

Basic Principles of an Inclusive Teachers' Education ¹

Georg Feuser

"If therefore, people shall be educated, nothing is of more value than the study of the laws in the course of their development" (Piaget 1986,10)

1. The difficulties are within the details, but begin already with the first word ...

At the beginning I would like to share with you an experience from my last advisory course for teacher students. I believe that the fact of matter concerned there, will draw our attention quickly and precisely to the point of problems, which, shall be subject of my speech here – Teacher Education. However, I shall first draw your attention to the topic of my speech. It deals with "Basic Principles of an Inclusive Teachers' Education".

At a first glance, this topic seems to be totally clear. However, as I began to put my thoughts in order, it soon occurred to me that the name of this topic leaves room for many interpretations, which need to be clarified. This, not only to prevent the various expectations that arise, which in a frame of time, narrowly calculated for a speech, hardly makes sufficient allowance, but mainly for reasons of contents of the statement itself. I would like to name some aspects, which may seem to you as hair splitting, but prove to be substantial for the topic, as we shall see:

1. Unspokenly, we associate with the topic, under the aspect of this meeting, for which we gathered, that it concerns itself with the education of teachers, who consequently shall be teaching in inclusive classrooms. The words of the topic do not say that. They speak of an "inclusive teachers' education". This, again, if we follow the words,
2. could give the impression, that it deals with the ways and means of teachers' education as such, which in itself should be integrated or maybe interdisciplinary. For example, primary and secondary teachers may have joined phases of education, or those, who specialise in languages, study with students whose main interests are in the field of science. It can also mean that regular teachers and special education teachers, jointly, and not in different educational institutions, or within the same institution in different subjects, study fields, different institutional departments are educated. We would associate the latter with these conceptions again, especially because this demand in the integration movement has been emphasised for a long time, which should bring about a wide consensus. But also this interpretation is only a significant association in regards to the subject and no conclusions shall necessarily be drawn from within. Furthermore,
3. fundamental principles are involved. First, we probably think of an educational prescription, which the study has to rely on. It could also mean a sort of teaching plan, an educational curriculum. With the conception of principles it would be totally possible to connect the material and personal requirements as well as the provisions for teacher education, which need to be promised and guaranteed, in order to be able to take place at all. All three aspects are surely basic conditions of teacher education, but not its foundation! Or did it, right away, occur to you, that therefore – if we bring the teacher education in connection with the following professional way of achievement of teaching in inclusive classes – the understanding of "inclusion" could mean, that the training procedures, curricula and the institutional frame of teacher education, that also the organisational frame, and even the study and test arrangements be part of it or should be? Such a conception towards the principles of teacher education would

¹ Speech at the 5th Praktiker-Forum from 19th – 23rd April, 1999 at the State College of Upper Austria, Linz on 23th April, 1999

have a great influence later on the way to their professional work. It would have a strong influence on the whole pedagogical-, educational- and instructional system (EBU) and be able to help in the determination of future development.

Reflecting these subjects, we recognise many relevant aspects in reference to the subject relevant to the matters, who, regarding the subject of inclusion, are in no way incidental nor consisting of the same value. What are "The Principles of an Inclusive Teachers' Education" all about, that should enable teachers in the school system by way of instruction to realise integration? Before we concern ourselves with it in the following step, here the announced report.

At an hour of consultation, a female student teacher sits in front of me. She reports of her just ended instructional lesson as we call the practical phases of the study, which as a rule are integrated in three semester projects. The emphasis of her instructional unit was the subject German, which she took next to special education, as a second subject, for primary grades. Two pupils caught her attention in the classroom, who did not participate on written parts of the instruction. She found out that both of them were not able to write, and this fact was of no consideration of the classroom teacher. If anything, both pupils received discriminatory remarks, but no appropriate lessons or even help in acquiring the skills. This challenged the student teacher in a special way. She designed the didactical part of instruction, for which she was responsible, according to criteria of a challenged diagnostic inner differentiated foundation of learning expectations of the entire class, respectively, she supported these pupils in their effort of writing skills in an appropriate way, at the times when she worked in the classroom, but the classroom teacher was in charge. This brought on her severe arguments, that the effort didn't pay for both of the pupils, since they belonged into special school anyway, since the differentiation are an unfair disadvantage to the other pupils. When the student teacher defended her method of teaching, the mentor turned to the professor in charge of "German", denouncing the student teacher in an evil way and demanded in writing, that no certificate of successful completion of teaching be issued to her.

This short report, actually points out all the problems and questions as we know them today in connection with efforts regarding non-selective and non segregated teaching. I choose this expression deliberately. As legitimate it is that we bring inclusion, with regard to our EBU, in connection with both dimensions, the segregation of pupils from regular instructional procedures, to avoid and to block, and children and pupils, who, already have been segregated, to be placed again in regular educational and instructional classes, there is so little achievement in my opinion, that deserves to be called inclusion. The short preceding case makes that more than clear. To state it differently: Even if the classroom teacher wanted to, she could not place these pupils into special schools anymore, since, alone the legal power is not given and the primary class has no special provision for pupils with learning disabilities. But is this already inclusion?

Looking at the situation of the two pupils more closely, the first one comes from an migratory family, who have been in Germany only a short time. Just the grandparents are somewhat in control of the German language, the parents speak only a broken German and for the pupil himself it was of no relevance until the point of moving to Bremen. The other pupil comes from a very disadvantages social and economical family, in which the mother, with unskilled labour, earns the living for the family, while, the father, since the breakdown of the shipbuilding, has been out of work and gave up on himself. Written language is actually of no communicational consequence in this family. Their cultural value stays, considering the daily distress to be overcome, relative, and there is no time for the children anyway. It is, therefore, obvious, that the learning deficits, which are only recognised by the teacher, do not reveal the cognitive capability of these pupils. If, in the end, they flock together and show disturbing behaviour, the conclusion, cannot be drawn that they lack emotional and social competence, that could, on part of the teacher, draw attention and encouraging words of validity. On the contrary, the pupils are treated with rejection and personal downgrading criticism. This discreditable distance declassifies both pupils towards their classmates. It not only leaves both without appropriate offers and help, to overcome their learning difficulties, it makes them worse and creates constantly new ones, because, she has not only given up on the pupils, but she also, on account of their deficit

hypothesis, leaves them no chance, to be different, than she expects them to be.

The classroom teacher has a student teacher in her class, who is quite competent diagnostically and knowledgeable. She is capable to recognise the biographically integrated and from the individual learning history explainable and understandable reasons of their learning behaviour problems and she can translate it into a suitable didactical differentiated offer, that would allow both of the pupils motivated leaning and to participate in the learning process again. Is this already inclusion? The answer is negative here too. Things that are of no desired consequences to the experienced classroom teacher, for decades involved in practical teaching, should not allow her either, special consideration of the responsibilities of the special educational teacher, nor should she succeed in it. Rivalry, fear about authority in the classroom, the notion of hierarchy of old and young, classroom teacher and "second help" in the classroom, as it is often named, produces in the end a changeable, not acceptable, poisoned climate, which over formal sanctions, as in this case, from the superior part towards the dependant, be brought to a solution. The personal triumphs, in the end, over the knowledgeable – a professional ethics not acceptable perversion of the circumstances.

These supplementary explanations may suffice. They explain that instruction, in which certain students, for example handicapped or not, can no longer be in selective and special education schools, cannot be segregated. This does not have necessarily anything to do with "inclusion" and per se is not an inclusive one. The discussed facts portray a central tendency, as came to know from scientifically accompanied school experimental programs and also as solutions, with especially designed questionnaires in studies portrayed (Eberwein/Michaelis 1993, Kreie 1985, Ortmann 1993, Theis-Scholz/Thümmel 1993).

2. Inclusion is today – more than ever – in the hands of the teachers

If one knows the history of the integration movement, as it is portrayed on part of the parents under the motto: "Live together – learn together" and "Law instead of mercy" and as it was on part of the experts carried out with an effort, to create instructional lessons with handicapped and non-handicapped children being together, who has experienced this from the beginning, would have no difficulty, to agree with my theory, that the development of inclusion and with it, an institutionalised pedagogical and educational system, which aims for equality and of equal value among all learners, lies, more than ever today, in the hands of teachers – and dominantly, the responsibility is to be carried by them. Public discussion has opened many doors, which previously were closed for this kind of thinking and acting, and – to state it in short – it led to more or less satisfying political education and lawful possibilities, to create possible inclusion and also instructional practise in reality. It is valid for the present and probably for the next couple of decades more decisive than ever before, to perform the educational scientific and pedagogical practical translation of the thought of inclusion in our educational system and to accept the rising responsibility which occurs after the first phase of the development of integration for the education and practice of teaching. This marks the beginning of a second phase of the integration movement. It would have, concerning the quality, build upon, a co-operative teaching- and learning process of all instructive participating persons – thus teachers and the student teachers – results to be shown, concerning the cognitive, emotional-experience and social capabilities, which the learning persons develop in such instructions, and make their own, who, today still are against a school for all, consisting social, politic-educational and administrative barriers and blockades to be overcome and to convince the critics of inclusion. This – I will say in short – in the span of the traditional, social classification scheme as most severe multi-handicapped considered pupils up to such, that we consider "potentially gifted". Every minute, that we wait

today, in order to be served, with still better conditions for inclusion, is for its further development, not only lost time, but one in which accomplishment can be lost again. I don't see an alternative for that.

In the same matter, the developing tendencies point to the special meaning, the qualification – and competence profile of the teachers, which, they in such instructions, can fulfil, since the quality, practically, depends on it. This again, makes the question of teacher training across all areas of educational training and in service training much more important, as it has so far, penetrated into the conscience of scientific specialisation of education.

2.1. Central Moments of Teacher Education for Teaching General Education

In relation to teacher education, are from my point of view, the following moments of central importance:

1. The realisation, that inclusion concerns itself with unified instruction in heterogeneous classes, thus in classes whose heterogeneity is not only due because of physical handicaps, different developmental stages and learn-beginnings of pupils, but also because of language, religion, nationality and culture.
2. The fact that man on the one hand is the most complex and therefore the least determinate of all living beings, whose complexity still exponentially rises, when we dignify his interpersonal relations and interweaving in relation to intrapersonal reconstruction of his world: man-relations, thus dignify the whole of his perception, his thoughts and actions, and otherwise, the exploration of this complex being as his description, only in the integral community of all human science, can be achieved, may easily portray, that the teacher education is exclusively as inter-disciplinary to be comprehended.
3. Under the aspect of complexity of the subject and the necessary inner-disciplinary of the comprehension, the training of the capability of co-operation, within the qualities of interaction, communication and language, which this conception portrays, across all levels of the individual- and personal development as well as activity fields, in which we deal, deserves a leading role. What I mean is, for example mirrored in the statement of KREIE, in her study of integrative co-operation of 1985, when she writes: "For the success of co-operation, the physical state of development of the teachers is decisive, their internal and external perception, their self-esteem in professional interdependencies." (p. 117) Within those, as our experiences verify, is for an instruction, which is potentially inclusive, again the capability of special meaning at a constructive discussion of the co-operative teachers, concerning the common instructional work, to be recognised, "one identical common subject", to have "identical goals" and to work out an "agreement about the procedure" as to, how these goals in didactical transformation education-contained, methodically, in case required, therapeutically and medially can be reached. In these connections accumulate that in the many single factors devisable and in studies reported problems like a dilemma of a catastrophic deficiency on a professional profile in the activity of teachers – in the regular- as well as in the special school – this, as well in the sense of individual activity, as in a co-operative team.
4. Teacher training and in service training has to be appropriately self-interdisciplinary and co-operatively integrative with regards to the teachers in training and needs to be according to pre-experiences, goal expectancies and motivation for the own training, sufficiently individualised. This makes a learning possible only in projects which embrace the wholeness of the selected subject and the elements of the whole, maybe, it is better to say, to let the determining factors become transparent, which bring the observable appearances to light, without particularising the common subject. The main core of teacher training and integrative potential, non-selective or segregating instruction, is surely here. This instruction can, according to all my experiences

– no matter which grade it concerns – only as project instruction, offer the pupils the possibility to "*co-operation on a common subject*" and allow an "*inner differentiation through adequate developmental individualisation*" of the common subject, in order for the learning of every pupil to take place on his own level and according to his development, aim for the next level (Vygotskij 1987). This means for the teacher training as well as for the integrative teaching in the same manner,

(1) to make possible biographical-experience-based needs and motivational talents and provide access to the mater,

(2) to promote individual competence on this basis and

(3) those, step by step, to integrate in society so that they may contribute to a human and democratic solution of the "epochal-typical key problems" (p. 54)

This is always and necessary related, with reference to current accessible perception- and field of action, but in the same way with regarding to a global effect. In training and in instruction it works in an equivalent and corresponding way in "general education as education for all" (p. 56) "in media of the general" according to standards of 'epochal typical structural problems of the entire social structures, mostly, even internationally, respectively, world wide importance, which at the same time, are concerned with every single person' (Klafki 1991, 60).

5. Looking at these points as constitutionally for inclusion, it becomes clear in the end that it cannot concern teacher training for an integrative teaching, but, - as I have been demanding, for almost two decades – it concerns teacher training for a "General Pedagogy", that, in so far

(1) is **basal**, since it is capable to teach children and teams of all developmental levels, all grades of reality control, perception-, mental- and action competence, within the language and culture without teaching social discrimination and it is able to learn with them, a

(2) **child-centred** one, as it takes in account human subject-relativity (in a sense of his biography) and therefore assume the heterogeneity of every human group and a

(3) **general** one, as it does not exclude any human being from acquiring, in the same manner experiences, that are of equal importance to the entire society, as is pointed out in previous conditions.

Thus, teacher training as well as instruction concern themselves with

"permitting", instead of 'withholding',

to **act together instead of dealing with** (things as well as people) and to

"specialise" pedagogical actions instead of 'segregate' children, pupils and teachers.

In teaching and teacher training, such a pedagogical education can do without separation of regular- and special schools and without different forms of schools, as well as divided training for regular and special education teachers. As shown in integration practice, both professional groups lack the necessary qualifications. These essentially refer to the dialectic of developmental-diagnostic and didactical competence and to a co-operation together under the criteria of team-teaching and a transfer of competence free from envy to co-operate constructively. A divided training of regular and special education teachers is actually only an artificial fact of the preceding historical selection of people in handicapped and non-handicapped.

2.2. Central foundation of teacher training for an instruction of a general education

Let's remember the short portrayed account of the teacher student, about her experience in practical teaching, so would probably never have happened, what occurred there, if the classroom teacher had been able to experience a teacher training, maybe, further educational or in-service training herself, which can account for what I portrayed in the previous points. It would have been possible to become a teacher, as well as student satisfying instruction at the same time, which,

last not least, not only could have benefited the teacher student in the development of her personality and for her joined-living and –working be of importance, but also the professional satisfaction of the teachers and the physical wellness of all concerned would have been optimised. Under these points of view – and therewith to get precisely the contents of my lecture –teacher training in general is concerned with the following:

1. In order to name the foundation as such, that on the basis of today's realisation clearly states what inclusion means, will and is, namely is the attempt of realisation of a general pedagogy, in which "everyone is allowed to learn everything", "everyone can learn in his/her way" and "at all times the needed personnel and material help will be available for all", will in the end realise "a school for all". This is the point, not more and not less.

That shows us, that the necessity, to speak of inclusion, is owed to, that we have not developed – apart from first approaches - such a general education in the training sector, and it is by no means possible to practice it to the extent it has been developed. In any case is inclusion and the entire integration movement a sort of artificial fact of selection and segregation, in the way we still carry on, individually as well as collectively as a society; an artificial fact of a culture of continued and itself in every social aspect potentially and specialising separation – even though the whole world, considering the internationalisation and globalisation of our lives, seem to be convinced of inclusion and at present of NATO against the separation and exclusion of human beings, on account of their national, lingual, religious and cultural conviction even wars are conducted.

Thus foundations are here understood and composed as "principles", which rely on a general pedagogy that much, that makes it definable through them. This means, their disrespect would, in the training, result again in shaping non-competent mainstreaming teachers, and in teaching it would, even if we strongly consider it as integrative, mean the matter of sorting out and specialising of students, as it is, excuse me for the strict evaluation, the case for more than 90 %. Especially since we develop a general education on grounds of tradition and special pedagogy, and we need to come up with the strength, to free ourselves from prison of separation so to speak, a special analytical awareness and technical clarification is needed, this means, also an exact definition of the principles of teacher training, so that every step, that we try to get out of segregation, really points in the direction of inclusion and leads towards it. This is practicable – and here I am, to this day, totally convinced and from no one contradicted – at the core only through the didactical foundation of "co-operation on the common subject" and an "internal differentiation through a developmental standard-related individualisation" (of the common subject), as I developed in 1981, that on its behalf cannot and may not be "training subject" of the future teachers, but has to become a "didactical principle" of training.

2. The "orientation" towards such a common education is the first step into training and therewith into the learning of the trainees. An adequate teacher training should therefore be accompanied with a preceding survey of understanding and experienced knowledge, like self estimation concerning common education and the contents of the training but also concerning the motivation and special goals and interests of the students, that means to create a foundation for individualising their learning, whereas obligatory as well as facultative areas are both included as such that overlap, strictly pre-given educational procedures and such, whose construction and continuation corresponding with specific motivations, emphasis- and goal setting can be determined by the students themselves. Both, the "principles" and the "orientation" would be, what we can describe as the principles of the practice of teacher training for general education.

This calls for a modularising of the training curriculum, which, admittedly, could be problematic, because it could lead to an elementarisation of the core of the training, which it

particularises and fractionalises, so that some kind of specialisation results, which in practical instruction again, supports and promotes the selective and segregating school system. On the other hand, at this time, I see only in a curricular and practical modular constructed form of training the possibility to meet the requirements of the fundamental principles of individualisation and internal differentiation of the teach- and learn processes. It should therefore be paid special attention on a modular training pattern to avoid the possibility of counterproductive effects for integration, respectively their occurrence, especially in the beginning stages of such a teacher training, should be held as small as possible.

It became most likely distinct that the realisation of a general pedagogy, which distinguishes itself through comprehensive potency, in a sense portraying the most far-reaching progressive pedagogical intent in the history of education, as it is about an undivided humanising and democratising of the educational training system, therefore, about a consequent subject oriented pedagogy. The construction of an equivalent teacher training should follow consequently the implicit logic of its constructing moments. I would like to outline this in a short way:

1. The foundation of a general pedagogy, this became already clear, is rooted in the basic facts, that human existence is only possible as an exchange process with the world (A)², that is essential and dependent on the dialogue which has arranged the interaction and communication of man with fellow man (A1); this means on the importance of the constitution in the co-operation on the basis of a subjective sense, which is developed through co-operation. Better and nicer than in the statements: "Living according to our sense is created through the dialogue" from RENÉ. SPITZ (1976, 16) and: "Man from you to I" from MARTIN BUBER (1965, 32) can both those moments social psychological hardly be expressed, as they, also, in an indisputable way include our individual as well as social responsibility in the field of pedagogy and education, if we realise that man, subsequently becomes I, whose you we are! Basic rules of teaching and learning, thus of upbringing and education, can only be the basic rules and conditions of human development and human learning (A2). One of mutual dignity of the acceptance of equality in human society carried culture demands a "new school" (A3) which only, as we realise today more than ever before, has to be created on a laborious path, from separation to integration (A4).
2. Training and instruction and therewith teaching and learning will in this sense only be possible, if it analyses the individual developing- and learning condition of every learning person (B), that means predominantly the coherence of perception, thinking, communicating and acting of humans (B1) from his biography as well as the actual life situation and to be able to make a pedagogy corresponding specialised offer (B2). It must provide possibilities for assistance of a self determined life (B3) and practical help must be given, as to how the autonomy of a person in his life surrounding can be supported (B4).
3. Both complexes together are the foundation to create living- and learning fields, in which a general (integrative) pedagogy can be realised (C). This demands the planning and organisation of integrative instruction in form of projects and intentions (C1), the inclusion of experiences from the progressive pedagogical practise (C2), the creation of a climate in which all can freely develop themselves (C3), to effectively promote and support the development of models and learn processes (C4), the work-out of corresponding tasks and activity fields (C5) and the development of parameters of a subject related "assessment" under the aspect of inclusion (C6).
4. In the beginning of the integrative education practice in the kindergartens of the city of Bremen, in the early 80s, I already drew attention, that we should not give in to the idea that

² With the numbers in parenthesis I refer to the curriculum in the appendix, as it was worked out as a curriculum of an inclusive instruction preparation of teacher training in the frame of CDI-project INTEGER

the shortening of common education and common instruction are already inclusion. It is concerned with the realisation of a general pedagogy, causing inclusion, to prepare people, to qualify them and to have test fields to their disposal. Places of integration are all those, where people meet, live together, work, share free time, etc. Therefore, a special meaning has to be given to joined work at school and its surroundings (D). The role understanding and self-concept of the teachers play quite a part in this, which is necessary to thematise (D1), as procedures of association, the co-operation and the communication to learn them at the same time and to develop them suitable to needs (D2). This also within in the sense of team teaching of multi-professional teams on a school for everyone (D3), that are fundamentally be taken into society and be opened to them (D4), if inclusion shall not be atrophied in a self-satisfied pedagogy.

5. In so far are, in a general pedagogy, tied together, for which a qualification is needed, the necessary developments of new social, political and organisational perspectives for inclusion. At this point, I also bring to your attention, an old statement, which I made two decades ago, that inclusion will never be a condition of society, but a process, which is to be renewed steadily. In the process of social changes, inclusion will have to change too. Thus, stable social perspectives will have to be built (E) in the same manner differentiated as well as complex individual attitudes have to be acquired (E1), perspectives of lawful assurance of anti-discrimination and equality be developed (E2) and finally concepts of evaluation of the training in general (inclusive) pedagogy are to be drafted in this pedagogy (E3), that a continued training- and school development (E4) makes possible, in which changes require the stated experiences and cope with them in the course of the entered direction, with the focus towards the principles of the defined goal – that can be corrected if needed.

With those explanations, I hope that I was able to portray how my topic is to be understood in relevance to the subject. I would name it as follows: "Principles and orientations for qualification of teachers for an instruction, according to a general pedagogy". At the same time, I was given the honour to introduce to you, in this lecture, the curricular complex, which we, within the frame of the project INTEGER have worked out, on which, in the development for an EU practise training model for teachers, who should be able to lead an integrative instruction, 25 colleagues from 16 partner universities and 10 European countries work together. The cornerstone for today's – and I believe, the central contents carried out by all commission members of this version was initiated in Vienna at the second meeting in 1998.

3. Originating Places and Perspectives

I mentioned that nearly all scientifically accompanied trial programs in schools and also, separately to the question of co-operation of teachers and other experts, within the integrative instruction, geared studies reflect great conflict potentials. Personal disappointments about unsuccessful co-operation of regular and special education teachers and their own well-being in connection with joined tasks, are often placed much above the connected professional concerns. The exchangeable reciprocal behaviours, mainly those concerning special education teachers in inclusive classes, are distorted and overdone, as special education teachers, after a long time, to them isolated instructions, hardly have a learning interest left, the ambition and agility of non handicapped children cannot competently interactive and didactically be answered. The powerlessness of the questions, which developmental disturbed children, pedagogically and therapeutically raise, is enormous, whereas it is relative, if it concerns not handicapped labelled, but psycho-social in their personal development, self recognition and identity severely damaged or, for example, if it is about children and youth with severe developmental- and perceptive disturbances with stereotypes of self inflicting or aggressive-destructive actions. Nevertheless,

the always occurring expelling is, especially of those children from inclusion, which is indivisible from its principle, almost completely due to this professional incompetence and hardly due to the ignorance of administration and the unwillingness of politicians.

A silent sneaking psychiatrisation and hospitalisation of such children and youth has long ago developed under the eyes of integration; which at a time, where more than ever, talks about unhospitalising can be heard. Without a successful integration, unhospitalisation stays a hollow wording, indeed a legitimate demand, but without effect, as well as the debate about quality assurance in those fields, which I can overlook, still has not lead to improvement of the concerned, but it has lead to security of save-political goals. Also the movement of empowerment in the sense of authorisation, self-authority of handicapped to free them from being under legal control, dependency, helplessness and outside decision-making, which can come about from those only who continuously make them dependent and hold them under legal control, becomes thus cynical. Such processes have their definite starting point in our alternation, in our change of thought and in the change of the circumstances that regulate the life of handicapped people.

In relation to these, that the problems, of which I only pointed out a few, already became apparent with the beginning of integrative practice, the consequences which were drawn from the education, -in service training and continued studies of teachers may be estimated as little. The education, -in service training and continued studies of the mentor teachers in matters of general pedagogy is surely important in the same manner as the training of the teachers. Maybe I can make you aware, with my expression which already made history, that inclusion starts in our heads, where the problems are to be searched for and solved. We educators were also socialised in an achievement driven society, which leans on selection, segregation, and we became in it, with origin and sight of a selective and segregating EBU, pedagogical experts. Maybe, therefore the intention, to establish a teacher training, appropriately to a system of integration, is such a slow, hardly noticeable process – probably also, because, people with handicaps are rare cases among educators.

the suggestions, which are portrayed in pertaining expert literature, may partially be understood as steps on the way to an educational reform. Concerning the contents, they are mainly left to the fact of a segregating school system and to the deficit model at a consideration of handicaps and leave much to be desired. In the context of corresponding realisation theories and of general education, we realise in the integrative work connection, which appears as "pathological" active structure of a person, that led to singling out and against whom there was always an anti-therapeutically attitude, as a development-logical product, as one under the circumstances given requirements its biography optimally worked out adaptation-theory and action-competency. Leading from that, the concern is to develop new activity structures and to strive towards improvement of a reality control, this means enlargement and stabilisation of the autonomy and identity of the concerned person, to work towards the nearest, to him, reachable developmental level. This, and not the fixation of syndrom groups of handicaps or even population specific 'kinds of pedagogy', for example, mentally retarded-, learn-deficient- or behaviour disturbed pedagogy, just to name a few, must be considered in a future teacher training program, as the same manner, such a fixation of Middle – Real – or Gymnasium school student on the regular pedagogical side, cannot have a perspective for a general pedagogy. In so far, the separate and separating training system is to be overcome to the same extent, as the segregating school system. Which development, here, will precede the other, is not predictable today.

Supplement: We don't know in Bremen the "special education teacher" according to the traditional view. The education for a "teacher at public schools" is founded on principles that the teacher students choose a point of interest on each study level, for example at the primary level, stressing the – not selected – level (Sek. I) and study two subjects, of which one may be special education; in addition the main aim is also educational- and social science (EGW). The study itself is, after a one semester introduction into the chosen field and into university work

(integrative beginning phase of teacher education – IEL), divided into a basic- and main study and is done in projects, usually at a duration of three semesters, in which also the instructional practice and for example the working out of a diagnostic evaluation, or the therapeutic practice are located. Within the handicapped pedagogy are again the fields of socialisation, pedagogic-diagnostic, pedagogic-didactic and therapy-obligatory fields. On principal, it concerns the basic questions and demands of human development and human learning among the manifold questions, which are interdisciplinary rooted and from them originating, also to be dealt with, what seems to be "pathology". Focus points in a sense of the traditional 'handicapped pedagogy' are marginal and generally do not show up until the oral final exams. With this short outline of our educational training practice, which always includes the pedagogy of a school level of a regular school and a suitable teaching subject, we are very close to what in many reports, under the aspects of inclusion for a suitable teacher education, to be striven at, is demanded. I, personally, was already called to the University of Bremen in 1978, with the job description "Didactics and Inclusion of mentally retarded". What the female student, of whom I reported, was able to realise in the regular class for the pupils, even in spite of the reported resistance, has surely something to do with this training program.

The realisation of a general pedagogy is in the educational section more, than we want to admit, looking at society on the whole, for a self integrating earth population, without which there hardly will be any survival on this planet, without alternative. It is, on the basis of our constitution a human right, so to speak, in the first plane, an ethical and cultural obligation.

The realisation of inclusion demands of us an educational qualification, as a teacher to understand oneself as an explorer, and to acquire competence in order to be able to perform controlled accordingly. The uniqueness of interaction processes and human actions, often in equally identical manner unrepeatabe fields of events, is one in pedagogy not replaceable and important source of realisation, which is to be securely integrated, and in a passing-on hermeneutic process to be recognised, to be discussed and to be integrated in one's own actions. This requires mainly - I allow myself to say it simply and directly – that teachers learn to read again. The cultural treasures, which the documented experience of inclusion has brought about already, would it be recognised, discussed, reflected, in the face of further experiments tested and farther developed, a quality of a general pedagogy in theory and practice could be possible, which lies far from what we dare to dream, without need of a change of law or a Euro more. The ignorance of all of us for our own work needs to end!

... my speech also ...! I will summarise in short reflections, what I would name as the central basic qualification of a pedagogic-therapeutic action competence, based on grounds of our research results in the frame of general pedagogy, whose every teacher requires and in reference to a traditional manner binding on definite training tied to teacher groupings doesn't make sense. These are reduced to a few elements:

1. Theory-followed actions
 - Basic aversion of human and educational sciences
 - Interdisciplinary orientation
 - Solid knowledge of special fields
2. Diagnostic competence
 - Developmental-diagnostic and
 - Remedial-diagnostic orientation
 - as reconstruction of life- developmental- and learn history in a sense of biographical reconstruction
 - + Determination of the "actual zone of development"
 - + Determination of the "following zone of development"
 - + Determination of the blocked developmental level and the
 - + Points of fixation on which, under stress towards stabilisation a regression follows.
3. Didactical competence to
 - Structural-activity-analysis in the sense of biographical re-historisation
 - + Curricular-didactic orientation

- Theme-structural analysis in the sense of project planning
- + Structuring of goals and contents
- + Structuring of learning fields
- + Theme-structural helps

4. Research competence

Observing (making notes, assuring) è Analysing è (classifying, systemising) è synthesising (building of hypothesis/building of theory) è planning è enforcement è (accompanied) observation (making notes, assuring) è analysing è synthesising è (revised) planning è è è General pedagogy in the sense of what we connect with inclusion, has essentially to do with bringing up and educating. This is probably the most fundamental basis, which we, as teachers, and under the aspect of instruction, have to consider in a total new light. Let's agree, in face of socially, again accepted fundamental violation of human dignity through bio-ethic, 'life-value debate' and "new euthanasia" with ADORNO (1971), that the "demand, that Auschwitz shall never be again, is the highest priority in education (p. 88), then it can in education and training only concern the need of man towards man and on this foundation concerning the structure of activity of man with the goal of greatest reality control and education for the entire perception-, think- and action competence of man in the sense of his active self-organisation, condensed in his biography – in that case, the realisation of a general pedagogy will have a chance and therefore inclusion will have a future. Maybe, a spark of hope can be nourished, that the results of the international INTEGER-working group, and their efforts finally realise a visible becoming education reform.

<p>☞ <i>all may study everything</i> ☞ <i>each in his/her way</i> ☞ <i>all of them get the personal and means of material helps required for this</i> (G.Feuser)</p>	<p>PRINCIPLES in INCLUSIVE EDUCATION</p>				<p>Basic Didactics: »Cooperation on a Shared Topic« »Internal Differentiation by the (development-logical) Individualization«</p>
<p>O R I E N T A T I O N</p>	<p>A: Fundamentals in Inclusive Education Coordination: G. Feuser (Uni Bremen)</p>	<p>A 1: Human being and inclusive society G. Feuser (Uni Bremen) F. Schaffhauser (Uni Budapest)</p>	<p>A 2: The principles of human development and learning G. Feuser (Uni Bremen)</p>	<p>A 3: A “new school“ for a “new civilisation“ M. Molero (Uni Malaga)</p>	<p>A 4: From segregation to inclusion: an overview H. Tiemann (FU Berlin)</p>

<p>B: Analysing the conditions for development and learning of persons Coordination: H. Tiemann (FU Berlin)</p>	<p>B 1: The context of perception, thinking, communication and action P. Rödler (Uni Koblenz) R. Schleiffer (Uni Köln)</p>	<p>B 2: Analysing methods for specific situations H. Tiemann (FU Berlin)</p>	<p>B 3: Supports and independence living J. Schmidt-Hansen J. Borup (Blaagaard Copenhagen)</p>	<p>B 4: Practical aids to support the autonomy of a person in his/her environment F. Schaffhauser M. Réthy (Uni Budapest)</p>
<p>C: Creating Inclusive Education Coordination: G. Binting M. Wilhelm (Päd. Ak. Wien) N. Cuomo (Uni Bologna)</p>	<p>C 1: Planning and organisation of inclusive programs G. Feuser (Uni Bremen) E. Feyerer (Päd. Ak. Linz)</p>	<p>C 2: Progressive education G. Binting H. Eichelberger (Päd. Ak. Wien) C 3: Creating a climate where everybody can develop L. Hayward (College Glasgow)</p>	<p>C 4: Models of supporting learning T. Bonfield (College Limerick) C 5: Designing tasks and activities G. Binting (Päd. Ak. Wien)</p>	<p>C 6: Assessment and Inclusive Education E. Feyerer (Päd. Ak. Linz)</p>
<p>D: Working together in the community (with all partners in school) Coordination: F. Tollmien (Uni Köln)</p>	<p>D 1: Role and self-concept of teachers J.-M. Lehtinen (Uni Oulu)</p>	<p>D 2: Co-operating and Communication strategies W. Dreher (Uni Köln) H. Ten Ham L. Cornelissen (HS Arnhem/Nijm.)</p>	<p>D 3: Co-operation and successful teamteaching F. Tollmien B. Brokamp (Uni Köln)</p>	<p>D 4: Opening the school F. Tollmien (Uni Köln)</p>
<p>E: Societal and organisational perspectives Coordination: L. Hayward (Coll. Glasgow)</p>	<p>E 1: General attitudes towards Inclusive Education L. Hayward (Coll. Glasgow)</p>	<p>E 2: Legal perspectives L. Hayward (Coll. Glasgow)</p>	<p>E 3: Evaluation of Inclusive Education L. Hayward (Coll. Glasgow)</p>	<p>E 4: Inclusive schooldevelopment M. Wilhelm (Päd. Ak. Wien)</p>

Literaturhinweise:

- ADORNO, TH.W.: Erziehung zur Mündigkeit. Frankfurt/Main 1971
- BUBER, M.: Das dialogische Prinzip. Heidelberg 1965
- DAOUD-HARMS, MOUNIRA: Arbeitsgegenstand oder Subjekt unserer Lebensgeschichte - Erfahrungen und Reflexionen zum Verhältnis von Betreuern/Experten und "Behinderten". In: Eberwein, H. (Hrsg.): Handbuch Integrationspädagogik. Weinheim/Basel 1997⁴, 429-434
- EBERWEIN, H.: Zur dialektischen Aufhebung der Sonderpädagogik. In: Eberwein, H. (Hrsg.): Handbuch Integrationspädagogik. Weinheim/Basel 1997⁴, 423-428
- EBERWEIN, H. und MICHAELIS, EVELYN: Welche spezifischen Qualifikationen brauchen "Sonder"-Pädagogen in Integrationsschulen?. In: Z. Heilpäd. 44(1993)6, 395-401
- FEUSER, G.: Gemeinsame Erziehung behinderter und nichtbehinderter Kinder im Kindertagesheim - Ein Zwischenbericht. Bremen: Selbstverlag Diak. Werk e.V. [Slevogtstr. 52, 28209 Bremen] 1987³
- ders.: Gemeinsame Erziehung behinderter und nichtbehinderter Kinder (Integration) als Regelfall?! In: Behindertenpädagogik 24(1985)4, 354-391
- ders.: Unverzichtbare Grundlagen und Formen der gemeinsamen Erziehung und Bildung behinderter und nichtbehinderter Kinder in Kindergarten und Schule. In: Behindertenpädagogik 25(1986)2, 122-138
- ders.: Allgemeine integrative Pädagogik und entwicklungslogische Didaktik. In: Behindertenpädagogik 28(1989)1, 4-48
- ders.: Grundlagen einer integrativen Pädagogik im Kindergarten- und Vorschulalter. In: Behinderte in Familie, Schule und Gesellschaft 13(1990)1, 5-26
- ders.: Integration in der Sekundarstufe. In: Behinderte in Familie, Schule und Gesellschaft 14(1991) 5, 23-39
- ders.: Möglichkeit und Notwendigkeit der Integration autistischer Menschen. In: Behinderte in Familie, Schule und Gesellschaft 15(1992)1, 5-18
- ders.: Grundlagen und Voraussetzungen für integrativen Unterricht in der Schule der 10- bis 15jährigen. In: Hug, R (Hrsg.): Integration in der Schule der 10- bis 14jährigen. Innsbruck: Österreichischer Studienverlag 1994, 125-162
- ders.: Vom Weltbild zum Menschenbild. Aspekte eines neuen Verständnisses von Behinderung und einer Ethik wider die "Neue Euthanasie". In: Merz, H.-P. und Frei, E.X. (Hrsg.): Behinderung - verhandeltes Menschenbild?. Luzern: Edition SZH 1994, 93-174
- ders.: Behinderte Kinder und Jugendliche. - Zwischen Integration und Aussonderung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1995
- ders.: Gemeinsames Lernen am gemeinsamen Gegenstand. Didaktisches Fundamentum einer Allgemeinen (integrativen) Pädagogik. In: Hildeschiedt, Anne u. Schnell, Irmtraud (Hrsg.): Integrationspädagogik. Auf dem Weg zu einer Schule für alle. Weinheim/München 1998, 19-35
- FEUSER, G. u. MEYER, HEIKE: Integrativer Unterricht in der Grundschule - Ein Zwischenbericht. Solms-Oberbiel: Jarick Oberbiel Verlag 1987
- HEYER, P. u. MEYER, R.: Zur Lehrerbildung für die integrationspädagogische Arbeit an Grundschulen. In: Eberwein, H. (Hrsg.): Handbuch Integrationspädagogik. Weinheim/Basel 1997⁴, 417-428
- KLAFKI, W.: Neue Studien zur Bildungstheorie und Didaktik. Weinheim/Basel 1991²
- KREIE, GISELA: Integrative Kooperation. Weinheim/Basel 1985
- ORTMANN, MONIKA: Grundschullehrer und Sonderpädagogen in Prozessen schulischer Integration von Kindern und Jugendlichen mit Behinderungen. In: Z. Heilpäd. 44(1993)6, 383-394
- PIAGET, J.: Das moralische Urteil beim Kinde. München 1986
- SPITZ, R.: Vom Dialog. Stuttgart 1976
- THEIS-SCHOLZ, MARGIT und THÜMMEL, INGE: Handlungsorientierung von Grund- und Sonderschullehrern: Einstellungen zur Integration. In: Z. Heilpäd. 44(1993)6, 375-382
- THEUNISSEN, G.: Enthospitalisierung in Deutschland. In: Bradl, Chr. U. Steinhart, I. (Hrsg.): Mehr Selbstbestimmung durch Enthospitalisierung. Bonn 1996, 67-93
- ders. (Hrsg.): Enthospitalisierung - ein Etikettenschwindel?. Bad Heilbrunn 1998
- VYGOTSKIJ, L.: Ausgewählte Schriften, Band 2. Köln 1987

Anschrift des Verfassers:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. GEORG FEUSER
Universität Bremen,
Fachbereich 12: Erziehungs- und Gesellschaftswissenschaften
Studiengang Behindertenpädagogik
Postfach 330 440
D - 28334 Bremen
Contact: gfeuser@swissonline.ch