriminacije in odpravljanju ovir v učnem okolju in pri sodelovanju, pa tudi pri prihodnjem zaposlovanju.

Received 05.04.2018 / Accepted 10.12.2018

Scientific paper

UDC 373.5:316.4.063.3

KEYWORDS: school, social and inclusive culture, policies and practices, barriers to learning and participation, support for diversity

ABSTRACT – In their reflections on school as an educational institution, most authors have written about its organizational and institutional issues, which is why, in the past, the school theories were most commonly interpreted as school organization theories. Contemporary school theories attempt to include the school as a whole, with a deeper understanding of its social, educational and inclusive identity. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to answer the question to which extent the covered primary and secondary schools create and develop inclusive cultures, produce inclusive policies and evolve inclusive practices. The results indicate that the schools, secondary in particular, should take more responsibility and share the philosophy of inclusive education with the parents and the community. They should continuously develop the school as a safe community that embraces, cooperates and respects, supports and shows tolerance, develops common inclusive values that guide the decision-making on school policies and practices. Different forms of support and resources require better coordination, and the expertise of school staff should be further developed and upgraded in finding answers to the question of how to respond to diversity among students. The Index for Inclusion is recognized as an important cultural, political and economic issue woven into the social, inclusive and pedagogical/educational identity of the schools. It strives to reduce all forms of discrimination and remove barriers to learning and participation as well as future employment.

1 Introduction

The concept of culture as the ideals, values and beliefs shared by the members of a society was developed by anthropologists at the end of the 19th century. Culture as "a complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, art, law, morals, custom, and any

other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” was defined, among the first, by anthropologist Tylor (Hawiland, 2004: p. 34). Following this first and generally accepted definition of culture, there have been many others that seek to more clearly distinguish the actual behaviour from abstract values, beliefs and perceptions of the world as the foundation of that behaviour. Therefore, great attention is paid to social culture, distinguishing between how people think their society should function and how it actually functions. In this sense, culture provides models of identity and drives the actions of its members. It has become a central concept in many efforts to change organizations, institutions and foundations to achieve improvements at all levels of their organization, growth and development.

In their reflections on school as an educational institution, most authors have written about its organizational and institutional issues (Sušanj, 2005), which is why the school theories of the past were most commonly interpreted as school organization theories (Jurić, 1999). Contemporary school theories attempt to cover the school as a whole, with a deeper understanding of its educational, social, cultural and inclusive identity (Previšić, 2010) pervaded by strong dynamics and frequent changes, the need for adjustment and removal of barriers to learning and participation. It is particularly this attitude of inclusive and social identity of schools that will be examined in this paper in order to answer the question to which extent the covered primary and secondary schools create and develop inclusive cultures, produce inclusive policies and evolve inclusive practices on the pathway to optimal growth and development of students and their maturing in the institutional environment. The main features of this process are the dynamism, flexibility, variability and adaptability of roles and relationships, which means that there is no universal model of social and inclusive culture of the school. Each school has its own unique culture, i.e. there are no two schools that manifest their social and inclusive culture in the same identical way.

The culture of school and education is not followed by conceptual clarity and precision (Stolp and Prosser, 1999; Strugar, 2005; Vujičić, 2008). Deal and Peterson (1990) understand school culture as including values, beliefs and traditions, while Heckman (1993), Patterson et al. (1986) define the determinants, elements, functions and dimensions of school culture through the postulates of constructiveness, cohesion, formation, variability and uniqueness. Constructiveness pertains to the building and development of the school through relationships, and cohesion pertains to a clear mission and vision, purpose and the direction pursued which has the power of gathering and unification. Formation relates to the behavioural patterns that influence success/failure, and variability is the variable postulate that emphasizes that school culture is not static; it is constantly changing, although very slowly, and is therefore perceived as a relatively stable category, unique to each school.

School culture can be defined as a historically transferrable behavioural pattern that includes norms, values, beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, customs and myths, and is developed by the members of the school community and their relationships, ways of thinking and action, leadership and management (Stolp and Smith, 1994). Furthermore, terms such as “climate”, “ethos”, “tone”, “atmosphere”, “character” and “interpersonal relationships” are used interchangeably as synonyms for school culture.

According to the criteria of instrumentality (degree of control and focus on the task) and expressiveness (degree of cohesion and maintaining of positive interpersonal

relationships), Hargreaves (1999) lists the traditionalist, collaborationist, controlled and anomic school culture. The prevalent feature of a traditionalist culture is formality, routine and inaccessibility; in a collaborationist culture, the sense of relaxation and mutual care prevails; in a controlled culture, the sense of isolation is predominant, whereas in an anomic school culture, insecurity and a sense of isolation prevail. None of these cultures is optimal and feasible as completely pure; it is often a combination of different influences and patterns of behaviour. Namely, learning in the school is conditioned by a situational and cultural context, an approach based on the nature of the mind and the nature of the culture.

Social culture as a developmental category is subject to temporal and spatial developments and the interrelationship between processes (enculturation) embracing the social and cultural phenomena as a whole with an emphasis on their interaction. Social culture is a type of a social environment created by people, their beliefs, customs, knowledge and practices that determine the behaviour within the society. According to authors, the elements of social culture are cultural diversity and cultural changes (Gellner, 1988; Newstrom and Davis, 1983). They observe cultural diversity through the lens of identification, recognition, appreciation and positive use of the wealth of diversity among people, and cultural changes are seen as a sense of confusion, uncertainty and anxiety caused by exposure of an individual to a new, unfamiliar culture until one has adapted. A single, generally acceptable definition of social culture can be drawn from the above mentioned definitions – social culture is a social concept created by individuals and their interaction (Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2016).

Social culture is also linked to the concept of social responsibility. A socially responsible behaviour is the concept of thinking about the welfare, of being focused on the progress of the community where the individual, group and corporate and organisational behaviour is directed towards achieving the set goals based on the unique inner values, strengths and capabilities of employees and organizations. Although organisational culture represents the personality and character of the organization, the firm system of values, attitudes, understandings, beliefs, ethics, lifestyles, identities (Denison, 1990), it is an ongoing process that changes and follows the development of the organization and the changes within it. It is a result of natural, social, dynamic and long-term external and internal aspects and processes where the attitudes, beliefs and the conduct of people is gradually formed into a unique personality and a sort of a soul of the organization (Schein, 1992).

Contemporary pedagogy and sociology analyse the community culture at both macro and micro levels. Macrosociology deals with global social systems and relationships, and microsociology with small groups. Macropedagogy is focused on the macro-organization of schools and teaching, and micropedagogy on interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal relationships are dynamic processes that determine the behaviour of people who participate in it and determine the interdependence of behaviour. This means that the behaviour of one person in a relationship is conditioned by the behaviour of the other. General characteristics of interpersonal relationships are interaction (degree of quality of the established interactions) and reciprocity (the behaviour of one person determines the behaviour of the other). The elements of this relationship are identified through personal affection, mutual understanding, interests, attitudes and values, and among the factors of

success of interpersonal relationships there are three that stand out in particular: social perception, emotional attitudes and empathy (Bratanić, 1991).

The social culture of the school is an external frame of reference in the context of culture and can be called “group culture”. The school as a community of learning, growth and development implies a culture of groups and individuals and is reflected in clear value systems, the developmental vision, mission and objectives that can be achieved by applying effective strategies of education and respect for diversity of all students (Ivančić and Stančić, 2013).

In modern education at the turn of this century, inclusive school culture, which implies respect for diversity of all students included in education, was increasingly evaluated (Sekulić-Majurec, 1997, Igrić et al., 2012). Education for All, which, according to UNESCO, is part of a priority education program, is focused on the students and their needs. In order to best address the needs of students in learning and participation, particularly when it comes to children with disabilities, a frequently mentioned concept nowadays is the schools’ Index for Inclusion (Booth, 2008; Livazović, 2008; Đurek, 2010), i.e. fostering of inclusive cultures, policies and practices. The Index for Inclusion, as the authors highlight, helps schools towards human development that equally appreciates all students in accordance with inclusive values and processes. Inclusive values guide the desired school objectives, enrich its vision of development, motivate individuals and groups to be more harmonized, more connected, more moral, more tolerant, more socially sensitive and more entrepreneurial, primarily for themselves, and then the other, taking into account the uniqueness and diversity within the development process.

Numerous international and Croatian documents promote inclusion, but despite a clearly defined legal framework, the process of inclusion of children with difficulties in the regular education system and the achievement of planned measures and the monitoring of their implementation are impeded (Bouillet, 1995). Insufficient understanding of the social and educational environment, lack of interaction and cooperation and inadequate respect for the need for a multidisciplinary approach are perceived as aggravating circumstances. It is this particular segment of successful performance, which implies cooperation and networking of different resources in the building of inclusive culture and practices, that has proved to be sustainable but has not been practiced in desirable proportions (Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2015).

Inclusion, as opposed to a mere integration, is a process that requires a group effort, accessible and effective education within the community which includes the school and the family as well as all forms of educational initiatives in the community and support of all resources (Stubbs, 1998; Giangerco et al. 2001). This synergy is viewed as a joint mission (Rouse and Florian, 1996) where students with developmental difficulties as well as the other students feel valued, needed and equal (Uditsky, 1993), have friends and are socially accepted, not only inside but also outside the school, within the community (Hall, 1996). From this standpoint, social and inclusive cultures of the school aim at a co-construction of an inclusive curriculum (Daniels et al., 2003) which strengthens inclusion (Ballard, 1995; Sebba, 1996) and reduces exclusion from the basic functioning of society in order to deal more effectively with diversity and differences (Forest, Pearpoint, 1992). Diversity is not perceived as a problem to be overcome, but rather as a precious resource that supports learning for all and promotes and develops the rela-

tionship between the family, the school and the community (Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2015).

Booth (2008) views the school's Index for Inclusion through three dimensions: creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies and evolving inclusive practices. In the creation of inclusive cultures, the emphasis is laid on building a community and the establishment of inclusive values. The producing of inclusive policies aims to develop the school for all and organize support for diversity. The producing of inclusive practices is focused on orchestrating learning and mobilisation of all available resources. Similarly, the Index for Inclusion has abandoned the established term "children with special needs" and offers an alternative term "barriers to learning and participation." The idea that problems in education can be overcome by identifying some children as children with special educational needs is quite deficient. The author points out that this contributes to a waste of efforts the schools invests to address the differences between students grouped into different categories. Acceptance and friendship of children and youth with developmental difficulties are shown as important determinants of integration and inclusive education (Žic-Ralić and Ljubas, 2013) and whether we evaluate their knowledge or needs, interests and abilities (Greenspan 2003; Buljubašić-Kuzmanović and Kelić, 2012).

2 Research Methodology

The aim of this paper is to examine the fostering of the development of social and inclusive culture of the school and to answer the question to which extent the covered primary and secondary schools create and develop inclusive cultures, promote inclusive policies and evolve inclusive practices. To this end, the instrument for measuring the schools' Index for Inclusion was developed, intended for school pedagogues from 65 (7.3%) primary and 45 (6.5%) secondary schools at the national level. The questionnaire includes 67 items distributed in three scales related to inclusive cultures, policies and practices (according to Booth, 2008). The dimensions of inclusive culture are operationalized through the decisive factors, i.e. determinants of: building community (13 items), establishing inclusive values (7 items), developing the school for all (7 items), organizing support for diversity (13 items), orchestrating learning (17 items) and mobilising resources (10 items).

Based on the objective, the following research problems were defined:

- Examining the measurement properties of the questionnaire, its validity and reliability coefficient;
- Examining the dimensions and determinants of the schools' Index for Inclusion and their correlation;
- Comparing the results obtained with respect to the type of school and determine to which extent the covered primary and secondary schools create and develop inclusive cultures, produce inclusive policies and evolve inclusive practices.

It is to be assumed that the examined dimensions and determinants of inclusive school culture will show a high level of correlation. The assessment provided by the pedagogues will most strongly concentrate on the Index for Inclusion related to the creation of inclusive cultures, closely linked to the social culture of the school, building a community and inclusive values, and least strongly on the dimension of inclusive practices. The selected dimensions of the Index for Inclusion will indicate the interconnectedness, i.e. correlation of the social, inclusive and educational identity of the schools, of the overall culture of education.

The dependent variables are the dimensions and the determinants of inclusive school culture as the measures of its social identity, and the independent variables are the gender and type of school in which the pedagogue is employed (primary, secondary).

It is expected that the results of this research will expand the existing knowledge of the culture of school and education, and contribute to shedding light on its social and inclusive identity at both theoretical and practical levels. In addition, education practitioners will be offered insight into a possible approach to the promotion and monitoring of the development of social culture and the school's Index for Inclusion.

The study was conducted at the National Conference of Pedagogues in mid-October 2016 and included 110 pedagogues (65 from primary and 45 from secondary schools). The respondents were asked to assess to which extent they agree with the 69 items included in the questionnaire on a scale from 1 to 5, where the numbers have the following meaning: 1 – Strongly Agree, 2 – Agree, 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 – Disagree and 5 – Fully Disagree. The lower numbers represent a more favourable assessment and the higher number the less favourable one. The SPSS package for computer assisted statistical data processing was used in the study. The analysis was conducted by using descriptive and analytical, inferential statistical analysis. In the processing of the data, the number of the respondents deviated from the total number of 110, ranging from 1 to 11, due to incomplete responses to the individual items of the questionnaire.

3 Results and Discussion

Prior to the processing of the data and according to the problems set, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire used (Table 1) will be checked by analysing the correlation of its dimensions: creating inclusive culture, producing inclusive policies and evolving inclusive practices (Table 2). After that, the descriptive statistics of the determinants of inclusive school culture will be presented (Table 3) and their relationship will be examined (Table 5). Using the t-test for independent samples, the significance of the differences in the results on the dimensions and determinants of the inclusive culture of elementary and secondary schools (Table 6, 7) will be sought, preceded by the application of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of probability distribution (Table 4).

Table 1. Coefficients of internal consistency of the questionnaire – School’s Index for Inclusion

<i>Dimensions of the schools’ Index for Inclusion</i>	<i>Creating inclusive cultures</i>	<i>Producing inclusive policies</i>	<i>Evolving inclusive practices</i>
Cronbach’s alpha coefficient	0.923	0.939	0.941
Total Cronbach’s alpha coefficient = 0.974			

Based on the alpha coefficients obtained, it can be concluded that the questionnaire applied is an extremely homogenous instrument, both in individual measurements of the dimensions of inclusion and in the overall result. The calculated Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of internal consistency for individual questionnaire scales ranged from 0.932 to 0.941 and the coefficient for the whole questionnaire is 0.974.

Table 2. Coefficients of correlation between the dimensions of the schools’ Index for Inclusion

<i>Dimensions of the schools’ Index for Inclusion</i>	<i>Creating inclusive cultures</i>	<i>Producing inclusive policies</i>	<i>Evolving inclusive practices</i>
Creating inclusive cultures	1.000	0.909**	0,855**
Producing inclusive policies		1.000	0.902**
Evolving inclusive practices			1.000

Note: p < 0.05*; p < 0.01**; p < 0.001***

Table 2 shows that the correlations between the different dimensions of the inclusive culture of the schools are extremely high. Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) ranges from 0.855 to 0.909 and it is apparent that creating inclusive cultures increases producing inclusive policies, i.e. evolving inclusive practices.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the determinants of the schools’ Index for Inclusion

<i>Determinants of the schools’ Index for Inclusion</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Building community	104	20	65	34.115	8.316
Establishing inclusive values	109	10	35	18.725	5.494
Developing the school for all	109	7	35	16.055	6.823
Organising support for diversity	104	14	65	34.067	9.188
Orchestrating learning	102	20	85	44.961	11.877
Mobilising resources	108	10	50	27.426	7.781

As the range of the results for each subscale of the determinants of the schools’ Index for Inclusion varies, for the purpose of a better insight into the respondents’ as-

assessments, the results have been interpreted according to the nearest scale value of the questionnaire, with the lower assessment considered a more favourable result. Accordingly, the Index for Inclusion of the covered schools is mostly recognizable in the determinants of developing the school for all (integration of all pupils into a regular education system) and developing the school as a learning community in which support is organized to cater for diversity. There is somewhat less recognisability reflected in the orchestration of learning (removing barriers to learning and participation of all students), mobilisation of available resources, and the establishment of inclusive values.

Table 4. Test of probability distribution for the determinants of the schools' Index for Inclusion

<i>Determinants of the schools' inclusive culture</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>K-S test</i>	<i>p</i>
Community building	CB	1.060	0.003**
Establishing inclusive values	EIV	0.799	0.001**
Developing the school for all	DSFO	1.145	0.000**
Organising support for diversity	OSFD	0.840	0.006**
Orchestrating learning	OL	0.608	0.127
Mobilising resources	MR	0.587	0.060

Note: K-S test = Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of probability distribution; $p < 0.05^*$; $p < 0.01^{**}$; $p < 0.001^{***}$

Table 4 shows that four distributions of the determinants of the schools' Index for Inclusion significantly differ from the reference probability distribution. Petz (1997) states that it is possible to use parametric statistics if the distributions are not regular. It is not conditional that they are completely symmetric, but they must not be distinctly bimodal or U-shaped, which is not the case in the above mentioned tests.

Table 5. Correlation coefficients between the determinants of the schools' Index for Inclusion

<i>Variable</i>	<i>CB</i>	<i>EIV</i>	<i>DSFO</i>	<i>OSFD</i>	<i>OL</i>	<i>MR</i>
<i>CB</i>	1.000	0.827**	0.806**	0.772**	0.787**	0.640**
<i>EIV</i>		1.000	0.763**	0.800**	0.778**	0.633**
<i>DSFO</i>			1.000	0.757**	0.761**	0.629**
<i>OSFD</i>				1.000	0.865**	0.733**
<i>OL</i>					1.000	0.791**
<i>MR</i>						1.000

Note: $p < 0.05^*$; $p < 0.01^{**}$; $p < 0.001^{***}$

Table 5 shows that all listed correlations are significant and high. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) ranges from 0.629 to 0.865, with building community being highly correlated with all research variables. It forms the pillar of developing the culture of the school, education, its social, pedagogical and inclusive identity. This is also mentioned in the studies on the indicators and determinants of social inclusion (Hayes et al., 2008; Greenspan et al., 2003; Atkinson et al 2004; Bouillet, 2014), on the challenges of inclusive and integrated education (Bouillet, 210; 2013) and in the findings of the research on the social culture of school and teaching (Prosser, 1999; Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2016). It is a multidimensional process aimed at creating conditions that provide for full and active participation of every member of the community in all aspects of life, such as civic, social, economic and political activities, including participation in the decision-making processes (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs – DESA, 2009).

Table 6. Differences in the results for the determinants of inclusiveness of the school with respect to the type of school

<i>Determinants of inclusiveness of the school</i>	<i>Type of school</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-test</i>
Building community	Primary School	63	34.03	8.94	-0.03
	Secondary School	38	34.08	7.47	
Establishing inclusive values	Primary School	65	18.82	6.01	0.25
	Secondary School	41	18.54	4.77	
Developing the school for all	Primary School	65	15.52	7.13	-0.98
	Secondary School	42	16.86	6.48	
Organising support for diversity	Primary School	62	33.47	9.84	-0.66
	Secondary School	39	34.72	8.26	
Orchestrating learning	Primary School	64	43.81	13.13	-1.24
	Secondary School	36	46.89	9.49	
Mobilising resources	Primary School	65	27.32	8.57	-0.00
	Secondary School	40	27.33	6.58	

Note: $p < 0,05^*$; $p < 0,01^{**}$; $p < 0,001^{***}$

The analysis of the correlation between all determinants of school culture has identified a statistically significant positive correlation between building community and establishing inclusive values $r(106) = 0.83$, $p < 0.001$; developing the school for all $r(101) = 0.80$, $p < 0.001$; organizing support for diversity $r(98) = 0.77$, $p < 0.001$; orchestrating learning $r(95) = 0.79$, $p < 0.001$ and mobilising resources $r(102) = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$. In other words, increased efforts in building a community contribute to the increase of the mentioned determinants of inclusiveness of the social culture of the school and vice versa. The strongest correlation and causality is significant between organizing support for diversity and orchestrating learning $r(97) = 0.86$, $p < 0.001$, where increased support for diversity results in the increase of the orchestration of learning and

the barriers to learning and participation of all students are reduced. On the other hand, the mobilisation of the available resources of inclusive culture of the school should show an even greater recognition and, therefore, prognostic correlation to all the developmental processes included in the research. Namely, some resources are unknown, unavailable and/or neglected and they constitute an important link to the mission and vision of the school, its values and beliefs, patterns of behaviour, willingness to change and continuous development based on sustainable and democratic foundations.

The t-test for independent samples has not established a statistically significant difference in the determinants of school inclusiveness with respect to primary or secondary school ($p > 0.05$). Although the primary school results for all the examined variables have a more positive trend, the biggest difference has been observed in orchestrating learning, i.e. removal of barriers to learning and participation and developing the school for all. In this respect, primary and particularly secondary schools need to invest significantly more efforts in the development and recognisability of inclusive cultures, policies and practices in their environment.

The Index for Inclusion of the social culture of the school is related to the producing of inclusive policies aimed at developing the school for all and organizing support for diversity, where primary and secondary schools differ from each other. Although these differences are not statistically significant, orchestrated learning itself is again in favour of more positive assessments in primary schools.

The aforementioned determinants of the inclusive culture of the schools lead to the development of a safe community that embraces, cooperates and respects, develops common inclusive values that direct the decision-making on school policies and classroom practices, so that school development becomes a continuous process involving the parents and the community, all the available resources. It is also a lesson to the practitioners in the development of social, inclusive and pedagogical identity of the school.

Table 7. Differences in the results for the school inclusiveness dimensions with respect to the type of school

<i>Dimensions of inclusiveness of the school</i>	<i>Type of school</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>
Creating inclusive cultures	Primary School	63	52.80	14.33	0.04
	Secondary School	38	52.71	11.68	
Producing inclusive policies	Primary School	62	48.76	15.77	-1.02
	Secondary School	39	51.89	14.02	
Evolving inclusive practices	Primary School	64	71.23	20.91	-0.91
	Secondary School	35	74.83	14.41	

Note: $p < 0.05^*$; $p < 0.01^{**}$; $p < 0.001^{***}$

The t-test for independent samples has not established a statistically significant difference in the dimensions of the schools' inclusiveness, i.e. creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies and evolving inclusive practices in primary and secondary schools ($p > 0.05$). Each school has its own unique culture and the Index for Inclusion

differs from school to school, therefore, in the following analysis, only the examined determinants of this developmental process will be interpreted and summarized in the listed dimensions which are mostly or insufficiently recognizable in the schools.

Creating inclusive cultures is recognizable in the openness of the school to all students, parents and community partners. The school strives to show co-operation and support, friendship and tolerance as well as appreciation of all kinds of diversity to allow all students to develop their potentials and their sense of a maximum success. The teachers and school staff, together with their partners, try to abandon the term “students with special needs” or “disadvantaged students”. They increasingly use the term “obstacles to learning and participation”. Building a school community that provides support and cooperation is considered equally important as achieving academic success. Everyone in the school assumes responsibility for creating a more inclusive school, sharing the philosophy of inclusion. The students are equally respected and it is considered that everyone can succeed and face barriers in learning and participation.

Producing inclusive policies is reflected in the reduction of all forms of discrimination and new students are offered help to adapt and all steps are taken to introduce students to the school before enrolling in it. The inclusion of all students from the local community in the school is publicly promoted as a school policy, students with special needs are not refused and they are not referred to better equipped schools with better qualified staff (defectologist, psychologist). The school building and the space are arranged so that they are accessible to everyone. The school takes care to support all aspects of diversity. All forms of support are coordinated, and teachers and staff of the school are involved in continuing education and training – learning how to respond to the diversity among students and barriers to learning and participation. Policies geared to specific educational needs are aimed at promoting learning and participation, reducing exclusion and categorization. The school seeks to strengthen the sense of own values and uniqueness among students, reduce all kinds of poor adaptation and school failure, all kinds of exclusion and neglect (unjustified absences, skipping classes and written exams), and violent behaviour and punishment (reprimand, strict reprimand, resettlement to another school).

Promoting inclusive practices is mostly related to teaching, which is most frequently planned so that all students can learn the same topic and not have the students with developmental difficulties work on completely different contents and activities. Teaching is socially and culturally sensitive, recognizes the differences in origin, culture, ethical affiliation, gender, religious denomination ... Children with difficulties are included in pair work, group work and discussions, and they take responsibility for their own learning. All students receive feedback on what they have learned and what they can do to improve the learning outcomes, and classroom discipline is based on mutual respect and approach that leads to self-correction and self-reliance. Partnership teaching and the integration of teaching subjects are increasingly used and the teaching assistants are a great support to the students. Furthermore, teachers help each other, take care of student workload and provide adequate schoolwork. All students participate in extracurricular activities and the overall life and work of the school. The differences among students are used as a resource for teaching and learning. The expertise of the school staff is fully utilized, developed and upgraded. If needed, different external experts and professional associates are contacted within the community. Teaching and other school staff develop

resources to support the learning and participation of all students. The school library is available to everyone and provides the opportunity for students to learn at the school. New technologies are also included in the everyday life of the school, the students/parents have the ability to send electronic mail or have insight into the grades, etc. Resources in the community are known and used for the school development and the material resources are distributed so as to support inclusion. All other resources and all forms of support are directed towards the prevention of obstacles in learning and participation and the reduction of the use of different terms for categorisation of students.

The above-mentioned dimensions and the determinants of the inclusive culture of the school need to be systematically developed. It is a dynamic process and a networked relationship that are causally interconnected. This causal link means that the value of a dimension or a determinant predicts the value of another determinant or dimension with a certain probability. It is their predictive and prognostic orientation that would certainly be interesting to investigate further.

4 Conclusion

The results of the Index for Inclusion of social culture of the schools has shown that inclusive education is slightly more prominent in primary than in secondary schools, although the differences in the results are not statistically significant. The weakest dimensions of this process are the producing of inclusive policies and the evolving of inclusive practices aimed at developing the school for all and organizing support for diversity. Insufficiently recognizable inclusive practices are mostly reflected in the orchestrating of learning and mobilising resources. All this implies the adoption of a clearer strategy for change, identifiable support for inclusive principles integrated in the national framework curriculum, the mission and vision of the development of each school and its ability to respond to the diversity among students. The concepts of an inclusive education or the movement known throughout the world as 'Education for All' aims to improve the situation in schools and eliminate barriers in the environment. The examining of the schools' Index for Inclusion is in line with this practice, where support, inclusion and participation present recognizable determinants of development. Another important thing is the full utilization of human resources and the mobilisation of all available resources, employability, lifelong learning and development of children and youth. The Index for Inclusion has become an important measure of everything in society, politics and economy and therefore poses a challenge to the school, education, its educational and social identity. The strengthening of inclusive education reduces exclusion and all forms of support along the way are interwoven in inclusive cultures, practices and policies. The building of a school community which provides support and cooperation is considered as important as achieving academic success. Therefore, everyone in the school, the parents and the community, must take responsibility for creating more inclusive schools, share the philosophy of inclusion and support each other. An important determinant along this pathway is equal respect for all children, their needs, interests and abilities as well as the understanding that everyone can succeed, face barriers to learning and participation, and employment later on.

Dr. Vesna Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, dr. Sanja Španja

Indeks inkluzivnosti socialne kulture šole

Pri razumevanju šole kot vzgojno-izobraževalne ustanove se je v največjem številu primerov pisalo o njenih organizacijskih in institucionalnih problemih (Sušanj, 2005), zaradi česar se je teorije šole v preteklosti najpogosteje tolmačilo kot teorije šolske organizacije (Jurić, 1999). Današnje šolske teorije si prizadevajo šolo zajeti v celoti, z globljim razumevanjem njenega pedagoškega, socialnega, kulturnega in inkluzivnega bistva (Previšić, 2010), prežetega z močno dinamiko in pogostimi spremembami, potrebami po prilagajanju in zavračanju preprek pri učenju in sodelovanju. To se uresničuje na različnih izvedbenih področjih, kar je odvisno od obstoječih potreb in vizije razvoja šole znotraj vključujoče, inovativne, razumne in demokratske družbe, družbe znanja. Navedene smernice sodobna šola razume kot izzive (Pivac, 2009), kako na najboljši način odgovoriti na potrebe vseh učencev oziroma dijakov po izobraževanju, učenju in aktivnem sodelovanju ne glede na nacionalno, versko, kulturno, starostno, spolno, jezikovno, socialno ali katero drugo identiteto raznolikosti. Ena izmed teh smernic je tudi kultura šole. Njena deskriptivna definicija izpostavlja naštevanje delov kulture, zgodovinsko zajema elemente kolektivne dediščine ali tradicijo, normativno se naslanja na norme ali pravila obnašanja. Psihološke definicije kulture poudarjajo sposobnost prilagajanja, učenja ali navajanja, medtem ko strukturne svoja izhodišča povezujejo z organizacijsko kulturo, genetske pa poudarjajo pomen kulture kot izdelka, ideje ali kot simbola.

Gledajoč z vidika socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole, so se kot pomembne pokazale njene eksplicitne in implicitne dimenzije, tiste vidne in nevidne, dostopne in skrite, ki nudijo širši okvir razumevanja socialne kulture šole in šolskih odnosov. Bruner (2000) kulturo, um in izobraževanje pojasnjuje s pomočjo devetih postavk psiho-kulturnega pristopa k izobraževanju. Poudarja postavke perspektivnosti, omejevanja, konstruktivizma, interakcije, eksternalizacije, instrumentalizma, inštitucionalnosti, identitete in samospoštovanja ter narativnosti. Skupek navedenih postavk kaže, da sta vzgoja in izobraževanje kompleksna procesa s težnjo po vključevanju kulture v potrebe svojih učencev in potrebe njihovega načina učenja oziroma da mora izobraževalni sistem pomagati tistim, ki odraščajo v neki kulturi, da znotraj te kulture najdejo svojo identiteto (Bruner, 2000: str. 54).

Socialna kultura šole in poučevanja promovira tiste vrednote in vrline, ki lahko mladim pomagajo pri aktivnem razmišljanju ter doseganju varne in uspešne prihodnosti v družbi enakih možnosti, socialne solidarnosti in družbeno vrednotenje kreativnosti ter inovativnosti. Spodbuja aktivno sodelovanje pri reševanju družbenih ter lastnih in generacijskih problemov skozi vključevanje v procese odločanja na vseh ravneh. Doseči samomotiviranost in vzgojiti učenca oziroma dijaka, ki bi se rad in se želi učiti ter ima pozitiven odnos do učenja, upornega in neodvisnega, ki ima rad izzive, optimističnega in radovednega, je nemogoče brez podpore in bogatenja poučevanja. Tradicionalna šola ne daje dovolj prostora in ne podpira v zadostni meri razvoja vrtilin, značilnih za učence oziroma dijake, ki se radi učijo. Še vedno je učenje zreducirano na pomnjenje

informacij, učenje za test in oceno ter hitro pozabljanje že naučenega (Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2014).

V sodobni šoli in pouku se "socialno" razume kot metoda v razvoju kritičnega razmišljanja, reševanja problemov ter učenja iz izkušenj in življenjskega okolja, kar govori o kompleksnosti vlog in odnosov v vzgojno-izobraževalnem procesu ter njihovi dinamični strukturi. Razmišljanja o socialnem svetu spreminjajo tudi nove tehnologije. Uporaba multimedijskih pripomočkov v izobraževanju zahteva preoblikovanje in posodabljanje šolskega kurikulumu: od zaporednega proti kumulativnemu, od formalnega proti intencionalnemu in od verbalnega proti večmodalnemu. Opušča se monodisciplinarni pristop k poučevanju in učenju, teži se k interdisciplinarnemu in transdisciplinarnemu oziroma IKT kurikulumu, ki je zasnovan na medijih kot socialno-kulturnih sredstvih vzgoje in izobraževanja. Prav tako se konstruktivističen pristop k učenju in poučevanju ponuja kot dobra filozofska, psihološka in pedagoška perspektiva v določenem socio-kulturnem kontekstu, kjer učenje zahteva samoregulacijo in izgradnjo konceptualne in uporabne strukture znanja, smiselno konstrukcijo sveta, v kateri so prisotne različne perspektive in možnosti osebnega, družbenega in poklicnega razvoja, konkurenčnosti in zaposljivosti (Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, 2016). Nadalje je spodbujanje razvoja socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole razumljeno kot pot proti šolski skupnosti, ki sprejema in sodeluje, v kateri se vsak lahko udejanji. To je šola, v kateri vsi učenci oziroma dijaki, učitelji, starši in skupnost lahko zadovoljijo svoje potrebe, pomemben je kriterij kakovosti, izvrstnosti in prepoznavnosti njene kulture in odnosov, ki v njej vladajo. Spodbujanje razvoja socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole se ne odraža samo v priznavanju in spoštovanju, temveč tudi v osebnih in družbenih močeh posameznika, ki se na ta način negujejo in razvijajo. Hkrati se izkazujejo kot močni in kompetentni, konstruktivni in spodbudni, brez ogrožanja drugih, neprimernih primerjav, kategoriziranja in izločanja. Različne oblike podpore in sredstev bi morale biti bolj koordinirane (uskajane), strokovnost šolskega osebja pa bi se morala bolj razvijati in nadgrajevati v iskanju odgovorov na vprašanje "Kako odgovoriti na različnosti med učenci oziroma dijaki?". Indeks inkluzivnosti se prepozna kot pomembno kulturno, politično in gospodarsko vprašanje, vitkano v socialno, inkluzivno in pedagoško bit šole. Teži k zmanjšanju vsake vrste diskriminacije in odstranjevanju prepek v okrožju za učenje in sodelovanje kakor tudi prihodnje zaposlovanje. Čeprav ima vsaka šola svojo edinstveno kulturo oziroma ne obstajata dve šoli, ki manifestirata svojo socialno in inkluzivno kulturo na enak način, so rezultati tega raziskovanja v poduk praksi pri nadaljnjem raziskovanju, spodbujanju in spremljanju kulture šole.

Cilj tega prispevka je raziskati spodbujanje razvoja socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole in dobiti odgovor na vprašanje, v kolikšni meri se v zajetih osnovnih in srednjih šolah ustvarja in razvija inkluzivna kultura, oblikuje inkluzivna politika in promovira inkluzivna praksa. V ta namen je bil oblikovan instrument za merjenje indeksa inkluzivnosti šole, namenjen šolskim pedagogom iz 65 (7,3%) osnovnih in 45 (6,5%) srednjih šol na državni ravni. Vprašalnik je sestavljen iz 67 celic, razporejenih v 3 skale, ki so povezane z inkluzivno kulturo, politiko in prakso (po Booth, 2008). Dimenzije inkluzivne kulture so bile operacionirane skozi smernice izgradnje skupnosti (13 dejavnikov), vzpostave inkluzivnih vrednot (7 dejavnikov), ustvarjanje skupnosti za vse (7 dejavnikov), organiziranje podpore različnostim (13 dejavnikov), načine organizacije učenja (17 dejavnikov) in mobilizacijo virov (10 dejavnikov).

Glede na cilj so bili določeni naslednji raziskovalni problemi:

- raziskati merske značilnosti vprašalnika, njegovo ustreznost in koeficient zanesljivosti;
- raziskati dimenzije in smernice indeksa inkluzivnosti šole in njihovo razmerje;
- primerjati dobljene rezultate glede na vrsto šole in ugotoviti, koliko se v zajetih osnovnih in srednjih šolah ustvarja in razvija inkluzivna kultura, oblikuje inkluzivna politika in spodbuja inkluzivna praksa.

Navedene dimenzije in smernice inkluzivne kulture šole je treba sistemsko razvijati. Gre za dinamičen proces in omrežen odnos, ki sta kavzalno povezana. Pri tem vzročno-posledična povezanost pomeni, da vrednost ene dimenzije ali smernice z določeno verjetnostjo predvideva vrednost druge smernice ali dimenzije. Gre za njihovo predikativno in napovedno usmerjenost, kar bi bilo vsekakor zanimivo za nadaljnje raziskovanje.

Rezultati indeksa inkluzivnosti socialne kulture šole so pokazali, da se inkluzivna vzgoja in izobraževanje v glavnem izvajata, sicer nekoliko več v osnovnih kot v srednjih šolah, čeprav razlike v rezultatih niso statistično pomembne. Najslabše dimenzije tega procesa so oblikovanje inkluzivne politike in spodbujanje inkluzivne prakse, usmerjene k ustvarjanju šole za vse in organizaciji podpore različnostim. Nezadostno prepoznavna inkluzivna praksa se najbolj odraža pri organizaciji učenja in mobilizaciji sredstev. Vse to pomeni sprejemanje jasnejše strategije za spremembe, prepoznavne podpore inkluzivnim načelom, združenim v nacionalnem okvirnem kurikulumu, misiji in viziji razvoja vsake šole in njeni sposobnosti podati odgovor na različnosti med učenci oziroma dijaki. Koncepti inkluzivne vzgoje in izobraževanja oziroma gibanje, po celem svetu znano pod nazivom "Izobraževanje za vse", teži k izboljšanju stanja v šolah in odstranjevanju preprek v okolju. Temu sledi tudi raziskovanje indeksa inkluzivnosti šole, kjer so podpora, vključenost in sodelovanje prepoznavne smernice razvoja. Pomembna je tudi popolna izkoriščenost človeških potencialov in mobilizacija vseh razpoložljivih sredstev, možnost zaposlovanja in vseživljenjskega učenja ter razvoja otrok in mladih. Indeks inkluzivnosti postaja pomembna mera vsega v družbi, politiki in gospodarstvu, s tem pa postaja izziv šoli, vzgoji in izobraževanju, njenemu pedagoškemu in socialnemu bistvu. Krepitev inkluzivne vzgoje in izobraževanja namreč zmanjšuje izključenost, vse oblike podpore na tej poti so prepletene z inkluzivno kulturo, prakso in politiko. Izgradnja šolske skupnosti, ki nudi podporo in sodelovanje, je ravno tako pomembna kot doseganje akademskega uspeha. Zato morajo vsi v šoli, starši in skupnost prevzeti odgovornost za ustvarjanje inkluzivnejše šole, medsebojno deliti filozofijo inkluzije in podpirati drug drugega. Pomembna smernica na tej poti je enako upoštevanje vseh otrok, njihovih potreb, interesov in sposobnosti ter spoznanje, da lahko vsi uspejo in se soočijo s preprekami pri učenju in sodelovanju ter kasneje tudi pri zaposlovanju.

Poleg tega se na spodbujanje razvoja socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole gleda kot na pot k šolski skupnosti, ki sprejema in sodeluje, v kateri se vsak lahko udejanji. To je šola, v kateri vsi učenci oziroma dijaki, učitelji, starši in skupnost lahko zadovoljijo svoje potrebe, pri čemer je pomemben kriterij kakovosti, izvrstnosti in prepoznavnosti njene kulture in odnosov, ki v njej vladajo. Spodbujanje razvoja socialne in inkluzivne kulture šole se ne odraža samo v priznavanju in spoštovanju, temveč tudi v osebnih in

družbenih močeh posameznika, ki se na ta način negujejo in razvijajo ter se kažejo močne in kompetentne, konstruktivne in spodbudne, brez ogrožanja drugih, neprimernih primerjav, kategoriziranja in izločanja. Različne oblike podpore in sredstev bi morale biti bolje koordinirane (uskajene), strokovnost šolskega osebja pa bi se morala bolj razvijati in nadgrajevati v iskanju odgovorov na vprašanje “Kako odgovoriti na različnosti med učenci oziroma dijaki?”. Indeks inkluzivnosti se prepoznava kot pomembno kulturno, politično in gospodarsko vprašanje, vtkano v socialno, inkluzivno in pedagoško bit šole. Teži k zmanjšanju vsake vrste diskriminacije in odstranjevanju preprek v okolju za učenje in sodelovanje kakor tudi prihodnje zaposlovanje. Čeprav ima vsaka šola svojo edinstveno kulturo oziroma ne obstajata dve šoli, ki manifestirata svojo socialno in inkluzivno kulturo na enak način, so rezultati tega raziskovanja v poduk praksi pri nadaljnjem raziskovanju, spodbujanju in spremljanju kulture šole. Pričakuje se, da bodo rezultati tega raziskovanja razširili obstoječa spoznanja o kulturi šole, vzgoje in izobraževanja ter prispevali k razsvetljevanju njene socialne in inkluzivne biti na teoretični in praktični ravni.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, A., Marlier, E., Nolan, B. (2004). Indicators and targets for Social Inclusion in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(1), str. 47–75.
2. Ballard, K. (1995). Inclusion, paradigms, power and participation. U Clark, C., Dyson, A. and Millward, A. (Ur.), *Towards Inclusive Schools?* London: David Fulton.
3. Bouillet, D. (2010). Izazovi integriranog odgoja i obrazovanja. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
4. Bouillet, D. (2013). Some Aspects of Collaboration in Inclusive Education – Teacher’s Experiences. *C.E.P.S Journal (Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal)*, 3(2): str. 93–117.
5. Bouillet, D. (2014). Nevidljiva djeca – od prepoznavanja do inkluzije, Zagreb: UNICEF Office in Croatia.
6. Booth, T. (2008). Index inkluzivnosti: promicanje učenja i sudjelovanja u školama. Zenica: Pedagoški zavod.
7. Bratanić, M. (1991). Mikropedagogija: interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
8. Bruner, J. (2000). *Kultura obrazovanja*. Zagreb: Educa.
9. Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, V. (2016). *Socijalna kultura škole i nastave*. Osijek: Grafika
10. Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, V., Kelić, M. (2012). Ocjenjivanje djece s teškoćama u čitanju i pisanju: vrednujemo li znanja ili sposobnosti? *Život i škola*, 28 (2), str. 45–62.
11. Daniels, E.R., Stafford, K. (2003). Kurikulum za inkluziju: razvojno-primjereni program za rad s djecom s posebnim potrebama. Zagreb: Udruga roditelja Korak po korak.
12. Deal, T.E., Peterson, K.D. (1990). *The principal’s role in shaping school culture*. Washington: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
13. Forest, M., Pearpoint, J. (1992). Families, friends, and circles. U J. Nisbet (Ur.), *Natural supports in school, at work, and in the community for people with severe disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, str. 65–86.
14. Gellner, E. (1988). *Plough, book and sword: The structure of human history*. London: Collins Harvill.
15. Greenspan, S., Wieder, S., Simons, R. (2003). *Dijete s posebnim potrebama: poticanje intelektualnog i emocionalnog razvoja*. Lekenik: Ostvarenje.
16. Giangerco, M.F., Edelman, S.W., Broer, S.M., Doyle, M.B. (2001). *Paraprofessional support of students with disabilities: Literature from the past decade*. Council for Exceptional Children, 68(1), str. 45–63.

17. Hargreaves, A. (1999). *Helping Practicioners Explore Their Culture*. U: Prosser, J. *School Culture*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, str. 48–65.
18. Hall, J. (1996). *Integration, inclusion, What Does It All Mean?* U O’Kane C.J., and Goldbart, J. (Ur). *Whose Choice? Contentious Issues for Those Working with People with Learning Difficulties*. London: David Fulton.
19. Haviland, A. W. (2004). *Kulturna antropologija*. Jastrebarsko: Slap.
20. Hayes, A., Gray, M., Edwards, B. (2008.). *Social inclusion: Origins, concepts and key themes*. Barton: Social Inclusion Unit, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
21. Heckman, P.E. (1993). *School Restructuring in Practice: Reckoning with the Culture of School*. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 2 (3), str. 63–71.
22. Heckman, P.E. (1993). *School Restructuring in Practice: Reckoning with the Culture of School*. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 2 (3), str. 63–71.
23. Ivančić, Đ., Stančić, Z. (2013). *Stvaranje inkluzivne kulture škole*. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 49(2), str. 139–157.
24. Igrić, Lj., Wagner Jakab, A., Cvitković, D. (2012). *Samoprocjena i procjena ponašanja učenika s teškoćama u redovnoj osnovnoj školi*. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja* 1 (48), Zagreb, str. 1–10.
25. Jurić, V. (1999). *Razvojni smjer školskih teorija*. U: Mijatović, A. (ur.), *Osnove suvremene pedagogije*. Zagreb: Hrvatski pedagoško-književni zbor, str. 245–290.
26. Livazović, G. (2008). *Primjena računalne tehnologije u odgoju i obrazovanju djece s posebnim potrebama*. *Život i škola* (19). Osijek, str. 79–86.
27. Newstrom, J.W., Davis, K. (1993). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
28. Patterson, J.L., Purkey, S.C., Parker, J.V. (1986). *Productive school systems for a nonrational world*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
29. Petz, B. (1997). *Osnovne statističke metode za nematematičare*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
30. Previšić, V. (2010). *Socijalno i kulturno biće škole*. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 7 (2), str. 165–176.
31. Prosser, J. (ed.) (1999). *School Culture*. London: P.C.P.
32. Rouse, M., Florian, L. (1996). *EffectiveInclusiveschools: a studyintwocountries*. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(1), str. 71–85.
33. Sekulić-Majurec, A. (1997). *Integracija kao pretpostavka uspješnije socijalizacije djece i mladeži s teškoćama u razvoju: očekivanja, postignuća, perspektive*. *Društvena istraživanja*, br. 4-5, Zagreb, str. 537–550.
34. Stolp, S., Smith, S.C. (1994). *School culture and climate the role of the leder*. *OSSC Bulletin*. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council.
35. Strugar, V. (2005). *Kultura, odgoj i škola: suočavanje s izazovima budućnosti*. U: Vrgoč, H. (ur.), *Škola i obilježja hrvatske nacionalnosti: jezik, povijest, kultura, vjera*. Zagreb: HPKZ, str. 41–61.
36. Sušan, Z. (2005). *Organizacijska klima i kultura*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
37. Sebba, J. (1996). *Developing Inclusive Schools*. University of Cambridge Institute of Education, No. 31, str. 3.
38. Stubbs, S. (1998). *What is Inclusive Education? Concept Sheet*. Enabling.
39. Uditsky, B. (1993). *FromIntegration to Inclusion: The Canadian Experience*. U Slee, R. (Ur.) *Is There a Desk With my Name On It: The Politics of Integration*. London: The Falmer Press.
40. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, DESA (2009.). *Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration*.
41. Vujičić, L. (2008). *Kultura odgojno-obrazovne ustanove i kvaliteta promjena odgojno-obrazovne prakse*, *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 5 (1), str. 7–21.
42. Đurek, V. (ur.) (2010). *Uključivanje i podrška u zajednici: zbornik radova*. Savez defektologa Hrvatske. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
43. Žic-Ralić, A., Ljubas, M. (2013). *Prihvaćenost i prijateljstvo djece i mladih s teškoćama u razvoju*. *Društvena istraživanja*, 22 (3), str. 435–453.

*Vesna Buljubašić-Kuzmanović, PhD (1953), associate professor of didactics and school pedagogy at the Department of pedagogy, Faculty of humanities and social sciences, University of Osijek.
Address: Bapska 7, 31000 Osijek, Croatia; Telephone: (+385) 098 184 70 17
E-mail: vbuljubasic@ffos.hr*

*Sanja Španja, PhD (1966), assistant at the Department of pedagogy, Faculty of humanities and social sciences, University of Osijek.
Address: Željeznička 22, 32000 Vukovar, Croatia; Telephone: (+385) 032 424 842
E-mail: sspanja@ffos.hr*